AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

PUBLIC PAPERS OF THE PRESIDENTS
OF THE
UNITED STATES

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

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

Foreword

In 1996, our Nation strived to make the American dream a reality for all who would work for it, to continue as the world's strongest force for peace, freedom, and democracy, and to build a stronger country.

In my State of the Union Address, I discussed the age of possibility in which we live and issued seven challenges to the country: strengthen families, improve education, enhance economic security, preserve our natural environment, fight against crime and drugs, maintain our world leadership, and reinvent Government. I said we would meet these challenges by working in partnership with all of our citizens, through State and local governments, in the workplace, in religious, charitable, and civic associations. The era of big government is over, yet we cannot go back to the time when our citizens were left to fend for themselves. We must give all our people the tools to make the most of their own lives.

During the first half of the year, I worked to enable the American people to meet these challenges—by helping those communities that wanted to instill discipline in young people through community curfews, school uniforms, and truancy enforcement; by handing the television remote control back to parents through the v-chip and a television ratings system; and by calling upon the tobacco industry to stop the massive marketing campaigns that appeal to children. In all the actions I took, my paramount goal was to help families meet their responsibilities, and succeed both at home and at work.

During this period, I also worked beyond our borders to advance our Nation's interests in security and prosperity. At a special summit in Moscow, President Yeltsin and I took important steps to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons. With our partners in Japan and South Korea, we strengthened our military alliances and our common efforts to increase economic growth for the future. In the wake of a series of terrorist attacks in the Middle East, I traveled to Egypt for a landmark "Summit of the Peacemakers" that the United States co-hosted, bringing together an unprecedented number of regional leaders who are committed to building peace with security. We also saw, once again, that our global leadership can impose great sacrifice. Americans felt tremendous sorrow after the tragic death of my friend, Commerce Secretary Ron Brown. That loss strengthened our determination to continue his mission so that economic reconstruction goes forward in the Balkans and peace takes hold.

In a series of commencement addresses, I set forth the challenges that I believed our country faced as it approached the new century, culminating in the national goal, announced at Princeton University, of making the 13th and 14th years of education—the first two years of college—as universal as high school is today. To meet that goal, I proposed a Hope Scholarship tax credit to help every American get the education he or she needs.

This was a time when America began to regain its self-confidence, coming together around shared national goals, and realizing that when we work together, we can act—and act effectively—to meet our challenges and protect our values.

William J. Clinton

Preface

This book contains the papers and speeches of the 42d President of the United States that were issued by the Office of the Press Secretary during the period January 1–June 30, 1996. The material has been compiled and published by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Raymond A. Mosley
Director of the Federal Register

John W. Carlin
Archivist of the United States

Contents

Foreword . . . v

Preface . . . vii

Cabinet . . . xi

Public Papers of William J. Clinton,
January 1–June 30, 1996 . . . 1

Appendix A
Digest of Other White House Announcements . . . 1003

Appendix B
Nominations Submitted to the Senate . . . 1019

Appendix C
Checklist of White House Press Releases . . . 1029

Appendix D
Presidential Documents Published in the Federal Register . . . 1043

Subject Index . . . A–1

Name Index . . . B–1

Document Categories List . . . C–1

Cabinet

Secretary of State	Warren M. Christopher
Secretary of the Treasury	Robert E. Rubin
Secretary of Defense	William J. Perry
Attorney General	Janet Reno
Secretary of the Interior	Bruce Babbitt
Secretary of Agriculture	Dan Glickman
Secretary of Commerce	Ronald H. Brown Michael Kantor (effective April 12)
Secretary of Labor	Robert B. Reich
Secretary of Health and Human Services	Donna E. Shalala
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development	Henry G. Cisneros
Secretary of Transportation	Federico Peña
Secretary of Energy	Hazel Rollins O'Leary
Secretary of Education	Richard W. Riley
Secretary of Veterans Affairs	Jesse Brown
United States Representative to the United Nations	Madeleine Korbel Albright
Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency	Carol M. Browner
United States Trade Representative	Michael Kantor Charlene Barshefsky (acting, effective April 12)

Director of the Office of Management and Budget	Alice M. Rivlin
Chief of Staff	Leon E. Panetta
Counselor to the President	Thomas F. McLarty III
Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers	Joseph E. Stiglitz
Director of National Drug Control Policy	Lee Patrick Brown Barry R. McCaffrey (effective March 1)
Administrator of the Small Business Administration	Philip Lader
Director of Central Intelligence	John M. Deutch
Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency	James Lee Witt

Administration of William J. Clinton

1996

Statement on the Death of Admiral Arleigh A. Burke

January 1, 1996

We mourn the passing today of Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy (Retired), whose dedicated and exceptional career is cherished by everyone who knew of his extraordinary courage, legendary reputation, and selfless service.

Last summer, as I prepared for the 50th anniversary of the commemoration of V–J Day and the end of the war in the Pacific, I had the honor and privilege of having dinner with Admiral Burke. I benefited then from his wise counsel, as had previous Presidents before me. Courageous and gallant, he was renowned for his heroism and leadership during the Pacific battles of World War II, from Cape St. George and the Solomon Sea to Leyte Gulf and Okinawa. During his 6-year tenure as Chief of Naval Operations in the pivotal years of the cold war, Admiral Burke's vision ensured a balanced and versatile Navy to help deter world war and respond to whatever crises might come. The U.S. Navy, in naming one of its most powerful class of surface ships after "31-Knot Burke," has ensured that his name will ride the seas as a reminder in the coming century of an indomitable destroyerman and naval leader who stood for freedom and the excellence needed to defend it.

To Admiral Burke's wife of 72 years, Roberta, his family and friends, and to the Navy community, I extend my heartfelt condolences. We will remember him as one of America's finest sailors and most capable military leaders.

NOTE: The related proclamation of January 2 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Loan Guarantees to Israel

December 30, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

Enclosed is an unclassified report on the Loan Guarantees to Israel Program and on economic conditions in Israel, as required by section 226(k) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (Public Law 87–195), and section 1205 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–983).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
December 30, 1995.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 2, 1996.

Exchange With Reporters on the Budget Negotiations

January 2, 1996

Q. Mr. President, is this the meeting at which you're going to start making some compromises on the most contentious issues?

The President. Well, I'm looking forward to it, and I hope we can reach an agreement. I want to compliment the Senate on voting to

reopen the Government today for the next several days while we attempt to finalize this, and I hope the House will follow suit. That's a very good sign, and I'm looking forward to the meeting tonight.

Q. Will the House follow suit, Mr. Speaker?

Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich. Well, our Members will be back by noon tomorrow, and we hope to meet with all of them and brief them on tonight's meeting and whatever happens tomorrow morning and maybe get something done during the day tomorrow. I think if we can both get movement on the balanced budget and get the Government back to work and paid for, that really would be a good step in the right direction.

Q. Will you encourage them to take the Senate bill?

Speaker Gingrich. We're going to have a good meeting tonight, and we'll report to the Members what happened when they get back tomorrow.

NOTE: The exchange began at 6:15 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House, prior to a meeting with congressional leaders. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on the Impact of the Budget Impasse and an Exchange With Reporters

January 3, 1996

The President. Good afternoon. I have just finished meeting with my Cabinet to receive an update on the consequences of the Government shutdown that Congress has imposed on the American people and on the hardworking public employees who are now working without pay and the many who want to work but are not permitted to return to work. Each day this shutdown continues, the consequences grow worse.

Before I get into some of the specific things that came out of the Cabinet meeting, let me remind the American people that this shutdown is not caused by the fact that the congressional leaders and I have not yet reached agreement on a balanced budget plan or on all the appropriations for this year. In fact, it is part of an explicit strategy by Republicans to shut the Government down to get their way on budget and tax issues. This has never been done before. It is not a natural disaster. It is an unnatural disaster born of a cynical political strategy.

It is long past time to reopen the Government. I am pleased that after 2 weeks of this shutdown, the Senate Republicans have voted to reopen the Government, putting the interest of our country ahead of politics. Our budget talks are proceeding seriously and in good faith. I have been impressed by the efforts made on all sides, including those by Senator Dole and by Speaker Gingrich and Leader Armey and Senator Daschle and Mr. Gephardt. We are working together in good faith. This shutdown is not speeding our talks. It is only casting a shadow over them.

Let me report to you some of the specific examples of harm already caused by the shutdown. This week, the Meals on Wheels program for senior citizens will run out of money. Half the Head Start programs in the country will run out of money within the month. The Centers for Disease Control tracking system cannot accurately keep up with the flu outbreak in the Midwest. On an average day, 260 small businesses are being denied $40 million in capital, loans that would create new jobs for Americans. We are not able to enforce our trade laws to protect our workers and our products. We're not able to weatherize homes in this winter to protect the elderly from the cold.

Yesterday, the Environmental Protection Agency shut down toxic waste cleanups at 32 sites across America. Every day, 240 calls to the Drinking Water Contamination Hotline now go unanswered. The EPA's efforts to prevent cryptosporidium from contaminating city water supplies, something that proved a deadly threat in the city of Milwaukee, have been badly delayed. EPA enforcement efforts have completely stopped.

Medicare contractors who serve our elderly are not being paid. Many of them now are dip-

ping into their own pockets to keep health care coming, but they won't be able to do it for long. Ten States have run out of the funding they use to run our unemployment insurance program, and 15 more will soon do so.

Ninety-five percent of all workplace safety activities have been shut down. All sweatshop enforcement has been stopped. And investigations into 3,500 potential cases of pension fraud have ground to a halt. Two weeks ago when a mill burned down in Massachusetts, workers received immediate assistance for child care, transportation, and job training. Last week when 2,000 workers lost their jobs from a Rhode Island factory, the Labor Department could not respond at all.

Medicaid funding that goes to pay for nursing home care, pregnant women, the disabled, and poor children will be exhausted by the end of this month. Every day we are unable to process 2,500 applications for mortgage insurance; that means now a backlog of 20,000 people who are losing their home loans, many of them losing their chance to buy their new homes. Funds to pay for drugs, food, and supplies at veterans hospitals run out today, and 170,000 veterans did not receive their December educational benefits.

At FEMA, an agency that has been universally praised by Republicans and Democrats alike, the emergency food and shelter program for people facing disasters has run out of funds. And according to Director James Lee Witt, some State emergency management agencies have actually had to shut their operations. We can only hope that they will not suffer a disaster while this occurs.

The Secretary of State reports that this shutdown is adversely affecting the national security of the country. We are running the risk of not being able to maintain our diplomacy abroad. And this shutdown, frankly, is injuring the reputation of the United States around the world. People wonder what is going on.

The shutdown has been especially devastating to hundreds of thousands of dedicated public servants who work for the American people through the Federal Government. Some of them have actually had their phones cut off or can no longer pay for child care because they are working without pay or because they are not permitted to work. Some of those are so dedicated to their mission that they've actually tried to go to work and had to be run off.

It's time to stop holding the Federal workers hostage in this process. As the Secretary of State says, this is not how a great country behaves. And as I have said for months and months and every day since this shutdown occurred, this is not how to balance the budget; it is not influencing our talks; we ought to reopen the Government.

Again, let me say I'm convinced both sides want to balance the budget. We have different philosophies about how to do so. Based on the hours and hours we've spent working together, I'm convinced we can do it. But it is wrong, it is deeply wrong to shut the Government down while we negotiate under the illusion that somehow that will affect the decisions that I would make on specific issues. As I said, this is only casting a shadow over our talks. I will continue to do everything I can in good faith to reach an agreement. But it is wrong to shut the Government down.

Again, let me compliment the Senate on abandoning that process and voting to open the Government while we continue to work, and ask the House to follow suit.

Thank you very much.

Q. Mr. President, House leaders——

Q. What about your role in this, Mr. President?

Q. Is there anything you can do to bring the workers, some workers back?

The President. Well, I have worked with our people, obviously, at OMB to explore every conceivable option to bring them back. And I will continue to do that. I have done everything that I have been told I can legally do, and we are exploring some other options. As other options come up, I will do whatever I can. I think this is very wrong.

But they also deserve to be paid. And the American people need to know that those who are not working are not out there idle of their own choice. They want to be here. They want to be working, and we ought to give them a chance to do it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:19 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Message to the Congress on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Libya

January 3, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Libyan emergency is to continue in effect beyond January 7, 1996, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The crisis between the United States and Libya that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 7, 1986, has not been resolved. The Government of Libya has continued its actions and policies in support of terrorism, despite the calls by the United Nations Security Council, in Resolutions 731 (1992), 748 (1992), and 883 (1993) that it demonstrate by concrete actions its renunciation of such terrorism. Such Libyan actions and policies pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and vital foreign policy interests of the United States. For these reasons, the national emergency declared on January 7, 1986, and the measures adopted on January 7 and January 8, 1986, to deal with that emergency, must continue in effect beyond January 7, 1996. I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure to the Government of Libya to reduce its ability to support international terrorism.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 3, 1996.

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

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

January 3, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 19, 1995, I determined and reported to the Congress that Romania is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This action allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Romania and certain other activities without the requirement of an annual waiver.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 3, 1996.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Netherlands-United States Tax Protocol

January 3, 1996

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for Senate advice and consent to ratification, the Protocol between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Respect of the Netherlands Antilles Amending Article VIII of the 1948 Convention with Respect to Taxes on Income and Certain Other Taxes as Applicable to the Netherlands Antilles, signed at Washington on October 10, 1995. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Protocol.

The Protocol amends Article VIII (1) of the Convention to limit the exemption from U.S. taxation of interest on debt instruments to interest paid on instruments issued on or before October 15, 1984, by a U.S. person to a related controlled foreign corporation that was in existence before October 15, 1984.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 3, 1996.

Remarks at the Funeral Service for Admiral Arleigh A. Burke in Annapolis, Maryland

January 4, 1996

Vice Admiral Metcalf, we thank you for your remarks and for your service. Admiral Owens, Admiral Boorda, Admiral Larson, Secretary Dalton, Deputy Secretary White, Senator Lugar, Senator Chafee, Mr. Perot, Mr. Justice White, to the members of the diplomatic corps who are here, representatives of the four services, all those who served with Arleigh Burke, Dr. Ward, and most especially Mrs. Burke.

We gather today to honor the life of one of the Navy's finest sailors and greatest leaders. Every life is a lesson, but his life particularly so, for in 94 years on this Earth, at sea and on land, Arleigh Burke gave nothing less than everything he had for his cherished Navy and his beloved country. Born at the dawn of this century on a hardscrabble farm at the foot of the Colorado Rockies, educated at this great Academy, wed to his wife 72 years ago here in this very chapel, Arleigh Burke stood watch over our freedom for more than four decades.

Late this summer, just before I traveled to Pearl Harbor to commemorate the end of the Second World War, I had the honor of spending an evening with Admiral Burke at the Pentagon. This hero of long nights and long days of the Pacific war gave me his wise counsel—and like so many of my predecessors, I came away far richer for it—in an evening I will never forget.

As a Navy captain in 1943, it was Arleigh Burke who understood the full potential of the Navy's destroyers, its "tin cans." In so doing, he helped turn the tide in freedom's favor—at Empress Augusta Bay, off Cape St. George, and across vast stretches of the South Pacific. During one campaign that spanned 22 separate engagements, Burke and his squadron of Little Beavers, some of whom are here with us today, accomplished astonishingly big feats. They demolished an enemy cruiser, 9 destroyers, a submarine, 9 smaller ships, and downed some 30 aircraft.

Later, while serving under Admiral Marc Mitscher, Arleigh Burke pulled shipmates from the flaming aftermath of kamikaze attacks and helped plan the war's concluding battles at Philippine Sea, Leyte, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa. For that extraordinary heroism and grand vision, he earned the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart.

Like all good sailors, Admiral Burke had the ability to see over the horizon. He taught the

Navy how to fight at night, attacking with torpedoes as well as guns. As Chief of Naval Operations for those unprecedented three terms, he created the most balanced, versatile fleet in history, one that enabled us to preserve the peace and safeguard our freedom throughout all of the hard days of the cold war. He built nuclear submarines so that our Navy would be as strong below the ocean's surface as it was above it. He armed them with Polaris missiles so we could better deter Soviet attacks. He took from blueprint to shipyard the idea of a fleet propelled by the power of the atom.

The Navy all Americans are so proud of, the Navy that stood up to fascism and stared down communism and advances our values and freedom even today, that Navy is Arleigh Burke's Navy.

Today we mourn the passing of a great American. But his spirit is all around us. We see it in the promise of the young midshipmen who will take on the challenge of living up to his magnificent example. We see it in the fine men of the ship that bears Admiral Burke's name and who will soon man the rails on the road to his gravesite. We see it in all the *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers that are protecting peace and helping democracy take root from the Persian Gulf to Haiti, to the former Yugoslavia.

These destroyers, each named for a naval hero, a naval leader such as John Paul Jones, John Berry, and just recently, Winston Churchill, are a special class of ships, the class of *Arleigh Burke*. Admiral Burke was the inspiration for these ships. They were meant to be feared and fast, the very attributes that earned their nickname—their namesake the nickname "31-Knot Burke." And they are both feared and fast. Today, in memory of this destroyerman, I have ordered all the *Burke* class and Little Beaver squadron ships currently underway to steam at 31 knots for 5 minutes beginning at noon.

Arleigh Burke's life spanned what has come to be called the American century, one in which the American people understood our Nation's special place in the world as a force for freedom and hope and peace. As the new century approaches, it is fair to say that no American did more to act upon that responsibility than Arleigh Burke. The freedoms we cherish, the peace we enjoy were sustained by his vision and his labors. Those freedoms and that peace are his greatest legacy. As long as we remain devoted to them, we will stay faithful to him and to the remarkable generation of Americans he helped to lead.

My fellow Americans, the challenges we face today are new. The foes who oppose us have changed. But the values and the interests we must stand for are the same ones Arleigh Burke dedicated his 18-hour days to preserve, the same freedom and peace and democracy and human dignity.

With Arleigh Burke's passing, we change the watch. A new generation takes the helm. May it find guidance and inspiration in the lessons of his long life so well lived. And may it stay true to the course Admiral Burke set of peace through strength, of freedom through sacrifice, of success through tireless devotion to duty.

Mrs. Burke, you were the Admiral's partner throughout his long and rich life. You blessed him greatly with your love, as his powerful quote on the front of our program so clearly says. In turn, he blessed America with his service.

May God now bless Arleigh Burke in the warm embrace of His eternal love. In the timeless words of the sailor, "Fair winds and following seas."

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:42 p.m. in the Chapel at the U.S. Naval Academy. In his remarks, he referred to Vice Adm. Joseph Metcalf III, USN (Ret.); Adm. William A. Owens, USN, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Adm. J.M. Boorda, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; Adm. Charles Larson, USN, Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy; former Presidential candidate Ross Perot; former Supreme Court Justice Byron White; and Roberta Burke, widow of Admiral Burke, and her godson, Dr. Patrick C. Ward.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions

January 4, 1996

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1), and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council.

On December 17, 1995, the Executive Chairman of the U.N. Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM), responsible for dismantling Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs, released his latest report to the Security Council. The report makes clear that Iraq remains far from compliance with its WMD obligations. The regime's promises of new openness and honesty in its relationship with UNSCOM have proven worthless. Not only is Iraq continuing to hide information on its past weapons programs, UNSCOM has discovered that it has continued work on prohibited missile programs up to the present day. This was evidenced by the recent interception by the Jordanian government of a shipment of missile components destined for Iraq. In addition, the Iraqi government only recently turned over other prohibited missile parts.

Further, Iraq continues to drag its feet on its obligations to account for hundreds of Kuwaitis and third country nationals missing since the invasion. Iraq has not returned the millions of dollars worth of Kuwaiti property looted during the occupation. The Iraqi Republican Guards still use a large quantity of stolen Kuwaiti military equipment. Iraq continues to provide safe haven for terrorist groups. Given this Iraqi track record of disrespect for its international obligations, the Security Council maintained the sanctions regime without change at the November 8, 1995, review. The U.N. Security Council has authorized Iraq, pursuant to Resolution 986, to export a limited quantity of oil in order to purchase humanitarian goods. However, the Government of Iraq continues to reject this Resolution.

Saddam Hussein's unwillingness to comply with the norms of international behavior extends to his regime's continuing threat to Iraqi citizens throughout the country. We and our allies continue to enforce the no-fly zones over northern and southern Iraq as part of our efforts to deter Iraq's use of aircraft against its population. Iraq's repression of its southern Shi'a population continues, with policies aimed at destroying the Marsh Arabs' way of life and important environmental resources. Along with international and local relief organizations, we continue to provide humanitarian assistance to the people of northern Iraq. We have facilitated talks between the two major Kurdish groups in an effort to help them resolve their differences and increase stability in northern Iraq.

The human rights situation throughout Iraq remains unchanged. Saddam Hussein shows no signs of complying with U.N. Security Council Resolution 688, which demands that Iraq cease the repression of its own people. The international community and human rights observers joined us in dismissing Saddam's October 15, 1995, referendum to extend his rule as a farce.

In October 1994 the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 949, which demanded that Iraq not utilize its forces to threaten its neighbors or U.N. operations and that it not redeploy or enhance its military capacity in southern Iraq. The defections last August of Saddam Hussein's family members increased the uncertainty of the Iraqi situation. In view of Saddam Hussein's proven record of unreliability, we felt it prudent to improve the deterrence and warfighting capability of U.S. forces within the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility. Among the steps taken to accomplish this end were the movement of prepositioning ships into the Gulf and the deployment of an air expeditionary force to Bahrain.

The Multinational Interception Force (MIF) conducting the maritime enforcement of sanctions against Iraq continues to serve magnificently. Since my last report, the MIF has encountered the busiest sanctions enforcement period since 1991, diverting 20 dhow vessels carrying Iraqi dates worth an estimated $3.45 million. The expeditious acceptance of these vessels by the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, and Kuwait has greatly contributed to the deterrent effect of MIF sanctions enforcement operations and

has also freed enforcement vessels escorting the diverted vessels to return to patrol operations.

We continue to achieve a significant foreign policy objective in ensuring multinational participation in the MIF. Ships from Belgium, New Zealand, Italy, Canada, and the United Kingdom have served with the MIF since September, effectively refuting Iraqi assertions that the MIF is a "U.S.-only operation."

Other countries have made different but important contributions toward enforcing the U.N. sanctions against Iraq. Since MIF operations began, Panama and St. Vincent and the Grenadines have deflagged four vessels, and Honduras has enacted stricter sanctions enforcement measures and has continued to pursue deflagging proceedings against several vessels involved in sanctions violations.

The United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia have assumed responsibility for disposition of the approximately 30,000 metric tons of Iraqi gas and oil cargo seized by the MIF and valued at about $6 million. The United Arab Emirates and Kuwait have sold a portion of this cargo and are expected to turn over the proceeds to the United Nations. Saudi Arabia is preparing to sell a portion of the seized oil as well. The Iraqi dates seized by the MIF are subject to disposal in order to deny any benefit to Iraq.

Security Council Resolution 687 affirmed that Iraq is liable under international law for compensating the victims of its unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. Although the U.N. Compensation Commission (UNCC) has approved some 790,000 individual awards against Iraq, worth about $3.0 billion, it has been able to authorize the payment of only the fixed awards for serious personal injury or death (aggregating approximately $13.5 million). The remainder of the awards cannot be paid because the U.N. Compensation Fund lacks sufficient funding. The awards are supposed to be financed by a deduction from the proceeds of future Iraqi oil sales, once such sales are permitted to resume. However, Iraq's refusal to meet the Security Council's terms for a resumption of oil sales has left the UNCC without adequate financial resources to pay the awards. Iraq's intransigence means that the victims of its aggression remain uncompensated for their losses over 4 years after the end of the Gulf War.

To conclude, Iraq remains a serious threat to regional peace and stability. I remain determined that Iraq comply fully with all its obligations under the U.N. Security Council Resolutions. My Administration will continue to oppose any relaxation of sanctions until Iraq demonstrates peaceful intentions through its overall compliance with the relevant resolutions.

I appreciate the support of the Congress for our efforts and shall continue to keep the Congress informed about this important issue.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Cyprus
January 4, 1996

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

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous submission covered progress through September 30, 1995. The current submission covers the period October 1, 1995, through November 30, 1995.

The focus of my Administration's activity during this reporting period was preparations for the December trip to Cyprus of my Special Emissary, Richard Beattie. Mr. Beattie's travel reflects my interest in intensifying United States Government efforts to achieve progress towards an intercommunal settlement. His ongoing work supports the U.N.-led effort to attain lasting peace on the island. Consultations with the parties confirmed that security has not diminished as a key concern for both sides.

With respect to Cyprus' European Union (EU) accession process, in discussions with European officials and others, my representatives continued to urge that the EU engage both communities regularly to explain what EU membership would mean for a federal Cyprus state. Such dialogue would encourage the parties to use the period before accession negotiations to establish a bizonal, bicommunal federation that could ultimately enter the EU.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

Statement on Signing District of Columbia Continuing Appropriations Legislation

January 4, 1996

Today I have signed into law House Joint Resolution 153, which provides authority for the District of Columbia to continue full operations.

This measure continues the authority provided by the Fourth Continuing Resolution for FY 1996, which I signed December 22, and will enable the District to continue to operate, using District funds, through January 25.

Because H.J. Res. 153 allows the District government to continue to operate without disruption, it is a step in the right direction. Nevertheless, it is only a step. It does not end the partial shutdown of the Federal Government that continues to affect the Departments of Commerce, Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Justice, Labor, State, and Veterans Affairs; the Environmental Protection Agency; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the Small Business Administration; and nearly three dozen smaller agencies.

This shutdown is hurting millions of innocent Americans—such as the 600,000 senior citizens who may not get services under the "Meals on Wheels" program, or the 2,500 moderate- and low-income working families per day who cannot get their Federal Housing Administration (FHA) mortgage loans processed. The longer the shutdown continues, the more Americans across the country will feel its impact.

The shutdown has forced the Administration to furlough 280,000 workers in these departments and agencies. And while the Administration has kept 480,000 others on the job because they perform emergency services, we cannot pay them until the shutdown ends. Thus, by not ending the shutdown, the Congress is disrupting the lives of three-quarters of a million Federal workers, most of whom live paycheck to paycheck and are having severe problems paying their mortgages or rent, buying food, and protecting their families.

I am concerned that this bill contains an objectionable provision that would single out poor women by prohibiting the use of District funds for providing abortion services. I oppose including this provision in the regular fiscal year 1996 District of Columbia Appropriations Bill, and I urge the Congress to send that bill to me—in a form I can sign—as expeditiously as possible.

Once again, I urge the Congress to end this shutdown immediately by sending me an acceptable continuing resolution to fund these departments and agencies, or acceptable fiscal 1996 appropriations bills for them.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 4, 1996.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 153, approved January 4, was assigned Public Law No. 104–90. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 5.

Remarks to Senior Citizens at St. Monica's Episcopal Church
January 5, 1996

Well, let me first thank Father Darko for his comments and for the work being done here at St. Monica's Church. I was hoping he'd say something—I've never seen a preacher pass up a podium. [*Laughter*] And I'm glad he didn't. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank the Friendship House for the leadership shown in being a true friend to our seniors. I want to thank all of you especially for working for this Meals on Wheels program. And I want to thank all of you for making me feel so welcome—me and, of course, the members of our administration: the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Glickman; the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary Shalala; Assistant Secretary Fernando Torres-Gil. And of course, we're joined here by Senator Leahy and by Congress—from Vermont, he came all the way from Vermont. And those that—he brought his wife with him, and she's a nurse. So if I get sick she can help me get out of here. [*Laughter*]

I'm delighted that Mayor Barry joined us, and it's good to see you in good health, Mayor. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton for the brilliant job she's done in sticking up for these programs in the Congress. I want to thank this fine couple that run this program here for the work they have done.

And I want to say a word of thanks especially to the folks who sat at my table and talked to me about this program and about Medicare and about what all is going on. I got a pretty good education. [*Laughter*] And I think most of what they said to me is true. Now—but the lady sitting next to me, she swears that she is 93 years old. [*Laughter*] You know, usually when somebody doesn't tell the truth about their age, they're kind of turning it low. But I'm not sure she didn't exaggerate a little bit. [*Laughter*] She looks awful young to me. And I thank you so much.

I know all of you know this, but all across this great country of ours, there are seniors like you and others who depend upon meals like this that are federally funded. In one year alone, more than 230 million of these meals are served to seniors all across America. And for a lot of seniors, this is the only really good, warm, nutritious meal they get every day. Now, these meals are one of the things that are threatened by the shutdown that was forced by the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

This strategy has been abandoned, I want to say, by the Senate Republicans led by Senator Dole, and was never supported by the Democrats in the Senate and the House. And I want to thank all of them for not supporting that. And I understand that there are others in the House among the Republicans who may want to abandon it or change it.

But unless we do something within days, the regular Federal funds for the senior meals program, including the Meals on Wheels, could dry up. State and local charities all across America are stepping in to help in some cases, but the future of these meals programs could be at risk, and that would literally be a disaster for the lives of a lot of senior citizens in America. And we cannot allow that.

Where I can, as all of you know, I have acted in this crisis to keep services going to the American people. And today I am going to take some action that will keep providing food to these senior centers even if the Congress doesn't correct the problem today. I agree with Father Darko; this is not a politically sensitive program. This is a people program. It shouldn't have anything to do with politics. This has been a program that people in both parties have supported, and it ought to be again.

But in the event that Congress does not fix this problem, I am instructing the Secretary of Agriculture to provide temporary funding to help these centers continue to serve meals. And they have—Secretary Glickman can explain to the press later—they have some money that can be put into this meals program to keep it going for quite some time, to make sure that you don't get caught up in this, and we intend to do it.

We've been able to do some other things like this. We got some money through the low-income heating assistance programs to some of the States that are having such a cold winter, where there are a lot of seniors and some younger people who are living in homes that are poorly heated and without a little extra help

would have a hard time dealing with this cold winter.

But I want to make it clear that even if we can solve this problem for an extended period of time, there are some problems that cannot be solved unless the Government is just opened back up. All the furloughed employees—we have one furloughed Federal employee here—they ought to be brought back to work, and those that are working ought to be paid. The services that they are instructed to provide that we all agree are going to be provided when we get a final budget agreement ought to be provided. This has never been done before in the history of the country, and we shouldn't continue to do it now.

This shutdown is hurting people in every State in America. And as I said before, there are some things that I can do to help, like the heating assistance program or like keeping this Meals on Wheels program going. But some of these things require action by Congress. Now, today they said, as Father Darko said, that they might bring the Federal employees back and they might pay them but not let them do very much. And they might continue some of the so-called politically sensitive programs. I don't want to minimize that. That is a step in the right direction. Better to have this than not; that is a step in the right direction.

But you should also know that there are now 20,000 young people who have applications for home mortgages in to the Federal Government who can't close those mortgages because of this shutdown. And they may lose those homes, their chance to buy a home. There are I think now $40 million—$40 million in small business loans held up, because the Small Business Administration guarantees those loans, that would prevent people from starting their businesses and hiring people. And we need more small businesses being started. We need to create jobs for our people.

There are any number of toxic waste dumps that large numbers of American children live near that ought to be cleaned up. And all the cleanup work has just been stopped in neighborhoods all across America.

Now, this is wrong. It's wrong. And it amounts to cruel and unusual punishment, not only for all the people who need these services but for all the rest of the people in this country who pay the taxes for them. They are not getting what they paid for, and the people are not getting the services that have been authorized.

I want to say again this—this is one of the things that came up at our lunch when one of the folks at the table said, "I thank you for standing firm"—this shutdown does not have anything to do with balancing the budget. I have pledged to the Republicans—I gave my word, and I was raised in an old-fashioned home in an old-fashioned time, maybe, but I still think when you tell somebody you're going to do something, you ought to do everything you can to do it. That's the way I was raised. I gave them my word I would work with them to pass a plan which would bring our Federal budget into balance in 7 years, according to the estimates of the Congress. I gave them my word I would do that; I have been doing that.

The last time there was a crisis like this the Government didn't shut down, but there was a budget crisis about 5 years ago and the President at that time was involved in those negotiations for about a half an hour. I have spent days and days and days working with the leaders of Congress, and I will do it some more. I was ready yesterday. We missed a day yesterday.

But this threat of the shutdown—as much as I hate to see people furloughed, as much as I hate to see people working and not getting paid, as much as I hate to see these young people not getting their homes and these businesses not being funded—we've even got businesses that have jobs that depend on their getting permission from the Government to sell their products overseas, and they can't get permission. They may have to lay people off when they could be hiring people.

I hate to see all that. But that cannot affect a single, solitary decision I make on what kind of a balanced budget plan we're going to have. Because that's this year and now, but if we're going to make plans for 7 years I have to know that if we're going to balance the budget, we are going to protect the Medicare program, the Medicaid program, the education of our children, the environment that we all share, and that we're not going to raise taxes on the hardest pressed working families.

Now, we can balance the budget and protect all that. And that's what I'm trying to do. And I am behaving in these negotiations exactly as I would be behaving if the Government was running and if you didn't have to think about the Meals on Wheels program and if nobody

was being furloughed. But I want you to know, as much as I hate to see these problems, I cannot change a single, solitary decision I would make, because you don't want me to make a bad decision for the long run because of a problem we've got in the short run.

So the time has come to stop playing politics with this. Let's do what our country has always done: Let the Government go on and perform its basic services, and let's get back to work. Every day we miss in these negotiations is a day we're putting off balancing the budget. Let's just go back to work, roll up our sleeves, balance a budget, but do it in a way that protects the fundamental interests of the American people. That's what I'm trying to do.

And I hope by coming here today—and I not only got a very good meal—[*laughter*]—and had a lot of conversations. Lots of days I just eat lunch alone at my desk. I had much more fun today than I normally do. [*Laughter*] But I hope we will send a message across this country that this is a good and worthy program. And if the House of Representatives votes to put it back into funding today, we will applaud them and give them a pat on the back. But we want to go all the way. We shouldn't have any of the essential functions of Government shut down.

You know, those young people ought to be able to get loans to start their businesses. Those folks ought to be able to get permission from the Government to sell our products to foreign countries. We're all buying things from other countries here every day. We ought to be selling our things overseas. And those young families that are having a chance because interest rates are low to move into homes for the first time, they ought to be able to do it. We should not leave this work undone.

So again I say thank you. If you need it, we're going to provide the money to keep the Meals on Wheels program going. And we will be there. But I think what we all want is for our country to stop—stop all this political squabbling in Washington, put all the partisanship aside, and get back to the work of balancing the budget in a way that protects our obligations to our parents and our children and to the future of this country.

We can do this. This is a very great country. This is hardly the biggest problem we ever faced. We can do it, and do it right if we'll do it in the kind of spirit that I have felt in this room today.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:34 p.m. in the Rectory Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. Daniel Darko, pastor, St. Monica's Episcopal Church, and Mayor Marion Barry of Washington, DC.

The President's Radio Address
January 6, 1996

Good morning. Today I want to talk with you about the great debate on the budget. This debate is not just about abstract numbers, and it certainly goes far beyond party politics as usual. It is instead about vital principles and momentous issues for our country. We're addressing profound questions about what kind of country we are and what kind of country we're going to be, about what we owe to each other and what we owe to our children and to America's future. These questions have dominated our politics for quite a long time now. And now it is decision time, time to move beyond arguments and come to conclusions.

For 3 weeks, the Federal Government has been shut down because Republicans in Congress refused to enact legislation to keep it open. This shutdown has had a real and unfortunate impact on the lives of millions of Americans. Now, I'm pleased to report that Congress has acted to bring Government employees back to work and to reopen most services to the public. This sets the stage for constructive, honest, and focused discussions on how to balance the budget while remaining true to our values and true to our future.

America is at a crossroads. One path leads to continual partisan conflict, where nothing is ever really resolved and each decision simply

sets the stage for the next fight. The other path leads to national unity, a unity built on true solutions and real common ground. Down this path lies progress and strength; that has always been the right path for America. So I appeal to the Congress and to Members of both parties to put aside partisanship and work to craft a balanced budget agreement that upholds our values and reflects the common ground the American people have decided upon.

You know, we've been talking about the budget for months. The American people have heard our deeply held views, and we've had time to listen to theirs. I believe there is an overwhelming consensus on a course that is also the right course for America: a balanced budget in 7 years, because it's wrong to leave a legacy of debt to our children; a budget that protects Medicare and Medicaid, because we owe a duty to our parents, to the disabled, and to our poorest children; a balanced budget that protects education and the environment, because we owe a duty to our children and to future generations; and a balanced budget that doesn't single out the hardest pressed working families for higher taxes.

The American people have decided that it is better for people to work than be on welfare, that welfare should be a temporary help, not a way of life, but that the solution should support children and families, not undermine them. Americans have decided they want a smaller Government that is less bureaucratic and more creative, that serves them as well or better with less money, and that there should be a tax cut that promotes educational opportunity and strengthens the ability of families to care for their children.

Now, we can achieve these goals. We can balance the budget while remaining true to these values. This is a great challenge, but not the greatest one we have faced. It is not the financial numbers that are blocking our progress, it is political ideology. It is time now to do what our parents have done before us, to put the national interests above narrow interests.

Later today, I will be meeting for several hours with the Republican and Democratic leaders of the House and the Senate. Over the past 2 weeks, we have had serious, detailed, constructive discussions about all the issues before us: Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, taxes, and spending. I know that if we work together and embrace the possibility for a true national unity, we can reach an agreement to balance the budget that you will be proud of and that will be good for America. And that's what I am determined to do.

This is a moment of great progress and great promise for our country. Many of us hold very strong views about how best to seize that moment. But above all else, now is the time to find common ground, for taking the best that each side has to offer and fashioning a sensible solution. That's the American way. And that is what will get us to the right kind of balanced budget.

This budget debate has been difficult, demanding, and not always pretty. But remember, democracy is raucous and often full of debate that is not always pretty. But our country is still the world's greatest democracy, a beacon of peace and freedom for the world. I ask for the help of every American so that we can build an even greater future for our children.

Thanks for listening.

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

Statement on Signing the Sixth Continuing Resolution

January 6, 1996

Last night, I signed into law H.R. 1643, the Sixth Continuing Resolution for fiscal 1996, which puts all Federal workers back on the job with pay from December 16 until January 26 and also funds a limited number of Federal activities until September 30, 1996.

This bill is a step in the right direction—but only a step. It does not end the partial shutdown of the Federal Government that continues to seriously impair the activities of the Departments of Commerce, Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban De-

velopment, Interior, Justice, Labor, State, and Veterans Affairs; the Environmental Protection Agency; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the Small Business Administration; and many smaller agencies.

Most importantly, H.R. 1643 enables Federal workers to return to the job and to be paid—both the 480,000 who have been working without pay and the 280,000 furloughed workers.

The bill also funds a limited number of Federal functions for the rest of fiscal 1996. They include nutrition services for the elderly; grants to States for child welfare services; Federal Parent Locator Service activities; State unemployment insurance administration activities; general welfare assistance payments and foster care payments to Indians; the Federal subsidy to the rail industry pension and certain other expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board; visitor services of the National Park System, National Wildlife Refuges, National Forests, Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and United States Holocaust Memorial; and State Department visa, passport, and U.S. citizen services. In addition, family support payments to States and payments to States for foster care and adoption assistance are provided through March 15, 1996.

The bill ensures, through September 30, 1996, benefit payments to about 3.3 million veterans and their survivors. It also provides for payments to contractors of the Veterans Health Administration for services related to the health and safety of patients in Veterans Affairs medical facilities.

The measure provides authority for the District of Columbia to continue full operations, using District funds, through September 30, thereby extending the authority provided by the Fifth Continuing Resolution for fiscal 1996, which expires January 25. Regrettably, the measure contains an objectionable provision that would single out poor women by prohibiting the use of District funds for providing abortion services. I oppose including this provision in the regular fiscal 1996 District of Columbia appropriations bill, and I urge the Congress to send that bill to me—in a form I can sign—as soon as possible.

The measure also provides for reimbursement to States for State funds used to implement Federal programs and to pay furloughed State employees whose compensation is advanced or reimbursed, in whole or in part, by the Federal Government during any 1996 lapse in appropriations and it makes interest payable on the State funds that were used.

The problem with this bill is in what it does *not* do. It does not end the inconvenience, if not suffering, that millions of Americans continue to experience because of the partial government shutdown. It does not provide funds to help put 100,000 more police officers on the streets of U.S. cities; funds for Head Start; funds for the States for social services and job training; funds to help U.S. businesses with export financing; and funds to continue the Space Station program and other key initiatives at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Nor does the bill provide needed funds for contracts vital to protecting the environment.

Along with denying services, the shutdown is threatening the vitality of thousands of businesses, many of them with contracts with the Federal Government. Also at risk are the jobs of thousands of workers in those businesses. The longer the shutdown continues, the more its effects will be felt.

Clearly, this bill is only a partial solution to the partial shutdown. The real solution, and the one that the Congress should pursue without delay, is to send me acceptable 1996 appropriations bills for the agencies in question or, at a minimum, an acceptable continuing resolution that will permit the Government to perform the full range of services that citizens expect.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 6, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 1643, approved January 6, was assigned Public Law No. 104–92.

Statement on Signing the Seventh Continuing Resolution
January 6, 1996

Today I have signed into law H.R. 1358, the Seventh Continuing Resolution for fiscal 1996, which provides funds for a long list of Federal activities through September 30.

This continuing resolution builds upon H.R. 1643, which I signed early this morning and which put all Federal workers back on the job with pay from December 16 to January 26 and provided funding for a limited list of Federal activities.

While both measures help to restore needed Government services, the Congress has not ended the partial shutdown of the Federal Government, nor the suffering it is causing millions of Americans and thousands of businesses. The shutdown continues to affect the Departments of Commerce, Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Justice, Labor, State, and Veterans Affairs; the Environmental Protection Agency; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the Small Business Administration; and many smaller agencies.

This bill provides full-year funding for allowances to Peace Corps volunteers, their spouses and minor children; activities, including administrative expenses, needed to process single-family mortgage loans and refinancing for low-income and moderate-income families; projects and activities directly related to the security of U.S. diplomatic posts and facilities abroad; the Federal Emergency Management Agency's emergency food and shelter program; retirement pay and medical benefits for Public Health Service Commissioned Officers, payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan and Survivor Benefit Plan and for the medical care of dependents and retired personnel, and payments to the Social Security trust funds, which the Secretary of Health and Human Services deemed necessary because of Commissioned Officer pay raises; and projects and certain activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration, Organized Crime Drug Enforcement, Federal Prison System, U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshals Service, Support of U.S. Prisoners, Fees and Expenses of Witnesses, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review.

Also funded are projects and activities of the Judiciary; Health Care Financing Administration State surveys and certifications; trade adjustment assistance benefits and North American Free Trade Act benefits; payments to health care trust funds; expenses of Medicare contractors; grants to States for Medicaid; the general business loan guaranty program and section 504 certified development company program; surety bond guarantees revolving fund; visitors services on public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management; disease control, research, and training; Indian self-determination and self-governance projects and activities of tribes or tribal organizations; expenses of the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf; and payments for benefits and interest on advances, and expenses of operation and administration, for black lung disabilities and disabled coal miners.

This measure also extends, from December 31, 1995, to June 30, 1996, the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 1994 and extends the San Carlos Apache Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 1992 from December 31, 1995, to December 31, 1996. The bill also includes fisheries related provisions.

Even with H.R. 1643 and H.R. 1358 in place, however, the Congress has not funded significant activities covered by the six appropriations bills that are not enacted. The Congress has not provided funds to help put 100,000 more police officers on the streets of our communities; funds for the States for social services and job training; funds for Head Start; funds to help U.S. businesses with export financing; funds to help the Environmental Protection Agency enforce environmental laws; and funds to continue the Shuttle program and other key initiatives at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Along with denying services to our citizens, the shutdown is threatening the vitality of thousands of businesses which supply goods and services to the Federal Government under contract. The jobs of thousands of workers in those businesses are at risk. The longer the shutdown

continues, the more that its effects will be felt. Clearly, this is no way to run the Government and deliver services and benefits to millions of Americans, whether they are elderly, children, students, working parents, or businessmen and women.

More than 3 months into fiscal 1996, the Congress has not even sent me three of the six remaining, full-year appropriations bills. I vetoed the other three because they would have been bad for the country. Those bills underfunded essential programs for the environment, for veterans, for law enforcement, for technology, and for Native Americans.

At this point, the Congress should work with me to reach agreement on these six measures. At the very least, the Congress should send me an acceptable continuing resolution that will fully reopen the Government while they work with me to find common ground on the budget.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 6, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 1358, to require the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the National Marine Fisheries Service laboratory located on Emerson Avenue in Gloucester, Massachusetts, approved January 6, was assigned Public Law No. 104–91.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Balanced Budget Legislation
January 6, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby submit to the Congress a plan to achieve a balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002 as certified by the Congressional Budget Office on January 6, 1996. This plan has been prepared by Senator Daschle and if passed in its current form by the Congress, I would sign it into law.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 6, 1996.

Open Letter to Federal Government Employees on the Furlough
January 6, 1996

We want to welcome back those of you who have been furloughed and express our deep appreciation to *all* of you in the federal work force.

Through no fault of your own, you have been forced to carry on in very difficult circumstances—some of you on furlough, and more of you unpaid, all of you doubtless unsettled. Although the continuing resolutions signed today provide neither a satisfactory nor a complete resolution to the current budget dispute, we have succeeded in returning all of you to work with full retroactive pay.

And if there is any positive outcome to the pain and hardship you have undergone for the past three weeks, it is that your fellow Americans have been made painfully aware of the importance of your work.

The inconvenience and pain of this shutdown spread from coast to coast. Veterans benefits were curtailed. Services to small businesses have been interrupted. Important environmental protections have been shut down, including Superfund cleanup and programs to combat air and water pollution. FBI training of state and local law enforcement officers was stopped.

The list of curtailed or limited services goes on and on. FHA mortgages and housing vouchers were halted. State rehabilitation services for those with physical and mental disabilities have started to shut down. Travellers found National Park Service facilities closed, National Forests restricted, great museums padlocked, and passports unavailable.

A ripple effect extended the economic hardship beyond the federal work force to millions of other Americans who provide services to or receive them from you—hardships that, sadly, will not disappear with the stroke of a pen.

Let us be clear: there was absolutely no excuse for this shutdown. We and Republicans in Congress have differing views on how to balance the budget, and that's why we are engaged in negotiations. But there was no justification for this government to be closed while negotiations progress. And there is no justification for Congress' failure to fully fund all government services.

Once again, many of the men and women who make up our federal government were held hostage, with your paychecks delayed and your security threatened during the holiday season. You were put unfairly in the middle of a battle you did not seek. But—whether you were furloughed or working—by your commitment and your sacrifice, you continued to serve our nation as loyally as ever during this crisis.

We salute you for your dedication, and we thank you.

BILL CLINTON
AL GORE

Remarks on the Budget Negotiations and an Exchange With Reporters
January 6, 1996

The President. Let me say that I am pleased that Congress has completed the task of reopening the Federal Government which was begun a few days ago. And I hope that no Congress will ever again shut the Federal Government down in this way. As has been said, it is morally indefensible to hold needed Government services and hard-working Government employees hostage in a political battle.

I'm also pleased to submit the budget plan prepared by Senator Daschle which the Congressional Budget Office says will reach balance in 7 years. This plan illustrates what we have been saying all along, that you can balance the budget in 7 years and protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment and provide tax relief to working families.

Now it's time to get back to work. This is a moment of great national promise, and we need to find unity and common ground; we need to rise above partisanship to fashion a sensible solution that is true to our values, honors our obligations to our parents and to our children, and builds a stronger future for our country. And in just a few moments we will go back to work.

Q. Sir, what was your priority, to technically meet their demands and open it up, or to get it——

The President. Well, we have reached a point in our negotiations—we have been working in good faith now for days and days, identifying areas of agreement as well as areas of disagreement. And last evening when we ended our session and we agreed to meet again today, we both said that we would try to speed up the negotiations, move as quickly as possible to see if we couldn't at least reach a framework agreement. And this was an appropriate time to do that. And so I'm hopeful that we can reach agreement.

As I said, these numbers show that the Congressional Budget Office agrees that you can balance the budget and still provide adequate protection for Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment.

Q. How soon do you think you can get this closed?

The President. How soon? I don't know. We've been in about a 2-hour recess now, and I'm looking forward to getting back to work. And I'm prepared to work all day tomorrow. We have tentatively agreed to start again tomorrow morning, and if the weather doesn't prevent us, I'm prepared to just stay all day. Depending on how big a snow, the weather might not only not prevent us but actually help us to stay here and get downright cozy.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:06 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Statement on the Death of François Mitterrand
January 8, 1996

I learned with deep regret this morning of the death of former President of France François Mitterrand. During his 14 years as President of the French Republic and in frequent service as a minister in the post-war years, President Mitterrand put his remarkable intellect and deep-rooted dedication to democracy at the service of the French nation.

Not only France but the United States and the entire world benefited from his strong and principled leadership. He stood shoulder-to-shoulder with his NATO allies during the Soviet challenges of the early 1980's, the Gulf war, and the peaceful revolutions that ended a half-century of East-West confrontation. President Mitterrand's stalwart leadership during some of the Alliance's greatest challenges leaves the people of Europe with a hard-won legacy of peace.

I consulted frequently with President Mitterrand, as did my predecessors, and greatly valued his insights, advice, and wisdom. He was a man of vision whose strength helped bring Europe and the West through a period of tough confrontation to the peaceful, undivided Europe we are building today.

Hillary and I join the American people in expressing heartfelt sympathy to the people and the Government of France and to Danielle Mitterrand and the Mitterrand family. We hope the sorrow of this difficult time will be eased by an appreciation of the profound contribution that President Mitterrand made to his nation and the world. He was a great statesman.

The President's News Conference
January 9, 1996

Budget Negotiations

The President. Good afternoon. As you know, we have just completed another long meeting with the Republican and Democratic leaders in the Congress. We have arrived at a point where, clearly, all sides have agreed on more than enough cuts to both balance the budget in 7 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, and allow a modest tax cut. A final agreement on the balanced budget, I believe, is clearly within reach.

Unfortunately, the talks have not yet succeeded because we do still disagree on the level of cuts in the programs of Medicare, Medicaid, aid to poor children, the earned-income credit, which protects the hardest pressed working families, and education and the environment. The Republicans still want cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that we believe are well beyond what is necessary to balance the budget and cuts in the discretionary account which funds education and the environment that we believe are excessive and beyond what is needed to balance the budget or to provide a reasonable tax cut.

Still, I want to emphasize that we made progress today. The atmosphere was good. It was a genuine bipartisan effort. We are moving closer together on the spending numbers. At the opening of the meeting, we moved and made an initial offer to them. We are clarifying areas of policy agreement as well as the areas of disagreement. And today we agreed to a recess to last no longer than until next Wednesday, during which time our staffs will work directly to clarify the agreements as well as the remaining areas of disagreement, and hope to find some new ideas to bridge the gap which remains.

I also would say, right at the very end of the meeting I left all the parties with a proposal which could possibly bring this to a conclusion. And I asked both the Democratic and the Republican leaders to consider that proposal.

Over the last year, I've worked hard to find common ground on this issue. At the start of the process, I said the Republican Party and the Democrats and I shared a common goal to balance the budget. And I agreed that we also ought to have at least a modest tax cut

targeted to middle class families. I was determined to reach this goal in a way that reflects our fundamental values: our duty to care for our parents and our children, our commitment to provide opportunity for all Americans, to invest in education, and to protect the environment for the future.

In June I announced a balanced budget plan that offered a modest tax cut and protected Medicare and Medicaid, education and the environment, without raising taxes on working people. Then the congressional Republicans said that the plan took too long and asked me to do it in 7 years. In an effort to find common ground, I went back to work and cut several hundred billion more dollars out of the budget and presented a 7-year budget. Then, because we disagreed on certain assumptions in the budget—primarily affecting the last 3 years, I might add—they asked me to agree that in the end we would have to have a budget that met their assumptions. I agreed to that, as long as the budget protected Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment and did not raise taxes on working people.

Then some of those in Congress said they wanted me to present such a budget. So after our negotiations had gone on for some time, I did that. When I presented that budget, which was prepared by Senator Daschle, it did highlight the differences between us, because it does have smaller cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment. There is no tax increase on the hardest pressed working families. And the tax cut is a smaller one and more carefully targeted to middle class families. But clearly, it balances the budget in 7 years, and the Congress and the Congressional Budget Office agreed.

I want to emphasize that I want to do this. And I ask all of you to remember that the deficit has already been cut in half in just 3 years from what I found when I came here. This administration has the credibility of its actions behind its plan. I hope that we can reach agreement. There is still about a hundred billion dollars' difference in the cuts that the Republicans want us to make in Medicare, Medicaid, aid to poor children, and the earned-income tax credit for working families that we believe are not necessary. We are trying to work through that.

It seems to me clear that—and as I've said this many, many times—sooner or later a decision has to be made: Are we going to balance the budget and provide a modest tax cut, or are we going to fundamentally weaken the guarantees inherent in the Medicare and Medicaid programs and change policies dramatically and provide a tax cut that, in my view, cannot be justified by the circumstances in which we find ourselves? So that is where we are today.

Let me say again, we moved closer together today. I made a move toward them, and then at the end I made a proposal, then asked them to consider it. I hope that we can continue to make some progress. I will say again, we have agreed on several policy areas in the Medicare program, for example. The most important policy we can adopt is one which gives more incentives for people to move into managed care programs without forcing them to do so. I've been for that since 1993. We are in complete agreement on that. And the Medicaid program—we've agreed that the States should have more flexibility to get people into managed care, to find ways to save money on the program so that they can expand coverage to others who don't have it. We're in agreement on that. And we can agree on a balanced budget with a tax cut if we don't hold either goal hostage to an excessive tax cut or to excessive cuts in the priorities that are very important to our future.

So I want to keep working together. I think we did; we've covered a lot of ground. We have certainly learned a lot from each other. And I am very much hoping that we can make this agreement. It will require us to make some more steps to bridge the gap, but the—we have agreed to well over—way over $600 billion in savings, more than enough to balance the budget. What remains is the, if you will, the ideological differences over the size and shape of the tax cut and over the size and character of the changes in Medicare and Medicaid and the investments in education and the environment.

Q. Mr. President, do the Republicans want the biggest tax cut for the richest people in the country? Do they still hold to that?

The President. Well, the largest amount of money in their tax program is one, of course, with which we're very sympathetic; it's a children's tax credit. I've proposed the family tax credit for children, and they have, and theirs is more generous than mine. They spend much more money on theirs than mine. So that's the largest amount.

The capital gains tax credit will have the biggest economic benefit to the smallest number of people. And then there are some other things in their tax program which is kind of skewed upward. There are also some other very good things in their program. We have to ask ourselves, you know, how much we can afford. A lot of the things in their program that I agree with involve help for small business on the expensing provision. I have proposed some pension reform legislation. That was the number one priority of the White House Conference on Small Business. It only costs a billion and a half dollars over 7 years, but it was their number priority, and we agree on that.

So—and of course I would like to see this education credit that I have been advocating. But overall we have to ask ourselves: What is the prudent amount of tax cut that can be afforded in a credible balanced budget plan? And how much saving can you achieve in the Medicare and Medicaid plan without either hurting the beneficiaries or crippling the health care delivery system? That is the issue.

And the truth is, no one knows for sure over 7 years. The savings that we have proposed are by far the greatest ever actually enacted. If the ones I have proposed were to be enacted, they'd be by far the largest ever enacted. But I have tried, instead of taking an arbitrary number, to go out and analyze what the burdens on the providers, analyze what is likely to happen with the—for example, the number of poor children, the number of disabled people, the number of elderly people, and just figure out what we think the system can bear as we move towards managed care.

Keep in mind, if the Republicans turn out to be right and a lot of these reforms that are happening in the health care system generate more savings than I think they will or than I—than we can know they will, then no one in the wide world will object to us putting those in the budget next year, the year after that, the year after that. I just hate to see us write into stone something now that we might not be able to live with. And the markets are entitled to know, if we adopt a balanced budget plan, it is a credible plan with a reasonable chance of achievement.

Q. Mr. President, could you tell us whether the offer that you made at the start of today's meeting was a full-blown counter to the offer that the Republicans had made over the weekend? And secondly, could you describe, at least to some extent, the idea that you outlined at the end of the meeting?

The President. Well, we have agreed not to get into too much of our negotiations. I can say that—I don't know whether you'd call it a full-blown counter. It was—I moved in advance of the Daschle budget, toward their position at the beginning of the meeting, with the agreement of our Democratic negotiators. At the end of the meeting, I basically offered a set of changes which would bring us to the same amount of dollar savings, with a tax cut that would be targeted to families that would, I thought, come nearer to meeting what they said their objectives were on the tax side, without compromising where I thought we had to go with Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment. Whether it will be—they want to examine it, I think, and I understand that. I don't think they would characterize it as an offer, because it came literally from me only, not from Senator Daschle or Senator—or Congressman Gephardt.

Q. They seem to be suggesting that they'd made a great big step and that the response had been a rather smaller step——

The President. No. Well, you can make numbers look like anything, but I—but let me say, I think if you go back and look at where my first budget plan was and where their first budget plan was, we have moved, I believe, at least as far as they have in the numbers.

But the point I want to emphasize to the American people is our administration has cut this deficit in half in 3 years. I have always been for balancing the budget. I have bent over backwards to meet them halfway in a good bipartisan spirit, to do it in 7 years, not 9, as my plan would have done; to do it according to the Congressional Budget Office analyses, even though I don't entirely agree with it; and to make significant savings in the entitlement programs as well as the investment programs. But I don't believe we can go to the point where we don't know for sure that we have protected the people that are entitled to protection.

I have already—neither of these budgets is a big spending budget. Both these budgets will require steep cuts in spending. My discretionary budget, out of which we fund education and the environment, is lower than a hard freeze, which means there will have to be steep cuts

in other areas in order for us to protect education and the environment.

So I will continue to work with them. We can do that, but we have to know when we adopt this budget that we can achieve these numbers without hurting innocent people. They depend upon us to balance the budget with discipline and with compassion.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, if I could just change the subject for a second. Your spokesman earlier today said that if you could, you'd like to punch William Safire in the nose for calling Mrs. Clinton a congenital liar in his column yesterday. I wonder if you'd care to respond publicly to these accusations against your wife.

The President. Well, what I said was, you know, when you're President, there are a few more constraints on you than if you're an ordinary citizen. If I were an ordinary citizen, I might give that article the response it deserves.

I'm reminded of the great letter that Harry Truman wrote, which I—by the way, which I have now; it was a gift to me from a distinguished Republican, and I have it on my wall—you know, that Presidents have feelings too. I think the American people—I would just remind the American people, we've been through this for 4 years now. And every time somebody has made a charge related to the Whitewater issue, it's turned up dry. And the only records, as far as I know, that haven't been disclosed so far, as far as I know, we still haven't seen the release of the RTC report, which says that, after all, we told the truth all along about the underlying matters here. So I just would like to ask the American people to take a deep breath, relax, and listen to the First Lady's answers, because we've been through this for over 4 years now, and every time a set of questions comes up, we answer the questions and we go on. The American people are satisfied, and they will be again.

She is—I've said before, I'll say again—if everybody in this country had the character that my wife has, we'd be a better place to live.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 112th news conference began at 5:16 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to the former Resolution Trust Corporation, which ceased operations in 1995.

Statement on the Death of Ambassador M. Larry Lawrence

January 9, 1996

I was deeply saddened to learn of the death today of our Ambassador to Switzerland, M. Larry Lawrence. Larry was a good friend and a valued colleague who brought his abundant energy and fresh vision to every task he undertook. As Ambassador in Switzerland, he was a tireless and effective advocate of U.S. interests, especially the promotion of U.S. exports and commercial ties. Larry's service to his country did not begin with his diplomatic assignment. During World War II, at the age of 18, he volunteered for the merchant marines. He was wounded when his ship was sunk by enemy torpedoes in arctic waters. Many years later, Larry was decorated with the Medal of Valor by the Government of the Russian Federation.

Larry's civilian life showed the same courage and resolve. As an entrepreneur, he restored the Hotel del Coronado, one of the west coast's outstanding architectural landmarks. Larry's quiet philanthropy also touched many lives. He believed passionately in education for women; the scholarships he endowed for minority women at the University of Arizona represent a lasting contribution. Hillary joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Larry's wife, Shelia, and to his children. We will miss him.

Statement on the Death of Mike Synar
January 9, 1996

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn this morning of the death of former Oklahoma Congressman Mike Synar. Mike Synar was a brave and unflinching public servant who in tough political times remained true to his principles. He did not always do what was popular, but he always did what he thought was right—for Oklahoma and for America. Throughout his life, and especially during the past 6 months, Mike Synar was a true profile in courage.

Hillary and I will miss him. Our thoughts and prayers go out to his family and friends at this difficult time.

Message to the House of Representatives Returning Without Approval Legislation on the Welfare System
January 9, 1996

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 4, the "Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1995." In disapproving H.R. 4, I am nevertheless determined to keep working with the Congress to enact real, bipartisan welfare reform. The current welfare system is broken and must be replaced, for the sake of the taxpayers who pay for it and the people who are trapped by it. But H.R. 4 does too little to move people from welfare to work. It is burdened with deep budget cuts and structural changes that fall short of real reform. I urge the Congress to work with me in good faith to produce a bipartisan welfare reform agreement that is tough on work and responsibility, but not tough on children and on parents who are responsible and who want to work.

The Congress and the Administration are engaged in serious negotiations toward a balanced budget that is consistent with our priorities—one of which is to "reform welfare," as November's agreement between Republicans and Democrats made clear. Welfare reform must be considered in the context of other critical and related issues such as Medicaid and the Earned Income Tax Credit. Americans know we have to reform the broken welfare system, but they also know that welfare reform is about moving people from welfare to work, not playing budget politics.

The Administration has and will continue to set forth in detail our goals for reform and our objections to this legislation. The Administration strongly supported the Senate Democratic and House Democratic welfare reform bills, which ensured that States would have the resources and incentives to move people from welfare to work and that children would be protected. I strongly support time limits, work requirements, the toughest possible child support enforcement, and requiring minor mothers to live at home as a condition of assistance, and I am pleased that these central elements of my approach have been addressed in H.R. 4.

We remain ready at any moment to sit down in good faith with Republicans and Democrats in the Congress to work out an acceptable welfare reform plan that is motivated by the urgency of reform rather than by a budget plan that is contrary to America's values. There is a bipartisan consensus around the country on the fundamental elements of real welfare reform, and it would be a tragedy for this Congress to squander this historic opportunity to achieve it. It is essential for the Congress to address shortcomings in the legislation in the following areas:

- *Work and Child Care:* Welfare reform is first and foremost about work. H.R. 4 weakens several important work provisions that are vital to welfare reform's success. The final welfare reform legislation should provide sufficient child care to enable recipients to leave welfare for work; reward States for placing people in jobs; restore the guarantee of health coverage for poor families; require States to maintain their

stake in moving people from welfare to work; and protect States and families in the event of economic downturn and population growth. In addition, the Congress should abandon efforts included in the budget reconciliation bill that would gut the Earned Income Tax Credit, a powerful work incentive that is enabling hundreds of thousands of families to choose work over welfare.

- *Deep Budget Cuts and Damaging Structural Changes:* H.R. 4 was designed to meet an arbitrary budget target rather than to achieve serious reform. The legislation makes damaging structural changes and deep budget cuts that would fall hardest on children and undermine States' ability to move people from welfare to work. We should work together to balance the budget and reform welfare, but the Congress should not use the words "welfare reform" as a cover to violate the Nation's values. Making $60 billion in budget cuts and massive structural changes in a variety of programs, including foster care and adoption assistance, help for disabled children, legal immigrants, food stamps, and school lunch is not welfare reform. The final welfare reform legislation should reduce the magnitude of these budget cuts and the sweep of structural changes that have little connection to the central goal of work-based reform. We must demand responsibility from young mothers and young fathers, not penalize children for their parents' mistakes.

I am deeply committed to working with the Congress to reach bipartisan agreement on an acceptable welfare reform bill that addresses these and other concerns. We owe it to the people who sent us here not to let this opportunity slip away by doing the wrong thing or failing to act at all.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 9, 1996.

Excerpts of Remarks on Nickelodeon's "Clearing the Air: Kids Talk to the President About Smoking"

January 9, 1996

Linda Ellerbee. How can a kid ask a grownup to stop smoking?

The President. Oh, I think directly. I think children should not be self-conscious about that. I can tell you, you know, Chelsea did some very blunt things to her grandmother. She said, "You ever seen a picture of a lung where people have smoked for years, as against the picture of a lung where people haven't?" I mean, very straightforward stuff.

Ms. Ellerbee. Did it work?

The President. It worked. It took a few years, but it worked finally. On my daughter's 8th birthday, her grandmother's present was that she quit smoking.

Ms. Ellerbee. Mr. President, do you have any final thoughts for kids on this issue?

The President. You young people cannot believe the potential influence you can have. You can ask adults the kind of hard questions you asked me. You can encourage every adult you care about and love to stop smoking. You can make it so that the cool thing to do is not to smoke instead of to smoke.

And you know, none of us are going to live forever, but you have the choice to maximize, to increase the chances of your living a long and full life. This is a choice you can make. The smoking choice is a choice you can make. It's totally within your control.

And I just want to encourage you. I'll do what I can, but I want to encourage you to do everything you can to get everybody you know to remain smoke free. I think that is—that's the answer. And you can do it. We can change this country if we do it together.

NOTE: The President's remarks were recorded at 12:10 p.m. on December 12, 1995, for broadcast at 8 p.m. on January 9. Linda Ellerbee hosted Nickelodeon cable television's "Nick News" program.

Remarks at a National Democratic Club Dinner
January 9, 1996

Thank you. I needed that. [*Laughter and applause*] Thanks. I said that because, you know, I just needed a Democratic fix. [*Laughter*] I've spent more time with Senator Dole and Speaker Gingrich than I have with Hillary and Chelsea in the last 3 weeks. [*Laughter*] And it's nice to sort of be home.

I want to thank Dawson Mathis and Pat Rissler and Bill Long, Barbara Boggs, and all the others who have made me feel so welcome tonight. I'm glad to be here with Congressman Bonior and Mrs. Bonior. I want to tell you, if we had 100 people in the Congress like David Bonior, this would be a better country. This would be a better country. He is a great man. [*Applause*] Thank you. And if we had 218, we'd be in the majority. [*Laughter*]

All of you know this is a very interesting time to be in Washington, DC, to be in public life, indeed, to be an American. I'm glad to see so many young people here tonight. I'm glad to see that anybody showed up. I was afraid that only the President could navigate the roads. [*Laughter*] I figured this was going to be like my early campaign rallies in New Hampshire. Wherever two or more are gathered, you know, I just showed up, and I figured that—[*laughter*]—so I'm glad you made it tonight.

But particularly for the young people, I would say to you that you are living through an era of more profound change than any the United States has experienced in a hundred years in terms of the way we work and live and relate to each other and the rest of the world, trading the cold war for the global village, trading the industrial age for an information and technology age, trading a lot of yesterday's problems for tomorrow's problems.

And I believe for the young people who are here, if we do our job now, it will also be an age of immense possibility, beyond things that even we can imagine now. But it's also a time of great difficulty. And as with every period of great change, we have to reaffirm what it means to be an American and also make the right kinds of decisions. That's really what's going on here.

And this great debate in Washington about the budget is not about balancing the budget at all, really. As I announced today, we have now, both sides, agreed on far more than enough savings to bring the budget into balance—already. We could do that tomorrow. In an hour, we could draw it up and put it out and have a balanced budget. That's not what we're debating.

We're really debating what kind of country we're going to be and what our common obligations to each other are, what our obligations to the future are. And tonight I just want to take just a few minutes to ask you to think about that in terms of where we are now and what this country has always been about.

If you go back to the Founding Fathers and you go through the Civil War, the period of Reconstruction, the progressive era with Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, the Great Depression, the Second World War, the cold war, and the great explosion of opportunity in the United States afterward, in everything that has happened, you will see that there have always been three great, constant themes in American life: our love of liberty, our belief in progress, and our struggle to find common ground.

And sooner or later, we have always understood that each of them depended upon the other. Our Constitution enshrined liberty in a Bill of Rights that said that black people only counted as three-fifths of human beings, so sooner or later we realized we couldn't really preserve everybody's liberty until all people were free. And we found some common ground.

Progress was largely an individual thing until we came to understand that in an industrial economy, the Government had a role to play to create a framework in which everybody could get ahead who was willing to work and make the most of their God-given abilities.

And now, as we move out of the industrial age into a time that will be far less centralized, far less dominated by large organizations, at least in terms of employment, and far more dominated by new forms of communications and technology, we have to once again examine these three questions and ask ourselves: How will we preserve our liberty? Do we have to stand up for people's liberty beyond our borders? How

will we preserve the idea of progress in an age in which we have more new millionaires every year than the year before for the last 3 years, but more than half the people are working harder for the same or lower wages they were making 20 years ago, and a million people a year are losing their health insurance? How can we preserve the idea of progress for everyone? And how can we continue the struggle for common ground?

When I ran for President in 1992, I thought that the real problem with the country was that our leaders had no strategy for dealing with these three challenges. And I said, "I want you to vote for me because I want to restore the American dream for all people in the 21st century. I want to bring our country together, and I want to preserve the leadership of America as the world's greatest force for peace and freedom and democracy. And here's how I will do it."

In 1995 and 1996, we see that now the issue is not one strategy for getting into the future as against no strategy; it is two very different ideas of change and what our country ought to be about. We now have about 3 years of experience with the strategy that our administration brought to the White House, a strategy based on economic growth, based on a reaffirmation of our traditional values, based on radically changing the way the Government operates, and based on reasserting the vigor and leadership of the United States as a force for peace and freedom and security.

So in this budget fight, one of the things that I want the Democrats to help remind the American people of is, we have—their theory is unproven at best. You have 3 years of experience with the way we think it ought to be done.

What was our economic strategy? Bring the deficit down; expand trade on not only free terms but fairer terms; and invest in the American people, in their education, in their technology, in their research, in their capacity, in their infrastructure. We did it.

What's happened in the last 3 years? Don't forget to remind people who are debating this budget that the deficit has already been cut in half in the last 3 years. Don't forget to remind people that we cut it in half and still invested more in education, in training, in technology, in research, in expanding the frontiers of possibility in America.

And what have the results been? In 3 years, almost 8 million new jobs; each year, a record number of new business formations; after 3 years, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years; a 15-year high in homeownership; an all-time record in American exports. Why would you change that policy?

So that first question to be asked is, why would you change an economic policy that is working? It is not perfect. We still have one enormous economic problem. As in every single instance that I am aware of in history—you can see it in China today, you could see it in the United States 100 years ago—whenever you change the whole economic structure of a country, you open up new possibilities and you make a lot of new millionaires, but you disturb the established order of things so much that a lot of people fall through the cracks.

And there are too many people today who are working hard but never getting ahead. There are too many people today my age who are white-collar workers who are told one day that "30 days from now you won't have a job; in a year from now you won't be able to find another job paying anything like what you've been making. And you've got three kids, and I don't know how you're going to send them to college; that's not my problem."

I got a letter the other day from a guy I went to grade school with. He came up in a family that was far worse off than mine. We were just two little kids on a play yard in a little public school in a little town in Arkansas. He was the first person in his family, like me, ever to get a college degree. He became an engineer. He went to work for a Fortune 500 company. One day about a year ago, he and two other white male 50-year-old men were told that they wouldn't be needed anymore, that two younger people were going to get the jobs that those three used to do, in a year when the company was experiencing very strong profits.

Now, maybe they needed to downsize, and maybe they didn't need them anymore. But the point is, that fellow has been out there for nearly a year now, working hour after hour every day on a computer program with 250 different contacts around America, everybody who could possibly hire anyone who did the kind of job he did for anything remotely approximating the pay that he used to make, and he still hasn't found anything. And he has two children, like these young people, he's trying to send to col-

lege. So it's not just lower income workers, it's also white-collar workers that are afflicted by this insecurity.

Now, we can't stop these changes that technology and global competition are driving, but we can ask ourselves, what are those challenges? I think the great challenge that we face is how to define a new security for families in the 21st century. If you don't have a guaranteed job, you ought to have access to education, access to health care, and a pension you can tote around with you that nobody can take away from you—at least that.

So in the debate over this—over which way to balance the budget is better, you should ask yourself, what is the evidence we have about which path works? And what are the problems that the Clinton administration still has not been able to solve? And which policy will make it better or worse, more or less likely we can solve them? If you look at the record, you can be proud of that. If you look at the challenges, you know we need to do more of what we've been doing, not less.

If you look at the reaffirmation of our basic values of respect for one another and for our diversity and for the integrity of people and their safety, in the last 3 years we have some pretty good evidence of that. We passed a crime bill that's helping to put 100,000 more police officers on the street. New York City just reported the biggest drop in crime since 1972; my hometown, Little Rock, Arkansas, a 7-year low in crime. All over America, the crime rate is down.

We've given 35 States pretty much the freedom to do whatever they wanted to change their welfare programs to move people from welfare to work as long as they took care of the little children and didn't hurt children but strengthened families while they were promoting work. And we passed the family and medical leave law and the national service law. And these things were consistent with our national values.

Well, what's happened in the last 3 years? The crime rate's down. The welfare rolls are down. The food stamp rolls are down. The poverty rate is down. For 2 years, the teen pregnancy rate has dropped.

Did we cause all that? No. The American people caused it, but our policies supported it. They helped it. Why would you, then, change? Why would you scrap the police program and just send a check to cities and say, spend the money however you want? Is the crime rate low enough? No. So what we should do is to keep on doing what we're doing; it's working.

Same thing is true in welfare reform. I worked on that before the Republican contract was a gleam in anybody's eye. I'm all for that. But welfare reform should be that, should be welfare reform. It should liberate people and hold them to high standards and have high expectations. And it should make it possible for people to succeed as parents and as workers. The same problem we've got with blue-collar people around this country and white-collar people around this country.

Most people who have children work. Most people who have children have to work. Since we want people to have children—most workers, we should want to have children. Therefore, it follows, one of our great national goals should be to help people succeed as parents and in the workplace. That ought to be welfare reform's goal; that ought to be our work program today.

So I say to you: Should we reform the welfare system? Should we find ways to be more effective in lowering the crime rate? Absolutely. But we shouldn't reverse policies that work. We should build on them and go in the same direction.

If you look at the whole area of Government—the Republican majority in Congress, they rail about big Government all the time. You know how big your Government is? There are 200,000 fewer people working for the Government today than there were the day I became President—actually, now, about 205,000 fewer. The last time the Government was this size was when Lyndon Johnson was President of the United States in 1965. As a percentage of the civilian work force, your Federal Government is now the smallest it has been since 1933 before the New Deal.

Don't let the Republicans say they're ending big Government. That is done, and the Democrats did that for you. And nobody even noticed because we did it in the right way, with no suffering of Government services and without putting good public employees out on the street and treating them like they were disposable products.

So there is a right way and a wrong way to do that. When we downsized the Federal Government, we had generous early retirement system. We had generous severance pay. We

gave people time to find other jobs. We made sure when they left they had enough money to build another life. And we've had very few complaints. And we also did it in a planned and disciplined way so that all the work that the public needed done could be done.

So no one in America knows that there are 200,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government today than there were before I took office, and that is a good thing. That means we did our job. And that means the Federal employees did their job.

One of the reasons that I was so angry in the last Government shutdown was that here these people are working with 200,000 fewer people putting out more work than they were 3 years ago, never even getting so much as a thank-you, and now they're being thrown out of work against their will. So we can't let that happen again. But we ought to recognize that a remarkable transformation has happened in the Federal Government.

We're working on getting rid of 16,000 of the 86,000 pages of Federal regulation and improving the quality of environmental protection and public health, not weakening it. Now, that is the right way to do that, not with some uncritical condemnation of the Government but by defining in modern terms what it is we need our Government to do.

And finally, let me say that—and I owe a special word of thanks to Mr. Bonior for the last item on this list—I am profoundly proud that our country has been a great source of peace and freedom, from Haiti to Northern Ireland, to the Middle East, and to Bosnia, in the last 3 years. And I want to thank those in Congress who have stood by me in this.

The truth is that at the end of the cold war, the world is still a little unsettled and the new security patterns are not there, and the United States has to lead. I am proud of the fact there are no Russian missiles pointed at any Americans during this administration for the first time since the end of the cold war.

And I'm proud of the fact that we've got nearly 180 countries to say that they wouldn't engage in nuclear proliferation. And I'm proud of the fact that our antinarcotics, anti-drug-ring strategy, using the military and our civilian law enforcement authorities, have helped to result in the arrest of most of the leaders of the notorious Cali drug cartel in Colombia. I am proud of the fact that we are making progress on these things.

Now, do we have problems at home and abroad? You bet we do. What's the biggest violation of our values? We already talked about our biggest economic problem. Our biggest social problem is that the crime rate's going down, but crime among young juveniles, people under 18, is going up. Drug use among young adults 18 to 34 is going down; drug use among young people 12 to 17 is going up. Why? There are too many of those kids out there raising themselves. There are too many kids who have been abandoned in inner cities and isolated rural areas that think they have no future.

Is the answer to do less for them? Or is the answer to try to build on the progress of the last 3 years and be honest and say, you know, if you want people to choose a good future, you have to tell them what they should say no to, but you've got to make sure there's something for them to say yes to as well. There has to be a future out there for all of our children.

And one other thing I want to say about that. The other big issue that I think we as Democrats ought to be proud to embrace is the idea that we will draw strength from our diversity. We have always drawn strength from our diversity. Every time we have broadened opportunity in this country, we've been stronger for it.

We're a better country than we would have been if we'd tried to hold on to slavery longer. We're a better country than we would have been if we'd never had the civil rights revolution. We're a better country than we would have been if we'd never given women the opportunity to do the things that they can do and that they want to do and that their imagination would lead them to do. We are a better country when we open opportunities to people.

There will always be great difficulty in a country full of great conviction when a lot of those convictions collide. I gave a speech about affirmative action at the National Archives not very long ago, saying that I thought it should be ended someday, but not until we knew there was no longer any institutional and pattern of racism in the country; it was time to change it, but not to end it.

I was able to go out to James Madison High School in Virginia a few months ago to talk about prayer in the schools and religious observance in the schools, no matter what religion

people have, and to explain to the American people it is not true that there can be no expression of religious conviction in the schools. It is simply true that the State may not sanction one particular form or another.

So our Secretary of Education, who's doing a magnificent job, by the way, sent out a list of guidelines to schools all over America. And we have been deluged with gratitude from fundamentalist ministers, from rabbis, from ordinary citizens, from confused teachers, from people all over the country who simply did not know what the rules were, because now they do.

I spent a lot of time trying to figure out how we can make this diversity work for us. But I'll tell you something, wedge politics is not one way to do it. Pitting one group of Americans against another is not a way to do it. You may win a lot of elections getting one group of Americans to be frightened of another, but you won't win many hearts and minds and futures, and you won't win many battles for America doing it that way. I don't believe it works.

And if you look at where we have to go in the world, I am telling you—I don't know how many of you saw the—I guess a lot of you did—the coverage of the trip I took to Ireland and to England and then later to Germany to see our troops and to Madrid to meet with the leaders of Europe, but on the street everywhere it was amazing the response that people gave, not to me, to the United States of America because they thought America was still there trying to lead, trying to fulfill a role that only we can fulfill now.

Maybe 10, 20 years from now, all the security problems in the world will be handled by groups of democracies dealing with the problems in their own backyard, and that all we'll have to do is to cooperate through the United Nations to help solve problems in distant lands where there is no structure to deal with them, at a time or place in the future. But today, whether we like it or not, America is still needed. America still matters in the Middle East. America still matters in Northern Ireland. America still matters in Bosnia. America still matters. I do not believe the answer is to walk away from those responsibilities.

So that's the context in which I think you should see this debate over the budget. If you are a young person and most of your life is still ahead of you, you've got a lot more at stake in this debate than the people who right now are drawing Medicare. But you should care about those people, because if you're 20 years old and you have a grandparent who is 75 years old and you have parents in the middle, I can tell you that if it weren't for the Medicare program, a lot of middle class parents wouldn't be able to send their children to college because they'd have to spend every last dime they have taking care of their parents.

You should care about the Medicaid program, even if you're an upper income person, because the Medicaid program gives health care to 4 million children who wouldn't get it otherwise, and they are a part of our future, too. And every day we neglect them is a day we will pay back for it, sure as the world, before it's over.

You may never draw a Pell grant because you may be so fortunate you don't need it, but you should care whether this budget eliminates 360,000 Pell grant scholarships. America will pay for that. We already have a problem getting poor kids to go on to college and to stay in college because the cost of a college education has gone up so much. And we should not cut back on those college scholarships.

You ought to care if we eliminate the direct student loan program, which gives people lower cost, more hassle-free loans with better terms of repayment, because we need more young people going on to college. If you look at the 1990 census, it is absolutely chilling to see what has happened to young people who don't have at least 2 years of education after high school, what happens to their job prospects, their earnings, their prospects for health care, for retirement, for continuing education, for stability in their lives. It is chilling.

So it matters. That's what this whole debate is about. Let me tell you again, we have already identified enough cuts in the budget that both the leaders of the Democratic Party, not just the President but the congressional leaders, and the Republican congressional leaders, that we all agreed have to be made that we could balance the budget like that. This is about how we will do it. And to me it is not about this dollar or that dollar, it's how I imagine your country will look 10, 20, 30 years from now. I'm asking myself, will this make America stronger in the future? Will we honor our responsibilities to our parents, as well as to our

children? What kind of country will we be? What are our common responsibilities?

And there's a huge debate. Let me just give you two examples in closing. First major piece of legislation I signed in 1993 was the Family and Medical Leave Act. Basically, it said that if you worked for a company with 50 or more employees, you can have a little time off, unpaid, if you're having a baby born or you've got a sick child or a sick parent, and you can't be fired for it. A hundred and seventy countries had that law before we did because the business interests in our country said, "Oh, it will kill us. It will cost a lot of jobs. It will break businesses." I have no evidence that any business has closed because of the family leave law, not any.

But the people who now lead the Congress in both Houses opposed that 3 years ago because they said, "Oh, this is a terrible Government infringement on the private sector." Let me tell you, not very long ago I went out to the National Institute of Health, and I met with a lot of sick children—a lot of them probably won't live—and I met with their parents. And I met with couple after couple after couple who would have lost their health insurance had it not been for the family leave law, who would not have been able to be with their sick children had it not been for the family leave law, and who still have jobs because of the family leave law. And this is a better country and the people are better, stronger employees and their businesses are more successful because we passed that little law. But it was a big thing because of the differences in our philosophy.

I'll just close with this story. I got a call the other night in the middle of this debate from a man I went to college with, who is the model of what the Republican Party says we ought to have for citizens. He is a pro-life Irish Catholic who married an Irish Catholic girl and raised two beautiful Irish Catholic boys. And when we got out of college, he went into the Marine Corps and served with great distinction. And when he got out of the Marine Corps, he became a pilot. And he's worked hard all his life. And when a relative of his wife had a child with cerebral palsy and their family fell apart and they couldn't raise the child, this man and his wife adopted that child as their own, and they raised that child.

And while they were raising these three children, one of whom had cerebral palsy, they spent all their free time with their church. And twice a year, because they lived in southern California, they went to Mexico to build houses for poor people. And they didn't ask anything from the Government. They paid their taxes; they did their work; they gave their lives to their family. When one member of their family needed a little help, they adopted a child with difficulties and raised her to be a wonderful young woman. They are a model of what the people who say the Government is not needed ought to be.

This man called me on the phone the other night. He said, "I've been following this budget debate, and I'm sitting here with a catalog buying my daughter another wheelchair. And I don't need any help from the Government. And I'm grateful that I've got a good job, and I can afford to do it." But he said, "You know, when we lived in California, one of my daughter's best friends was a child with spina bifida. And she lived with her mother, a single parent who worked for about $6 an hour and rode a bus an hour a day each way to work." He said, "Now, the way I got it figured, this budget proposal, if you let it become law, would hit that woman in three ways." He said, "I'm going to get a tax cut, right?" I said, "That's right." I think so. I mean, I don't exactly know that his income is, but I think he will. And he said, "Now, she's going to get hit three ways: They're going to reduce her transportation subsidy, so the cost of her busfare is going to rise. They're going to cut back on the earned-income tax credit, so her tax bill is going to go up when mine goes down. And then they're going to cut back on aid to disabled children so she won't get the help that she now gets or won't get as much of it to help her buy a wheelchair or new shoes for her child who drags her shoes and ruins them every few weeks. Is that right?" I said, "That's about it." He said, "You've got to stop that. You've got to stop that." That's what we've been trying to stop.

Now, what I want you to understand is that—and let me say this, and with all respect to the people whom I've spent the last several weeks with, and don't laugh about this—a lot of these people are very well meaning, very sincere; they just look at the world different than we do. They really believe that nearly any Government spending is worse than nearly any kind of tax cut. They really believe that nearly every interruption of the market is a bad thing and

that whenever Government tries to define the public interest, something bad will happen which will be worse than all the good can offset.

And I have a lot more respect, frankly, for all of them and for the debates we've had. And I think we understand each other's position. And I hope more than anything we can get agreement, and I still think we probably can. But I just want you to know what I have been fighting for, because I can remember what it was like. I'm almost 50 now. I'm old enough to remember what it was like when there were no regulations in nursing homes. I was in chicken plants before there were any health regulations for people who worked in chicken plants. I walked in factories before OSHA came there, and I saw men working in factories with three of their fingers gone. I can remember.

I don't believe we're a weaker country because of Medicare. If you live to be over 70 in America today—people over 70 have a longer life expectancy in America than in any other country in the world because of Medicare. I believe that the Government needs to invest in research. One of the biggest—there's no votes in this one way or the other, but one of these budgets would cut our research budget 30 percent over the next 7 years; the Japanese just voted to double theirs. We just had America's Nobel Prize winners in, nine of them, into the White House; seven of them had Government research. That's the way it's done in the world.

So those are the debates we're having. There's some very good people on the other side of this debate, and they have some good points. But fundamentally, I believe that we're better off if we say: What do our values require us to do? What will be good economic policy? What will preserve our leadership into the 21st century? How can we fight for liberty, reassure the availability of progress to everybody, and struggle for common ground? Those are the questions.

And I think about the children and the young people much more than I do people my age. You know, most of us who have already lived most of our lives have been given great gifts by America. It is our job to pass on to you a future that will be worthy of our past and that will meet the challenges of the moment. That is what this debate is about. It is not about balancing the budget. And you have two huge competing world views. Both have their points. But let me tell you something, the Democratic Party has been pronounced dead over and over and over again in the last 2 years. But tonight when I finished my work, I was never more proud to be a Democrat.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:35 p.m. at the Capital Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Dawson Mathis, president, and Patricia Rissler, secretary, National Democratic Club; William Long, former Assistant Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives; Barbara Boggs, dinner coordinator; and Judy Bonior, wife of Representative David Bonior.

Remarks on the Budget Negotiations and an Exchange With Reporters
January 10, 1996

The President. Hello, everybody. Is everyone in here? Well, first, let me say that we're having this Cabinet meeting to discuss the present status of our budget negotiations and where we are. As I have said all along, I am for balancing the budget in 7 years, but I want to protect the fundamental priorities of the American people and the future of the American people. We can balance a budget in 7 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, without having dangerously low levels of commitment to Medicare and Medicaid, without having big cuts that undermine our commitments in education and the environment, without raising taxes on working families.

Now, that's what the Congress said they wanted. I've got this letter here from Congress, a letter from Congress to the Speaker saying that the budget we submitted in fact balances the budget in 7 years. The differences between these two budgets are now clear. We do not want to fundamentally change the commitment of the Medicare program to the health care of seniors. We do not want to fundamentally

change the commitment of the Medicaid program to senior citizens, to poor children, to the disabled. We do not want to adopt a level of investment that makes it certain that we will have to turn our backs on the needs of education or the environment.

That is what this is all about. We can even have a modest tax cut for the American people, and for families especially, and balance the budget in 7 years according to the Congressional Budget Office. That's what this letter says. They agree now, so the only differences left between us are ideological differences.

And I said in the beginning, let me say again: If the objective is to get a 7-year balanced budget that Congress says is balanced, we can do that. If the objective is to get a modest tax cut, we can do that. If the objective is to dismantle the fundamental American commitments through Medicare and Medicaid or to undermine our obligations in education and the environment, I will not do that. That is basically where it is.

Q. Mr. President, it seems like that what's being said here today and also with what's being said on Capitol Hill, that despite all of the good will that was apparent here yesterday, this really was a breakdown in the talks. You're very far away, and it sounds like you're not getting any closer together in this break.

The President. We're not—we're only very far away if you turn this into—if you insist on a tax cut which requires unacceptable levels of cuts in education and the environment and Medicare and Medicaid, or you insist on fundamentally changing those programs in ways that will erode the protections that Medicare and Medicaid now give to seniors and to poor children and to disabled people, or you insist on cuts in education that will cut back on scholarships or Head Start, or you insist on cuts which will really weaken our ability to protect the environment. If that's the deal, it's reconciling not only the level of cuts—it's not just the money here, I want to emphasize that. It's the policy.

The Republicans—if I might, let me just take Medicare for an example, just for example. The Republicans and I agree that there should be changes in the Medicare program to encourage more seniors to have more options to join managed care programs. And we agree on a number of other provisions that should be changed that will strengthen Medicare and give more options to our senior citizens. I do not agree with changes that I think will, in effect, break up Medicare and put more and more seniors at the mercy of the present private insurance system so that the older and lower income and sicker you are, the more at risk you are. I don't want to do that.

So if we can work that out, we'll have an agreement. It's the same thing——

Q. Can you explain why——

Q. It seems like what you're talking about here really is a fundamental policy difference that is not going to be bridged and, for example, can you possibly accept the idea that Medicaid would no longer be an entitlement?

The President. No. No. But let me say this: More than my predecessors, my Republican predecessors, I have been for and I continue to be for giving the States far more flexibility in the way they run the programs. But I don't believe we should send a check, a Federal check to the States and say if you decide that you no longer want to provide health care to some poor children or some disabled people or some seniors who are getting it now, that's okay with us. I don't believe that. There is a national interest—a national interest—in protecting the health care of our children, our seniors, our disabled population. And I believe the American people believe that.

In terms of letting the States have more flexibility to make the money go further, to do different things with it, to expand coverage in different ways, we have been on the forefront of that. That's what the Vice President's reinventing Government effort is about, that's what Secretary Shalala has done in giving all these waivers to States. We are willing to go much further there.

But let me ask—I thought that we were supposed to be balancing the budget. We have agreed already, both sides have agreed, to far more savings than are necessary to balance the budget in 7 years according to the Congressional Budget Office. That's what this little letter says here. That's what their letter says. Both sides have agreed.

If this is about balancing the budget, we could do it in 15 minutes tomorrow afternoon. The American people need to understand that. Congress now agrees. I have done this. I have given them a plan. It just simply does not have the dramatic changes in Medicare and Medicaid that I think will weaken our commitment to those folks, and it does not mandate cuts in education

and the environment that are far larger than we could sustain. That would be—we cannot take the discretionary account down so low that we know that we will not be able to protect education and the environment.

So that's where we are. We can balance the budget. It's very important that the American people understand that. We have agreed, the congressional leaders and I have agreed already, to far more than enough reductions in Government spending to balance the budget within 7 years. We already have.

The issue here is over the policies involving Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, our opposition to raising taxes on the lowest paid working people and on the size and structure of the tax cut. This has nothing to do with balancing the budget anymore. Nothing.

We could balance the budget, literally, in 15 minutes tomorrow afternoon. And the Congressional Budget Office would say hooray. The financial markets would say hooray. Interest rates would drop. The economy would start to grow. Everything would be fine. Then we could have an election in 1996 about whether the American people agree with their view of Medicare or mine, with their view of Medicaid or mine, with their view of our obligations in education and training of our work force and our children or mine, with their view of environmental protection or mine.

Now, that's what we ought to do. We can do this in 15 minutes. So when they express pessimism, it's because they don't believe that—at least, maybe in the House and perhaps in the Senate as well—that they can pass a balanced budget program that they, their own Congressional Budget Office, will say is balanced but doesn't further these ideological goals. We ought to have an election about that.

If we're going to walk away from the fundamental commitments of Medicare, we ought to have an election about that. We haven't had an election about that. If we're going to say that our children, because they are poor, are not entitled to the health care they would otherwise get or that middle class families that have disabled children who are now getting help will or will not get that help depending on who happens to be Governor of a given State, we ought to have an election about that. And if we're going to say we're going to reduce the number of college scholarships, college loans, investments in our education system, investments in environmental protection, we ought to have an election about that. That is not what the '94 election was about, certainly not what the '92 election was about.

So let's come back here, balance a budget in 7 years, show the American people we can do it, get the economic benefits of doing it, and then have all 1996 to argue about these policies. That's the proper thing to do.

We have bent over backwards to reach good-faith, honorable, principled compromise, and we can still do that. And I don't understand what the problem is. We can even have a reasonably good-sized tax cut and do it. But there is a limit to how big the tax cut can be, and there certainly is a limit beyond which we cannot go in good conscience based on our priorities.

And let me just make one final statement. Ever since the Congress and I agreed to reopen the Government the first time, there was a resolution we passed—we all agreed to it. It said that, finally, we would agree on a budget that was balanced in 7 years, that the Congress would say was balanced in 7 years, that protected our priorities, Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, and that's what the resolution said.

From the next day, all I ever heard was, "Where is your budget that they say is scored?" As if they had no obligation at all to deal with the other parts of the resolution. Well, here it is. This is their letter.

Now, what we ought to do is honor the second part of the resolution. That resolution said we're going to put off the ideological battles until the next election. That resolution said, yes, we'll balance the budget in 7 years, but we will protect education and the environment and Medicare and Medicaid. And all I'm trying to do now is honor the resolution that I signed off on when we had the first Government crisis a few weeks ago.

Q. Do you think they've deceived you, Mr. President, in their goals? Did they deceive you?

The President. No, no. I always told you what this is about. I said this weeks and weeks ago, months ago. I have not been deceived. But you know, we don't—in a political system where one party, where even, I might say, one philosophy within one party does not have total control, sooner or later you have to ask yourself, are you going to make the perfect the enemy of the good?

You know, when the Democrats—let me just give you an example. When the Democrats had the Congress in 1993 and '94, we passed the most sweeping education reform we've passed in 30 years. I did not agree with every last line in every one of those bills. But I did not make the perfect the enemy of the good. I said, I want the education reform.

We passed a crime bill after 6 years of people talking about it before I got here. I did not agree with every line in the crime bill, but I said—and neither did the Attorney General. But we said, we're not going to make the perfect the enemy of the good. We're going to have a principled, honorable compromise. We passed the crime bill. We put over 30,000 police on the street. Crime is going down in America.

So I would plead with the Republicans to think about that, to look at that example. They can have an election over the biggest differences they have with me. Let's not make the perfect the enemy of the good. We have already agreed to enough spending cuts to balance the budget and to give a modest tax cut. Let us do it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:24 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House, prior to a Cabinet meeting.

The President's News Conference
January 11, 1996

The President. Good afternoon. I want to report to you this afternoon and to the American people about the progress we've made toward achieving a balanced budget that reflects our values. But first, let me tell you about the action we are taking to help the millions of people along the East Coast who are stranded and afflicted by the Blizzard of 1996.

I have asked the Director of FEMA, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of Defense to work together and to take all appropriate actions. Today I announced that we will provide Federal disaster assistance in situations where response is beyond the capability of State and local governments. In particular, we will provide funds to open up emergency routes in communities once States have applied for this assistance and FEMA verifies the need. This will allow ambulances, fire trucks, and other emergency workers to do their jobs.

Today I am announcing that this assistance will be provided to Maryland and the District of Columbia. FEMA has also received a request for assistance from New York, and we are expecting shortly to receive requests for assistance from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and Delaware. We will act on these requests quickly.

This has been a trying time for everybody affected. It's often the case that in natural disasters you see the best come out in people. As we continue to dig out from the Blizzard of '96, I hope Americans in their communities will continue to look out for their neighbors, to help those in need, and to pull together. We will do what we can here.

Now I want to discuss the budget. After many weeks of public debate and private discussion, historic agreement on a balanced budget is within reach if we set aside partisanship and work to seize this moment. I'm optimistic that we will balance the budget, and I know we have come too far to let this opportunity slip away.

In the 12 years before I took office, for the first time in America's peacetime history, our Government deficit skyrocketed. Our administration has already cut the deficit nearly in half. But our need to pay off the interest on the debt run up in the last 12 years is giving us a deficit. Indeed, but for the interest payments on the debt run up in the 12 years before I became President, our budget would be in balance today.

We have already reduced the size of the Federal Government by more than 200,000, so that it is smaller than it has been at any time since 1965. As a percentage of the civilian work force, the Federal Government is the smallest it's been since 1933. We cut hundreds of programs. We're eliminating 16,000 pages of rules and regulations. But it's time to finish the job.

Let me be clear: We can balance the budget. We can do it in a way that invests in our people and reflects our values: opportunity for all, doing

our duty for our parents and our children, strengthening our communities, our families, and America.

As all of you know, I have submitted a plan to balance the budget in 7 years using the conservative estimates of the Congressional Budget Office. Let me repeat: With this letter, which I am carrying around with me to remind everyone that we have done it, Congress' own economists confirm what we have said all along. We can balance the budget without excessive cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, without cutting education or the environment or raising taxes on our hardest pressed working families.

Now, as all of you know also, the Republicans in Congress are insisting on cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment that I believe are well beyond what is necessary to balance the budget, well beyond what is necessary to secure the solvencies of those programs, well beyond what is necessary for the Congressional Budget Office to say we have to do to balance the budget.

We all know, too, that there are two strains at work in the Republican effort. There is the genuine desire to balance the budget, which I share. But there are those who want to use the balanced budget and a huge tax cut crammed within the balanced budget to strip our National Government and our country of our ability to do our part here in Washington to help people out in our communities with the challenges they face. We shouldn't let our fundamental agreement on a balanced budget be held hostage to a narrower agenda that seeks to prevent America from giving Medicare to senior citizens or quality nursing home care or educational opportunity for young people or environmental protection to all of us.

We could quickly find common ground on balancing the budget and providing appropriate modest tax relief; we could do this in 15 minutes, after the tens of hours we have already spent together. What has held up this agreement is the insistence of the Republicans on cuts that I believe are excessive in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, and insistence on a tax hike on the lowest income of our working families. These things are not necessary to balance the budget.

Having said that, let me say we have come a long way. We have agreed on well over $600 billion of savings, far more than necessary to balance the budget. This should be a moment for national unity, a time to put aside partisanship, to reject ideology, to find common ground for the common good. A balanced budget that reflects the best of both parties, the best of our values, and will pass on to the next generation a stronger America, that is within our grasp. We should get it done now, and I believe we will get it done in the near future.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

The First Lady

Q. Mr. President, some newly released documents raised questions about some statements by Mrs. Clinton on the White House Travel Office firings and her role in representing the Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan Association. Do you think it would be a good idea for her to testify before Congress to clear up these issues?

The President. Well, she has said that she will do whatever is necessary to answer all the appropriate questions, and I think that she should do that. And I think that we will determine in the days ahead, together, what is necessary. She has begun to answer those questions. We'll be doing some more of that before the week is out, and I presume we'll be doing quite a lot of it in the days ahead. And as you know, there was a hearing, I think, today on part of this matter in the Senate and will be another one next week. These questions should be answered.

Let me say, for 4 years, as these questions have come up, we have tried to answer them all; we have tried to be fully cooperative. And we will be in this case. And I think she should do what is necessary to answer the questions. That's what she said she'll do, and I think that's what will happen.

Q. Is that within the pale, though, testifying? Do you——

The President. Well, I think—I want to leave it the way I said it today. I think whatever is necessary to fully answer the questions she will do. That's what she said she would do, and I think we should leave it there for now.

Budget Negotiations

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Q. Mr. President, Speaker Gingrich seems to have thrown in the towel on the budget, seems to—says something about there won't be a budget, not until the next election. And you

talked to Senator Dole today. Did he agree with that? What's going to happen? Is there a meeting on Wednesday? Also, the last proposal you put on the table, did that make a lot of new major concessions?

The President. Well, let me try to answer all those questions. First of all, we all pledged, all the parties, that we would not discuss our proposals that would require all of us to agree. So I don't believe that I should violate the understandings that we had in our meeting to discuss the specifics.

Let me say that we have come very close together, I believe. We have come most of the way. The differences in dollars are not as different now as some of the differences in policies. We have also made some remarkable progress on policies in some areas. We've had some interesting discussions, for example, on what we should do for small business, arising out of the White House Conference on Small Business. We've talked a lot about the serious problems that would befall our farmers if farm legislation is not enacted, or at least this farm bill extended—should it be allowed to lapse; we can't have that. So we've talked about a lot of other things. We've had long, exhaustive discussions about welfare reform in an attempt to resolve that in the context of these negotiations. So I think the talks have been good, even though there are still some thorny difficulties remaining.

I called Senator Dole today because I just kind of wanted to check in with him and get a reality check. I said, "You know, when we left that meeting I asked you and I asked the Democratic leaders to consider a proposal that I made because I had not made it to the Democrats either. I wanted them, all four, to look at it. We had an agenda of things that our staffs were going to work on during this week, and we characterized it quite consciously as a recess. And I still feel that we can and should reach an agreement. And I just want to make sure you feel that way, and if so, we'll keep working together." And I got a pretty good response.

Now, I have not had a chance to talk to the Speaker. But I can tell you this: When we left, we agreed that they would consider the last suggestion I made, all of them. We agreed that there would be certain things that we would work on together and with the Governors. We agreed that this would be a recess, and we agreed that we would meet on Wednesday. So I assume that all that is still the way it was agreed.

Q. Well, are the American people going to have to tolerate one shutdown after another and neglect of all their services?

The President. Well, as you know, I didn't—I don't approve of any of these shutdowns. I think Congress was wrong to do it the first time. I think it was wrong to continue. I was pleased when Senator Dole said that that policy should be abandoned, and I was pleased when the Speaker said that it was morally indefensible to hold the Federal employees hostage. So I do not believe it will shut down again. There is no need to have a shutdown again.

I'm telling you, we're not that far apart. If the objective is balancing the budget and giving an appropriate tax cut, we are not that far apart. And we ought to resolve the policy issues we can resolve, put the ones we can't to the side. There will be plenty of things to argue about in the election season, but this is something we ought to give the American people. And I think we will. I'm quite confident. I think we will.

Mr. Blitzer [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

President's Visit to Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, could you explain to us why it's so important that you go to Bosnia at this moment, when U.S. troops and NATO troops are still trying to implement the peace agreement and having all sorts of logistical problems, and the security situation, frankly, is not very good, as well? Why endanger yourself and the deployment in order to go to Bosnia right now?

The President. Well, first of all, I do not believe that in going there I would endanger the deployment. And the judgment about whether I am in danger is one that is made by the Secret Service, and they believe we can make the trip that we have scheduled. I would not go if the commanders were not ready for me to come.

As you know, I wanted very much to go there over Christmas, on Christmas Eve. But our commander there said that it was an inappropriate thing to do because of the disruption in the deployment.

I think it's important that I go see the troops, that I see firsthand how this mission that I have

sent them on is being implemented, that I tell them, personally, that they are doing a good job. They are performing a remarkable service in a terribly important mission. So I feel quite comfortable about this trip. We have worked very hard with our commanders on the ground in Bosnia to structure the trip so that its objectives can be met without in any way undermining our fundamental mission there. And on the security front, I feel quite comfortable with the trip as it has been designed and as we will carry it out.

Yes?

Budget Negotiations

Q. The offer that you made over the weekend—certified now, as you point out, by the Congressional Budget Office—has extracted from the Republicans a rather substantial set of concessions, the most substantial they've made yet. In light of that, they seem to be expecting you to counter that with a similar offer of your own. If you did, and you're as close as you say they are, it seems that would almost clinch it. Why not go ahead and do that, sir?

The President. That's my speech. You just made my speech for me. [*Laughter*] I have—first of all, I believe if you look at the spending concessions and you start from equal points, whether you start from our beginning budget offers or the ones that were made back in December, we have both made substantial concessions away from our original point.

My belief is that we should go for a balanced budget that is scored in a way that Congress recognizes because that's what the law requires, but that having done that, we should not—we should not—violate the other conditions of our previous agreement which is to take any risks with Medicare or Medicaid or do things that we know will cause us to undermine our investment in education and the environment.

Now, we can do that and get a tax cut. We still have some differences on policies relating to Medicare. We're trying to work out our differences over Medicaid. We still have some significant differences on environmental policies. But I believe all that can be worked out. And so that's why I say I have been somewhat surprised at some of the negative tone of the stories coming out since we adjourned because I, frankly, felt quite good, and I did make them, as I said, an offer that I hoped that they would sleep on and work on.

Q. Well, is now the time for the President to come forward and say, let's split the difference?

The President. It's not as simple as splitting the difference. It's not just—there's more than money at stake here. There are policies at stake. And if you split the difference, again, according to the rules of the Congressional Budget Office, there must be policies which back up whatever number that you pick. So that's why I say that if we know we can balance the budget and we know it will work over 7 years, we shouldn't go beyond that in any kind of gratuitous cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that will require policy changes that either we may have to back up on, which will undermine the credibility of the agreement, or that could do serious damage to the programs.

The First Lady

Q. Mr. President, when you campaigned in 1992, you and the First Lady both said that the American people would get two for the price of one. I wondered if that's still going to be a slogan in 1996, and if the First Lady has really taken the role that you envisioned for her as First Lady or if she's just simply become too controversial?

The President. Well, first of all, I think she's done a fine job. I may have asked her to do more than anybody should ever have been asked to do when I asked her to undertake the health care effort. But there are worse things than wanting every American child to have health care coverage, just the way every child in every other advanced country in the world has.

I believe that—in the last 6 months or 8 months she wanted to take a lot of time off to write her book, which she did do. And I think the book is a very important contribution to America which reflects 25 years of work, learning, and exposure on her part. And I expect that she will continue to be an enormous positive force in this country.

And in terms of controversy, very often in this town you don't make yourself controversial; someone else makes you controversial. So I don't think you can do anything about that, especially in the wake of the health care issue.

Q. If I could just follow up, sir, are you saying that her conduct, especially involving the Travel Office and the discrepancies in what she said about her involvement in Madison Guaranty,

that these things have nothing to do with the controversy?

The President. Well, let me tell you, you are assuming something that has not been proved. No discrepancies have been established. Now, we were all concerned, as we have all said, that we kept hearing all these reports after we got here that there were problems with the Travel Office. It turns out there were problems with the Travel Office, and they were serious. An accounting firm said they were serious. Those have been corrected. The American people should feel good about that. We also said—Mr. McLarty did, who was then the Chief of Staff, undertook his own review and said the matter wasn't handled well and detailed why. There have been something like seven reviews of the Travel Office.

So I would dispute your characterization. An allegation is not the same thing as a fact. And particularly, I would remind the American people, when it comes to the whole Whitewater issue, the allegations have often—matter of fact, virtually always borne no relationship to the facts. That's really the story of this for the last 4 years. An allegation comes up, and we answer it. And then people say, "Well, here's another allegation. Answer this." And then, "Here's another allegation. Answer this." That is the way we are living here in Washington today.

We're going to do it, and I would ask that—the American people are fundamentally fair-minded. And as I would say, I just ask all of you to listen to the answers and do what the American people will do, make up your own mind.

Yes, Brian [Brian Williams, NBC News].

Q. Mr. President, do you worry about the cumulative effect of this drumbeat, which is getting louder? As of close of business today, there will be more people under subpoena in the Travel Office matter than were fired in the Travel Office matter. And second, you must have discussed why it is—even if cleared in the end of all charges—why it is your wife, the First Lady, appears to be the most—arguably, the most controversial First Lady at least in modern politics.

The President. Since Eleanor Roosevelt, for many of the same reasons, from many of the same sources. And that's just part of what we're living through. The American people can make up their own mind about the facts of it.

President's Financial Obligations

Q. To kind of stay on this theme of controversy, the end result seems to be that it's taken a toll financially on your obligations. And there's a magazine report out that's assessed your situation and basically decides that you're pretty close to bankruptcy. Could you give us a little bit of the financial toll?

The President. You know, I feel worse—I suppose that probably is right. I've never added it all up, but that's probably right. And I would like to remind you that today finally, at long last, records that everybody knew existed that weren't released apparently had been released. Apparently, the Republicans finally agreed to release the Resolution Trust Corporation report, which spent another $4 million of the taxpayers' money to say what we said all along, that there is no basis even for a civil action against us, that we told the truth about the land agreement we had, that we'd lost the money that we'd said we'd lost, that we had nothing to do with operating the savings and loan, that we took no money from it, just like we've said all along.

So I think that's apparently part of the price of this. I tell you, I feel a lot worse about all the innocent people who work here who don't make particularly high salaries and don't have the net worth that we brought here, who had to hire lawyers and pay legal fees too, who were completely innocent of any wrongdoing and who have to deal with that.

I think it is interesting—let me say, I have no objection to—if anybody has a question of me, I'll be glad to keep answering them. But I do think it is interesting, when you were talking about getting the budget balanced and the controversy over Medicare, that this Congress has had over 40 hearings on Whitewater and one hearing on its Medicare bill. And if you look at—and I think that's an observation worth noting. I don't know what it means exactly.

Yes.

Budget Negotiations

Q. Back to the budget for a second. If the Republicans agree to reduce their tax cut, would you, in turn, agree to make more cuts in Medicare and Medicaid?

The President. Let me say again, I think it is wrong—first of all, I agreed not to discuss the negotiations retrospectively, and I'm having

a hard enough time negotiating in private. I can't do it with you as well as them.

But I want to make two comments. First of all, it is important that the budget number have integrity. Therefore, it is important that the budget number be supported by policies to achieve that number. And I will—I have not offered anything that I did not think there was a policy to back up, that would actually save money without hurting our efforts to provide Medicare to the seniors or to help poor and disabled children or the seniors in nursing homes that get the benefit of the Medicaid program.

So that is basically my parameter. And I'm open to new ideas and new suggestions on that. We're trying to encourage more people and more States to have the option of managed care because we know that will lower inflation in the out-years without undermining the integrity of the program or the services available. No one knows exactly how much savings that will achieve, so we're trying to find a more reasonable thing to do on that.

Now, as a general proposition, I don't think that I or any Democrat—and I believe many Republicans—want to be in the position of appearing to have cut Medicare and Medicaid to fund an excessive tax cut. On the other hand, we can have some modest, but significant, tax relief in this budget bill if we do it right.

Q. Mr. President, back to the economy again. In assuming that perhaps some of the pessimism might be justified, as the markets have done in the past couple of days, are you willing, first of all, to consider a long-term CR that would keep the Government operating but not settle the budget question until, as you say, there is an election about it? And two, are you willing to pay the economic price of that happening, considering the way the markets reacted over the past couple of days on news that there may not be a deal?

The President. Let me give you two answers to that. First of all, if that happens, I'll cross that bridge when I come to it, and we'll all have to talk about it. But every time we have started to talk about what would happen if we didn't reach an agreement in our private meetings and how we would move from—we stopped after about 2 minutes, because at least in the context of our private conversations, no one has wanted to acknowledge that we could not reach an agreement for a plan over 7 years because we are close enough to do it and because we know we owe it to the United States to do it. So I believe we will reach an agreement.

Now, let me make a comment that I made the other day in a different context that I think perhaps I didn't emphasize enough. You now have two parties, not one, committed to reducing this deficit until it is eliminated. You have a record here of the Democratic President and our Democrats in Congress who alone—alone—passed a budget plan in 1993 that has reduced our deficit by one-half.

So I would say to the American people and to the financial markets, we're going to get this budget deficit down until the budget is balanced. But the best way to do it is to sign an agreement now so people can see. It's like the man on the moon—the budget will be balanced by "x" date. And that's what I think we should do. And I still believe that we will.

Tax Cut

Q. Mr. President, back on the budget, the Republicans propose a tax cut; you propose a tax cut. How will a tax cut, a modest tax cut, reduce the deficit?

The President. Well, first of all, the tax cut won't reduce the deficit unless it leads to increased growth in the context of a deficit reduction plan. If it does lead to increased growth, if it's part of—if it's a balanced plan so that the deficit reduction still has credibility, then the tax cut can play an important part of that by helping to provide some extra income, particularly to hard-pressed families with children who have had a more difficult time the last 10 or 15 years.

Let me ask you—you could make the same argument about education. You could say, well, how can you invest money on education and reduce the deficit? You do it because it strengthens the economy over the long run.

So if we target this tax relief particularly to families, to people seeking an education, to some of the priorities of the White House Conference on Small Business, some of those things that we've all talked about that I think we have broad agreement on, it will strengthen America, and in so strengthening America, it will make us stronger, we'll grow more, and we'll do better. But we have to do it in the context of knowing we're going to balance that budget.

Yes, Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio].

Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich

Q. Mr. President, at the height of one of the earlier phases of the budget negotiations you made a comment about the tail wagging the dog in the House of Representatives. You didn't mention any names that day. So I'd like to ask you, what is your assessment of Mr. Gingrich's leadership of his troops during the budget fight and, for that matter, for the past year of his speakership overall?

The President. Well, first of all, you have to look and say that they've held together pretty well. And you have to give him credit for that. He's held them together pretty well on a course that I have often disagreed with, but you must give him credit for that.

The only time that they had a significant breaking of ranks that moved toward the Democrats was on some environmental issues that I—and of course, I agreed with those who broke because I think we should have a stronger environmental policy in the United States than most of them do. But otherwise, they've pretty well stayed together.

Now, on the Government reopening, there were 17 that were, if you will, to Mr. Gingrich's right; they wanted to leave the Government closed and continue to play out this strategy, which I think was wrong. But I think he did the right thing there, just as I believe Senator Dole did in abandoning the strategy first. I think that when Speaker Gingrich saw that we had a plan that the Congressional Budget Office had scored, that I was continuing to work hard with him to reach an agreement, and it was wrong to keep the people out of work or have people working and not be paid—you know, you never—I say, "never"—you often don't get 100 percent.

So I think he's still clearly the Speaker and clearly the leader of that House group. And I think he has a strong hand there.

Q. Do you think he should be more cautious about comments that affect the market like the comment that he made yesterday?

The President. Well, you know, this is one of those areas where I think we all have to take responsibility for ourselves. I don't think I should be characterizing that.

Yes, Mara [Mara Liasson, National Public Radio].

Whitewater Investigation

Q. You made a point about being open and cooperative with the Special Counsel and the investigating committees, and you've turned over tens of thousands of documents. The documents that were recently turned over, however, weren't turned over for a very long period of time. I'm wondering if you're concerned enough about that delay to look into why they weren't turned over, and if you found that any of your staff hadn't been cooperative with the committees, what would you recommend to do about it?

The President. Well, first of all, I have no reason to believe that anybody on our staff has not been cooperative. And I think that everyone who's commented on this from the other side has basically supported that.

Now, on these last two matters, the people who—and let me remind you, these documents were not leaked, they were not found by investigators. These documents were found by people in the White House who turned them over. And the people who are on the committees will have every opportunity to ask them what the circumstances were in which they were found.

But we've told everybody that we're in the cooperation business. That's what we want to do. We want to get this over with. If I had known about these documents at the time they existed, I would have been glad to put them in an envelope myself and send them down there, because I think to just keep dragging this out is not good and not necessary. So I'm—the more the merrier, the quicker the better.

Q. Mr. President.

The President. Yes.

Q. If I could follow up, do you, though, feel you've gotten a satisfactory explanation from whatever staff was involved on why they were not found, and what was that explanation?

The President. Well, I have no reason to believe that there was any intentional failure to turn them over. I do not know. I want to wait and see what happens. They are all going to be given the opportunity to explain what the circumstances were. But our rules are clear, and our record is clear. I mean, we have literally pushed, I think, over 50,000 pieces of paper to the committees now and to all the relevant other bodies. And we are clearly trying to cooperate.

Yes, ma'am.

1996 Presidential Election

Q. Mr. President, the New Hampshire primary is now only about 6 weeks away. Do you plan to formally announce that you intend to run for reelection and name a campaign manager and a campaign chairman? And if so, when?

The President. Well, I think people know what my intentions are, but I—in due course I will make those announcements.

I do believe, and I have said this repeatedly, that I think this process going on 4 years is too long. Indeed, when I announced for President as a virtual unknown in 1991, I didn't do it until October of 1991. And I just think that the process is too long. And I have a lot of work to do here as President. I'm trying to work with Senator Dole and Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Armey and others to get an agreement on the balanced budget. I am very concerned about making sure that things are going as they should in Bosnia. And I want to do my job as long as I can. But there will be plenty of time for politics this year. I imagine that everybody will be glad when the next election is done.

Debt Limit

Q. Mr. President, no budget deal could well mean no increase in the Government's borrowing authority. And I'm wondering whether you are willing to risk default as one of the costs of having no deal, or whether you're willing to invoke some emergency powers to increase that authority, even though the Treasury has been concerned that they may not have the legal basis to do that?

The President. Well, the Secretary of the Treasury has done a very good job in managing that so far and has not done anything that he has not been told he's on solid ground in doing. I think it would be wrong and almost inconceivable for the United States to default on its debt. It was bad enough to shut the Government down. It was harmful to the American people and to the good people who work for the Federal Government. That was wrong as part of some sort of strategy. And this would be wrong. We have never refused to pay our debts. We are a great nation, and I don't believe we'll do that.

Q. Mr. President, following up on that, with the debt limit so close at hand, it's not one of the issues that can be put off until November. Secretary Rubin, for example, says in a few weeks we may face another crunch. Are you actively negotiating anything on the debt limit that could resolve it well ahead of some of the other budget issues that might be delayed until November?

The President. Well, we have had very serious discussions within the context of the budget talks. And obviously, if there is a budget agreement, everyone assumes it will be resolved. But I believe it will be resolved regardless, because it would be wrong not to do it. It would be simply wrong.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman

Q. Mr. President, a question about Alan Greenspan. As you know, his term is due to expire in a couple of months. Can you tell us when you plan to make a decision about whether you will nominate him for another term, what factors you are going to consider, and whether one of those factors would be the potential instability in the financial markets if you decided to nominate someone else?

The President. I have to make that decision within a couple of months, as you pointed out, and I'm going to follow my standard practice and tell you that I will make that decision in an appropriate way and announce it at the appropriate time. Obviously, I have done what I could to show the American people that we have a responsible Government. We are bringing the deficit down. We are looking out for the long-term health of the American economy, and we've had, I believe, the appropriate relationship with the Federal Reserve. And that's why we're still growing the economy without inflation.

Budget Negotiations

Q. Mr. President, do you see any danger to the economy if there is no budget deal this year at all, such as a recession?

The President. There should not be. We have the lowest combined rates of inflation and unemployment in 27 years now. We have worked very hard to keep unemployment going down, keep it well down under 6 percent, and to keep the inflation low. The underlying fundamentals are good. And our economic analysts say that they expect continued growth with no inflation in 1996.

I think it would—let me just say this: I think that if we could get a budget agreement, it would be better for the economy, because I think it would be a spur for even lower interest rates and to have a longer recovery with longer, more stable growth. So I don't know that anything bad will happen if we don't get it, but it would be considerably better if we did.

And let me say again, if we decide that what we want to do is to balance the budget in 7 years—I have demonstrated with this letter I keep showing you that Congress has said that I have a plan to do it; they have a plan to do it; we are closer together than we were by far when these talks began. We can balance the budget. In order to do that, some of the differences between me and the Congress over some of these issues will have to be taken out of that budget agreement and deferred for the election. But that's what elections are for. We should not make the perfect the enemy of the good. Let me say that again: We should not make the perfect the enemy of the good. It is a good thing to balance the budget. It is a good thing to have the right kind of tax cut.

If there are other matters that cannot be resolved, we should defer them, have an election about them, let the American people make their judgments. Meanwhile, all of us, whatever happens in the next election, will always be able to say we passed a credible balanced budget plan; we passed a reasonable tax cut; we did what was right for America; and we didn't undermine our obligations in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment.

1996 Election Issues

Q. Mr. President, as I recall, you once told the Republicans that if they wanted to pass these ideological changes, they'd have to have someone else behind the Oval Office desk to sign them into law. Is that what this boils down to, you putting your Presidency on the line for the budgetary items and the Government programs you believe in? And isn't that what the Speaker is saying, that these have—isn't he saying that these have to be resolved before they'll do any budget, other than continuing resolutions?

The President. But the point I'm trying to make—that is what I said. And if you look at the context in which I said it, at the proposals they then had on the table, already they have moved on that. And I have made a good faith effort to come toward them. But that's what you have elections about.

The way democracies work—and particularly the way ours has worked for 200 years—is that people of good faith and honest differences attempt to reconcile their differences. And then when they can't, they attempt to do what they can and then let the voters resolve their differences that they can't resolve at election time. The important thing now is that all the American people know that one of the differences we do not have to resolve is whether we should pass a credible balanced budget plan. That can be done. That can be done in no time. We have already—both sides have agreed to well over—well over $600 billion in spending reductions. We have agreed to more than enough to balance the budget in 7 years and still give a modest tax cut. So that is no longer at issue.

My view is we should do both those things. We should pass the balanced budget. We should give a modest tax cut. We should put the other differences off for the election. That's what elections are for. But that's not an excuse for us to lay down on the job now. The people hired us to show up for work every day. I mean, to say, well, we're not going to do anything until the people vote in November—this is not a parliamentary system. This is the American system, and it requires us responsibly to do what we can to set aside our partisan differences when we have an agreement and not hold up the good things waiting for what we believe are the better things. The better things, we can debate those in the election.

Q. Mr. President, what are the issues you think should be deferred to the election? You've mentioned Medicare and Medicaid several times as things you just can't tolerate that degree of cut.

The President. Well, I think the—and the structure of Medicare. You know, we can try some experiments, but to fundamentally change the structure of Medicare so that it would no longer be a recognizable guarantee for our seniors, I think that is going too far in the direction of just turning it over to insurance companies and other private providers.

Whether Medicaid should be a block grant instead of a guarantee from the Nation to our poor and disabled children and to seniors in nursing homes, that's something I think could be deferred to the election. But we can make an 80 percent agreement because I am in favor

of letting the States have much more flexibility in the way they run the program.

Or some of the environmental aspects of their plan that I do not believe properly belong in that. I don't see why we should cloud this budget agreement with controversial items like whether we should drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Those things are not necessary to balance the budget.

Q. Is that to say then, sir, that Medicaid and——

Debt Limit

Q. What can you say to U.S. investors to allay their fears that a debt limit will be increased? And do you feel that the Republicans actually understand what they're playing with?

The President. Well, I hope they do. Normally they say they're more pro-business than I am. I dispute that. I think that this administration has been very good for American business. But I will say again: It would be wrong for the Congress not to extend the debt limit so that we can pay our bills. As a country, a great country, we have never done that. We have never let the financial markets be in any doubt; we have never let the citizens who hold our debt be in any doubt that America is as good as its word, and we pay our bills. And I believe in the end that's what we'll do.

Earned-Income Tax Credit

Q. What are your policy—Mr. President, what are your policy concerns and parameters around the earned-income tax credit?

The President. Well, my policies are simple. The earned-income tax credit was first enacted, I believe, under a Republican President, Mr. Ford. I believe that either President Bush or President Reagan expanded it a little bit. President Reagan said it was the best antipoverty program in the last 30 years. So this has always had strong bipartisan support. When I became President, I asked the Congress to roughly double the earned-income tax credit because I wanted to say, "If you work 40 hours a week and you have a child in your home, no matter how low your wage is, you will not live in poverty. You will not be taxed into poverty. The tax system will lift you out of poverty." I wanted to do that because I thought it was pro-work and pro-family, and because I thought it would encourage people to leave welfare and come to work.

Now, in the last 3 years we've had a decline in the welfare rolls, a decline in the food stamp rolls, a decline in the poverty rolls. That didn't all happen because of the earned-income tax credit, but it made a contribution. They believe there are some abuses in it; so do I. We have agreed on savings from abuse. There are disputes. Should single workers get a modest earned-income tax credit even though they don't have children? Many of them say no. I believe they should because if you're out there working, even if you're single, with minimum wage, your payroll—or even above minimum wage—your payroll tax will be much bigger than your income tax. And those folks are having a hard time keeping body and soul together. The vast majority of this money goes to people with children.

There are some other questions there that we could debate, but the core principle is the one I want to maintain. I think the United States ought to be able to say if you're out there working like you should full time and you have a child when you come home from work, you ought not to have to raise that child in poverty. That is the principle behind the program and the one to which I want to adhere.

I'll take one more.

Whitewater Related Legal Bills

Q. Mr. President, another Whitewater related question. Money magazine recently reported that you owe some $1.6 million in unpaid legal bills——

The President. That's just what he said.

Q. ——related mostly to Whitewater investigations. Is it fair that taxpayers could end up paying some of those legal bills?

The President. Well, this is a—as I understand the law, the taxpayers won't pay any of the bills, because I'm not a target of the investigation, which the American people might find interesting to know. As I understand it, the Federal Government doesn't reimburse people's legal bills unless—I think one of the Cabinet members in a previous administration got some legal bills reimbursed because he was a target of an investigation and then was either acquitted or not charged or something.

So I am assuming that I will be responsible in some form or fashion for those legal bills. But as I said, I didn't run for this office for the money. And I feel badly that 20 years of our hard effort and savings may go away. We've

received some help from some people who, as you know, have contributed to the legal expense fund.

But if I stay healthy, I'll be able to pay my bills and earn a pretty good living. I'm far more concerned about the legal bills of other people that are much—they're smaller legal bills, but for them it's a lot of money. So I'm a lot more concerned about them than myself.

Yes, sir. One more.

Budget Negotiations

Q. Could you clarify something, sir? Some of your answers today seem to suggest that you might agree with Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Dole that it might well take another election to resolve this whole budget deal.

The President. No, I disagree with that. I completely disagree with that.

Q. So you believe then, sir, that this is not going to go on and on and on. I mean, can you predict right now that by the State of the Union Address——

The President. Let me just say that if it's up to me, I will do everything I can to keep it from going on and on. That is, we know you have now two plans that the Congressional Budget Office has certified. You just have to take my word for it, because we promised not to discuss the negotiations, but we've moved closer together. We are not that far apart on the money. As a percentage of the total monies that will be spent in the categories at issue, we probably are warring over less than 2 percent now. But in terms of the policies and the human impact, the potential is very great in that money that's left. So there are policy differences left.

Now, what I'm saying to you is we owe it to the American people to pass a balanced budget deal and to do it now, because we have both identified more than enough savings to do it and to have the tax cut. We should agree on everything we possibly can. Then those things we can't we should defer to the next election. But when the voters vote in the next election they should have no doubt that their budget is going to be balanced and that Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment are going to be protected; that the country is going to be stronger, that we are moving in the right direction and that here are these two very different sets of views about how we can best meet the challenges of the future. You decide, make your judgment, and you're still in the driver's seat. But meanwhile, we did what we were hired to do and what we said we would do, which is to balance the budget.

We have to adjourn, but let me just say this before I quit—where's Charlie Tasnadi? Where are you? Where are you? This is his—after 32 years working for AP, this is his very last Presidential press conference. Thanks for doing a great job. Let's give him a big hand. [*Applause*] I'm not sure you're old enough to retire, but there are some days when I can understand why you decided to. [*Laughter*]

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President's 113th news conference began at 4 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. A portion of this news conference could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Teleconference Remarks to Ohio Democratic Caucuses
January 11, 1996

I want to say hello to all of you in Ohio, and especially—[*applause*]—can you hear me? [*Applause*] That's great.

I want to thank your party chair, David Leland, and Senator John Glenn and your former party chair, Jim Ruvolo, for all of your hard work in organizing tonight's caucuses. And I want to thank all of you for signing on to help us tonight.

We've got people there, I know, from all across Ohio: in Cleveland and Greenville; in Columbus and New Philadelphia, Cincinnati and Waverly; in Dayton, where the Bosnian peace agreement was made; in Marion, Toledo, and Milan; in Youngstown and Springfield; in Canton and Mentor and Akron and Lorain. To all of you, thank you very much.

You all know that Ohio is very special to me. The Ohio primaries put me over the top

on the road to the Democratic nomination. And Ohio's delegates put me over the top for the nomination at the convention in New York City in 1992. And of course, on November 4th, 1992, it was the electoral votes of the State of Ohio that put me over the top in the electoral college. So I know how much I owe to the State of Ohio and to all of you in particular. And I thank you for everything you have done and for your commitment to help us in the months ahead.

Every American knows that we are living in a time of great change. We're moving toward a new century. We're moving from the industrial to the information and technology age. We're moving from the cold war to the global village. This is a time of immense possibility and great challenge for our country.

I think all of you know that when I ran for President it was to address these challenges and to take advantage of these possibilities; to restore the American dream; to make the American people a stronger community; and to preserve our leadership as a great force for peace and freedom around the world. And we've done that with a simple strategy: grow the economy; give the American people a smaller, better Government; and restore mainstream values in our national life.

If you look at the Ohio economy, if you look at the national economy, we've cut the deficit in half. We've expanded trade to record levels. We've invested in the education of the American people and their technological future. And look what we've got: almost 8 million jobs, a 15-year high in homeownership, a 27-year low in the combined rates of unemployment and inflation. Unemployment is down in Ohio from 7 percent to under 5 percent. In Ohio, you've got almost 300,000 new private sector jobs. And the debt has been cut over $15,000 for every family of four in Ohio.

We changed the way this Government works. Do you know there are more than 200,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government than there were when I became President, thanks to the work the Democrats did to make Government more effective and fairer?

And most important of all, we're being more true to our values. We passed a tough crime bill, and that helped people all across America to bring the crime rate down. We've given States all over America the freedom to move people from welfare to work. And the welfare rolls are down. The food stamp rolls are down. The poverty rolls are down. The teen pregnancy rolls are down. These are things the American people did, but our policies, the crime bill, the welfare reform, they have helped.

You know we have challenges ahead, but the only way we can meet them is to keep moving in the direction that we're going—and I know that everyone in Ohio must be so proud that Ohio was the place, with the eyes of the world watching, where the peace in Bosnia was made—to go with the progress that our country has made in the Middle East, in Northern Ireland, and reducing the nuclear threat. That's a record we can all be proud of, a record we can all be proud to run on and run with, and embrace and bring people to the Democratic Party with.

Now, if you look at this budget fight we're having in Congress today, it's another example of what I've been working for since 1993 when I became your President. I want to balance the budget. If it weren't for the debt run up in the 12 years before I became President, the interest payments on that, we'd have a balanced budget today. I have worked hard in good faith to reach an agreement with the Congress. But you know, this is not about numbers. We have already identified more than enough cuts to balance the budget and give a modest tax cut. This is about whether we're going to protect Medicare, Medicaid, our investments in education, our environment, whether we're going to protect working families from having their taxes increased while others get a tax cut. That's what I'm fighting for, for an America in the future that you can be proud of, that will be worthy of the support that I received from the people of Ohio.

I want every child in the State of Ohio and in the United States to be able to look forward to a brighter future. That's what I'm working for. I think you can go out in the State and say, "Look at where we were in 1992; look at where we are today; look at where we have to go." If you'll do that, we'll work together, we'll win a victory, but more importantly, the people of our country will win a victory.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:52 p.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

Address to the People of Bosnia
January 11, 1996

To all the people of Bosnia, let me say I look forward to being with you tomorrow in a land where the waste of war is finally giving way to the promise of peace. As I visit with American peacekeeping forces stationed in Bosnia, I urge you to seize that promise, to turn the peace agreement signed one month ago from words into deeds.

For nearly 4 years, the war that tore Bosnia apart dramatized your differences. But for all that divides you, so much more unites you. Of course you are proud to be Muslims or Croats or Serbs. But all of you are also citizens of Bosnia, bound together by marriage and culture, by language and work, by shared love in a place you all call home. I believe that deep down you all want the same things: To live and raise your families without fear, to make a better life for your children. If these desires are ever to become reality, there must be peace.

The United States and countries all around the world have sent you the men and women of our Armed Forces to help safeguard the peace so many of you have wanted for so long. Our troops are well prepared and heavily armed, but they come in peace. Their mission is to supervise the withdrawal of your armies behind the agreed separation line, to help assure that war does not break out again, to create a more secure climate throughout Bosnia so that you can rebuild your towns and roads, your factories and shops, your parks and playgrounds.

We can help you do all these things, but we cannot guarantee that the people of Bosnia will come together and stay together as citizens, equal citizens, of a common land with a shared destiny. Only you can do that, with the courage of an open mind and the generosity of an open heart.

After so many lives lost and futures destroyed, I know that rebuilding a sense of community and trust may be the very hardest task you face. But you have a responsibility to try—not because other nations want you to do it, not even because your leaders want you to do it—you must do that for yourselves and especially for your children. It is said that every child is the chance for a new beginning. Now this peace gives to all the children of Bosnia and to all of their families the chance for a new beginning. Seize this chance for peace.

We don't have to imagine what the future will look like if you don't; we have seen that in the sorrow and suffering you have endured already over the past 4 years. But just imagine the future if you do seize this moment, if you do rebuild your land and your lives together. For so much of your history you found strength in your diversity. Muslims, Croats, and Serbs flourished side by side in Sarajevo, in Tuzla, in Mostar, and throughout Bosnia. Some of you prayed in churches, some in mosques, some in synagogues. But you lived and worked together, building schools and libraries, trading goods and services, creating plays and music. You were neighbors and friends and families, and you can be again if you seize the best chance for peace you have had, and what could be the last chance for peace you will have for a long, long time.

I speak to you today on behalf of the American people, who know from our own experience the hard work it takes to forge a community from a nation of so many different groups. More than a century ago, we fought a fierce Civil War over race and slavery. Still today we struggle with the legacy of that war and the challenge of our present makeup when we have so many races and religions and ethnic groups all over America. But we have learned that there are great benefits which come from finding common ground. Our Nation is stronger and the lives of our people are more peaceful, more prosperous, more filled with hope when we bridge the valley of our differences to become a real community. Together with nations from all corners of the world, we have come here to Bosnia to help you do the same.

So, people of Bosnia, you have ended your war, but now you must build your peace. I believe the greatest struggle you face is not among Muslims and Serbs and Croats; it is between those who embrace peace and those who reject it, those who look to the future and those who are blinded by the past, those who open their arms and those who still clench their fists. So each and every one of you must choose. You have seen the horror of war; you know the promise of peace. Choose peace.

May God bless all the people of Bosnia.

NOTE: This address was videotaped at 10:04 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for later broadcast on the U.S. Information Agency WORLDNET, and it was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 12. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address.

Interview on Bosnia With the Voice of America
January 11, 1996

Q. Mr. President, you are regarded as a hero in Bosnia; you are the person who brought peace over there. Yet, we do have some renewed fighting between Muslims and Croats. Are you going to be meeting with any local leaders and addressing the issue?

The President. Well, I know I'm going to see President Izetbegovic, and I'm going to hopefully see President Tudjman. And we may be able to see some others, as well; I don't think that it's been finalized, all the people I will speak with. But I will do what I can while I'm there to help to encourage the parties to follow the letter and the spirit of the Dayton agreement and the Paris peace accord.

Q. NATO bombed the Bosnian Serbs, we know that, and these people are terrified. What do we tell them now that NATO is back in Bosnia?

The President. You should tell them that NATO is back in Bosnia only because the leaders of all the groups asked NATO to come in, as a strictly neutral partner. If you look at the United States, we have agreed to work in an area of Bosnia where we will be working with the Russians who are more sympathetic with the Serbs. We and the Russians are working together in the hope that we can convince all the parties, the Serbs, the Croats, and the Muslims, that we have no ill will toward anyone, we wish to hurt no one, we are there only to help them implement the peace agreement their own leaders have made.

Q. Thank you.

The President. Thank you.

Q. Good luck.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at approximately 10:15 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House, and it was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 12. In his remarks, the President referred to President Alija Izetbegovic of Bosnia-Herzegovina and President Franjo Tudjman of Croatia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Remarks to Employees at the Peterbilt Truck Plant in Nashville, Tennessee
January 12, 1996

The President. Thank you. Boy, I'm glad to be here. I need this—sort of a fix from home. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank the Vice President for his wonderful statement this morning, but more important, I want every one of you to know that whether it's working on downsizing our Government in a way that gives the American people a Government that works better for less, or working on finding ways to protect our environment in ways that grow jobs instead of undermining the economy, or working on our relationships with Russia in a way that makes sure we are never, never, never again threatened with the specter of nuclear war, Al Gore, from Carthage, Tennessee, is the most influential and effective Vice President in the history of the United States of America.

I've got a lot of friends here today. I want to thank the mayor for coming, and Congressmen Clement and Gordon and Tanner, and my dear friend, your former Governor, Ned Ray

McWherter, who actually purchases your trucks. At least, that's what he tells me. [*Laughter*] The first time I met Ned McWherter, I talked to him for 30 seconds, and I wanted to reach in my back pocket and make sure my billfold was still there. [*Laughter*] But they're not making many like him anymore, and I'm glad to see him looking so thin and fit. Looks like a new morning. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Joe Scattergood and Wayne Wooten for going through the plant with me. And thank you, Bobby Lee, for what you said and for being here. And thank you, Tom Plimpton, for the wonderful tour. And let me say also, I want to thank these retirees who are back here, and I want to mention I met two people today who work here and this is their last day on the job. And I want to acknowledge them because I think Al Gore and I should have shown up for their retirement parties.

The first person has been here 25 years, Mr. Bill Douglas. He's over there. [*Applause*] Thank you. And I met a lady on the line. I don't know where she is, but she's been here 19 years, and she's leaving today. Her name is Dorris Skaggs. Dorris, where are you? Give her a hand. [*Applause*]

I want to say one word—before I talk about where we are with the big budget fight in Washington and the economy, I want to say a word about one other issue that involves three people from this plant. As the Vice President said, as soon as I leave you here in Nashville today I am going to Bosnia to visit the men and women who are helping to secure the peace agreement there. With our help the people of Bosnia, who for 4 long years were denied the simple chance to go to work and raise their children in peace, now have an opportunity to rebuild their lives and their country.

Bosnia is the country where World War I began. Bosnia is a country that's so closely tied to others that if that war were to spread, it could cause many Americans and many other people from freedom-loving countries around the world to lose their lives trying to stop it. So we have worked hard not to try to fight a war but to bring a peace for the humanitarian reasons that involve the people there and to keep that war from spreading in ways that could hurt the United States and our friends and allies in Europe. This is a very good thing the American people and our friends from around the world are doing. And all Americans should be proud of what they are doing in Bosnia.

Three of your own coworkers are in Germany right now with their National Guard units supporting that mission. A lot of Americans don't know this, but you can't just send soldiers to Bosnia. We have people in Hungary supporting them, people in Croatia supporting them, and people in Germany supporting them. And the people that you have are Emmett Northington, who puts these world-class trucks together, Charles Hobson, who paints them, and Richard "Lightning" Maxwell, who actually gets to test drive these machines. Give them a hand. Let's give them a hand. [*Applause*] Most of the time these people work right beside you. Today they are a long way away, working for a better, safer world. I know they and their families will remain in your prayers until the day when they all come back here to work again.

What they are doing, to me symbolizes what the great issue of our time is all about. The United States, if you just look at the rest of the world with the cold war over, it is tempting for us to say, "Boy, we ought to just shut down our defense and come home and hope nothing bad happens." But the truth is that, as Nashville, as this area perhaps more than any other area of the South knows, we are tied in with the rest of the world today whether we like it or not. And we have a profound interest in seeing the United States be the world's leading source of energy for peace and freedom and democracy. It helps us economically, and it helps us to be more secure.

I am proud of what our country has been able to do in the last couple of years in Bosnia and the Middle East, in Haiti and Northern Ireland and southern Africa. I am proud of the fact that with the leadership of the Vice President, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not a single nuclear missile pointed at an American child today. I am proud of that.

With terrorism threatening people all around the world, both homegrown terrorism—we've seen that—and terrorists coming into our country to make mischief and kill people—we've seen that—I am proud of the fact that because we're cooperating with other countries, we have actually seen them help us arrest, apprehend, and send back to this country people who came into our country and killed innocent people for

illegitimate political ends. I am proud of that, because we do cooperate.

Because we cooperate with other countries, I am proud of the fact that our military and our civilian law enforcement officials helped to capture seven of the biggest drug leaders in Colombia in the last 2 years, because we're cooperating with other countries. And I am proud of the fact that in the last 3 years, our exports of American products have increased by one-third in only 3 years to an all-time high. So we are involved in the rest of the world.

People are making decisions about dope in other countries that are going to kill American kids on the streets here. We need to be involved with them. Their governments are having to take more risks than we do to try to stop it. They have to put their lives on the line. We need to be their partners. If we want people to buy our products, we need to be their partners. If we want people to dismantle their nuclear weapons and not to build these awful biological and chemical weapons, we have to be their partners. If we want people to stand up to terrorism, we know no country can do it alone.

So you have to see what we're doing in Bosnia and what your three coworkers are doing as part of America's efforts to create a world where people like you everywhere can build strong families and have decent jobs and relate to one another in an atmosphere of peace. That is what those people are doing in Bosnia. And I am very, very proud of them.

Now, here at home, all the headlines are dominated by the budget debate. And every day sounds like a long horse race. Well, are they going to get a deal or aren't they going to get a deal? I want you to see that in kind of a big picture, too.

One of my favorite Presidents is Andrew Jackson, and one of the things Andrew Jackson did was to get rid of the national debt. Now, it was easier back then, but it was still hard. And he got it done because he was determined.

When I showed up in Washington, I could not believe that we had quadrupled the debt of this country in only 12 years. Until 1981, we never—we never—had a policy, in all of our history, of consistently spending more money than we were taking in. Debts had been used to try to spark the economy when there was a recession. Or if we were at war, we had to sell bonds and borrow more money because we had to gear up in a hurry. But until the 12 years before I became President, there had never been a policy in our country to just run a big debt all the time, in good years and bad years, just because it was too much trouble to be disciplined.

So I don't like what has happened. And when we showed up, we had a different idea. We said, the people who think you don't have to be concerned about the deficit are wrong. But the people who think that it doesn't matter how you spend your money and therefore you don't have to invest in anything, they're wrong, too. We have to cut the deficit and invest in our future. It's worth investing in education. It's worth protecting Medicare and Medicaid. It's worth investing in the environment to protect the environment for the future. We have to invest in some things, but we've got to get rid of this deficit. It is eating us alive.

I want you to know that in the last 3 years, we've cut that deficit in half in only 3 years, from nearly $300 billion a year down to $160 billion. I want you to know that your Federal budget would be balanced today if it weren't for the interest we have to pay on the debt that was run up between 1981 and the end of 1992, before we took office. Just that interest rate—this budget would be balanced today if it weren't for the interest we're paying on the 12 years when we departed from the historical practice of this country of paying our way and running the deficit only in recessions or wartime.

Now, those are the facts. So you need to know there is no party in Washington trying to expand the deficit. We now have a consensus on that. This debate is over how to balance the budget, not whether to balance the budget.

You heard the Vice President talk. You know, I'm proud of the fact that the economy has rebounded since we took office. It's rebounded because we invested in our country and cut the deficit. It's rebounded because we changed the way the Government works. Under his leadership—I bet you nobody in this room knows this—under his leadership there are now 205,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government than there were the day we took office—205,000.

Now, how come nobody knows that? For two good reasons. One is we just didn't throw those people in the street. I don't believe in that. If you've got to downsize the Government, you need to treat the workers with dignity. And we

gave them good early retirement packages. We gave them good severance pay. We gave them extra time to find other jobs. We gave them time to go on and find a different life where they could be even more productive.

The second reason is, the folks that are left are working harder and smarter, and they're doing a better job, just like you. Their productivity has gone up. But all these people that talk about big Government—your Government is the smallest it's been since 1965. As a percentage of the work force, because the population has been growing, your Government is the smallest it's been since 1933. So don't let people tell you that we're the big Government crowd in Washington.

But maybe more important, we've tried to do things that would reinforce our values. We passed a tough and a smart crime bill. Do you know, in America—read the cover of one of our national news magazines this week—the crime rate is down in America; the welfare rolls are down in America; the food stamp rolls are down in America; the poverty rolls are down in America. For 2 years, the teen pregnancy rate has come down in America. The American people are rallying around their basic values. And if we can keep this economy growing and keep people moving from welfare to work, so that we stand up for our values and grow the economy, that's what will take this country into the next century as the world's strongest force for freedom and opportunity. That's what we've got to do.

So what I want you—that's how I want you to see this budget debate. That's the background. This country is moving toward the right kind of future. We do have to finish the job and balance the budget; the question is how. The Vice President framed it in one way. He said, we try to think about what's best for people like you. We want to grow the middle class and shrink the under class. We think the best way to make more millionaires is to have more successful working people buying the things that they're putting out, whether they're products or services. That's one way to say it.

Let me say it in another way. I think what works in this plant is what works in America. What works is teamwork. We believe in individualism. We believe in individual rights. We believe in individual decisionmaking. But the truth is, we are not in this alone. And another big line, a way to think about this debate we're having in Washington is whether you think we're working toward a society where we've either got winner-take-all or a society where everybody has got a chance to win. I think we ought to have a society where everybody's got a chance to win. If you're willing to work hard and play by the rules, everybody ought to have a chance to win.

And if you look at the teamwork—you know, everybody cheered here, everybody cheered here when you said that Peterbilt was the world's best plant making trucks. Everybody cheered. I didn't know who was management and who was labor. I didn't know who was working on the chassis or the cabs. Right? What works is when you work together.

Yes, we have created a good economic climate, but if you folks weren't doing a good job, you still wouldn't have these extra 650 workers. You did that. We didn't do that. We didn't have anything to do with that. Our job in Washington is to create a framework in which you can succeed. But we can't guarantee that. That's all your doing. You deserve all the credit. But you didn't do it by first one person running this way and another running the other way and pulling everything apart. You did it by pulling together.

That's what I'm trying to do for this country. And that's what this budget debate is about.

Now, I introduced a budget and—that balanced the budget in 9 years. Then the Republicans said, "Let's do it in 7." I said, "Okay." Then they said, "We think that you're too hopeful about the economy." I said, "Well, I think the economy will get better if we balance the budget. But if you don't think it will, we'll do it on your numbers." So then I gave them a 7-year balanced budget on their numbers. And then we began to try to work out our differences. Now all the press is about the differences. But I want you to know that we have resolved a lot of those differences, and the differences that remain, I think, are quite important.

My plan protects Medicare so we can honor our duty to our parents by seeing to it that they're able to lead lives of dignity. But it is not just for them, because if you weaken Medicare too much, then people like you will have to spend more money on your parents, and you'll have less money to send your kids to college. This is an intergenerational thing. This

is not about pandering to senior citizens. This is about helping families stay together.

Our plan also leaves more funds to invest in education from Head Start to helping our schools meet higher standards, not by telling them what to do but by saying, "Here are the standards and you figure out how to meet them, and we'll give you some money so you can do it;" by providing more affordable college loans and more college scholarships, not just because we're trying to help the young but because we're trying to provide for the future. And that's what we have to do.

Our plan leaves more money to invest in the environment because we know we've got to find a way to grow the economy and preserve the environment. Just last week there was a big story about something the Vice President's been saying for years and years and years. Last year was the hottest year on record, and we have got to find a way to keep growing the economy without burning up the atmospheric layer that protects us all. We've got to find a way to do it and still preserve the clean rivers that we fish in and the woods that we hunt in and the parks that we take our children to. It's a big issue. You've got to set aside something for that. And that's what we do.

The Medicaid program is the program that pays for middle class folks to send their parents to nursing homes so that they don't have to go totally bankrupt and their kids don't have to go totally bankrupt. It also pays for health care for poor children, including some children of working people who make very modest wages. We can make some savings there, but we've got to be careful how far we go. It also pays for care for middle class people who have disabled children. I bet there are people that work in this plant who have children with some sort of physical disability who get a little help through that program. That is an honorable and a decent thing to do.

Yes, we need to control medical inflation, but we have to do it in a way that leaves that intact. Why? Because we are stronger when we are working together than we are when we just cut everybody loose. That is the issue: Are we going up or down together? Do we want a society where all can win, or are we satisfied with winner-take-all? America is best when everybody's winning as a team. That is what we are for. We are not for big Government in Washington. We're for a Government in Washington that plays its part as your partner to see that everybody has a chance to win. That's what this whole budget debate is about.

As I said, to be fair to the Republican and the Democratic congressional leaders, we have sat together for 50 hours. And I thought the other day, you know, sometimes we fight with one another in these 50 hours, and they think I'm wrong and I think they're wrong. And here we are in Nashville; it reminds me of that old country song, "It's hard to soar like an eagle when I'm stuck with a turkey like you." [*Laughter*] Sometimes they think that about me. Sometimes I think that about them.

But we've tried to resolve our differences, and we've made a lot of progress. And here's where we are. They still want levels of reductions in Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment that are not necessary to balance the budget. They admit they're not necessary to balance the budget. They sent me a letter saying that my plan balanced the budget. So there's no question that they're not necessary to balance the budget.

My plan strengthens the Medicare Trust Fund and gives more choice and more preventive benefits to older Americans and added help for families that are caring for loved ones with problems like Alzheimer's disease. But it will save money from the present system. We agree on that. But they want to go beyond that.

Their plan cuts Medicare more than it needs to be cut to balance the budget. And they would favor wealthier and healthier senior citizens at the expense of everybody else by giving them many more opportunities just to get out of the Medicare system. Well, the reason Medicare works is that everybody's in it, the sick and the healthy alike. You've got a great big pool that's low risk. And we can afford to run it, and you can afford to pay for it. So I just disagree with that.

Under their plan, older couples would pay $400 more a year. Well, if you're making a good living, $400 may not be very much. But there's a lot of retired people in the hills of Tennessee and rural Arkansas that $400 is a whole bunch of money. And I simply don't think it's right for me to get a tax cut in my income bracket and then to charge them $400 more a year. I just don't think it's right. If it were necessary to balance the budget, it would be all right. But it's not. It is not necessary to balance the budget. You know, where I come from, $400

is still a whole lot of money to a lot of those old folks; it really matters. Now, if we had to have it to balance the budget or save Medicare, I'd be happy to ask for it. But since we know we don't, we shouldn't take it.

The real problem is this: Some of the Republicans honestly just want to balance the budget, and they're also honestly concerned with the cost of Medicare and Medicaid. Some of the Republicans are using the balanced budget and the very large tax cut they want to say, "Well, if we balance the budget, we have a big tax cut, then we just don't have any money for this." What they want to do is to end the ability of your Nation's Government to say America can protect all our seniors through Medicare, can protect the poor children, the handicapped children, the people in nursing homes through Medicaid, can make a major contribution to education, to educational technology, to reviving this country. They don't believe we ought to do that any more. They think we should put that back to the market alone.

The problem is if the market alone does that, then we're not working as a team anymore. Then we're not saying everybody has a chance to win anymore. Then we're not being your partner anymore. That is the whole issue here. It's not about big Government. We have given you the smallest Government the American people have had as a percentage of our civilian work force since 1933. It's not about regulation. We're getting rid of 16,000 pages of Federal regulation. It's not about the deficit. The deficit has been cut in half, would be balanced today if it weren't for the debt run up in the 12 years before we showed up. But it's nothing about that. It's about philosophy.

Now, here's the argument I'm making to them. Now, they've got a lot of compelling points. If they were here today, they could make their speeches, and you'd think they'd make some good points, too. My argument is, we're going to have an election here in November, and we can argue about how the Medicare program should be structured, beyond where we can agree; we can argue what our environmental policy should be, beyond where we can agree; we could argue whether it's a good or a bad thing for the Federal Government to give lower cost college loans to students and give them better terms to repay it so nobody will be discouraged from going to college by the debt. We can argue all that, but we have already agreed on enough savings to balance the budget. And since we agree on that, and we've already agreed on how to save the money to do it, let's go on and balance the budget and get that out of the way. We owe that to the American people. It is wrong not to do it. Let us balance the budget and do it now.

I will say today, I watched that cab being set down on the chassis today, right before I came up here, and I thought, now, that's a picture of what America's all about. We work well when we work together. I got tickled—you know, the Vice President talked for 6 minutes before he mentioned the Tennessee football team. I didn't dream it would take him that long. [*Laughter*] Now, Tennessee's got a great quarterback, but if it weren't for the other 10 people on the offense and the other 11 on the defense, you wouldn't have the ranking you enjoy. You watched that Ohio State game; it was a balanced team that won that game.

If you look at what happens when the American military goes someplace and you're proud of them, there are a lot of heroes out there, but it's the team that wins. And that's what this is all about. It's also about recognizing that in life you do what you can today and you put off the rest until tomorrow. So I say again to my Republican and my Democratic friends in the Congress, we can balance the budget today. We have already agreed on how to do that. We can give a modest tax relief geared to childrearing and education for the working families of America. We have agreed on that. We can do some things for small business. We've agreed on that.

Let us take what we can agree on and balance the budget while we protect Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment and give modest tax relief. Let us be honest with the American people what we disagree on, and let the American people make their decision in November. But we are hired to show up for work every day, just like you are. We can't just go on a work stoppage from now until November and not deal with this. So we should balance the budget now and put the differences off and let you decide in November who you think is right. Whatever you say, it will probably be right. It's been right most of the time for the last 200 years. But meanwhile, we should do our job.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:10 a.m. on the factory floor. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Philip N. Bredesen of Nashville; Joe Scattergood, plant manager; Wayne Wooten, president, United Auto Workers #1832; Bobby Lee Thompson, director, United Auto Workers, Region 8; and Tom Plimpton, general manager, Peterbilt Division. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks at a Democratic Luncheon in Nashville
January 12, 1996

Thank you so much, Mr. Vice President, Governor McWherter, Senator and Mrs. Gore, and Senator and Mrs. Sasser—they'll do a great job for our country in China, I know. Senator and Mrs. Mathews, and to Congressman Gordon, Congressman Clement, and Congressman Tanner, and former Congressman Jim Cooper is here with us. I'm glad to see all of you here. To the mayors who are here, my good friend Wayne Glenn, and to other people who are here from all over Tennessee and from all walks of life. And Marilyn Lloyd, I think, is here somewhere—where is she?—former Congresswoman.

And let me say to all of you that I sure liked that speech Al Gore gave. I want all of you from Tennessee to know that when the record of this administration has been written, the consequences of our actions may be only apparent to the American people in their positive aspects years from now. But one thing is already clear. In the entire history of our Republic, the most effective, the most important Vice President in American history is Al Gore.

He has overseen our efforts to reform our environmental laws so that we could be better at growing the economy and preserving the environment at the same time. He is developing a plan that will have our country work in partnership with the private sector to hook up every student in America to the Internet with good software, good computers, good training, just in the next few years.

He has managed a permanent relationship with the Prime Minister of Russia which has reinforced the positive direction in which we are going and which has helped us to lift the cloud of nuclear threat from the American people since we've been here. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not a single, solitary nuclear missile pointed at an American child, and I am proud of that.

While our friends on the other side talked about not liking big Government, wanting to give more power to States and localities in the private sector, in a very quiet and straightforward and effective way the Vice President has helped us to reduce the size of the Federal Government by over 200,000.

And when you hear your Republican friends back in your neighborhood saying that the Democrats are the party of big Government, ask them, "Well, if that's so, why is the Government now the smallest it's been since 1965? If that's so, why is the Government, as a percentage of the civilian work force, the smallest it's been since 1933? If that's so, why are they dismantling 16,000 pages of unnecessary Government regulations put in by Republican executives who were there before we were? If all that is so, how did this happen?"

It happened because it's not so, because a big part of what we came to do was to give you a smaller, more effective Government. But we did not go to Washington to walk away from the American people and their future, and we have no intention of doing that.

Let me say, I know that all the publicity in Washington that's coming down here to you is all this debate over the budget. And it's being kind of, is it a horserace and who's giving up what and are they going to get a deal or not, and all that sort of thing. I understand that. I just want to take a couple of minutes to try to put that into a larger picture.

You know, when I leave you I'm going to Bosnia. I will see soldiers there from all over America, including soldiers from Tennessee. I will go to Hungary to see the basing that we're doing there in Hungary. And then I will stop in Zagreb, Yugoslavia—Croatia, in the former Yugoslavia, where we have a military hospital, some other actions, and I will see the President

of that country to try to make sure that we continue to work to maintain the peace.

And a lot of people wonder, "Well, why did the United States send soldiers there? I mean, the cold war is over. They're doing well with Russia. Why did they do that?" Well, it's part of my view, at least, of where we ought to go as a country. I'd like it if we could just lay down all our arms and lay down all our responsibilities. But if you think about what the world is going to look like in the years ahead for all these children that are here, it really matters if America is the strongest force for peace and freedom.

World War I started in Bosnia. So many troubles are just right there around it. If this war was not contained, it could spread and cause many of our people to go and lose their lives down the road. Meanwhile, hundreds of innocent people, tens of thousands of innocent people, have been slaughtered, over a million turned into refugees from their own country.

So we went there to help other countries make the peace. We didn't have to go alone, we're only a third of the total force, but it would not have happened if it hadn't been for the United States. What I want you to think about is, by our being involved with other people, we can make a difference in the world for our own people.

Let me give you another example. We want to fight terrorism. We've had terrorism right here in the United States, whether it was homegrown terrorism or people coming from other countries to our shores. Because we're involved with other countries, we've been able to get some of those terrorists arrested in other countries and brought back here to stand trial for killing innocent Americans, because we worked with them.

We know that every day Americans die because of the scourge of drugs. Because we work with other countries, just this last year we were instrumental with our military and our civilian law enforcement in seeing seven members of the infamous Cali drug cartel in Colombia arrested, seven—it was unheard of—because we worked with other countries.

Because we worked with other countries to have not only more free trade but more fair trade, the exports of American products have increased by one-third in the last 3 years to an all-time high. Because we work with other countries, people in Nashville and in Tennessee have jobs and a better future. And we know if we're going to have a free trading system, it has to also be a fair trading system.

And that's how you need to see this fight over the budget and all the accomplishments the Vice President talked about. Our theory is that America is a team, that we're going forward together, we're going up or down together. If you look at the whole history of our country, you go back and read how we got started: We believed in liberty; we believed in progress; and we struggled to find common ground, to get together in spite of our differences. Those three things are constant in every important period in our history. And what we know is unless we get together and work together, our liberties can be threatened. And we know, unless we get together and work together, we can't make progress.

I just came from the Peterbilt truck factory here. I'm sure it's a source of pride to everyone in Tennessee. They've got backlog orders for 7 or 8 months. They've added 600 people to the payroll since we came into office. I'm proud of that. I'm proud for them. But we didn't do anything directly for them. Our job is to give them a framework within which they can do well. Why are they doing well? Because they work together.

Now, that's what this budget fight is all about. Should we have a country in which our hatred of Government says the market should control everything, everybody for themselves, winner take all? Or should we have a country that says we love the market system, we love the free enterprise system, but we know that winners work together, and we want a country where everybody has a chance to win? That's what this is about.

The congressional leaders now agree that I have submitted to them a budget which would be balanced in 7 years, by their scorekeeping. They sent me a little letter which I hold up all the time. They agree. The issue is not, will we balance the budget; the issue is, how should we do it?

Look, folks, I hate this deficit. Our country never had a permanent deficit until the 12 years before I became President. We never had that, never. It was in those 12 years when the debt was quadrupled. And our friends on the Republican side say, "Well, the Democrats controlled the Congress." That's not true. In the first 6 years when most of the damage was done, they

controlled the Senate and the White House, and they had effective control of the House of Representatives. And they put us in the hole we're still digging out of.

Now, when we came in, we cut the deficit in half in 3 years. They said—you need to know, when you talk to your friends about this budget debate, the Federal budget would be balanced today with a surplus—today with a surplus—but for the interest payments we pay on the debt run up between 1981 and the end of 1992. Only in those 12 years.

Now, I want to be fair. We have really worked hard together. We spent 50 hours together, the Vice President and I, the Republican and the Democratic congressional leaders. We found we did agree on a lot of things. One of the things we've agreed on is over $600 billion, way over $600 billion, in savings over the next 7 years, more than enough to bring our budget into balance and enough to still have a modest tax cut.

We don't have an agreement because of the things we disagree on. They think we should cut Medicare more than I think we should cut it. I think $400 a couple for elderly people—[*inaudible*]. If we don't need it to balance the budget, I don't think we ought to take it. We don't know how much can be taken out of these rural hospitals and rural nursing homes without doing damage to them. We have to save some money, but we've got to be careful.

The Medicaid program is not so widely known as Medicare. But there are millions, millions of children, poor children, many of them in poor working families, who depend upon it. Our middle class families have their parents in nursing homes depending on it. A lot of middle class families have disabled children who get a little help from Medicaid. It keeps them from going broke while they care for their children. And people say, "Oh, you know, the Democrats, they're pandering to the elderly." Bull! [*Laughter*] Bull!

If the savings that the Vice President and I have proposed are enacted into law, they will represent the biggest savings ever achieved in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. We know we've got to do better. We know we can't keep letting health care costs go up at 3 times the rate of inflation. We know we have to support these health care providers that are giving folks more choices if they want to go into managed care networks. We're all for that. But I say we should not do more than we know the system can take. We should not hurt any seniors that we know we can avoid hurting.

And keep in mind, this is not just an issue of elderly people. If you make it more difficult for people to have their parents in nursing homes and they have to spend more money on that, where will the money come from to send their children to college? If you make college loans more expensive or you have fewer scholarships, where will the strength in our economy come from 10 years from now when we know we need more young people going to college?

Look, we're all in this together. That is the central issue. And I will say again, my plea to the leaders of Congress—just as I pleaded with the Democrats to bend over backwards to meet the Republicans halfway, just as we have worked hard to do that—is we need to pass a plan to balance the budget because it will drive interest rates down, it'll make it easier for business people to go get a loan, easier to expand payrolls, easier to keep economic growth going. We need to do this.

But we are going to have some disagreements. What we need to do is to agree on everything we can, identify the disagreements and tell the American people that it's their business, it's their future, and they should resolve those disagreements in the election. But to put off balancing the budget because we have some disagreement over the size and shape of a tax cut, over changes at the margins in the Medicare program that can make huge impacts but aren't necessary to save the money we've talked about, over big cuts in education and the environment, that's wrong. We should not put this other business off.

You know, we have a system—this is not a parliamentary system. If we were having this kind of fight in Great Britain, for example, we'd just call an election 5 weeks from now, and you all would decide what you want, and I'd either go home or they'd do it our way or vice versa. That's the way we'd do it. This is not a parliamentary system. We can't have a work stoppage in Washington until November. It is inexcusable; it is unacceptable.

We ought to go back there and say, "Look, we've agreed on enough money to balance the budget. We've agreed we can provide at least a modest tax cut to people for childrearing and education. We can help small business some with their pensions and with some other things.

Let's get after it and do it and get it behind us and then go on and do politics."

But again I will say, the reason we have to balance the budget is because we misplayed this for 12 years. This was misplayed by our country. And the politicians, to be fair to them, were more or less just doing what the people wanted. Nobody was ready to take any tough decisions. We have obligations to each other. We owe these kids a better future, just like we owe our parents a decent health care system.

Now, that's the difference. I do not want to see America become a country full of possibility, with record numbers of new successful people every year, but more and more people falling behind. I think we're better when we're a team. I'm going to go see those military folks. Why are you so proud of them? You may not know the name of a single person over there, but you know they're going to do a good job, don't you? Why? Because they're a team, because they work together. You know they're going to do a good job.

Let me tell you, the only thing that surprised me about the Vice President's speech? It took him about 7 minutes to get around to rubbing it in about Tennessee winning a bowl game. [*Laughter*] Now, Tennessee has a great quarterback. But they didn't beat Ohio State with their quarterback. They beat them with the quarterback, the other 10 people on offense, the other 11 people on the defense. Right? If Ohio State scores three touchdowns instead of two, your great quarterback loses a game. Right? Teamwork! Why do we forget it when it comes to our public decisions?

That's what this whole issue is about, folks. We can balance the budget; we can keep this economy going; we can keep the good trends in our life going, keep the crime rate and the welfare rolls and the food stamp rolls and the poverty rolls coming down, which is what is happening now and I'm proud of that. But we can only do it if we remember that this country got here because at our most important moment we came together. That's what we're fighting for.

God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:25 p.m. at the Opryland Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Ned Ray McWherter, chairman, Tennessee Clinton/Gore Reelection Committee; former Senator Albert Gore, Sr., and his wife, Pauline; U.S. Ambassador to China Jim Sasser and his wife, Mary; former Senator Harlan Mathews and his wife, Patsy; Wayne E. Glenn, international president, United Paperworkers International Union; and Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin of Russia. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks to American Troops at Aviano Air Base, Italy

January 13, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. Good morning.

Audience members. Good morning.

The President. I know it's early, but we can do better than that. Good morning. [*Laughter*]

Minister Corcione, Ambassador Bartholomew, our distinguished Italian hosts and guests, General Joulwan, General Ryan, Colonel Wald, Chief Myers, Colonel Moody, Aviano families, and to the men and women of Operation Decisive Edge. Let me begin by thanking the colonel for that fine welcome and thanking all of you for making me feel so welcome. I am very pleased finally to have a chance to come here to Aviano and to see you. And since it's so early, I may be more pleased to see you than you are to see me. But I'm glad you came out anyway.

I thank you for giving me the chance to meet you and to tell you how important and how appreciated your work is. What you and our allies are doing here and in Bosnia is the difference between a war that resumes and a peace that takes hold. You are giving people who have suffered so very much a chance to enjoy the blessings of a normal life. You are living up to the great traditions of the Armed Forces of the United States, protecting our Nation's interest by keeping a fire out that has threatened the heart of Europe's stability. On behalf of

all the American people, I come here most of all to thank you for the superb job you are doing on this historic mission.

As you did in Operation Deny Flight and Operation Deliberate Force, the 31st Fighter Wing and all of the units here at Aviano, including the Guard and the Reserve, are showing in Operation Decisive Edge the professionalism, the skill, and the dedication that make America's military the greatest on Earth and make NATO a force for peace throughout Europe.

The American people know that the burden of America's leadership weighs heavily on you and on the families that are here. Many of you who are here have been a long way from home for a good long while. Others have just arrived. Because of the sacrifices you are making here and in the Balkans and the strength of the families that stand behind you, your country is able to stand up for its values and its interests.

I particularly want to thank Colonel Wald, who has done a tremendous job in commanding Aviano and the 31st Fighter Wing. America is proud of the way this base has met the challenge of this operation. He told me just before we came in here that he'd been here about 6 months, and the very first day he was on the job was one of the days that our bombing campaign was underway.

Today as a part of my visit here and in recognition of Colonel Wald's fine performance and his outstanding career over 25 years in the United States Air Force, I am pleased to promote him to brigadier general. [*Applause*] Colonel, it sounds like if we were doing this by popular opinion, I wouldn't stop there. [*Laughter*]

I would like to ask Mrs. Wald and their daughter, Marissa, to come up and stand with me. And I'd like to ask Mrs. Wald to help me as we put the stars on the general's shoulder.

General, our Nation and I look forward to many more years of your service. We thank you and congratulate you.

Let me say a special word of thanks to the Italian Defense Minister, Mr. Corcione, the Italian Government, and the people of Italy for the hospitality that all of them have shown our forces and for their help in coordinating this difficult operation. All of you know that all of our efforts over the last several years to contain the conflict in Bosnia, to deliver humanitarian aid, and in the end, to bring an end to it would not have been possible without the partnership of the Italian Government and the Italian people. And the United States is very grateful for it, and we thank you.

I also want to say a word of appreciation to all the other countries, especially those of our NATO allies participating in Decisive Edge. I know that distinguished units from Britain and Spain are here today. They, too, are playing a vital part in keeping our alliance strong and making sure this mission will succeed, and we thank them.

Men and women of Decisive Edge, let me say now, good luck and Godspeed. You are heroes for peace. Our Nation is very proud of you. And as long as you live, I hope you will always look back on this mission as something of historic importance and fundamental human decency.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:21 a.m. in Hangar One. In his remarks, he referred to Minister of Defense Domenico Corcione of Italy; U.S. Ambassador to Italy Reginald Bartholomew; Gen. George Joulwan, USA, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; Gen. Michael Ryan, USAF, Commander, 5th Allied Tactical Air Forces; Col. Charles Wald, USAF, Commander, Aviano Air Base; Chief M. Sgt. Michael Myers, USAF, Senior Enlisted Adviser, 31st Fighter Wing; and Col. David L. Moody, USAF, Vice Commander, 31st Fighter Wing.

Remarks to American Troops at Taszar Air Base, Hungary

January 13, 1996

Thank you very much, General Joulwan, and General Shalikashvili, General Crouch, and especially General Abrams. This is—he was saying on the way in, this is about the third time we have done this, and we're about to get the hang of it. I like General Abrams because he's not

bashful about his enthusiasm. [*Laughter*] He might be out there—if he were out there, he'd be cheering louder than all of you.

Let me say also I am delighted to be here with our United Nations Ambassador, Madeleine Albright; Brian Atwood, the Director of the Agency for International Development; Dick Holbrooke, who did such a fine job in making this peace that you are here to help enforce; Ambassador Hunter. And I'd like for the Members of Congress who have come with me to be recognized. I want you to make them welcome. If it weren't for them, none of us would be here today. Thank you, gentlemen, and—[*applause*]—thank you.

I also want to say a special word of regard for General Bill Bell, who had to leave because of his wife's illness. I know he's here in spirit. And I know that all of you will send him your thoughts and prayers.

Men and women of the 21st Theater Army Area Command, 1st Armored Division, the 29th Support Group, the 30th Medical Brigade, all of you who are taking part in Operation Joint Endeavor, I am very, very proud to be here with you today. A few moments ago, General Abrams briefed me on all you have achieved here in Hungary. As many of you know, General Abrams' father gave his name to the M1–A1 tank that is helping you to keep the peace in Bosnia. I have just reviewed a company of those tanks that are about to convoy to Tuzla. And when I look out at you, I can't help but think that those tanks are a good symbol for this whole operation. The Abrams is the best all-around tank in the world, and you are the best all-around fighting force. Like the tank, you are proven, fast, tough, and, if you have to be, lethal. But I did find one difference between the Abrams and the men and women of Operation Joint Endeavor: the Abrams is very, very quiet. [*Laughter*]

I'm going from here to Tuzla. You know, I meant to go from Tuzla to here, but the clouds made it impossible for us to land, and I had to come here, and that's why you had so much advance notice of our being here. [*Laughter*] I can't believe you got up such a crowd, General, on such short notice, but I think, speaking for all of us, we're delighted to see you.

I want to say for those of you heading to Tuzla, I have been fully briefed on the operation there. I'd like to be able to report that when you get there, you will find deluxe accommodations. [*Laughter*] I'd like to be able to report that. But even for a political leader that's stretching the truth a little more than it will bear. [*Laughter*]

I do understand they've got showers and heaters and Red Horse tents with hard floors and electricity. Some soldiers have turned their MRE boxes into dressers, shelves, and tables. They're even doing some custom conversions on Humvees, complete with car stereos. And I was told just before I got off the plane that with a little bit of ingenuity and a lot of plywood, duct tape, and sandbags, some of our soldiers are making Tuzla the next best thing to Taszar.

The most important thing I can say to you, seriously, is that Task Force Eagle is heavily armed and very well prepared. The airfield and communications are up and running. J–STAR aircraft are patrolling high above the clouds. The Navy and the Marines are keeping watch from the Adriatic. *Apache* gunships are flying the treetops. The Special Forces are everywhere. The operation in Bosnia is moving ahead, step by step, steadily, surely, and safely.

Let me say to those of you who are based here in Hungary, none of this could happen without you. You know that. You provide the beans, the bullets, the black oil that keep our people fed, armed, and ready to roll. As of today, in just a single month—think of it—12,000 troops, 700 trucks, 200 trains have passed through this point.

Our airplanes have flown 400 sorties. You've got a 300-bed hospital up and running that I just drove by and a tent city for 7,000 troops. That's a pretty impressive track record. You should feel proud of the job you're doing. I am very proud of the job you are doing.

I came here also to tell you that this is a very important job. Just before I left Washington I signed an Executive order that creates a new campaign medal. It's called the Armed Forces Service Medal, to be awarded to all those who serve our Nation in significant noncombat military missions, such as peacekeeping operations. And I'm pleased to announce that as participants in Operation Joint Endeavor, each of you will receive America's newest military honor.

While I'm here, I also want to express my gratitude to the people of Hungary, to their government and their military for their hospitality, their cooperation, their professionalism. Remember that just 6 years ago, Hungary was

still part of the Warsaw Pact. Now it's home to the largest American military operation in Europe since World War II. And that, too, is a tribute to the people who wore these uniforms before you, and for all America has stood for the last 50 years.

I am proud of the hard work that we have done in the last couple of years with Hungary and other nations getting the Partnership For Peace off the ground and preparing to open NATO's doors to new members. In Bosnia itself, those of you who are going will be joined by other new friends, Polish and Czech combat battalions, Hungarian engineering corps, soldiers from the Baltic States, and a Russian brigade.

When your mission is completed, all of you will be able to look back at this new partnership with former adversaries and say: We made history. We did something that really mattered. And you will be able to be proud of it for as long as you live. I thank you for that, and I hope you will always feel that deep pride.

I know you've been trained to fight wars and to win them. You are the best in the world at that. This mission is different. We have asked you not to fight a war but to give a people exhausted by war the strength to make and stay at peace. You will succeed because you're the finest fighting force in the world, and your presence in Bosnia can and will make the difference between a war that starts again and a peace that takes hold.

All over the world, people look to America for help, for hope, for inspiration. We can't be everywhere. Even you can't do everything. But where we can make a difference and where our values and our interests are clearly at stake, we must act, and they are clearly at stake in Bosnia.

All of its people are looking to America, and America looks to you, the men and women of our Armed Forces. I know that you and your families bear the heaviest burden of our leadership. We ask you to travel far from home, to be apart from your loved ones for long periods of time, to take on difficult and sometimes dangerous missions. We ask all these things, and time and time and time again you deliver.

So I really come here with one very simple message: The American people are proud of what you're doing. They're proud of how you're doing it. They're proud of you. And your Commander in Chief is very, very proud of you. To each and every one of you, I say: Godspeed, and God bless our United States of America.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:23 a.m. in the dining facility. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. William W. Crouch, USA, Commanding General, U.S. Army Europe; Gen. John N. Abrams, USA, Commander, 5th Corps; U.S. Ambassador to NATO Robert E. Hunter; and Brig. Gen. Burwell Bell, USA, Assistant Division Commander, 3d Infantry Division. The Executive order of January 11 establishing the Armed Forces Service Medal is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

The President's Radio Address
January 13, 1996

Good morning. I'm speaking to you today from Taszar, Hungary, the main staging base for America's soldiers in Bosnia. I've just visited with our commanders and troops. The American people should be very proud of the job they're doing.

Our Armed Forces are giving the Bosnian people, exhausted by 4 years of war, the strength to make peace. I wish every American could see firsthand what the men and women of our military are accomplishing under very difficult conditions, both here and in Bosnia.

Here in Taszar, our troops are providing the beans, bullets, and black oil that are keeping our people in Bosnia fed, armed, and ready to roll. In Tuzla, the headquarters for our troops in Bosnia, the weather report is pretty much the same every day: mud, mud, and more mud. But despite that and the snow and the freezing rain, in less than a month our soldiers have built a base camp with more than 100 hard-backed tents, complete with wooden floors, heat, and lights. They've set up a road network and sophisticated communications. The airfield,

which had no lights or navigational equipment when they got there, is up and running 24 hours a day.

Some of the men and women I'm seeing today designed, built, and now operate the pontoon bridge over the Sava River, the key landlink to Bosnia for our troops. The biggest Army bridging operation since World War II demanded the kind of strength and ingenuity that only American soldiers have. The river swelled to a record high for this century, washing away our encampments. Its banks became muddy bogs, but the Sava didn't drown America's spirit. As one of our Army engineers put it, "We've been crossing rivers for 218 years; we're going to cross this river." And they did.

Now that most of the preliminary work is done, our soldiers and their partners from more than two dozen other nations, including NATO allies and former adversaries like Hungary, Poland, and Russia, are set to carry out their mission, step by step, steadily, surely, and safely. They'll make sure the former warring parties in Bosnia live up to the letter of the peace agreement they signed, and they'll create a secure environment to give the people of Bosnia a chance to rebuild their lives and their land.

Only the people of Bosnia can seize that chance and come together as equal citizens of a shared land with a common destiny. After so many lives lost and futures destroyed, finding the strength to live and work side by side, as they have done for so much of their history, will now be very hard. But I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Bosnia's people agree that the alternative of return to the sorrow and suffering of the past 4 years must not be allowed to happen. And they're looking to our soldiers to help them make a new beginning.

So often when people abroad look to America for help and hope, America looks to the men and women of our Armed Forces. Of course, we can't be everywhere, and even they can't do everything. But where we can make a difference and where our interests and our values are clearly at stake, we must step forward. In Bosnia, where those interests and values are very clearly at stake, our soldiers are making a difference, the difference between a war that resumes and a peace that can take hold.

We've asked the men and women of our military to bear the burden of America's leadership, and they're rising to the challenge with strength, skill, and determination. The soldiers I've talked with are proud of their accomplishments and ready for the hard work ahead. I know all the American people are very proud of them, and that all Americans join me in saying Godspeed to the men and women of the world's finest military as they carry out their mission of peace in Bosnia.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11:19 a.m., local time, at IFOR Headquarters, Taszar, Hungary, for domestic broadcast at 10:06 a.m.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Arpad Goncz of Hungary and an Exchange With Reporters at Taszar Air Base

January 13, 1996

President Clinton. I would like to say on behalf of the American people how very much we appreciate the wonderful reception that our soldiers have received here in Hungary. I thank you, Mr. President and Mr. Prime Minister, to all the leaders of your country, especially to the Defense Minister and the Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff. We are very, very grateful for the cooperation that we've had.

I think it's a remarkable thing that Hungary and the United States are involved as partners for peace now, and they have received us here in this mission of peace in our staging area for Bosnia. Just think, it's been barely more than 6 years ago when Hungary was a member of the Warsaw Pact. What would have been unthinkable then now seems perfectly normal because we've been working together so closely for the last couple of years.

And I know I speak for all the American people and especially for the military, Mr. President, when I say thank you. We are very grate-

ful. And I have just met with our commanders and our troops; they're doing very well here, thanks to you. And we're enjoying it, and we appreciate it.

President Goncz. I can even say that it is symbolic. Four or five years ago, I think it would have been unthinkable to meet here with the President of the United States of America either in Washington or in Budapest, the least unthinkable to be able to meet in a small Hungarian village. In addition to the fact that on such an important occasion, your presence here as well as your personal presence, Mr. President, shows the commitment of the United States to ensure the people in the region.

It is a moral obligation to ask because this—we defend the same values, and we have common interests. It is a great pleasure for me that we have this meeting and that we are part of this great operation. This is a Partnership For Peace in the genuine sense of the word. And—it's a lot more than what we have done—and this is also an opportunity for us to get accustomed to each other the way—[*inaudible*].

Thank you, Mr. President.

NATO Expansion

Q. Mr. President, do you think this kind of cooperation with Hungary will accelerate Hungary's admittance into NATO as a full-scale member?

President Clinton. Well, as you know, we believe that NATO should be expanded and inevitably will be. And this is the sort of cooperation that I think shows you what can happen in a very positive way with this sort of partnership. I'm very pleased with it, and I think all of our American—and especially our military commanders have been very impressed by what's happened so far.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:40 a.m. in the Headquarters of the Air Base. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to American Troops at Tuzla Airfield, Bosnia-Herzegovina
January 13, 1996

The President. General Nash, Sergeant Major Tilley, the men and women of Task Force Eagle, the 1st Armored Division, the 3d Infantry Division, the 3d Battalion of the Three-Two-Five Parachute Infantry Regiment, the Air Force 4100th Provisional Group, the legendary Red Horse engineers, the Navy Seabees, and all the veterans of the Tuzla mud: I am proud to stand with you today on dry ground. I come with a simple message: Your country is very proud of you. I'm glad to be joined here today by General Shalikashvili; by General Joulwan; our Ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright; and a very distinguished delegation from the United States Congress. They're standing over there to my left and to your right. I hope you will make them feel welcome. They are here to support you.

We know that you are the best trained, best equipped, best prepared fighters in the world. Time and again, you have stood down aggression. Time and again you have triumphed in war. But to Bosnia you came on a mission of peace, a mission for heroes. We thank you for defending our Nation's values and our Nation's interests. We thank you for helping the Bosnian people. Men and women of Operation Joint Endeavor, we thank you here for being warriors for peace.

When I last saw many of you in Baumholder, the headquarters of the 1st Armored Division in Germany, your Humvees were a little cleaner, your BDU's a little greener. But to me, seeing you here in the field, doing the jobs you were trained for so well, you have never looked better.

Soon I will have a chance to be briefed again by your commanders, Admiral Smith and General Nash. On behalf of a grateful nation, I want to tell everyone what I know they are going to tell me from our already brief conversations. We know that in less than a month and despite terrible weather, 7,000 of our Nation's finest fighters, the first wave of a force to be

20,000 strong, have set up camp in Bosnia. We know you fought rain and floods to bridge the Sava River in our biggest military river crossing since 1945. We know that in only 2 weeks, more than 2,000 vehicles—M1's, Bradleys, Humvees and more—have rolled across the waters and rumbled into town. We know you have secured your base of operations and established base camps throughout your sector.

I just came from Outpost Lima, manned by the Charlie Rock Company of the 3d Battalion. I saw for myself that the "Third Herd" and everyone else at the outpost are doing a great job in what might be called less than great conditions.

You took an airfield that had no lights or navigational equipment, turned it around and opened it for business 24 hours a day, at least when the fog permits. You've strung nearly 5 miles of phone and cable wire to build a massive modern communications network.

You're working with soldiers from more than two dozen other nations, and I have met some of their leaders here today. Among them are former adversaries who are now our friends—Polish and Czech combat battalions, Hungarian engineering corps, soldiers from the Baltic States, an entire Russian brigade—and, of course, the Nordic brigade that has been here for some time now. From the ashes of war in Bosnia, you and they together are raising the torch of a new undivided Europe. Step by steady step, you are making history here in Bosnia. Don't you ever forget that, even when this extraordinary mission may seem routine.

I am told that some of you have compared life here with the Bill Murray movie "Groundhog Day," where the same day keeps repeating itself over and over and over again. I'm also told that there are really only two kinds of weather conditions here in Tuzla. When it snows, the mud freezes, and when it rains, the mud thaws. Even the dining hall apparently is in on the act, dishing out the same food every morning and night.

Just remember this: The military promised you square meals. And when you get your eggs each morning, you know the military has kept its commitment to you. I see you laughing about that, and I want you to be able to laugh. I hope you'll be laughing tomorrow morning at breakfast.

But I am very serious when I tell you that your mission is anything but routine. There has never been anything quite like it before. The Bosnian people have chosen peace, but they cannot do it alone. You and our allies must give them the confidence they need to follow the rules they have agreed to. We have a strong interest here in seeing peace take hold. The people of Bosnia have suffered so much; Europe's stability, so crucial to our own, has been threatened; and we all want a safer, better world for our children.

The Bosnian people are exhausted by war. You can give them the strength they need for peace. This mission requires your strength and your skill, separating former enemies, avoiding the dangers of mines, making sure the cease-fire holds, creating a stable environment. From the days on your feet in the rain and the snow to the nights you must sleep in your Bradleys, this mission requires your strength, your skills, your determination.

The people around you know you are prepared, heavily armed, ready to meet any threat to your safety. They know that our J–STAR aircraft are patrolling high above the clouds, tracking the smallest movement; that out in the Adriatic the Navy and the Marine Corps are ready to project power at a moment's notice; that just above the treetops, the Army's *Apache* gunships are scouring the ground below; and that our Special Forces are here, there, and everywhere.

I have said it before and I will say it again: You can see from this operation that America looks out for its own. I know the burden of our leadership weighs heavily on you and your loved ones back home. Just as your commanders and I are committed to protecting your safety, so we are working to help your families, to keep them informed and in touch with you, to help them with the things that matter most, like day care and health care and paying the bills. The pride your families have in you is shared by Americans all across our Nation. We look at you all and we look at all you're doing here, confident, compassionate, disciplined, and strong, and we see in you the best our country has to offer.

Before I left Washington to be with you, I signed an Executive order that creates a new campaign medal. It's called the Armed Forces Service Medal. It will be awarded to all those who serve our Nation in significant noncombat military missions, such as peacekeeping. I am pleased to announce that as participants in Op-

eration Joint Endeavor, each of you will receive America's newest military honor.

As you move around the world—excuse me, as you move ahead with your mission, I ask you, too, to keep this in mind: Around the world people look to America not just because of our size and strength but because of what we stand for and what we're willing to stand against. And though it imposes extra burdens on us, people trust us to help them share in the blessings of peace. We can't be everywhere, and even you can't do everything. But where we can make a difference, where our values and our interests are at stake, we must act. Here, where our values and interests so clearly are at stake, you are acting on America's behalf.

All the people of Bosnia are looking to America, and so we look to you, the men and women of our Armed Forces. Here our Nation, through you, can make a difference between a war that starts again and a peace that takes hold. From the highest commander to the newest recruit, that difference lies in your hands. You give America power and strength. And you are giving Bosnia a new day of peace. Always be proud of what you are doing here. Your country and your Commander in Chief are immensely proud of you.

God bless you all, and God bless the United States of America. Thank you.

As part of our family outreach, I'd like to ask Colonel Neal Patton to come up here. Colonel Patton, where are you?

I flew into Aviano, Italy, this morning at 6 o'clock, and there were a huge number of young children there and a lot of family members. Colonel Patton's wife gave me a hug and said, "You sent my husband to Tuzla. So I expect you, Mr. President, to personally deliver his birthday present." Here it is, Colonel. Happy birthday.

Col. Neal Patton. Sir, thank you very much. That's really something. Thank you.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:18 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. William L. Nash, USA, Commanding General, 1st Armored Division; Sgt. Maj. Jack Tilley, USA, 1st Armored Division; and Adm. Leighton Smith, USN, Commander in Chief, Allied Forces Southern Europe. The Executive order of January 11 establishing the Armed Forces Service Medal is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Alija Izetbegovic of Bosnia-Herzegovina at Tuzla Airfield

January 13, 1996

President's Visit

Q. Mr. Izetbegovic, can you tell us what it means for the President of the United States to be here in Bosnia?

President Izetbegovic. In President Clinton we see a great friend to Bosnia-Herzegovina. We wish him here a warm welcome. And of course, we see the opportunity that we have discussions on several important issues, issues relating to IFOR forces and especially the United States of America in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Q. Mr. President, was it worth all the effort to make the logistical nightmare of making this visit?

President Clinton. Absolutely. First of all, the most important thing for me was to come and see our troops and to tell them that I support them, the American people support them, and we appreciate what they're doing here, and to get a briefing about what's going well and what still needs work.

And the opportunity to meet with President Izetbegovic and the other members of his government I think is quite important because we still have a lot of work to do. And quite over and above the IFOR obligation, we've got a lot of work to do to rebuild Bosnia economically. And I want to do what I can to aid that.

And of course, I've got Mr. Bob Gallucci, one of our most able diplomats; he helped to unravel our problem, our North Korea problem. So I figured if he did that, he could certainly figure out how we're going to help Bosnia get

back on its feet, going in the direction that we ought to be going.

So we've got a lot to talk about, and I'm looking forward to it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:55 p.m. in the Old Command Post. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador at Large Robert Gallucci. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on Arrival in Zagreb, Croatia
January 13, 1996

Thank you very much, President Tudjman, for making me feel so welcome. And thank you for coming out in such large and enthusiastic numbers. It's wonderful to be here in Zagreb and in Croatia. And I thank you for making me feel so welcome.

I have just come from Bosnia, from visiting our troops there who are working with the others to support the peace process. And I come here to thank President Tudjman and the people of Croatia for supporting the peace process in Bosnia. I come to support not only the peace process but the federation in Bosnia between the Muslims and the Croats, the peaceful agreement for the return of Croatian lands in Eastern Slavonia, and the ultimate partnership of Croatia with not only the United States but with other Western nations who believe in freedom and human rights and democracy and peace and progress, working together.

My friends, on behalf of the United States, I have been honored to work for peace from the Middle East to Northern Ireland to Bosnia. And I believe that, in these conflicts I have seen, that the fight has not been between Arab and Jew in the Middle East, not between Catholic and Protestant in Northern Ireland, not between Serb and Croat and Muslim in Bosnia. It is a conflict between those who choose peace and those who would stay with war, those who look to a better future and those who are trapped in the past, those who open their arms to their neighbors and those who would keep their fist clenched.

So I ask you in closing to choose peace, choose the future, open your arms. The United States extends its hand in friendship to you.

Thank you again for making me feel so welcome.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:45 p.m. at the Zagreb Airport. In his remarks, he referred to President Franjo Tudjman of Croatia.

Remarks at the Martin Luther King, Jr., Commemorative Service in Atlanta, Georgia
January 15, 1996

I know that we have been here a long time, but aren't you glad you came?

Dexter King, thank you for that fine introduction and for your leadership. Coretta King, thank you for your kind remarks and for the visits we've had today and all the ones we've had in the past; the other members of the King family who are here, and especially to our co-presiders. I'm glad they don't keep women out of the pulpit anymore, aren't you? To Senator Coverdell; and my dear friend Governor Miller; Mayor Campbell—you can get back in the pulpit, I think, any time you want; my longtime friend Congressman John Lewis; and Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney; Congressman Mfume, my dear friend, we wish you well on your new mission. To all the ministers who are here and all others who spoke. Dr. Roberts, thank you for letting us come to this church. I want to thank all those who came with me today, many from the White House, starting with the White House Chief of Staff and most

of those who were referenced. And my good friend Ernest Green; Bob Johnson of the black entertainment network; and others who came.

I want to say so many things, and yet I think I should say so little, because I have already heard so much wisdom and humor—[*laughter*]—and passion and music. I'm going to do a test when I get back on the airplane, when I go back to the back of the airplane. [*Laughter*] I'm going to ask Weldon Latham and Bob Johnson and Ernie Green and all my staff members what they remembered about this long ceremony. Everyone will remember you, young man, because you remind us of what all this is all about. And you are a stern rebuke to the cynics who say we cannot do better.

I will remember something that the rest of you couldn't know, and that is that Coretta Scott King still has a beautiful voice and can hit all the high notes. I will remember this as the first time in my life I ever got to sing "Lift Every Voice and Sing" 2 days in a row because we sang it in church yesterday. I will remember that the mayor wants to be buried by a Southern preacher so he can stay on Earth one more hour. [*Laughter*] I remember that it was so cold in Washington Dick Gregory was willing to go to hell to get away from it. [*Laughter*] I will remember all this incredible music and David Arnold, whom I had never heard before, and my friend and brother Wintley Phipps, who can still bring tears to my eyes. For purely personal reasons, I will never forget the way you all stood when the mayor mentioned my wife's name, and I thank you for that. I will never forget my friend Governor Miller quoting Kris Kristofferson's song and thinking there's still a place for all us Southern rednecks in this church. [*Laughter*]

I am glad to see my good friends; I see Edwin Moses and Sonny Walker out there. And those of us who are your fans, Mr. Fishburne, are glad to see you here. Thank you. Thank you very much.

I was sitting here thinking, as everyone else spoke and I kept marking things through with my remarks, what might I say here? What would Dr. King say if he sort of showed up, sidled down the aisle? I think he would have enjoyed this, don't you? All the laughing, all the singing, all the wisdom, all the passion. I think he would have said amen when Congressman Mfume reminded us of that magnificent passage from Genesis, you can kill the dreamer but not the dream.

I think he'd be pretty proud of how far his hometown has come. The King Center is keeping the dream alive. Atlanta has more foreign corporations than any other American city headquartered here with this mayor and that police chief and that sheriff over there. Less than 200 days from today, the whole world will be looking at Atlanta when the Olympics come. The city too busy to hate will be the city the world will see. I think he would like that.

You know, only three Americans have ever had a holiday named for them by the Congress. Two were Presidents: George Washington helped to create our Union; Abraham Lincoln laid down his life to preserve it. Martin Luther King never held any elected office, but he is the third because he redeemed the moral purpose of the United States. He reminded us that since all of us are created equal—and that's what the Constitution says—all of us are equally entitled to the full benefits of American citizenship.

In this holiday we celebrate the life of a man who challenged us to face our flaws and to become a better nation, to use our great power in the service of peace and justice. That was his dream, and that is the spirit of this holiday. And that is why it is a good thing that all over America this is a legal national holiday. It is altogether fitting that if we can lay down our labors for a little while once a year to think about how we started, and we lay down our labors a little while once a year to think about how we might have been torn apart but we stayed together, that we take one day a year to remember that we have to live by the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States.

When we were coming in here, Rodney Slater, who is now the Federal Highway Administrator but was with me when I was Governor, reminded me, Mrs. King, that 10 years ago today I sent, on an early morning, 30 young children from Arkansas to Atlanta to march in the parade. And those children thought they had died and gone to heaven. [*Laughter*] They knew they were part of something that matters.

So if Dr. King were here today, how would he tell us that it matters? I just returned, as all of you know, from a visit to our brave men and women serving as peacekeepers in Bosnia. I think he'd be pleased by that, don't you? Our

troops come from all parts of our country, from all racial and religious and ethnic groups. They comprise a diversity unmatched anywhere in the world and, unfortunately, unmatched in any other organization in this country. They are all committed to equal opportunity, equal responsibility, and excellence.

I wish all of you could have been with me walking down the lines reviewing the troops. First, there's a little unit with a big captain who is 6 foot 4, comes from an industrial city in the Middle West, from an Eastern European ethnic group. Next, there's a unit captained by a young slip of a woman barely 5 feet tall, an African-American woman bossing around all these big, hulking guys. Why? Because she was judged by her merits. Yes, they have an affirmative action program, but no one gets a job for which they are not competent. It was a beautiful thing to see.

But more important than the composition of the military is the mission on which they went, a mission we can all identify with. Bosnia is a land that in the past has found strength in its diversity: the Muslims, the Croats, who are Catholic, and the Serbs, who are Orthodox. They have flourished side by side in the past. Even though they prayed apart, they lived and worked together. They've been neighbors and friends and even family members.

In giving in to appeals to primitive and blind hatred, those who started that awful war there were stepping back into an imagined, unreal past in which they say life has greater integrity and meaning when we define ourselves in terms of who we are not, instead of who we are. Does that sound familiar to you? When we define ourselves by whom we can denigrate and debase, instead of those whom we can reach out to and embrace.

We Americans understand the challenges they're facing in Bosnia. We know it's hard to forge a community from many different groups. It's hard to lay down old hatreds and ancient biases. We also know, as that old Broadway song says, children have to be taught to hate.

I was thinking—you all were making all those jokes about the bus and the airplane—you know what I was thinking about? When I was a kid growing up in my hometown in Arkansas, I rode the city bus to school every day. It cost a nickel. I can still remember one day when I got on the bus I had 4 cents, and there was a bus stop in front of my house and one about a block behind my house. And I asked the bus driver if he'd let me off behind with 4 cents, and let me run up and get another penny and run down the front and give it to him. And he did. That was the old days. But I was a kid. I didn't—I was so stupid, I thought the best place to sit was the back of the bus. They had to run me out of the back so other people could sit down who were supposed to be there. I thought I was supposed to be in the back of the bus. Children have to be taught to hate. We know about what they're going through in Bosnia.

Though our Founding Fathers celebrated in our documents the universal rights of man as being inherent in human nature, we actually started out with a Constitution that stated that slaves were not fully citizens and, by the language of the Constitution, therefore, not fully human.

We fought a Civil War over race and slavery. We lived through bitter days of lynchings and riots. Still today we struggle to overcome. But over time, Dr. King and Reverend Abernathy, others have helped us to see that history need not be our destiny. We can define ourselves by our hopes and not our fears. Most of all, we can understand that we are stronger when we live and work together as a community, not as a swarm of isolated individuals or antagonistic groups. That is still the decision for America today.

In the great budget debate, I believe—some disagree—I believe we ought to balance the budget. We never had a permanent deficit until the 12 years before I became President. Deficits were things that we ran when we had recessions or great wars that required us to mobilize the energies of the country.

So we have to do it. But we have to balance the budget in a balanced way that recognizes that we are all in this together. That is the struggle of America's whole history. That is the mission in Bosnia. We know that we have to be liberated, not bound by the lessons of the past.

Dr. King said that men hate each other because they fear each other. They fear each other because they don't know each other. They don't know each other because they can't communicate with each other. They can't communicate with each other because they're separated from each other.

The sad lesson of our experience is that sometimes we can be standing next to one another and still be separated from each other, miles and miles away in our minds. Now, even if we seek to help others bridge their differences, we have to say today, and he would say to us, "You've still got a ways to go yourselves."

We must be the world's drum major for peace. That's the role our troops and their allies from over 20 other countries, including countries that we were enemies with in the cold war, are playing in Bosnia. That's what we're trying to do in helping the Catholics and Protestants get together in Northern Ireland. That's what we're trying to do in working with the Arabs and the Jews in the Middle East. And I thank President King for his mention of my friend Prime Minister Rabin. Like Dr. King, he gave his life in the struggle for peace. And like so many of you who took up Dr. King's torch, Shimon Peres and others have taken his torch up. I'm glad that the United States is working with them.

I'm proud that the United States has supported the reconciliation of the peoples of South Africa and the triumph of President Mandela and all of you who work with him. It has been an honor for us, not a burden. If that is our role, to be drum majors for peace and justice around the world, surely, surely that must be our responsibility here at home.

We have much to be thankful for. Dexter King mentioned some things. I'm glad that in the last 3 years the crime rate and the welfare rolls and the food stamp rolls and the poverty rate and the teen pregnancy rate are all down. I'm proud of that.

But here's what I think Dr. King would say if he were giving this sermon in far more powerful and eloquent ways: You're doing better, but that's not nearly good enough. And don't do anything which will make it worse. Keep going in the right direction. There needs to be more peace and freedom on our streets. It is true that the murder rate had its biggest decline in 35 years last year. Hallelujah! It's also true a lot of innocent kids will get killed this year. We have to do better. There's still too much crime and violence and drugs in America, especially among our young people.

He would say, ask yourselves this question as you walk out of this church today: How can it be that the crime rate in America is down, but the crime rate among young people between the ages of 12 and 17 is up? Are they still out there raising themselves? What are you going to do about that? What are you going to do about that?

We have to continue to heal the racial divisions that still tear at our Nation. We can't rest until there are no more hate crimes, no more racial violence, and until we have moved beyond those far more subtle but still pervasive racial divisions that keep us from becoming one Nation under God. We have to be honest about where we are in this struggle. The job of ending discrimination in this country is not over. That's why I still believe we need the right kind of affirmative action. We can mend it, and some day we can end it. But we can't end it until everybody with a straight face can say there is no more discrimination on the basis of race.

We must bring more peace to our public discourse, even when we passionately disagree. We did a lot of laughing today, to some extent, at the expense of those who disagree with us. And that's okay, they laughed at me, too—[*laughter*]—and sometimes more. But let's remember, no matter how passionately Martin Luther King spoke about the wrongs he saw and the changes he advocated, he always, always spoke in the language of love and nonviolence and peace.

I remember when one of our clergy read that well-known but never tired passage from Corinthians. In the old King James Version it used to say, "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face. Now we know in part, but then we shall know even as we are known. And there abides faith, hope, and charity, and the greatest of these is charity." Charity and love, in that sense, are the same thing—charitable love, the understanding that even those who are totally different from us share a common human nature. And we all see through the glass darkly. Nobody has the whole truth. We should remember that, and we should ask them to.

And finally, let me say I think he would say that this is going to be a great age of possibility, the 21st century. And many will do very well. The great issue is whether we will go into that age of possibility together or divided, whether America will be a society, a great society, where winners can take everything, or whether it will be an even greater society in which everyone has a chance to win.

If you think about the characteristics of this time, people care more about their racial and their ethnic identities. If that builds pride and self-esteem and gets people back to good values that we all share, it is a good thing. If it leads people to the Bosnian war or killing in Northern Ireland or a lack of resolution in South Africa or continued carnage in the Middle East or on our own streets, it is a bad thing.

If you look at this global marketplace, if it means that a poor child in inner city Atlanta or in rural Arkansas in the hills of the Ozarks can hook into a computer and get himself or herself into a research library in Australia and learn what's going on in the world, if people in the inner cities can use technology to learn things that they couldn't learn and to build businesses and hope and opportunity, that is a very good thing. But if the global economy means that everywhere we have to have more inequality, more people thrown out of work, more people living without hope because those of us who are doing well won't set up the conditions in which everyone can win, it is not a good thing.

So the challenge of this time is to go forward together—to go forward together. And every single one of us has a role to play.

Let me remind you that in 1994 I signed legislation which transformed Martin Luther King's birthday into a national day of service to reflect the life and legacy of Dr. King. I recently appointed a friend of Dr. King's and an adviser, former Senator Harris Wofford, to head our Corporation for National Service. He said the King holiday should be a day on, not a day off; a day of action, not a day of apathy; a day of responding to the community, not a day of rest and recreation. That's what we have tried to do.

Today, all across America, members of AmeriCorps, our national service organization, are working with grassroots community volunteers to pull this country together, not to let it be divided. In Philadelphia, as we meet here, thousands of young people and their teachers are renovating homes for Habitat for Humanity, a project that started here in Georgia and has swept the whole world. In California, 2,300 young people are going to clean parks, remove graffiti, collect food and clothing for people who need it. And as we stand here and sit here, right here in Atlanta, members of the national service corps are joining forces with a coalition of citizens to honor the memory of Martin Luther King by painting classrooms, working at their food bank, renovating a homeless shelter.

Every American can be a drum major for peace. Every American can be a voice for justice. Every American can be a servant in the never-ending work of building our American community and building a stronger and more united and more decent world.

As he said, "Everybody can be great, because everybody can serve. You only need a heart full of grace and a soul generated by love." Because of all of you today, I leave with a heart more full of grace, a soul more generated by love. I thank you for that and hope you feel the same way.

God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1 p.m. at the Ebenezer Baptist Church. In his remarks, he referred to Dexter King, president and CEO, and Coretta Scott King, founder, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change, Inc.; Gov. Zell Miller of Georgia; Mayor William Campbell of Atlanta; former Representative Kweisi Mfume, president, NAACP; Dr. Joseph L. Roberts, Jr., pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church; Ernest Green, managing director, Lehman Brothers; Robert Johnson, chairman and chief executive officer, Black Entertainment Television; Weldon Latham, senior partner, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge; human rights activist Dick Gregory; former Olympic athlete Edwin Moses; William (Sonny) Walker, former executive director, Martin Luther King, Jr., Center; vocalists David Arnold and Wintley Phipps; actor Lawrence Fishburne; Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel; and President Nelson Mandela of South Africa.

Statement on the Decision of Alan Blinder Not To Seek a Second Term as Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

January 17, 1996

It is my deep regret to learn of Alan Blinder's decision not to seek a second term as Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Dr. Blinder's return to Princeton University is a tremendous gain for a respected university but a considerable loss for the Nation.

Alan is a powerful force for sound and sensible monetary policy. His tenure at the Board was marked by integrity, intelligence, and candor. He will be greatly missed there as he was when he left the White House Council of Economic Advisers to become Vice Chairman.

Statement on the Death of Barbara Jordan

January 17, 1996

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of our good friend Barbara Jordan. Her eloquent voice, which articulated the views and concerns of millions of Americans, was always a source of inspiration to us. Barbara's words flowed with heartfelt conviction and her actions rang of indefatigable determination as she challenged us as a nation to confront our weaknesses and live peacefully together as equals.

I am personally appreciative of her efforts to address the difficult problem of illegal immigration as Chair of the Commission on Immigration Reform. Hillary and I join the University of Texas, the Nation, and all those who fight for equal rights and justice in mourning the death of a great woman and a gifted public servant. We extend our deepest sympathies to her family.

Remarks on the Budget Negotiations

January 18, 1996

Good morning. Although I am disappointed that the Republican congressional leaders walked away from our negotiations yesterday, I am not entirely discouraged. After all, it is clear that a 7-year balanced budget, scored by the Congressional Budget Office, one that gives the American people modest tax relief and still protects the fundamental priorities of Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, that this kind of budget is clearly within our grasp right now. Republicans and Democrats have already agreed to far more than $600 billion in savings. That is more than we need to balance the budget and to provide modest tax relief.

We set out to find a common-ground approach to balancing the budget. We were successful in agreeing on more than enough cuts to do the job. As the charts that all of you have show, I have gone the extra mile. The Republicans asked for a plan from us that balanced the budget in 7 years. They then said they disagreed with our economic assumptions, and they asked for a plan based on their economic assumptions. They then made some move themselves toward us, and so I made further moves, as you see in that document. To say that there has not been a good-faith effort here is not credible. We have given a 7-year balanced budget based on the Congressional Budget Office's own estimates, and we have shown here some further movement.

Now let me say again: A lot of good has come out of these talks. It is plain now to the whole country that not only Americans in every community in our country but people here in Washington are committed to a balanced budget in 7 years.

There are areas of disagreement, and they involve more than money. They also involve policy. You already know, as I said, that we have moved toward them in trying to show good faith and reach agreement on the dollars. There are still significant money differences, and they are the same money differences that we started with. I believe that the Republicans are insisting on reductions in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment which are clearly not necessary to balance the budget and not necessary to give a modest tax cut. And I believe that those reductions are in effect being put into this budget to pay for a tax cut that is larger than is warranted under these circumstances.

But let me say there are also some policy differences. And I'll just mention a few. There are more, but let me mention a few. Their Medicare program could require elderly people who choose to go into managed care programs to pay extra fees to see the doctor of their choice, something which is not required today. The medical savings account and fee-for-service options they would provide to all seniors on Medicare could lead to the healthiest and most well off of our senior citizens taking money out of the program which would not be spent in any given year and leaving in the program people with higher medical costs with a lower financial base to cover it. If enough of this happened, it literally could cause the Medicare program to wither on the vine.

They would repeal Medicaid's guarantee of adequate medical coverage for poor people, including poor children, pregnant women, and the disabled. With block grants in Medicaid and lower levels of funding, States would be able to and actually might feel constrained to cut back on services to people who need mental health services, including hospital services. If the history that we all have, the modern history, is any indication, those would be the services that would be most vulnerable in tight budgetary times.

Their budget would dramatically cut programs that are designed to prevent drugs and violence in our public schools. It would deny preschool education through Head Start to about 200,000 young 3- and 4-year-old children from poor backgrounds and we know will be helped by it. It would impose great cuts in aids to poor schools that could cause class sizes to climb and certainly will undermine our efforts to put computers in all the classes of the United States as soon as we can in the next decade.

It ends the Goals 2000 program, which is the administration's program to meet national educational standards which have finally been set but to do it through grassroots reforms. It ends the national service program, which this year is providing 20,000 young people the opportunity to serve their communities and to bring in more volunteers to serve their communities in grassroots effort and earn money to go to college.

It would no longer require companies to pay for the cleanup of toxic wastes if the waste had been lying around 9 years or more. We know that 10 million children now live within 4 miles of a toxic waste site. Under their plan, the taxpayers would have to pick up the tab for these toxic dumps that were in existence before 1987. It would dramatically cut environmental enforcement to guarantee clean air and clean water. It would take the environmental police off the beat with cuts of about 30 percent.

So these are the policy issues involved, and these are just a few of them. When I submitted the plan to balance the budget in 7 years that the Congressional Budget Office agreed did that, I thought that would be the basis for our moving quickly to an agreement based on what we could agree on. I am still committed to that, but let me say—I heard the leaders of the Republican Congress say over and over again, "We have to balance the budget; we have to balance the budget. Why won't the President agree to balance the budget in 7 years? Why won't the President agree to the Congressional Budget Office numbers?" Now it is, "Why won't the President agree to bigger reductions in Medicare and a bigger tax cut?"

Now, if the job is balancing the budget, we know there will be differences between the two parties. These are healthy differences. We ought to have a lot of debates here. But I would remind you, there was only one hearing, only one, on the congressional Medicare plan.

So we can debate some of these policy differences all year long, and the American people can make their decision about what is or is not the right course to follow. But we already

have agreement on way more than enough budget savings to balance this budget and to give a modest tax cut. It is wrong for us to defer this because of disagreements that are not necessary to resolve in order to have a balanced budget or a modest tax cut.

I am committed to finishing this job. I am committed to working to resolve the remaining problems with the Congress. I did have a constructive 40-minute telephone conversation yesterday. And to the Republicans in Congress, let me say again: My door is open. It is open. It will stay open. I have spent 50 hours on this working with them, and I am committed to continuing to work with them until we get the job done.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:37 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Continuation of the Emergency With Respect to Terrorists Who Threaten To Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process

January 18, 1996

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

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists that disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 1996, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The crisis with respect to the grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists that threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that lead to the declaration on January 23, 1995, of a national emergency has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities with the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process, and that are hostile to U.S. interests in the region. Such actions threaten vital interests of the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to deny any financial support from the United States for foreign terrorists that threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 19. The notice of January 18 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Statement on Signing the Memorandum on Missing Persons and Missing Children

January 19, 1996

Every parent knows that their children are the most important thing in their lives. We cherish them, we invest our hopes in them, and when they fall victim to harm, it can be the most wrenching experience of all. For every parent, one of the most horrible things imaginable is the disappearance of a child. We must do

whatever we can to help parents in these situations find their children.

Every year, approximately 300 children are abducted by strangers. Just yesterday, we heard news of a terrible tragedy in Texas, where a young girl was found murdered, after she had been missing for 5 days. We must do everything we can to stop this from happening again. Time is the enemy in abduction cases—and the most important tool we have against it is making sure information gets out to the public.

The Federal Government, through the FBI and other law enforcement agencies, is doing its part to help State and local law enforcement investigate these cases and disseminate information as quickly as possible. But it is critical that the FBI be notified within 48 hours of the abduction. In 6 out of 10 recent cases, the FBI learned of the abduction from TV reports. We've got to do better. And we will.

Nearly all 16,000 police departments around the country have the capacity, through a state-of-the-art computer system, to report missing persons to the FBI. I have asked the Attorney General to make it the highest priority to make sure this system works as quickly as possible.

The Federal Government already works with States to establish clearinghouses for information on missing children. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, funded by the Justice Department, has helped establish clearinghouses in 47 States plus the District of Columbia. The Center also funds Project Alert, which uses the expertise of volunteer retired police officers to help search for missing children.

Now it is time to do more to help families beat the race against time in searching for their missing children. Federal offices come into contact with thousands of citizens and workers every day. That gives the Federal Government a unique role to play in the search for missing children.

Today I will sign an executive memorandum directing all agency heads to take the necessary actions to allow the posting of photos of missing children in Federal buildings. This Presidential action also directs agencies to appoint an action officer to maintain the space for these notices.

This memorandum is just one step, but it's a step in the right direction. There is more we can do—and we will.

The Federal Government is doing its part. But we know that the key to finding missing children is within their own communities. When these terrifying abductions occur, we have seen communities band together to distribute flyers, interview potential witnesses, and support the families. Unfortunately, sometimes a terrible tragedy brings out the very best in our communities and our country.

If we love our children, then we must do everything we can to help when they are in harm's way. Every one of us must take responsibility to do what they can to help find our missing children. Please look twice at the photos of missing children you see in the mail, on your milk cartons, and now, in Federal buildings across the country. Everyone can make a difference, and everyone has an obligation to try.

Memorandum on Missing Persons and Missing Children

January 19, 1996

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Missing Persons or Children Notices in Federal Facilities

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to provide for the posting of missing persons or children notices in buildings owned or controlled by the Federal Government, I hereby direct as follows:

Section 1. Posting of Missing Persons or Children Notices in Federal Facilities. Executive departments and agencies possessing custody or control over buildings or facilities occupied by Federal employees shall take such actions as are reasonable, necessary, and appropriate to provide for the posting of missing persons or children notices in public and other appropriate areas of such domestic buildings or facilities, as determined by the Federal official having pri-

mary responsibility for management and operation of the building or facility involved.

Sec. 2. Duties of Federal Official. Such official shall maintain, or shall designate a representative to maintain, the physical area upon which missing persons or children notices may be placed. The official or the designated representative shall give priority and special prominence to notices involving missing children who are believed to have been abducted by non-family members or otherwise are in imminent physical danger.

Sec. 3. Exceptions. Nothing in this memorandum shall require an executive department or agency to provide public access to its buildings or facilities if such access could impede or disrupt the performance of official duties by government employees or potentially be harmful to the national security.

Sec. 4. Consultation. Executive departments and agencies shall consult with the Department of Justice and the General Services Administration in carrying out the purposes of this memorandum.

Sec. 5. Judicial Review. This memorandum is intended only to improve the internal management of the Federal Government, and is not intended, and should not be construed, to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or its employees.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Message on the Observance of Ramadan
January 19, 1996

Greetings to everyone observing the holy month of Ramadan.

As the crescent moon signals the approach of this most sacred time in the Islamic year, Muslims the world over commemorate the revelation of the Koran to Muhammad. For Muslims, this marks a time of quiet reflection and religious devotion through fasting, self-examination, and intensive study of the teachings of Islam. Encouraging gratitude for our blessings and compassion for those in need, Ramadan cleanses the heart and lifts the soul.

During this time of unprecedented movement toward peace in the Middle East, Muslims and people of all faiths have the opportunity to join together in creating a new world of harmony. Ramadan, with its promise of renewal, helps to nourish the spirit of brotherhood in us all. In this season of hope, let us resolve to work together for a better, brighter future—a future in which children of every religion can live together in peace.

Hillary and I offer best wishes to Muslims everywhere for a memorable observance.

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 20.

The President's Radio Address
January 20, 1996

Good morning. Before I speak with you this morning about our budget, I want to take just a moment to remember someone very special, a national treasure our Nation lost this week, former Texas Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, the first African-American woman elected to Congress from the South.

In her years in public service, she gave voice to our national conscience and brought reasoned thought and eloquence to even the most emotional debates. After she left the Congress, she went home to Texas to teach at the University of Texas and to continue her work in public service. I appointed her to chair the United States Commission on Immigration Reform. And

Barbara Jordan was very instrumental in the progress we have made in tightening our border to keep illegal immigrants out and securing our workplace for American citizens and legal immigrants.

In developing a comprehensive system to keep us both a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws, her work was pure Barbara Jordan: fair, principled, and strong. Our Nation has lost a great American, a stateswoman, a representative of the people with a powerful voice and a great spirit. And many of us have lost a friend and an inspiration. We, the people, will greatly miss her.

Now I'd like to talk about our efforts to reach common ground on a balanced budget, a balanced budget that also protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, and does not raise taxes on working families. The budget talks are suspended now because the Republican congressional leaders walked away from the table. I wish they hadn't done that, and I hope they'll come back, and soon, because I believe our goal can be met. After all, we've both agreed on enough savings to balance the budget in 7 years according to the Congress' own estimates, without having to hurt our economy or sacrifice the values that I've talked about.

That's what we ought to do: balance the budget, protect the things we're committed to protect. And we ought not to delay in getting on with the people's business. In less than a week now, the Republican Congress could once again shut down our Government for the third time in 2 months. I urge them not to do that. In the last shutdown alone, the Federal Housing Administration was unable to insure single family home loans for tens of thousands of deserving applicants. Many, many thousands of citizens couldn't get passports. Some veterans couldn't get benefits. Many Medicare claims couldn't be processed. Small businesses—lots of them—couldn't get loans to create new jobs. Environmental cleanup actions were halted.

The shutdown also put hundreds of thousands of Federal workers with families to support under a horrible strain. Like most American workers, most of them live paycheck to paycheck. They simply cannot afford a third shutdown, and they don't deserve it.

Let's remember, since I've been President we have reduced the size of the United States Government by 205,000 employees. Your Government has closed thousands and thousands of offices, eliminated hundreds of programs. It's now the smallest Federal Government since 1965. As a percentage of our work force, it's the smallest Federal Government since 1933. You probably didn't know that. And one big reason is that the Federal employees who have been left behind are working harder, working smarter, and doing a better job for you. They deserve to be able to do their work and not to be thrown out of work.

Two Government shutdowns so far have cost taxpayers about a billion-and-a-half dollars—a billion-and-a-half dollars. That's not Monopoly money. Shutting down the Government again would be unbelievably irresponsible. So again I say to the Republican Congress, don't do that. We can't afford to bleed money and productivity at a time when we should be putting all our efforts into saving money, serving the American people, strengthening our economy, and moving forward.

I also urge the Congress to deal responsibly with the Federal debt ceiling. Congress should never threaten to default on America's debts. I'm encouraged that Republican leaders have acknowledged that Congress should not put the creditworthiness of the United States at risk in our budget negotiations. And we look forward to working with the congressional leadership to draft a clean debt limit increase, to allow the United States to meet our obligations and maintain our integrity.

I am committed—let me say again, I am committed—to finishing the job of balancing the budget. I have gone the extra mile in our talks. The Republicans asked for a 7-year plan to balance the budget; I gave them a plan. They asked that we use the figures from the Congressional Budget Office. Even though I disagreed with them, I did that, too. I tried every way I can to accommodate Republican demands and bargain in good faith. But there are areas of disagreement, and they involve far more than money. They involve our values and different visions about what kind of people we're going to be and how we're going to get to the next century.

The Republicans insist on cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment that I believe are unwarranted. I know they're not necessary to balance the budget. They admit they're not necessary to balance the budget. And I believe they violate our commitment to our children, our parents, and our future. Among

other things, their proposals would raise Medicare premiums; repeal Medicaid's guarantee of adequate medical coverage for pregnant women, people with disabilities, children, and older Americans; cut our efforts to keep drugs and violence out of public schools and to help schools reach high national standards of excellence in learning; and dramatically cut the enforcement of environmental laws to keep our air and water clean. My budget shows we don't need these drastic steps, and we can still give a modest tax cut to people who need it.

We can end this budget stalemate. Both the Republican leaders and I have already agreed to more than $700 billion in savings. That is more than enough to balance the budget in 7 years. We can give the American people their balanced budget and a modest tax cut. They deserve it, and we ought to do that immediately.

So let me say again to the Republicans: We don't agree on everything, but we agree on a lot. And we agree on more than enough to balance the budget, so let's do it. Come on back to the table. Don't shut the Government down. Don't make America default on its debt. Let's do the right thing. My door is open. Let's talk. Let's get the job done for the American people.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4:49 p.m. on January 19 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on January 20.

Remarks at the Funeral Service for Barbara Jordan in Houston, Texas
January 20, 1996

Thank you. Pastor Cofield; Bennie and Rosemary and John; and Aunt and Uncle, Mamie and Wilmer Lee; Mr. Mayor; my good friend Governor Richards; all the distinguished Texans who are here; and friends of Barbara Jordan around the country; Members of Congress; members of the Texas State government; the former Members of Congress who served with Barbara who came down with me today; to members of the Cabinet; my fellow Americans.

The last time I saw Barbara Jordan was late last fall when Liz Carpenter talked me into going to the University of Texas to give a speech on race relations on the day of the Million Man March. I was nervous enough as it was. [*Laughter*] And I walked out into that vast arena, and there were 17,000 people there. But I could only see one, Barbara Jordan, smiling at me. And there I was about to give a speech to her about race and the Constitution. [*Laughter*] I think it was the nearest experience on this Earth to the pastor's giving a sermon with God in the audience. [*Laughter*]

Through the sheer force of the truth she spoke, the poetry of her words, and the power of her voice, Barbara always stirred our national conscience. She did it as a legislator, a Member of Congress, a teacher, a citizen. Perhaps more than anything else in the last few years, for those of us who had the privilege of being around her, she did it in the incredible grace and good humor and dignity with which she bore her physical misfortunes. No matter what, there was always the dignity. When Barbara Jordan talked, we listened.

We listened in 1974 when she said of the preamble to our Constitution, "We the people. It is a very eloquent beginning, but when the document was completed on the 17th of September in 1787, I was not included in that 'we the people.' "

We listened in 1976 when President Carter asked her to be the first black woman to deliver a keynote address at the Democratic Convention. When she asked and answered one of those great questions with which we still struggle, she said, "Are we to be one people bound together by common spirit, sharing in a common endeavor, or will we become a divided nation? A spirit of harmony will survive in America," she said, "only if each of us remember that we share a common destiny."

We listened in 1992 when she honored me by again giving a keynote address at the convention. "The American dream is slipping away from too many people," she said. She said it would only be changed if we developed an environment characterized by a devotion to the public interest, to public servants, to tolerance, and to love.

After I became President, I asked her to chair the United States Commission on Immigration Reform. And she made us listen again when she reminded all sides on that delicate and difficult issue that we must remain both a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws.

Barbara Jordan's life was a monument to the three great threads that run constantly throughout the fabric of American history: our love of liberty, our belief in progress, our search for common ground. Wherever she could and whenever she stood to speak, she jolted the Nation's attention with her artful and articulate defense of the Constitution, the American dream, and the common heritage and destiny we share, whether we like it or not.

Barbara Jordan loved her family, her loved ones, her friends, her allies, her teachers. She loved Texas. And how she loved our beloved country. She reveled in its never-ending struggle to live up to our highest ideals.

She once said this: "All we are trying to do is to make this Government of the United States honest. We only ask that when we stand up and talk about one Nation under God with liberty and justice for all, we want to be able to look up at the flag, put our right hands over our hearts, repeat those words, and know that they are true." Well, if Barbara wasn't in the Constitution when it was first written, she made sure that once she got in, she stayed in it all the way.

She also did all she could as a lawmaker and as a teacher to give future generations of Americans for all time to come equal standing under that Constitution. That's what she was doing when God called her home, working with the students at the University of Texas Lyndon Johnson School of Public Affairs.

In 1994, in one of the most enjoyable moments of my Presidency, I was proud to give to Barbara Jordan the Nation's highest award to a civilian, the Presidential Medal of Freedom. I noticed her wearing it today. And it touched me so to know that she is now going to a place where her rewards will be greater.

As Ann Richards said, if we're all going to tell the truth today, Barbara Jordan made every one of us stand a little straighter, speak a little clearer, and be a little stronger. She took to heart what her Grandpa Patten told her when she was a little girl. "You just trot your own horse, and don't get into the same rut as everyone else." [*Laughter*] Well, she sure trotted her own horse, and she made her own path wide and deep.

Let me close with these lines from a poem I love by Stephen Spender. I understand Barbara loved it, too, and liked to read it aloud. I can't read it as well as she would have, but you'll see it could have been written about her. "I think continually of those who are truly great, who from the womb remembered the soul's history, who wore at their hearts the fire's center. Born of the sun, they traveled a short while toward the sun, and left the vivid air signed in their honor."

Barbara's magnificent voice is silenced. But she left the vivid air signed in her honor. Barbara, we the people will miss you. We thank you, and Godspeed.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:36 a.m. in the Good Hope Missionary Baptist Church. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. D.Z. Cofield, pastor, Good Hope Missionary Baptist Church; Barbara Jordan's sisters, Bennie Crisswell and Rosemary McGowan, and her brother-in-law, John McGowan; Mayor Bob Lanier of Houston, TX; Ann Richards, former Governor of Texas; and Liz Carpenter, distinguished alumna of the University of Texas.

Remarks on the Return of the Space Shuttle *Endeavour* Astronauts in Houston

January 20, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, I am so glad that I happened to be in Houston and at the airport at the right time. I just want to take a minute—I know you came to see this fine crew and their families and to celebrate with them—but I just want to say on behalf of the people of the United States, we are very proud of this mission, proud of this crew. We were thrilled

by its success, and we're glad to have them home.

And let me just make one plug to—I know that I'm preaching to the saved here, but I want to make one plug for the space program. You see all of our friends and allies from Japan here celebrating their participation in the person—where is he?—of Mr. Wakata. We thank him.

Our space program is an important part of our partnership for world peace. It is an important part of how we relate to and work with the Japanese, the Russians, and others in building a more cooperative, safer world for the 21st century. Our space program is also an important part of research we do in trying to solve medical mysteries and environmental mysteries. NASA has been a major, major force in helping us to figure out ways to save our planet Earth as we accommodate more population growth and more economic growth. So I ask all of you, remain steadfast in your support for America's investment in space and in our future together with our friends and allies throughout the world.

Thank you. God bless you.

Welcome home, gentlemen. Job well done.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:20 p.m. at Ellington Field. In his remarks, he referred to Japanese astronaut Koichi Wakata. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the 100th Birthday of George Burns

January 20, 1996

Hillary and I extend our warmest wishes for a wonderful birthday to one of the most talented entertainers of our time. George Burns' knowing smile and dry wit have touched the hearts and funny bones of three generations. His impeccable timing breathed life into the mundane, and his clever humor crystallized many ageless skits. His youthful attitude, now a century old, continues to inspire us today. We send him all our best on this happy occasion.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Foreign Minister Ehud Barak of Israel

January 22, 1996

State of the Union Address

Q. Is your State of the Union all ready, Mr. President?

The President. Just about ready.

Q. Some people are expecting a campaign-style speech.

The President. I don't think so. What I'm going to say tomorrow night is that the state of the Union is strong but it can be stronger, that I am absolutely confident and optimistic about our ability to meet the challenges that our country faces. And I'm going to say what I think they are and what I believe we should all do about them.

Q. Are you going to reach out to the Republicans to try and get things done?

The President. Absolutely. I did last year, and I will again. I think, you know, we have differences, but we should attempt to resolve those differences. And we should attempt, where we can't resolve them, to set them aside and do what we can do. Remember, throughout our history, the system that the framers of the Constitution set up demands honorable, principled compromise.

Public Debt

Q. Did Dick Armey's comments concern you?

The President. Well, I don't think we should default on the debt. I think that would be a terrible mistake. It's an unacceptable thing for a great nation to do, and we've never done it.

State of the Union Address

Q. Is this going to be longer than last year?

The President. Tune in. I suppose it depends on the applause, doesn't it? [*Laughter*]

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

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, I'm a correspondent of the Israeli television. Do you hope to reach an agreement between Israel and Syria by the end of '96?

The President. Well, of course, that's up to Israel and Syria. All the United States has tried to do throughout this process is to try to do whatever we could to encourage the process of peace. And I think the timetable has to be driven by the progress that is made. That is entirely up to the parties.

Q. What are you doing in order to speed up such an agreement?

The President. We will do whatever we can, whatever we're asked to do, within the limits of our ability, to try to make it possible for the parties to succeed. But the timetable is entirely up to the progress of the substance of the negotiations, and that is entirely up to the parties. The United States—I think we've had some success in the last 3 years because we have not tried to dictate terms or anything of that kind. We have only tried to be helpful and to try to support the parties as they search for peace. And if you look at the results of the last 3 years, that is the appropriate posture for the United States.

Q. Do you hope to initiate a meeting between President Asad and Prime Minister Peres of Israel? Is it one of your wishes for the months ahead?

The President. Well that, of course, will be up to them. If it is helpful in getting them to the point where they can make a peace, obviously, that would be a good thing. But that is a—like every other part of this process, ultimately that is up to them.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:15 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria and Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Message to the Congress on Economic Sanctions Against Libya

January 22, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of July 12, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order No. 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c).

1. On January 3, 1996, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the Libyan government in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked.

2. There has been one amendment to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) of the Department of the Treasury, since my last report on July 12, 1995. The amendment (60 *Fed. Reg.* 37940–37941, July 25, 1995) added three hotels in Malta to appendix A, Organizations Determined to Be Within the Term "Government of Libya" (Specially Designated Nationals (SDNs) of Libya). A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

Pursuant to section 550.304(a) of the Regulations, FAC has determined that these entities designated as SDNs are owned or controlled by, or acting or purporting to act directly or indirectly on behalf of, the Government of

Libya, or are agencies, instrumentalities, or entities of that government. By virtue of this determination, all property and interests in property of these entities that are in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked. Further, U.S. persons are prohibited from engaging in transactions with these entities unless the transactions are licensed by FAC. The designations were made in consultation with the Department of State.

3. During the current 6-month period, FAC made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions under the Regulations, issuing 54 licensing determinations—both approvals and denials. Consistent with FAC's ongoing scrutiny of banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (20) concerned requests by Libyan and non-Libyan persons or entities to unblock transfers interdicted because of an apparent Government of Libya interest. A license was also issued to a local taxing authority to foreclose on a property owned by the Government of Libya for failure to pay property tax arrearages.

4. During the current 6-month period, FAC continued to emphasize to the international banking community in the United States the importance of identifying and blocking payments made on behalf of Libya. The Office worked closely with the banks to implement new interdiction software systems to identify such payments. As a result, during the reporting period, more than 107 transactions potentially involving Libya, totaling more than $26.0 million, were interdicted. As of December 4, 23 of these transactions had been authorized for release, leaving a net amount of more than $24.6 million blocked.

Since my last report, FAC collected 27 civil monetary penalties totaling more than $119,500, for violations of the U.S. sanctions against Libya. Fourteen of the violations involved the failure of banks or credit unions to block funds transfers to Libyan-owned or -controlled banks. Two other penalties were received from corporations for export violations or violative payments to Libya for unlicensed trademark transactions. Eleven additional penalties were paid by U.S. citizens engaging in Libyan oilfield-related transactions while another 40 cases involving similar violations are in active penalty processing.

In November 1995, guilty verdicts were returned in two cases involving illegal exportation of U.S. goods to Libya. A jury in Denver, Colorado, found a Denver businessman guilty of violating the Regulations and IEEPA when he exported 50 trailers from the United States to Libya in 1991. A Houston, Texas, jury found three individuals and two companies guilty on charges of conspiracy and violating the Regulations and IEEPA for transactions relating to the 1992 shipment of oilfield equipment from the United States to Libya. Also in November, a Portland, Oregon, lumber company entered a two-count felony information plea agreement for two separate shipments of U.S.-origin lumber to Libya during 1993. These three actions were the result of lengthy criminal investigations begun in prior reporting periods. Several other investigations from prior reporting periods are continuing and new reports of violations are being pursued.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from July 6, 1995, through January 5, 1996, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the Libyan national emergency are estimated at approximately $990,000. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce.

6. The policies and actions of the Government of Libya continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. In adopting UNSCR 883 in November 1993, the Security Council determined that the continued failure of the Government of Libya to demonstrate by concrete actions its renunciation of terrorism, and in particular its continued failure to respond fully and effectively to the requests and decisions of the Security Council in Resolutions 731 and 748, concerning the bombing of the Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 flights, constituted a threat to international peace and security. The United States will continue to coordinate its comprehensive sanctions enforcement efforts with those of other U.N. member states. We remain determined to ensure that the perpetrators of the terrorist acts against Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 are brought to justice. The families of the victims in the murderous Lockerbie bombing and other acts of Libyan terrorism deserve nothing less. I shall continue to exercise

the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against Libya fully and effectively, so long as those measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments as required by law.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 22, 1996.

Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union
January 23, 1996

Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of the 104th Congress, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans all across our land: Let me begin tonight by saying to our men and women in uniform around the world and especially those helping peace take root in Bosnia and to their families, I thank you. America is very, very proud of you.

My duty tonight is to report on the state of the Union, not the state of our Government but of our American community, and to set forth our responsibilities, in the words of our Founders, to form a more perfect Union.

The state of the Union is strong. Our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. We have completed—created nearly 8 million new jobs, over a million of them in basic industries like construction and automobiles. America is selling more cars than Japan for the first time since the 1970's. And for 3 years in a row, we have had a record number of new businesses started in our country.

Our leadership in the world is also strong, bringing hope for new peace. And perhaps most important, we are gaining ground in restoring our fundamental values. The crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate, and the teen pregnancy rate are all down. And as they go down, prospects for America's future go up.

We live in an age of possibility. A hundred years ago we moved from farm to factory. Now we move to an age of technology, information, and global competition. These changes have opened vast new opportunities for our people, but they have also presented them with stiff challenges. While more Americans are living better, too many of our fellow citizens are working harder just to keep up, and they are rightly concerned about the security of their families.

We must answer here three fundamental questions: First, how do we make the American dream of opportunity for all a reality for all Americans who are willing to work for it? Second, how do we preserve our old and enduring values as we move into the future? And third, how do we meet these challenges together, as one America?

We know big Government does not have all the answers. We know there's not a program for every problem. We know, and we have worked to give the American people a smaller, less bureaucratic Government in Washington. And we have to give the American people one that lives within its means. The era of big Government is over. But we cannot go back to the time when our citizens were left to fend for themselves.

Instead, we must go forward as one America, one nation working together to meet the challenges we face together. Self-reliance and teamwork are not opposing virtues; we must have both. I believe our new, smaller Government must work in an old-fashioned American way, together with all of our citizens through State and local governments, in the workplace, in religious, charitable, and civic associations. Our goal must be to enable all our people to make the most of their own lives, with stronger families, more educational opportunity, economic security, safer streets, a cleaner environment in a safer world.

To improve the state of our Union, we must ask more of ourselves, we must expect more of each other, and we must face our challenges together.

Here, in this place, our responsibility begins with balancing the budget in a way that is fair

to all Americans. There is now broad bipartisan agreement that permanent deficit spending must come to an end. I compliment the Republican leadership and the membership for the energy and determination you have brought to this task of balancing the budget. And I thank the Democrats for passing the largest deficit reduction plan in history in 1993, which has already cut the deficit nearly in half in 3 years.

Since 1993, we have all begun to see the benefits of deficit reduction. Lower interest rates have made it easier for businesses to borrow and to invest and to create new jobs. Lower interest rates have brought down the cost of home mortgages, car payments, and credit card rates to ordinary citizens. Now it is time to finish the job and balance the budget.

Though differences remain among us which are significant, the combined total of the proposed savings that are common to both plans is more than enough, using the numbers from your Congressional Budget Office, to balance the budget in 7 years and to provide a modest tax cut.

These cuts are real. They will require sacrifice from everyone. But these cuts do not undermine our fundamental obligations to our parents, our children, and our future by endangering Medicare or Medicaid or education or the environment or by raising taxes on working families.

I have said before, and let me say again, many good ideas have come out of our negotiations. I have learned a lot about the way both Republicans and Democrats view the debate before us. I have learned a lot about the good ideas that each side has that we could all embrace.

We ought to resolve our remaining differences. I am willing to work to resolve them. I am ready to meet tomorrow. But I ask you to consider that we should at least enact these savings that both plans have in common and give the American people their balanced budget, a tax cut, lower interest rates, and a brighter future. We should do that now and make permanent deficits yesterday's legacy.

Now it is time for us to look also to the challenges of today and tomorrow, beyond the burdens of yesterday. The challenges are significant. But our Nation was built on challenges. America was built on challenges, not promises. And when we work together to meet them, we never fail. That is the key to a more perfect Union. Our individual dreams must be realized by our common efforts.

Tonight I want to speak to you about the challenges we all face as a people. Our first challenge is to cherish our children and strengthen America's families. Family is the foundation of American life. If we have stronger families, we will have a stronger America.

Before I go on, I'd like to take just a moment to thank my own family and to thank the person who has taught me more than anyone else over 25 years about the importance of families and children, a wonderful wife, a magnificent mother, and a great First Lady. Thank you, Hillary.

All strong families begin with taking more responsibility for our children. I've heard Mrs. Gore say that it's hard to be a parent today, but it's even harder to be a child. So all of us, not just as parents but all of us in our other roles—our media, our schools, our teachers, our communities, our churches and synagogues, our businesses, our governments—all of us have a responsibility to help our children to make it and to make the most of their lives and their God-given capacities.

To the media, I say you should create movies and CD's and television shows you'd want your own children and grandchildren to enjoy.

I call on Congress to pass the requirement for a V-chip in TV sets so that parents can screen out programs they believe are inappropriate for their children. When parents control what their young children see, that is not censorship; that is enabling parents to assume more personal responsibility for their children's upbringing. And I urge them to do it. The V-chip requirement is part of the important telecommunications bill now pending in this Congress. It has bipartisan support, and I urge you to pass it now.

To make the V-chip work, I challenge the broadcast industry to do what movies have done, to identify your program in ways that help parents to protect their children. And I invite the leaders of major media corporations in the entertainment industry to come to the White House next month to work with us in a positive way on concrete ways to improve what our children see on television. I am ready to work with you.

I say to those who make and market cigarettes, every year a million children take up smoking, even though it's against the law. Three hundred thousand of them will have their lives shortened as a result. Our administration has taken steps to stop the massive marketing cam-

paigns that appeal to our children. We are simply saying: Market your products to adults, if you wish, but draw the line on children.

I say to those who are on welfare, and especially to those who have been trapped on welfare for a long time: For too long our welfare system has undermined the values of family and work instead of supporting them. The Congress and I are near agreement on sweeping welfare reform. We agree on time limits, tough work requirements, and the toughest possible child support enforcement. But I believe we must also provide child care so that mothers who are required to go to work can do so without worrying about what is happening to their children.

I challenge this Congress to send me a bipartisan welfare reform bill that will really move people from welfare to work and do the right thing by our children. I will sign it immediately.

Let us be candid about this difficult problem. Passing a law, even the best possible law, is only a first step. The next step is to make it work. I challenge people on welfare to make the most of this opportunity for independence. I challenge American businesses to give people on welfare the chance to move into the work force. I applaud the work of religious groups and others who care for the poor. More than anyone else in our society, they know the true difficulty of the task before us, and they are in a position to help. Every one of us should join them. That is the only way we can make real welfare reform a reality in the lives of the American people.

To strengthen the family we must do everything we can to keep the teen pregnancy rate going down. I am gratified, as I'm sure all Americans are, that it has dropped for 2 years in a row. But we all know it is still far too high. Tonight I am pleased to announce that a group of prominent Americans is responding to that challenge by forming an organization that will support grassroots community efforts all across our country in a national campaign against teen pregnancy. And I challenge all of us and every American to join their efforts.

I call on American men and women in families to give greater respect to one another. We must end the deadly scourge of domestic violence in our country. And I challenge America's families to work harder to stay together. For families who stay together not only do better economically, their children do better as well.

In particular, I challenge the fathers of this country to love and care for their children. If your family has separated, you must pay your child support. We're doing more than ever to make sure you do, and we're going to do more. But let's all admit something about that, too: A check will never substitute for a parent's love and guidance. And only you—only you can make the decision to help raise your children. No matter who you are, how low or high your station in life, it is the most basic human duty of every American to do that job to the best of his or her ability.

Our second challenge is to provide Americans with the educational opportunities we'll all need for this new century. In our schools, every classroom in America must be connected to the information superhighway, with computers and good software and well-trained teachers. We are working with the telecommunications industry, educators, and parents to connect 20 percent of California's classrooms by this spring, and every classroom and every library in the entire United States by the year 2000. I ask Congress to support this education technology initiative so that we can make sure this national partnership succeeds.

Every diploma ought to mean something. I challenge every community, every school, and every State to adopt national standards of excellence, to measure whether schools are meeting those standards, to cut bureaucratic redtape so that schools and teachers have more flexibility for grassroots reform, and to hold them accountable for results. That's what our Goals 2000 initiative is all about. I challenge every State to give all parents the right to choose which public school their children will attend and to let teachers form new schools with a charter they can keep only if they do a good job.

I challenge all our schools to teach character education, to teach good values and good citizenship. And if it means that teenagers will stop killing each other over designer jackets, then our public schools should be able to require their students to wear school uniforms.

I challenge our parents to become their children's first teachers. Turn off the TV. See that the homework is done. And visit your children's classroom. No program, no teacher, no one else can do that for you.

My fellow Americans, higher education is more important today than ever before. We've created a new student loan program that's made

it easier to borrow and repay those loans, and we have dramatically cut the student loan default rate. That's something we should all be proud of because it was unconscionably high just a few years ago.

Through AmeriCorps, our national service program, this year 25,000 young people will earn college money by serving their local communities to improve the lives of their friends and neighbors.

These initiatives are right for America, and we should keep them going. And we should also work hard to open the doors of college even wider. I challenge Congress to expand work-study and help one million young Americans work their way through college by the year 2000, to provide a $1,000 merit scholarship for the top 5 percent of graduates in every high school in the United States, to expand Pell grant scholarships for deserving and needy students, and to make up to $10,000 a year of college tuition tax deductible. It's a good idea for America.

Our third challenge is to help every American who is willing to work for it achieve economic security in this new age. People who work hard still need support to get ahead in the new economy. They need education and training for a lifetime. They need more support for families raising children. They need retirement security. They need access to health care. More and more Americans are finding that the education of their childhood simply doesn't last a lifetime.

So I challenge Congress to consolidate 70 overlapping, antiquated job training programs into a simple voucher worth $2,600 for unemployed or underemployed workers to use as they please for community college tuition or other training. This is a "GI bill" for America's workers we should all be able to agree on.

More and more Americans are working hard without a raise. Congress sets the minimum wage. Within a year, the minimum wage will fall to a 40-year low in purchasing power. Four dollars and 25 cents an hour is no longer a minimum wage, but millions of Americans and their children are trying to live on it. I challenge you to raise their minimum wage.

In 1993, Congress cut the taxes of 15 million hard-pressed working families to make sure that no parents who work full time would have to raise their children in poverty and to encourage people to move from welfare to work. This expanded earned-income tax credit is now worth about $1,800 a year to a family of four living on $20,000. The budget bill I vetoed would have reversed this achievement and raised taxes on nearly 8 million of these people. We should not do that. We should not do that.

But I also agree that the people who are helped under this initiative are not all those in our country who are working hard to do a good job raising their children and at work. I agree that we need a tax credit for working families with children. That's one of the things most of us in this Chamber, I hope, can agree on. I know it is strongly supported by the Republican majority. And it should be part of any final budget agreement.

I want to challenge every business that can possibly afford it to provide pensions for your employees. And I challenge Congress to pass a proposal recommended by the White House Conference on Small Business that would make it easier for small businesses and farmers to establish their own pension plans. That is something we should all agree on.

We should also protect existing pension plans. Two years ago, with bipartisan support that was almost unanimous on both sides of the aisle, we moved to protect the pensions of 8 million working people and to stabilize the pensions of 32 million more. Congress should not now let companies endanger those workers' pension funds. I know the proposal to liberalize the ability of employers to take money out of pension funds for other purposes would raise money for the Treasury, but I believe it is false economy. I vetoed that proposal last year, and I would have to do so again.

Finally, if our working families are going to succeed in the new economy, they must be able to buy health insurance policies that they do not lose when they change jobs or when someone in their family gets sick. Over the past 2 years, over one million Americans in working families have lost their health insurance. We have to do more to make health care available to every American. And Congress should start by passing the bipartisan bill sponsored by Senator Kennedy and Senator Kassebaum that would require insurance companies to stop dropping people when they switch jobs and stop denying coverage for preexisting conditions. Let's all do that.

And even as we enact savings in these programs, we must have a common commitment to preserve the basic protections of Medicare

and Medicaid, not just to the poor but to people in working families, including children, people with disabilities, people with AIDS, senior citizens in nursing homes. In the past 3 years, we've saved $15 billion just by fighting health care fraud and abuse. We have all agreed to save much more. We have all agreed to stabilize the Medicare Trust Fund. But we must not abandon our fundamental obligations to the people who need Medicare and Medicaid. America cannot become stronger if they become weaker.

The "GI bill" for workers, tax relief for education and childrearing, pension availability and protection, access to health care, preservation of Medicare and Medicaid, these things, along with the Family and Medical Leave Act passed in 1993, these things will help responsible, hard-working American families to make the most of their own lives.

But employers and employees must do their part as well, as they are doing in so many of our finest companies, working together, putting the long-term prosperity ahead of the short-term gain. As workers increase their hours and their productivity, employers should make sure they get the skills they need and share the benefits of the good years as well as the burdens of the bad ones. When companies and workers work as a team they do better, and so does America.

Our fourth great challenge is to take our streets back from crime and gangs and drugs. At last we have begun to find a way to reduce crime, forming community partnerships with local police forces to catch criminals and prevent crime. This strategy, called community policing, is clearly working. Violent crime is coming down all across America. In New York City, murders are down 25 percent; in St. Louis, 18 percent; in Seattle, 32 percent. But we still have a long way to go before our streets are safe and our people are free from fear.

The crime bill of 1994 is critical to the success of community policing. It provides funds for 100,000 new police in communities of all sizes. We're already a third of the way there. And I challenge the Congress to finish the job. Let us stick with a strategy that's working and keep the crime rate coming down.

Community policing also requires bonds of trust between citizens and police. I ask all Americans to respect and support our law enforcement officers. And to our police, I say, our children need you as role models and heroes. Don't let them down.

The Brady bill has already stopped 44,000 people with criminal records from buying guns. The assault weapons ban is keeping 19 kinds of assault weapons out of the hands of violent gangs. I challenge the Congress to keep those laws on the books.

Our next step in the fight against crime is to take on gangs the way we once took on the mob. I'm directing the FBI and other investigative agencies to target gangs that involve juveniles in violent crime, and to seek authority to prosecute as adults teenagers who maim and kill like adults.

And I challenge local housing authorities and tenant associations: Criminal gang members and drug dealers are destroying the lives of decent tenants. From now on, the rule for residents who commit crime and peddle drugs should be "one strike and you're out."

I challenge every State to match Federal policy to assure that serious violent criminals serve at least 85 percent of their sentence.

More police and punishment are important, but they're not enough. We have got to keep more of our young people out of trouble, with prevention strategies not dictated by Washington but developed in communities. I challenge all of our communities, all of our adults, to give our children futures to say yes to. And I challenge Congress not to abandon the crime bill's support of these grassroots prevention efforts.

Finally, to reduce crime and violence we have to reduce the drug problem. The challenge begins in our homes, with parents talking to their children openly and firmly. It embraces our churches and synagogues, our youth groups and our schools. I challenge Congress not to cut our support for drug-free schools. People like the D.A.R.E. officers are making a real impression on grade-school children that will give them the strength to say no when the time comes.

Meanwhile, we continue our efforts to cut the flow of drugs into America. For the last 2 years, one man in particular has been on the front lines of that effort. Tonight I am nominating him, a hero of the Persian Gulf war and the commander in chief of the United States Military Southern Command, General Barry McCaffrey, as America's new drug czar. General McCaffrey has earned three Purple Hearts and two Silver Stars fighting for this country. Tonight I ask that he lead our Nation's battle

against drugs at home and abroad. To succeed, he needs a force far larger than he has ever commanded before. He needs all of us. Every one of us has a role to play on this team.

Thank you, General McCaffrey, for agreeing to serve your country one more time.

Our fifth challenge: to leave our environment safe and clean for the next generation. Because of a generation of bipartisan effort we do have cleaner water and air, lead levels in children's blood has been cut by 70 percent, toxic emissions from factories cut in half. Lake Erie was dead, and now it's a thriving resource. But 10 million children under 12 still live within 4 miles of a toxic waste dump. A third of us breathe air that endangers our health. And in too many communities the water is not safe to drink. We still have much to do.

Yet Congress has voted to cut environmental enforcement by 25 percent. That means more toxic chemicals in our water, more smog in our air, more pesticides in our food. Lobbyists for polluters have been allowed to write their own loopholes into bills to weaken laws that protect the health and safety of our children. Some say that the taxpayer should pick up the tab for toxic waste and let polluters who can afford to fix it off the hook. I challenge Congress to reexamine those policies and to reverse them.

This issue has not been a partisan issue. The most significant environmental gains in the last 30 years were made under a Democratic Congress and President Richard Nixon. We can work together. We have to believe some basic things. Do you believe we can expand the economy without hurting the environment? I do. Do you believe we can create more jobs over the long run by cleaning the environment up? I know we can. That should be our commitment.

We must challenge businesses and communities to take more initiative in protecting the environment, and we have to make it easier for them to do it. To businesses this administration is saying, if you can find a cheaper, more efficient way than Government regulations require to meet tough pollution standards, do it, as long as you do it right. To communities we say, we must strengthen community right-to-know laws requiring polluters to disclose their emissions, but you have to use the information to work with business to cut pollution. People do have a right to know that their air and their water are safe.

Our sixth challenge is to maintain America's leadership in the fight for freedom and peace throughout the world. Because of American leadership, more people than ever before live free and at peace. And Americans have known 50 years of prosperity and security.

We owe thanks especially to our veterans of World War II. I would like to say to Senator Bob Dole and to all others in this Chamber who fought in World War II, and to all others on both sides of the aisle who have fought bravely in all our conflicts since: I salute your service, and so do the American people.

All over the world, even after the cold war, people still look to us and trust us to help them seek the blessings of peace and freedom. But as the cold war fades into memory, voices of isolation say America should retreat from its responsibilities. I say they are wrong.

The threats we face today as Americans respect no nation's borders. Think of them: terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, drug trafficking, ethnic and religious hatred, aggression by rogue states, environmental degradation. If we fail to address these threats today, we will suffer the consequences in all our tomorrows.

Of course, we can't be everywhere. Of course, we can't do everything. But where our interests and our values are at stake, and where we can make a difference, America must lead. We must not be isolationist. We must not be the world's policeman. But we can and should be the world's very best peacemaker.

By keeping our military strong, by using diplomacy where we can and force where we must, by working with others to share the risk and the cost of our efforts, America is making a difference for people here and around the world. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age—for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age—there is not a single Russian missile pointed at America's children.

North Korea has now frozen its dangerous nuclear weapons program. In Haiti, the dictators are gone, democracy has a new day, the flow of desperate refugees to our shores has subsided. Through tougher trade deals for America, over 80 of them, we have opened markets abroad, and now exports are at an all-time high, growing faster than imports and creating good American jobs.

We stood with those taking risks for peace: in Northern Ireland, where Catholic and Protes-

tant children now tell their parents violence must never return; in the Middle East, where Arabs and Jews who once seemed destined to fight forever now share knowledge and resources and even dreams.

And we stood up for peace in Bosnia. Remember the skeletal prisoners, the mass graves, the campaign to rape and torture, the endless lines of refugees, the threat of a spreading war. All these threats, all these horrors have now begun to give way to the promise of peace. Now our troops and a strong NATO, together with our new partners from central Europe and elsewhere, are helping that peace to take hold.

As all of you know, I was just there with a bipartisan congressional group, and I was so proud not only of what our troops were doing but of the pride they evidenced in what they were doing. They knew what America's mission in this world is, and they were proud to be carrying it out.

Through these efforts, we have enhanced the security of the American people, but make no mistake about it: Important challenges remain.

The START II treaty with Russia will cut our nuclear stockpiles by another 25 percent. I urge the Senate to ratify it now. We must end the race to create new nuclear weapons by signing a truly comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty this year.

As we remember what happened in the Japanese subway, we can outlaw poison gas forever if the Senate ratifies the Chemical Weapons Convention this year. We can intensify the fight against terrorists and organized criminals at home and abroad if Congress passes the antiterrorism legislation I proposed after the Oklahoma City bombing, now. We can help more people move from hatred to hope all across the world in our own interest if Congress gives us the means to remain the world's leader for peace.

My fellow Americans, the six challenges I have just discussed are for all of us. Our seventh challenge is really America's challenge to those of us in this hallowed Hall tonight: to reinvent our Government and make our democracy work for them.

Last year this Congress applied to itself the laws it applies to everyone else. This Congress banned gifts and meals from lobbyists. This Congress forced lobbyists to disclose who pays them and what legislation they are trying to pass or kill. This Congress did that, and I applaud you for it.

Now I challenge Congress to go further, to curb special interest influence in politics by passing the first truly bipartisan campaign finance reform bill in a generation. You, Republicans and Democrats alike, can show the American people that we can limit spending and we can open the airwaves to all candidates.

I also appeal to Congress to pass the line item veto you promised the American people.

Our administration is working hard to give the American people a Government that works better and costs less. Thanks to the work of Vice President Gore, we are eliminating 16,000 pages of unnecessary rules and regulations, shifting more decisionmaking out of Washington, back to States and local communities.

As we move into the era of balanced budgets and smaller Government, we must work in new ways to enable people to make the most of their own lives. We are helping America's communities, not with more bureaucracy but with more opportunities. Through our successful empowerment zones and community development banks, we're helping people to find jobs, to start businesses. And with tax incentives for companies that clean up abandoned industrial property, we can bring jobs back to places that desperately, desperately need them.

But there are some areas that the Federal Government should not leave and should address and address strongly. One of these areas is the problem of illegal immigration. After years of neglect, this administration has taken a strong stand to stiffen the protection of our borders. We are increasing border controls by 50 percent. We are increasing inspections to prevent the hiring of illegal immigrants. And tonight I announce I will sign an Executive order to deny Federal contracts to businesses that hire illegal immigrants.

Let me be very clear about this: We are still a nation of immigrants; we should be proud of it. We should honor every legal immigrant here, working hard to be a good citizen, working hard to become a new citizen. But we are also a nation of laws.

I want to say a special word now to those who work for our Federal Government. Today the Federal work force is 200,000 employees smaller than it was the day I took office as President. Our Federal Government today is the smallest it has been in 30 years, and it's getting

smaller every day. Most of our fellow Americans probably don't know that. And there's a good reason—a good reason: The remaining Federal work force is composed of hard-working Americans who are now working harder and working smarter than ever before to make sure the quality of our services does not decline.

I'd like to give you one example. His name is Richard Dean. He's a 49-year-old Vietnam veteran who's worked for the Social Security Administration for 22 years now. Last year he was hard at work in the Federal Building in Oklahoma City when the blast killed 169 people and brought the rubble down all around him. He reentered that building four times. He saved the lives of three women. He's here with us this evening, and I want to recognize Richard and applaud both his public service and his extraordinary personal heroism. But Richard Dean's story doesn't end there. This last November, he was forced out of his office when the Government shut down. And the second time the Government shut down he continued helping Social Security recipients, but he was working without pay.

On behalf of Richard Dean and his family, and all the other people who are out there working every day doing a good job for the American people, I challenge all of you in this Chamber: Let's never, ever shut the Federal Government down again.

On behalf of all Americans, especially those who need their Social Security payments at the beginning of March, I also challenge the Congress to preserve the full faith and credit of the United States, to honor the obligations of this great Nation as we have for 220 years, to rise above partisanship and pass a straightforward extension of the debt limit and show people America keeps its word.

I know that this evening I have asked a lot of Congress and even more from America. But I am confident: When Americans work together in their homes, their schools, their churches, their synagogues, their civic groups, their workplace, they can meet any challenge.

I say again, the era of big Government is over. But we can't go back to the era of fending for yourself. We have to go forward to the era of working together as a community, as a team, as one America, with all of us reaching across these lines that divide us—the division, the discrimination, the rancor—we have to reach across it to find common ground. We have got to work together if we want America to work.

I want you to meet two more people tonight who do just that. Lucius Wright is a teacher in the Jackson, Mississippi, public school system. A Vietnam veteran, he has created groups to help inner-city children turn away from gangs and build futures they can believe in. Sergeant Jennifer Rodgers is a police officer in Oklahoma City. Like Richard Dean, she helped to pull her fellow citizens out of the rubble and deal with that awful tragedy. She reminds us that in their response to that atrocity the people of Oklahoma City lifted all of us with their basic sense of decency and community.

Lucius Wright and Jennifer Rodgers are special Americans. And I have the honor to announce tonight that they are the very first of several thousand Americans who will be chosen to carry the Olympic torch on its long journey from Los Angeles to the centennial of the modern Olympics in Atlanta this summer, not because they are star athletes but because they are star citizens, community heroes meeting America's challenges. They are our real champions. Please stand up. [*Applause*]

Now each of us must hold high the torch of citizenship in our own lives. None of us can finish the race alone. We can only achieve our destiny together, one hand, one generation, one American connecting to another.

There have always been things we could do together, dreams we could make real which we could never have done on our own. We Americans have forged our identity, our very Union, from the very point of view that we can accommodate every point on the planet, every different opinion. But we must be bound together by a faith more powerful than any doctrine that divides us, by our belief in progress, our love of liberty, and our relentless search for common ground.

America has always sought and always risen to every challenge. Who would say that having come so far together, we will not go forward from here? Who would say that this age of possibility is not for all Americans?

Our country is and always has been a great and good nation. But the best is yet to come if we all do our parts.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless the United States of America. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:14 p.m. in the House Chamber of the Capitol. The Executive order of February 13 on economy and efficiency in Government procurement through compliance with certain Immigration and Naturalization Act provisions is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on Community Policing in Louisville, Kentucky

January 24, 1996

The President. Let me first of all thank the chief, the mayor, and Governor Patton, Congressman Ward for making us feel so welcome. The Attorney General and her entire team who work on this are here, and we want to thank all of the citizens and the police officers who want to meet with us.

I'd like to make just a couple of brief points. First of all, when I ran for President and I began to travel the country looking for ways to bring the crime rate down, when I realized in every community I visited that ordinary citizens were worried about crime and violence, the one thing that came up over and over in all parts of the country that seemed to be working was what is now known generally as community policing. And when we finally passed the crime bill in 1994, which had been debated in Congress for 6 years, we had added to that crime bill a specific title to give funds to communities all across our country to create 100,000 new police officers. There was a reason for that. Between 1965 and 1995, more or less, the violent crime rate in America tripled, but the number of police officers on our street increased by only 10 percent. And that's why we did that.

Now, we're about a third of the way home. Louisville's gotten 16 police; I think Jefferson County has gotten a total of 36, something like that. But we're working hard to try to get more people out here. It is now being recognized. I know one of the major news magazines had a cover story with the New York City police chief the other day, talking about how crime was coming down in America because of community policing. One of the things I asked the Congress to do last night was to support this program until we finished it.

I just want to make two other points if I might. This, in my opinion, is the way the Federal Government ought to relate to American citizens. We put up the money, and we say: This money is for police, and you have to put up some. We'll put up some, and here it is if you want it.

And then we developed a—I want to compliment the Attorney General and the Justice Department—they developed a pretty hassle-free way of applying for the money; there's not a lot of bureaucracy in it. And then we don't tell anybody how to train the police; we don't tell them how to deploy; we don't tell them how to relate to the community. That's all things that have to be decided here at the local level. That's none of our business. We just know that we have to do what we can to give you the resources necessary to achieve the goal.

The second point I want to make, just to emphasize what has already been said, it is obvious to me that there are basically three components to success. One is having the police out there properly deployed. And the second, and maybe the most important, is having some relationship with the community. That's why I asked the American people last night to respect and work with their police officers, because if you don't have that then this won't work.

The third thing I want to say—I want to compliment the mayor—is that within this whole framework our biggest problem now is rising levels of violence among juveniles nationwide. And the mayor also is participating in another one of our programs and got some funds to start, I know, some sports teams and other things here to make a special effort with young people. And that's the last thing I want to emphasize. You know, we've just got so many of these children out there that are in trouble, having difficulties. And the police cannot do that alone. They need people to support them in organizing and coming up with the resources to give the children in areas with high rates

of crime something positive to do. And I think that Louisville's got a lot to be proud of on all fronts. I'm glad to be here, and I've already said more than I meant to. I'd like to listen to you now.

[*At this point, Mayor Jerry Abramson introduced Carolyn MacLuton, past president, Community Oriented Policing Board, 4th Police District, and Nick Altieri, president, Mayor's Block Watch Council, who discussed community involvement with the police in Louisville.*]

The President. Let me ask you a question. You said—and I appreciate you saying that, but you couldn't be doing this without the Federal funds. But it's also true that you couldn't be doing it if you didn't have the citizens involved——

Mr. Altieri. Absolutely. Absolutely.

The President. And that's the point I was trying to make in the State of the Union last night, that when you're dealing with problems that are these people problems that—whether it's crime or the—you know, trying to get jobs into places, move people off welfare, you deal with all of these people problems, you've got to have a partnership. There is no Government program to solve this. You've got to have grassroots citizens involved in it; otherwise, there is no way to get it done.

I sort of liken it—we strike the match and you stoke the fire; you have to do it.

Mayor Abramson. And every district is different, so they can tailor things for what is unique to the district in their neighborhood, because the citizens and Ms. MacLuton understands her district and Nick understands his, and they can tailor their situation to the specifics right in their neighborhood. And that's what's been so successful.

The President. Since you've been doing this, do you think the general feeling of the people that live in your neighborhood about the police has improved?

[*Ms. MacLuton indicated that there had been a great deal of improvement in police-community relations. Mayor Abramson introduced Officer Charles Waters who discussed the importance of partnership between the community, the residents, and city agencies. Mayor Abramson then introduced Peggy Dawson, a member of the COPS Board and the Mayor's Block Watch Council, who discussed increased community understanding of problems faced by police through the Citizens Police Academy.*]

The President. Is this being done anywhere else in the country that you know of? Chief?

Mayor Abramson. Is it?

Police Chief Doug Hamilton. San Francisco?

The President. I must say, this is the first person I ever heard talk about that, but it makes a world of sense that it would be very good for citizens if one person on every block in a big city, for example, knew how the police department worked, what the police were up against, how the structure was, what the budget was. I think it would make a huge amount of difference. That's a wonderful idea.

Ms. Dawson. Mr. President, I think we have a manual that we can give you or some of your staff, that you can take back with you.

The President. Great. That's a wonderful idea.

Mayor Abramson. Yes, we've got that right there. You want us to just bring it up and put it on the——

The President. Go ahead.

[*Mayor Abramson introduced Stephen Kelsey and Robin Cook, district resource officers, who discussed police outreach efforts in the community to build grassroots support for community policing efforts.*]

The President. But it looks to me like what is happening in the—and, by the way, law enforcement is not the only place where we need to do this, as I said. But you know, to go back and organize people on a community basis is a very important thing in this country. I mean, if you think that's—really, we've gotten away from that in a lot of ways. And that's why so many organizations and so many Government programs fail, is because there's no structure underneath it that's capable of actually carrying the load. So I'm very impressed by this.

General Reno, do you want to say anything, ask any questions?

[*Attorney General Janet Reno stated that the Citizens Academy Manual was an excellent tool for community relations. The participants then discussed giving area youth positive activities in the community and economic growth as a factor in improving the community.*]

The President. If I could just make one observation about it, because I think it was Officer Waters that mentioned he could get business back into the neighborhoods when the crime

rate goes down—if you look at the American economy now, basically there are two problems. I talked about one of them last night, and that is that most Americans have jobs but it's hard for them to get a raise in the global economy because there's always so much pressure to hold down the wages. And so that's a different question. I've tried to deal with that.

The other big problem is that the national unemployment rate is 5.6 percent, but with the exception of a few States like California still getting over the terrible blow they took when the defense budget went down, for example, and the recession of the late eighties, most other places have an unemployment rate that's about 4 percent or 4½ percent generally, and then there will be these pockets where the unemployment rate is 10 or 12 or 15 percent.

Q. Thirty percent.

The President. Or 30 percent, yes. And you can't—so that, if you look at it in this way, that is the number one potential market for the rest of the American economy, if you look at it that way. There are all these people living in our country that if they had jobs and they had any money, they would be growing our economy faster. They would be, in effect, if you added another one percent to the work force, that would give everybody else a raise, because they'd be buying everything everybody else produced; they would be generating a higher level of growth.

And that's another thing that I think has been overlooked. One of the main economic strategies we could follow to grow the American economy from inside would be to make all these places that have high crime rates safe so investment that now might go, oh, south of the border or anywhere else could easily flow in there to put people to work and create opportunity. I think it's something that we've really underestimated, the economic aspect of this. I wanted to ask one other question mostly of those of you who have worked on the community boards and the crime watch. Would you say that this policing strategy makes your neighborhood safer primarily because you can catch people who commit crimes more quickly or because it prevents more crimes from occurring in the first place?

[*The participants indicated that the program was most effective in preventing crime but that it also fostered a sense of community empowerment. The last speaker said that it contributed to stronger families and discussed education in the family, concluding that because his grandmother corrected his grammar, he spoke well.*]

The President. I was so afraid you were going to say "good." [*Laughter*]

[*Gov. Paul Patton of Kentucky stated that the program had shown strong results in empowering the community and thanked Mayor Abramson for the presentation.*]

The President. Let me just say in closing that—I want to go back to the last question that I asked, what our goal is, you know, and all of the—I want to thank the police officers around the table who participated, as well as the citizens—when I asked, is the primary benefit of this system that it helps you catch people quicker when they commit crime so it helps prevent crimes in the first place.

I think in the end it will do both, but the answer of prevention is very important. I mean, we have to get back to a point in our country when the crime is the exception rather than the rule. I mean, and I thought it was so perceptive when you said that some police officers were wondering, "Well, are they going to turn me into social workers, or is this right or wrong?"

We don't want police forces to be occupying armies in our cities. We want them to be skilled. We want them to be able to shoot. We want them to be able to protect themselves. We want them to be able to protect other people. But we should be working toward a goal in America where the crimes are the exception, rather than the rule. We can't be in a position anymore where the fastest growing job category in the United States are prison guards and where the fastest growing part of the State budget is investing in more prisons. And I say that as a former Governor who has built as many prisons, I guess, as anybody on a per capita basis.

And you have to put people in jail, and if they're dangerous, you've got to leave them there a long time. But every child that you keep from committing that first armed robbery, from firing that gun the first time, from doing that first drug deal—every child you do that to, you've done 10 times as much than you even do when you make an arrest.

And I think what you see here—to go back to what the Congressman said—is that the further you get away from this neighborhood toward Washington, DC, and the more distance there is between Washington and you, the harder it is to communicate. And so simple messages tend to come through even though they may be wrong. And you say, well, this person says the answer is personal responsibility, and this person says somebody ought to help solve it. And the truth is, the answer is both. The answer is both. And that's what you all have done here. I take my hat off to you. And I've been very moved by what I've heard today, and I must say I'm very encouraged. And we'll keep trying to help you, and you keep carrying the load, and we'll keep cheering.

Mayor Abramson. Thank you, sir.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 2 p.m. at the Louisville District 4 Police Station.

Remarks to the Community in Louisville
January 24, 1996

Thank you. Thank you very much. Governor Patton, Mr. Mayor, Congressman Ward, Judge Armstrong, Chief Hamilton: Let me say on behalf of not only myself but Attorney General Reno, who is here with me, and our team from the Justice Department, we are honored to be in Louisville today. We are honored to be your partners in the search for a safer community. And I personally was honored to spend a few moments this morning with some of your community leaders and your police officers. And I think any community in America would be proud to have a community leader like Carolyn MacLuton and a police officer like Stephen Kelsey, and I thank them.

I want to thank Mr. Burks, your principal here at the Louisville Male High School. I thank the orchestra quartet and the band for playing and the people for singing. Some of my staff was in here listening, and they said I missed a pretty good show. And since I like music a lot I hope I'll get a raincheck to hear what I missed, because I heard they were terrific. Let's give them a hand. Thank you, sir. [*Applause*]

Since I am in this high school, too, I could not leave without acknowledging a graduate of this high school who is making a contribution of signal importance to the United States. Thomas Graham, Jr., is serving today as my Special Representative for Arms Control and Disarmament. His picture hangs in the school hall of fame here, and I just want you to know he's in my hall of fame, too. He's doing a great job for the United States of America.

Last night I had the privilege to deliver the State of the Union Address to the United States Congress and to our country. I came here today to continue to work on the themes and the issues that I discussed with the American people last night. And I did it because Louisville has done so much to make community policing a reality, and because without safe streets the American people cannot be free.

Without the fear of crime and violence it is going to be hard for us to get investment and jobs and opportunity back into some of our most distressed neighborhoods all across America. Unless we can prove that we have the discipline, the values, and the intelligence to organize ourselves into a safer society that give our young people a better hope for the future, it's going to be hard for America to reach its other objectives and for all of our people to live out their dreams.

So I came here today to follow up on the work of the State of the Union. As I said, our Union is strong. In many ways our economy is stronger than it's been in 30 years. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation we've had in 27 years. In the last 3 years there have been over 7.8 million new jobs coming into our economy. We have all-time high trade numbers. We have all-time high numbers of small business formation. We have an all-time high number of self-made millionaires, not people who are inheriting their money, people that went out there and earned it and made it on their own.

All these things are good. But we also know that most Americans are out there working harder and harder and harder just to get by, and they're worried about their family's security. This is the kind of thing that happens when you change the economy as dramatically as the world has changed in the last few years, when we're no longer basically a self-contained economy, we're in a global economy. We no longer have an established industrial society; the information and technology age is changing the way everybody works.

And because of this there are challenges in this economy, as well as things to be proud of. Our country has been the world's leading force for peace and freedom, as we are today, everyplace from Bosnia to the Middle East to Northern Ireland. And we're feeling secure, but we also know that we are threatened by terrorists from beyond and within our borders, by organized crime, by drug traffickers, by weapons of mass destruction. We see when a little vial of gas can break and open in a Tokyo subway and kill hundreds of people, we know we still have challenges there.

Our country is getting stronger in terms of reasserting our basic values. I think that's the most important thing of all. In the last 3 years the crime rate is down; the welfare rolls are down; the food stamp rolls are down; the poverty rolls are down; the teen pregnancy rolls are down; and the divorce rate is down in America. That's encouraging.

The American people did all that. I believe that our crime bill and cracking down on child support enforcement and some of the things we've done supported that. That's the American people kind of getting their act together and coming back to our roots.

And as you look ahead—this basically, this time we're living in and the time toward which we're going, should be the age of greatest possibility the American people have ever known. More people from all walks of life and all corners of our country should have more options to reach all kinds of personal and family and community fulfillment than they have ever had in all of human history.

Our question is, how are we going to do this? And my answer is, we have to do it together. We have to recognize that as a country everybody has got to have a chance to achieve the American dream. And if we're going to do this, we have to remain the world's strongest force for peace and freedom. And if we're going to do this, we have to find a way to go into this very modern, new world still clinging to our old-fashioned values, because it's no accident that we're around here after 220 years. This is the longest lasting democracy in human history because the principles on which we started were good, sound, correct principles that we have to hold fast to even as we change and adapt.

In Washington, our primary focus, as you know now, is on trying to reach agreement on how to balance the budget in 7 years. It's important that you understand that your country has rarely in its history had a permanent deficit, really never had a permanent deficit. There is a use for Government deficits, and we should all understand that.

It is generally conceded that there are two times when it is quite good to run a deficit. One is if you get into a steep recession; if the Government can borrow money today and spend it today and pay it back tomorrow, then you can send it to the places that are in recession. You can keep people from starving. You can help people get by. And you can pump the economy up to get out of the recession more quickly. We have always done that, particularly in this century. The other is if you have to mobilize the whole country for some emergency, usually in wartime. We had a huge deficit, by far bigger than we have today, back during World War II because we literally had to mobilize overnight. But those are generally the only two circumstances in which it is permissible to have a large deficit. We never had a—all during the 1970's we had relatively small deficits, but we had recession after recession after recession in the 1970's.

In the 1980's we adopted a theory that didn't work. We said we can cut taxes and increase spending, and it will be so good for the economy, the budget will be balanced. And it didn't work. So we quadrupled the debt in 12 years, and we got ourselves in a fix. And there's plenty of blame to go around. No party is blameless in this. I didn't come here to talk about blame. But we have to change that, and both parties are going to have to help change it.

Now, in 1993 the Democrats adopted what was a very controversial deficit reduction plan which they were criticized for. But it cut the deficit in half in 3 years, and it cut interest rates and got the economy going.

Now, the Republicans, as I said last night in my speech, are working hard. I believe they honestly do want to balance the budget in 7 years. And they want to do it, and we should give them credit for that. That's a genuine feeling on their part. And I have been working with them to get that done.

We have now identified, in common to our two plans, there are almost $700 billion in savings. And last night, if you heard the speech you know that I reached out to them, and I said, "Look, we still have some differences on the shape of—what we should do on Medicare. We still have some differences on Medicaid. We still differ on how much it takes in investment to protect education and the environment. We still have some policy differences on the environment. But we have both identified savings that are more than enough to balance the budget in 7 years. And we are both willing to assume that responsibility. And the American people will have plenty of opportunities to decide who they think is right about these other things, but we can really do this."

This morning the Speaker of the House, Mr. Gingrich, had a press conference in which he issued—basically showed some interest in a variation of this proposal. And I had a good conversation with him. I attempted to call Senator Dole. I expect to talk to him later. But our staffs are working. And I just want you to know that we are up there working on this. We ought to give the American people their balanced budget.

We can still afford a modest tax cut. It will drive interest rates down. And we can go on and worry about the future then. But we are determined to do this. We need to do this for America, and we have to do it together, Democrats and Republicans together. Everybody is going to have to make some sacrifice. We have got to do this. We cannot go on with the idea that we can permanently run a big deficit.

We now have as a percentage of our income the smallest deficit of any of the big countries, any of the big economies, because of what we've done in the last 3 years. But we need to finish it. It wouldn't even bother me today but for what happened in the 12 years before. And because of that we have got to keep going; we have got to finish this.

And I just ask for all of your support and your understanding. We're going to have to make some tough decisions, but we owe this to our country. And we need to do this in a bipartisan way so it doesn't become a big partisan issue because, like I said, there's plenty of blame to go around for what happened in the 12 years before. But now we have to fix it. And if we can adopt a plan that has discipline and support across the country, you will see interest rates go down, and we can keep this economic growth going and keep the jobs coming into Louisville, into Kentucky, into this county, and into our country. So I ask for your prayers, your support. Whether you're a Republican or a Democrat, this is something we need to do for the United States.

Now, I'd like to talk a little about what I think the future holds for the young people in this audience and for all of us here and to focus in particular on the crime issue that we discussed last night. Because we have moved from an industrial age to a technology and information-driven age, large bureaucracies will not dominate the future. The era of big Government would be over if for no other reason that the economy has changed.

In addition to that, we now know that a lot of our most profound problems may need the Government to act as partner but can't be solved by the Government. We can't drive the crime rate down unless people in their local communities are working at it. That's the genius of community policing. That's why those two people came up here and introduced me, the police officer and the community leader, working together to prevent crime.

We can't do that in Washington, but we can give them the ability to hire the police they need to do it. We can give them the ability to start the youth sports teams they need to give our kids something to say yes to. We can do things to help them, to empower them. But people at the grassroots level have to make the most of their own lives. That reduces dramatically the need for large Government organizations.

And the third reason is we've got a big deficit, so we can't afford it. [*Laughter*]

So in the last 3 years we've—as I said last night, we've reduced the size of your Federal Government by 200,000 people, by 16,000 pages of regulations, by literally hundreds of programs being eliminated and thousands of offices being closed. But we still have a role to play in being a partner with the American people as we go toward the future. And as I said, I believe that

basically we have a clear set of challenges that we have to meet in our families, in the workplace, in our churches and synagogues, in our community organizations.

We have to do it together, with the Government being a partner in this. We have a challenge to do better by our children and to help our families grow stronger and stay together, a challenge to renew our schools and open the doors of college education even wider, with more scholarships and loans and opportunities for work-study and community service. And I hope any tax cut that passes will give people a deduction for the cost of a college education. I think that's about the best kind of tax deduction we could have, because both children and their parents may need it.

We've got a challenge out there to help people that are working hard and struggling, trying to find enough economic security for their families. That's why I favor raising the minimum wage. That's why I favor giving people who lose their jobs or who are underemployed, instead of directing them to a specific Government training program, I want to stop all that and just give everybody a voucher and let them go to their local community college or pick the training program they want to attend.

You know, almost every community in America now has very good education programs, 2-year degree programs. Almost every American is within driving distance of one. The Government no longer needs to tell people when they're out of work or when they're struggling on a very low-wage job what kind of training they need. Employers and employees can figure that out on their own.

So we ought to get rid of the programs. And if you lose your job you just ought to get a slip of paper in the mail that says, "Here's $2,500 if you use it for education." That's what I want to do. I think it would make a big difference in the people's lives.

I think it is wrong that a million Americans in working families have lost their health insurance in the last 2 years. And if we just could change the rules—I know we cannot agree in Washington on what needs to be done to change this entirely; I proved that. But at least if we could agree to change the rules, there seems to be bipartisan agreement that we ought to be able to change the rules that says, if you get insured, you ought to be able to not lose your insurance if you change jobs and not be cut off just because somebody in your family gets sick and you develop a preexisting condition. I think if we could just change those two rules it would make a big difference.

I believe that—let me just say a couple of other things. We have a great challenge to keep our environment clean and safe. If you could see what I have just seen back on the East Coast with all these huge floods—I'm sure you've seen it on television—in Pennsylvania, right there. I called the Governor of Pennsylvania the other day. A couple years ago I spent the night in the Pennsylvania Governor's Mansion, and it's a hundred yards, I bet, from the river that's right in front of it. And the water was up in the Pennsylvania Governor's Mansion, in the basement. And all the flooding and all the problems—and one of our major news magazines had a cover a couple of weeks ago saying that a lot of this extreme weather, both the heat and the cold, the tornadoes and the hurricanes, was all due to the fact that we are changing the way the Earth works, by not protecting the air and basically by consuming more of the atmosphere.

I believe that if we're going to grow our economy over the long run, we have to be concerned about clean air and clean water. We have to be concerned about the fact that millions of our kids are growing up near toxic waste dumps. I believe we can have more economic growth by cleaning up the environment than we can by continuing to pollute it. And I think the American people should reach consensus on that across partisan lines.

I know—I will say again what I said last night, most of the foreign policy decisions I make, I think, from time to time are unpopular almost by definition. Most Americans will say, "We've got enough problems here at home. Don't worry about it. Leave it alone." But if you could see how people all across the world still react to the United States and if you could see how I do that the problems that we face have no borders, we can't protect ourselves from them, you would want us to cooperate with other countries for peace and freedom.

We got a terrorist that we arrested in Asia because another country cooperated with them and brought that person back here to face our system of justice. We see all the time the problems we have of drugs moving across national lines. That's why I named that four-star general last night, General Barry McCaffrey, to be our

drug czar, because he proved to me that we could use the military to help the Justice Department to cut off drugs coming into our country. But if we want those countries where those farmers are growing the coca leaf and other countries where criminal gangs are hiding out in thick jungle hideouts and making the drugs to go into the veins of our children, if we want them to risk their lives—which they have to do, they have to risk their lives to uproot this—then we have to be good neighbors with them. We have to be good partners with them. So this is an important thing.

And the last thing that I would say is that we need to do our part in Washington to convince you that you get your money's worth. And that's what I said last night. I want the Congress to pass a line item veto. I want them to pass campaign finance reform. I want us to be able to prove we can protect our borders from illegal immigration. And I want you to feel that you're getting your money's worth up there.

But I'll say again, these challenges, these six challenges, we can meet them all. And America will not become what it ought to be until people do not feel that they are at risk every time they walk outside their home. Today I heard stories in Louisville about police officers and community people being friends, about children being able to walk on their streets, about people slowly regaining self-confidence that their neighborhoods belong to them again.

Let me just tell you one tiny story about why this is such a big deal to me. At this time of year, almost exactly now, 4 years ago—just a few days later than this 4 years ago, we were coming up to the New Hampshire primary. I was a candidate for President. And I had to go down to New York City, and there was a fundraiser planned there. And I'm ashamed to admit this, but on this particular night I was feeling sorry for myself and totally preoccupied with what was going on in the campaign.

And they were taking me through a kitchen in this hotel where I was in New York. And I was lost in my own thoughts, wondering about what was going to happen in New Hampshire in 10 days and all that. And this man who was in a hotel uniform—he was obviously working there in the kitchen—came up to me and just grabbed me. He said, "Governor, I want to talk to you." And he spoke with a heavy accent. He was an immigrant, obviously, first-generation immigrant. I said, "Okay." He says, "My 10-year-old boy, he studies this election in the school. And he has decided I should vote for you."

I didn't know any 10-year-old boy in New York knew who I was at the time. [*Laughter*] And so my spirits brightened, and I said, "Well, thank you very much." And he said, "But let me tell you something. If I vote for you, I want you to do something for me." He said, "In the country where I came from," he said, "we were very poor, but we were free." He said, "Here we have a park across the street from our apartment house. My boy cannot play in it unless I am there with him because he would be in danger. We have a school, a good school, only two blocks from our home. My boy cannot walk to school, because he would be in danger unless I go with him. So if I vote for you, will you make my boy free?"

It's an amazing thought, isn't it? Liberty—we take it for granted that Americans have liberty. We cannot have liberty unless crime becomes the exception rather than the rule. We'll always have crime. We'll always have violence. You can't just transform human nature. But the kind of stuff we've been putting up with as Americans for years and years and years is unacceptable. We have to say no. We have to take our streets back.

I came to Louisville because this program is working. And I came to Louisville to say to the American people, we're going to put another 100,000 police on the street. We're going to do our best to work with community leaders, with mayors and county executives and neighborhood leaders all across this country to make sure—and police chiefs—that there is a good community policing program in every community in America. But as I learned today sitting around the table listening to the people who introduced me and the others who were there, none of this will work unless citizens are prepared to do their part in fighting crime and taking back the streets.

This system works primarily not because you catch people quicker when they commit crimes; it works primarily because people don't commit crimes in the first place if neighbors work with police officers, if every child is identified, if people work this all the time.

There are a lot of Americans out there who are concerned about crime. The Americans in Louisville have done something about it. The police have even started running an academy

for citizens so that neighborhood leaders can go to the police academy, learn how the police force is organized, learn what their budget is, learn how many people they have, learn what their resources are, understand how they're deployed.

People are working together here. And what I want to say to America here in Louisville is that every American has something to contribute. You may not think you do, but you could. You could be in a neighborhood watch group. If you see somebody in trouble, you could pick up the phone and call the police. If you don't have a neighborhood watch group, you could ask your neighbors to get one together and call the local police force and tell them you're ready to help. People could spend a few hours a week at a Boys Club or a Girls Club.

This city is also now trying to organize sports teams for boys and girls in areas where they'd be at risk. We've got to give our kids more to say yes to, and we've got to have citizen help here. The Government in Washington can provide funds to help hire the police. The Government in Washington can provide modest funds to help support the prevention efforts. The people power has to come from you.

We can't decide who should be hired for the police force, how they should be trained, where they should be deployed, for goodness' sakes. We don't know what the difference is between one neighborhood and another. You have to do this, and people like you all across America.

We can help with laws like the Brady bill. I went to a memorial service for my dear friend Mike Synar today, who died a few days ago, a former Member of Congress. And Jim and Sarah Brady were there, and we were talking about how people like Mike Synar made it possible to keep 44,000 felons, people with criminal records, from buying guns. We can do that. But unless somebody is out there taking responsibility, neighborhood by neighborhood, and child by child, we are not going to make crime the exception rather than the rule.

The Attorney General and I are very concerned about the problem of gangs, and there are too many violent gangs now which go out and try to involve juveniles in serious, serious criminal activity. We intend to target them. The FBI and the other investigative agencies are going to wage a coordinated war on gangs that involve juveniles in violent crime. We will do that. If there are young people who kill and maim like adults, they ought to be prosecuted like adults. If there are people living in these public housing projects, where the other law-abiding citizens have enough problems as it is keeping body and soul together and they're out there working their fingers to the bone for modest wages and trying to live a decent life, they ought not to be involved in crime and drugs. And if they are, they ought to be kicked out of the public housing project immediately.

But the point I want to make is, in the end the answer is to stop people from doing that in the first place. We will never be able to jail our way out of this crisis. We cannot do that. We will not be able to jail our way out of this crisis. If people hurt other people and they're serious threats to society, they ought to be put in jail for a long time. But we cannot solve the crime problem by making prison guards the fastest growing employment category in the United States of America.

We need you. That is ultimately my message to you. We're going to have the best drug strategy we can possibly have with General McCaffrey. We're going to have the best antigang strategy we can possibly have with the Attorney General. We're going to keep supporting community policing with the great team she has put together, and we're not going to give these cities any hassles, these counties any hassles when they're trying to get this job done. We will be supporting them.

But if you really want an America where crime is the exception, not the rule again, it's going to take you, too. We cannot do it unless people, block by block, neighborhood by neighborhood, say, "There's somebody that shouldn't be in this neighborhood." "There's an abandoned car that might have drugs or weapons in it." "There's a child that needs a helping hand." You have to do that. We have got to have your help.

I ask you to think about this as I close. We're here in this high school, this old, old high school—although this beautiful new auditorium—and you think about the life you want these young people who are coming out of this high school to live. Imagine all the possibilities that will be there. By the year 2000 we've got a plan to hook up every classroom in America and every library in America to the worldwide Internet. You'll have kids in Louisville who live in public housing projects getting into libraries

in Australia to do research about volcanoes. It will be amazing.

You'll have people able to travel the world and do things that people 20 or 30 years ago would never even have dreamed of being able to do. It will be very exciting. But they won't be free. No matter how modern, how fancy, how wonderful it is, they won't be free unless crime is the exception rather than the rule. And that won't happen unless all of us do our part to make sure those kids get to live up to their God-given abilities.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:32 p.m. in the auditorium of the Louisville Male High School. In his remarks, he referred to County Judge/Executive David Armstrong; Joseph Burks, Jr., school principal; and Gov. Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania.

Statement on the Northern Ireland Peace Process
January 24, 1996

I welcome the report released today by the international body on decommissioning that was set up by the British and Irish Governments as one track of the twin-track approach for moving the Northern Ireland peace process forward. I am proud that the international body was chaired by a distinguished American, Senator George Mitchell. Senator Mitchell and his colleagues, General de Chastelain of Canada and Mr. Holkeri of Finland, have made a significant and positive contribution to the peace process, and I join the British and Irish Governments in expressing gratitude for their service.

The international body's report is based on the submissions it received from relevant and interested parties in the United Kingdom and Ireland. Together with the political track, I believe it will be a valuable tool for the Irish and British Governments as they work to reach the goal of all-party talks.

I encourage all the parties to use the report of the international body to advance the peace process. Its recommendations do not reflect the views of any one party, but the considered judgment of its members, who want only to help the people of Northern Ireland achieve a just and lasting peace. Their recommendations deserve serious and open-minded consideration by all who share that goal.

The United States stands by its commitment to support the efforts of the British and Irish Governments, the political parties, and the people of Northern Ireland to create a bright and peaceful future for themselves and their children.

Remarks to the U.S. Conference of Mayors
January 25, 1996

Mayor Rice; Mayor Daley; Mayor Helmke, my old classmate, it's good to see you here. Mr. Vice President, you are the only person in the country that could have transformed a straight-man routine into the best comedy act in America. [*Laughter*]

I used to be able to be on a platform with someone I liked, and when they cracked a joke, I'd just write it down. And when no one else was looking I would use it. [*Laughter*] All of his jokes are now so carefully bound to the persona he has created—[*laughter*]—they aren't stealable. They don't even need to be patented anymore. [*Laughter*]

We are, all of us, very glad to have you here. I speak for Secretary Cisneros, Secretary Pena, for Carol Browner. We're glad to have you here in your house.

I want to say a word of thanks to Tom Cochran for being a good representative of your interests and your concerns and of working so closely with Marcia Hale and others here in

the White House. I want to thank you for the work you do every day and for so many of you who have made me feel welcome over the last 3 years as I've come to your cities.

As I said in the State of the Union a couple of days ago, the state of the Union is strong. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation we've had in 27 years. We've had 7.8 million new jobs. Those big numbers don't mean much to people; they really want to know how they are doing in their communities, "How is it on my block?" But I think we can take some encouragement from knowing that the unemployment rate has dropped 3½ percent in Detroit; it's about 4½ percent total in Chicago; it's dropped to under 5 percent in Philadelphia; 2 percent decline in Los Angeles; 2½ percent decline in New York. We could go through city and city and community after community to say that. That is good news.

It is good news that our country is helping peace to take root around the world, from the Middle East to Bosnia. It is good news that all over our country we see a lot of the social indicators that have troubled so many of us for so long turning around. The crime rate, the welfare rolls, the food stamp rolls, the poverty rate, the teen pregnancy rate, all down over the last 2 to 3 years; that is very, very good news.

But we also know that we've got a lot of work to do. And we know the world is changing very quickly. And we know that there are an awful lot of Americans that have not been privileged to participate in this recovering economy. And we know that saying that all these things are going down masks the fact that the crime rate, the welfare rolls, the food stamp rates, the poverty rolls, the teen pregnancy rates, they're all still far too high, unacceptably high.

In the State of the Union Address, as I was preparing for it, I really tried to say to myself, if I were in anybody's living room, what would I say to them? If I were just talking to one family about what the future of our country would be like 5 years from now, 10 years from now, 20 years from now, what is it I would say that we have to do to keep the American dream alive for all of our people, to keep this country coming together and moving together around its basic values, and to maintain the leadership of the United States in the world?

That is what I tried to talk about on Tuesday night. I think we should start with our families because we know now that families that work together and stay together are almost never in poverty. We know that their children are far less likely to have the problems which have consumed so much of our time and our emotions and so much of the public treasure.

An important part of helping our families is passing the right kind of welfare reform, not the wrong kind of welfare reform. I believe, since almost every parent in America has to work to make ends meet, whether in a one- or a two-parent household, it is perfectly acceptable to require people on welfare who can work to work. I think we ought to do that. We ought to be moving people from dependence to independence. But it's also important to remember that we want people to succeed as parents and as workers, and that all of us have—our first job is to our children.

That's why I say that I hope we can reach a bipartisan agreement on a welfare reform bill that will be very tough when it comes to work requirements and time limits and child support enforcement, but will understand we need adequate child care and we need adequate support for those children because what we really want in America is for every single parent to be able to succeed at home and at work.

The second great challenge we have is to provide our people with the educational opportunities they need for the 21st century. The 1990 census had, if you went through all of the data, it had one stunning piece of information that I personally felt was the most important information I got out of the '90 census. It was the first time we could see from 1990 and 1980, looking backward, one clear reason for the growing inequality in America. Why were so many middle class people working harder and harder and not getting ahead? Why was the rising tide not lifting all boats? If you look at the '90 census, you will see Americans who had at least 2 years of education after high school tended to get jobs that they were able to keep, where the incomes tended to grow; those who didn't were in the other boat.

We have got to create a whole set of opportunities in education that will sustain the American dream for everyone. We've got to get more parents and teachers able to run their own schools and able to have flexibility from redtape, but they ought to have national standards of excellence and a recognized way of measuring it, and people should be held accountable for re-

sults; more flexibility to meet higher standards. And one of the things that we can do together, one of the things the National Government can do is to implement this initiative that the Vice President has worked with the telecommunications industry to develop to hook up every school and every library in America to the Internet by the year 2000, every single classroom, and make sure that we not only have a hookup but that we have good software and skilled teachers, so that every single one of our children will be part of the information age. We're committed to that.

The third thing I think we have to recognize is that in this increasingly mobile economy we have to redefine what security means to a working family. It's amazing, the Fortune 500 companies keep laying off people, but there have been more people hired by just—only by businesses owned by women in the last 3 years than have been laid off by the Fortune 500. Interesting statistic. There is that much dynamism in this economy. And all this change is real exciting, unless—except in the times when you come out on the short end. Golly, elections are exciting, unless you don't win them. [*Laughter*] Then they're less interesting.

So the big picture is very exciting. But we have always recognized that the American people who are working hard and playing by the rules, obeying the law, and doing the very best they could were entitled to some level of security.

Let me just give you one example about how the old security systems don't work. And a lot of you, particularly before you became public officials, I'm sure were involved in the unemployment system as employers or employees, where you paid—if you were an employer you paid tax to the unemployment system. The unemployment system was a great idea the way it worked for decades. You paid the money in, and then when times were tough and you had to lay your workers off they could at least draw a living wage, a little less than they were making but a living wage, until you called them back.

For decades, 85 percent of the people who were laid off from work were called back to the job from which they were laid off. Today, over 80 percent of the people who are laid off are not called back to the job from which they were laid off because of the changes in the economy. So how do we deal with that?

For decades people had a pension they could rely on in addition to Social Security if they worked for a big company because they knew they'd go to work for one company and they'd stay there until their work career was over. And the same thing with health insurance. But a million people in America lost their health insurance in the last 2 years, and we've had real trouble trying to maintain the integrity of pension systems. In December of 1994, an almost unanimous vote of the Congress in both parties basically stabilized the pensions of 8 million Americans that were in real trouble and 32 million more that could have gotten in trouble.

So how are we going to define this kind of security for the working families that you represent? I think, at a minimum, we have to do the following things:

We have to give people access to affordable health insurance that they don't lose when they change jobs or when somebody in their family gets sick. And there's a bipartisan bill before the Congress today which they could adopt which would do that.

Secondly, we ought to recognize that people know their own best interests when they're laid off, and we ought to do what we can to move help to them as quickly as possible. And what I favor doing is collapsing 70 of the Government's training programs, which were each developed for little problems—collapse them, put the big pot of money there, and when somebody in your community is laid off or is grossly underemployed and they would qualify for these training programs, instead of having to figure out what training program for which they should sign up, just send them a voucher and let them go to the local community college or whatever training institute is there.

Then the third thing I think we have to do is to figure out a way to make it easier for small businesses, and farmers particularly, to take out their own pension plans for themselves and their employees. There's a bill in the Congress today—it hardly costs any money, but it would make some changes. I think—it was one of the top three or four priorities of the White House Conference on Small Business. It would make some changes which would make it possible for almost every business that could possibly afford to do it, including a lot of them that cannot even afford the legal costs today, to begin a pension program.

So these are good beginnings. And they would strengthen your communities by enabling your families that are working out there in this more dynamic economy to succeed.

The fourth thing we have to do is do a better job of helping you to bring the crime rate down. But you—this is a great success story in America. The crime rate is going down in most communities in this country, thanks to the efforts that you and your police chiefs, your police officers, and your community leaders are making. Finally, a couple of weeks ago, there was a big cover story in one of our major magazines acknowledging that, saying we can have some hope that we can drive crime down.

Yesterday I was with Mayor Abramson in Louisville, and we sat and talked to the citizens and the community police officers that were working together in Louisville. Just a few days ago I was with Mayor Lanier in Houston. We were conducting a funeral service for our friend Barbara Jordan. And he was telling me about the work that they have done there to drive down juvenile crime. They have 3,000 young people in a soccer program. And 2,500 of them get their uniforms and shoes from the city. They are kids that would never otherwise be able to afford to participate in that sort of activity.

These things are going on all over our country, and we are taking our streets back. And I want to say a little bit about this because this is—the model we've had together in fighting crime is the model that I believe we should try to replicate in other places. We've worked together. We passed the crime bill of 1994. We passed the Brady bill. That needed to be a national law, uniform standards; 44,000 people with criminal records have not gotten handguns as a result of it. We passed the assault weapons ban. That needed to be a national law. It wouldn't be worth—you know, a city ordinance on assault weapons? A State law on assault weapons? It wouldn't have worked.

We passed the crime bill, and we said, "Okay, this money can only be used for police," but that needed to be a national standard. Why? Because for 30 years we saw the violent crime rate triple, and the aggregate size of America's police force only went up 10 percent. But the Attorney General worked very hard to clean away all the sort of bureaucratic hassles to getting the money. No one said—the cities decided whom to hire, how to train them, where they'll be deployed, how they'll work. The cities decide what the relationship with the communities are. You make all the decisions of any significance within the framework of saying we've got to go to community policing, we've got to drive this crime rate down.

That is the kind of community-based partnership that I think ought to be the model. And the results are pretty hard to quarrel with, as all of you know. Now, the only thing I want to say about that is we have made progress bringing the crime rate down, but everybody knows it's still too high. You go out and interview any 20 citizens in America, and they'll tell you it's still one of their deepest concerns.

We have to keep working on this. What should our goal be? Our goal should be to make crime the exception rather than the rule. It's a simple goal. Our goal should be to make crime the exception rather than the rule so that people feel comfortable when their kids are on the street playing, people aren't afraid to walk down the street to the movie. We know that we will never abolish crime in America. You will never take—we can't transform what is inside every human being, but we could go back to a time when it's the exception rather than the rule. And we have to keep working until we achieve that goal.

The other challenges that I put before the country were, obviously, the important ones that you've worked on: to make sure that we continue to protect the environment and that we find even more ways to grow the economy while we're cleaning up the environment instead of the reverse; to maintain our country's leadership in the world; and to give our Government greater and greater and greater capacity to do more while it costs less and serves the people better.

And we don't have—the era of big Government is over, but the era of strong, effective Government in partnership with people is not over. We're not going back to a time when people can fend for themselves. Why do people come to cities in the first place? What do cities give people? The ability to make more of their lives together than they could if they were apart. I mean, the whole concept of cities is the symbol of what it is we ought to be trying to do in America. People live together because they think they'll all be better off than if they were all out somewhere else by themselves.

That is the idea. And that is, to me, the model that we ought to all have in our minds of what the role of Government ought to be

as we move into the 21st century, to make people to make more of their own lives, not to do anything for anybody that they ought to do for themselves but to help people make more of their own lives.

And that is the kind of partnership we have tried to have with you. It is very difficult to do that and to say you're doing it in Washington because everything here compulsively is filtered out to you through party politics, no matter how hard we try to avoid it. You don't have to worry about that quite as much as we do. I think it was Mayor LaGuardia who once said, "There is no Republican or Democratic way to clean the streets." [*Laughter*] And I believe we need to take some of that wisdom and bring it back here. There is, yes, a Democratic and a Republican way to balance the budget. I understand that. But there is also a whole lot of overlap, and that's what we ought to be focused on.

So let me just mention four things very quickly that I know you'll be discussing here that I think ought to be the basis of our partnership within this framework that I outlined in the State of the Union.

First of all, I want to thank again the Vice President and Secretary Cisneros for the work they've done on the empowerment zones and the enterprise communities. We are trying to find ways to take the lessons we learned there and apply them to other communities. And as we work through this budget and next year's budget, I believe that there should be a bipartisan consensus to find ways to use the power of the Federal Government in ways that essentially help build public-private partnerships to redevelop our cities. And I would urge you to support that and to give us any other ideas you have for that.

We have the HOME initiative, which all of you are familiar with, which provides funds for you to build and rehabilitate houses for your citizens. We continue to strongly support the community development block grants. They've been around a long time, but they really are the symbol of what it is we're trying to do: Here are the subjects; you do it, be accountable at the end. If you mess up, we'll tell you, but otherwise why should we be telling you how to do all this? Those community development block grants have worked well for America. This is a stronger country because of the way that program worked.

We have, secondly—let me just make one other comment. I believe that the way the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has worked with you on the problem of homelessness has worked well, too. You know how to move the homeless people off your streets. Every community has a slightly different homeless problem. And one of the things I would like to say is, while we do this budget, I know we're going to have to cut a lot of things, but I think we've made some real progress in dealing with homelessness in the last few years, and I think it would be a great mistake if we reverse that progress. I think it would be a great mistake if we reverse that progress. We need to continue to reduce the number of homeless people on our streets. This, again, should not be a partisan issue. I don't believe there is a single person in America that really believes that we should weaken our effort to do that.

The second thing we've done is to work on these community development banks. They're quite controversial now in the Congress because they seem like an easy thing to cut because they haven't been fully implemented. But if you look at the experience of the South Shore Development Bank in Chicago, or if you look at the experience of any of the other microenterprise loan programs that have been done in the United States, or if you look at how much our aid program has done in other countries, setting up development banks in places where they would be a lot harder to start than it would in most of your cities, it is obvious that if we had a source of capital to start more new businesses and small businesses, no matter if they're just one-person businesses, in a lot of our poorest areas we could grow the economy more quickly there than anyplace else.

What's the greatest opportunity for American business today? The distressed neighborhoods in our urban and rural areas. Where do the largest number of people live in America that we could use to expand the work force in a hurry or to expand the number of our consumers in a hurry? In the distressed neighborhoods of our urban and isolated rural areas.

AID gave a $1 million grant several years ago to a Central American country to set up a loan program. An average loan was $300 apiece. That loan program now accounts for one percent of all of the jobs in that country, and the $1 million fund that AID put down there now has—there's $4 million in that bank account

now. Those loans have been paid back several times with interest over and over again.

If we really believe that free enterprise and not Government spending is the answer to the problems of the inner city, we're going to have to give them some free enterprise. And free enterprise begins with capital. And there is lots and lots and lots of evidence that this can be successful. So I urge you to support that.

The third thing that I know is very important—I think more mayors have mentioned this to me than any other single issue—is our brownfields initiative, and I want to thank Carol Browner for the work that she has done on it. We were getting ready to come over here, and I was preparing it and I said we ought to call this Browner's brownfields. [*Laughter*] It sounds like a kids' softball team, you know? It was great.

This is a very important thing. If we can get these vacant spaces that you have to put fences around, that basically divide neighborhoods and are inviting targets for all kinds of destructive things, to turn back into safe, sustainable economic endeavors, we could do more in less time with less money to move our cities forward than nearly anything else we can do. So we want to help communities clean up old waste sites by giving tax incentives to those who will buy and clean them up. We want to clear away regulatory burdens. We want to do whatever we can to support you. But I know that the mayors have been on this issue, and I just want to assure you that we want to be there with you. And I believe, again, we can build broad bipartisan support for the brownfields initiative.

The fourth thing that I want to comment on is the reinvention of HUD that Mayor Cisneros is overseeing. I call him "mayor" when he starts talking to me about this. HUD has now got 81 field offices. They've moved huge numbers of people out of Washington. They're collapsing their divisions down to four basic programs. For communities of over 150,000 there will be a single point of contact in the community so you can do all your business in one place. Grants that once required 12 separate applications will now require only one.

So that's the kind of flexibility that I think we ought to have. Our goal is to reach, by the year 2000, 67½ percent homeownership in America. We're already at a 15-year high right now. We're moving. And if we can keep going in this direction and you'll help us and we work together, we can get up to the point where 67½ percent of the people are in their own homes. That has never happened in the United States before. And that, again, will carry with it a certain amount of economic growth and development in all your communities.

And let me just say one other word, since Secretary Pena is here. We have been quite successful and, again, have had a good support from the Congress in our efforts to maximize the amount of money we're putting out through the Department of Transportation in communities for infrastructure development. That's one place where we have worked together with hardly a hitch. And because we have, it's attracted hardly any notice. [*Laughter*] But we're moving in the right direction there, and I want to thank you for doing that.

So these are the things that we believe we can do with you. And I hope that they will be symbolic and will exemplify the kind of partnership that will take this country a long way down the road.

Let me just say one other thing about the budget. Since I gave the State of the Union Address, there have been some encouraging things said by the congressional leaders about the prospects of our getting a budget agreement and continuing to work to bring the deficit down. But I would remind you that we still have some roadblocks in the way that I think need to be cleared away. I urge Congress to keep the Government open and to pass the straightforward continuing resolution until we pass the rest of the appropriations bills for this year.

We've also seen news that just today—of the serious consequences that could result if the Congress was to default on the debt limit. No mayor would ever consider doing such a thing; the repercussions would be far too harmful. And the Congress should not either. Congress must choose not to shut the Government down again and must choose to honor the full faith and credit of the United States.

We are a very great nation, and we are a very great nation not just because we're big, not just because we're wealthy, and not just because we've got a powerful military. It's because people know that we stand for certain things. They know we can be trusted. They know we keep our word. When the United States of America borrowed that money, the United States gave its word it would honor its

obligations. And we should not, under any circumstances, for any reason, ever, ever, not a single one of us, break the word of the United States of America.

Let me say, too, to all of you, I have been very honored to fight the battles that we have fought together, across party lines, for the crime bill, to end unfunded mandates. You have been a source of great inspiration to me. But this organization has been a source of inspiration for progressive, positive change ever since you convinced a reluctant President Hoover to sign a municipal assistance bill in the Depression.

So I ask you to keep working with us. Help us to pass the "Community Flexibility Act." Help us to protect the community development banks. Help us to support the reform of HUD. Help us to get real welfare reform. Help us to keep the crime rate coming down. Help us to do these things. We can do these things if we do them together.

The cities are the model. Why did people begin to live in cities? Because they knew instinctively they could do things together that they could never do on their own. America can do what we have to do if we do it together. And the mayors, the cities, the community leaders can lead the way.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:02 p.m., in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to U.S. Conference of Mayors officers Mayor Norm Rice, Seattle, WA, president; Mayor Richard Daley, Chicago, IL, vice president; Mayor Paul Helmke, Fort Wayne, IN, advisory board chair; and J. Thomas Cochran, executive director.

Statement on the Resignation of Roger Johnson as Administrator of General Services

January 25, 1996

I learned of Roger Johnson's resignation as Administrator of the General Services Administration with deep regret. He served his country with distinction over the last 3 years, bringing a common-sense approach and let's-get-down-to-business style to the GSA.

He worked closely with the Vice President and the staff of the National Performance Review to implement real reforms at the GSA. Because of his work, today's GSA provides better service with a smaller bureaucracy and lower operating costs. We will continue to build on the work Roger started.

At a time when all Americans need to come together and confront our common challenges, we need people like Roger Johnson—a longtime Republican, a business leader—more than ever. Even as he leaves the Government, I hope public servants everywhere remember his example: to put partisan differences aside and work for the common good.

Hillary and I wish Roger and Janice nothing but the best as they return to California. I am deeply gratified by his kind words and look forward to working with Roger in the months ahead.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Department of Transportation

January 25, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 308 of Public Law 97–449 (49 U.S.C. 308(a)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Department of Transportation, which covers fiscal year 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 25, 1996.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 26.

Statement on the 10th Anniversary of the Loss of the Space Shuttle *Challenger*

January 26, 1996

Ten years ago this week, our nation and the world were stunned and saddened by the loss of the crew of the Space Shuttle Challenger. A decade later, we are still moved by the memory of the Challenger Seven and honor the extraordinary sacrifice they made for our country.

Throughout our history, pioneers have dared to dream and live life to the fullest. Like the pathfinders and explorers of our earliest days, like the settlers who pushed our boundaries westward, like the pilots who first took to the air, or the Apollo astronauts who lost their lives in pursuit of President Kennedy's visionary call to reach the moon, the Challenger astronauts believed in themselves and in their mission. They believed in the quest for knowledge and the pursuit of discovery. And each of them—including a special school teacher who touched America's heart, Christa McAuliffe—possessed the rare courage of those willing to risk much to achieve great things.

The people of our space program still carry with them the memory of the Challenger astronauts and keep alive in their daily striving the spirit of the friends and colleagues they lost on that tragic day. Today, our space program is still strong, the Shuttles continue to broaden our horizons, the frontiers of knowledge continue to expand, and the dream of exploration, as we find at Challenger Education Centers around the country, lives on.

We have been fortunate to view our world from the vastness of space, and we owe a lasting debt of gratitude to the Challenger Seven and all those who have taught and still teach us about our place in the cosmos. For, as T.S. Eliot wrote:

> We shall not cease from exploration
> And the end of all our exploring
> Will be to arrive where we started
> And know the place for the first time.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Statement on Signing the Ninth Continuing Resolution

January 26, 1996

Today I have signed H.R. 2880, the ninth continuing resolution for fiscal year 1996 that I have signed into law.

This bill ensures that the normal operations of Government continue for departments and agencies for which no full-year appropriations bill has been enacted. It provides funds for certain Federal activities through March 15, and other activities through September 30, 1996.

Specifically, H.R. 2880 provides funds, through March 15, for activities that are normally funded in the Commerce, Justice, State, and Related Agencies bill; the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies bill; the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bill; and the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies bill. It also provides full-year funding (i.e., through September 30) for programs in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs bill, ensuring adequate funds to implement an effective foreign policy that protects vital U.S. economic and strategic interests abroad.

I am pleased that the Congress avoided another partial government shutdown, and I appre-

ciate its bipartisan approach toward this bill. Nevertheless, I regret that the Congress has not sent me acceptable 1996 appropriations bills for agencies that received funding only through March 15. Governing by continuing resolution is not the appropriate way for the Congress to perform its work. Once again, I urge the Congress to work with me so that we can reach agreement on the remaining fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills.

I also urge the Congress to send me a straightforward, full-year extension of the debt limit. If the Congress does not raise the debt limit, we would not be able to meet all of our financial obligations on February 29 or March 1, and would risk not being able to make timely payment of $30 billion of Social Security benefits and other obligations. A default could raise interest rates and impose serious, long-term harm on the economy. The Congress must act without delay.

Finally, I urge congressional leaders to return to our negotiations to seek an agreement on a balanced budget. We should not give up on that goal.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 26, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 2880, approved January 26, was assigned Public Law No. 104–99.

Statement on Senate Ratification of the START II Nuclear Arms Reduction Treaty With Russia

January 26, 1996

Today, Senate Democrats and Republicans, working together, have increased the security of the American people by ratifying the START II nuclear arms reduction treaty with Russia. I applaud this historic step. As I stated in my State of the Union Address this week, it will make every American, every Russian, and people all over the world more secure.

START II requires dramatic cuts in the nuclear arsenals of our two countries. Together with the START I treaty, which we put into force in December 1994, it will eliminate submarine, bomber, and land-based missile launchers that carried more than 14,000 warheads—two-thirds of the nuclear arsenal the United States and the former Soviet Union maintained at the height of the cold war. START II will also eliminate the most destabilizing type of nuclear weapon—the multiple warhead ICBM. Starting with President Nixon, six American Presidents from both parties have worked to control and reduce the number of nuclear weapons. President Bush negotiated START II and submitted it to the Senate in January 1993. I am proud that we have seized the opportunity presented by the end of the cold war to take this big step back from the nuclear precipice.

As President, my most basic duty is to protect the security of the American people. That's why I have made reducing the nuclear threat one of my highest priorities.

As a result, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at our people. We convinced Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakstan to give up the nuclear weapons left on their land when the Soviet Union broke up. We persuaded North Korea to freeze its dangerous nuclear weapons program under international monitoring. We're working with countries around the world to safeguard and destroy nuclear weapons and materials—so that they don't fall into the hands of terrorists or criminals. We led global efforts to win the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which bans the spread of nuclear weapons to states that do not have them.

Now, as I urged in the State of the Union, we must do even more to give the American people real, lasting security. We can end the race to create new nuclear weapons by signing a truly comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty this year. We can outlaw forever poison gas if the Senate ratifies the Chemical Weapons Convention this year. We can take the fight to terrorists, who would acquire terrible weapons of mass destruction, if Congress finally passes legislation I proposed after Oklahoma City to give

American law enforcement an even stronger arsenal.

Working together, I believe we can and we will take all these important steps to increase the security of the American people.

Remarks to the National Association of Hispanic Publications
January 26, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. I feel a lot better than I did when I got here. [*Laughter*] Thank you so much. Thank you, Andres Tobar. Thank you, Louis Rossi. Thank you, Federico Pena.

Secretary Pena gave me a beautiful introduction, and it illustrates Clinton's first law of politics: Whenever possible, be introduced by someone you have appointed to high office. [*Laughter*] I thank him for the outstanding job he has done at the Transportation Department and for being our friend and leader.

I want to congratulate you on your 10th annual convention, on the opening of your office here in Washington under Executive Director Marlene Romero. There are so many Hispanic-Americans I want to thank, but I want to say a special word of thanks to Raul Yzaguirre for his leadership and his guidance and his advice. I know that you have leaders of several Hispanic organizations here with you tonight, Commander Jake Alarid and the members of the G.I. Forum. I think the Chairman of the EEOC is here, Gil Casellas; he's done a terrific job.

I wanted to tell you that—I know Secretary Cisneros spoke yesterday, and he was to be here tonight, but his son is having a Cub Scout meeting, and Henry is the den leader. So we are trying to practice family values in our administration, and he's doing what he should be doing.

Let me also tell you before I get into the remarks that I was going to make tonight—you know, when I gave the State of the Union Address I said, and I believe, the major choice before America is not whether we're going to have big or smaller Government but whether we're going to work together to solve the problems and meet the challenges and seize the opportunities that we have as a people. The choice is whether we're going forward together or whether we think Americans can really do their best out there on their own. And I believe we need to work together, and I asked the Congress to work with me.

I want you to know that just a few minutes ago the Congress passed a continuing resolution so that there's no question now of the Government shutting down, and we'll be able to go on. And now I hope very much we can go back to work and pass all the remaining budgets for this year and pass that 7-year balanced budget in a way that is fair to all Americans.

I also want you to know that the United States Senate has just voted overwhelmingly to ratify the START II treaty with Russia. And let me tell you what that means. That means that when the Russians follow suit—and I talked to President Yeltsin today and I told him that I thought the Senate would ratify it tonight. He said he would do his best to see that the Russian parliamentary body, the Duma, would do the same. When START II is ratified, between START I and START II we will have reduced nuclear weapons two-thirds below their cold-war high. Two-thirds of the nuclear weapons threatening the world will be gone. So I want to thank the United States Senate and the United States Congress for working together with us on this. And as I said, I very much hope that this is a sign of even more of that kind of work to come.

I wanted to say just one other thing, too, about the appointments issue. When I came here to Washington, I found that in strange corners I was criticized for trying to develop an administration that looked like America, that I had this idea that you could have diversity and excellence and we didn't have to sacrifice one for the other. You heard Secretary Pena say that we have appointed a record number of Hispanics—and I might add, and African-Americans and women—to the Federal bench. And just this week, I nominated a distinguished judge, Richard Paez from California, to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth

Circuit—a very important court, and he'll do very well.

And what I wanted to say, that what I'm very proud of is that this batch of judges together have the highest ratings from the American Bar Association in terms of their qualifications of any President's appointments since the ABA has been rating them in over 20 years now. So you don't have to sacrifice excellence to get diversity, to give everybody a chance to serve. And that is very important.

I would like to talk just a few moments tonight—I know you're all here and you're having a good time and I want to get down here and shake hands, and I only have about one speech a week in me like the State of the Union—[*laughter*]—but I would like to talk about the things that I discussed in the State of the Union in terms of what they mean for Hispanics in America.

I do believe that as we move from the industrial age and the cold war into the information technology age and the global village that we are going into an age of possibility where, for Americans who can take advantage of it, there will be more possibilities for people to live out their dreams than in any time in the history of our country.

I also know that we face some stiff challenges. An awful lot of Americans, including an awful lot of Hispanic-Americans, because of all these changes, are having to work harder and harder and harder just to keep up and are worried about the security of their families: Will they be able to provide health care; will they have a pension when they retire; will they be able to educate their children; will they be able to get education if they need it in their middle years? These are serious challenges.

I am encouraged that the family values that the Hispanic community has always embodied are reasserting themselves. It's a good thing that the crime rate and the welfare rolls and the poverty rolls and the teen pregnancy rate are all down and that overall drug use in America is down. That's all good, but it is troubling that random violence among adolescents under 18 and random drug use and even cigarette use is now up among young people under 18.

So that's a challenge. We have to find a way to reach these children and get them back into the mainstream of American life and give them the dreams that so many of us grew up with. And that's really what I was trying to talk about in the State of the Union.

You can see all the progress that's been made by Hispanic-Americans in the corporate sector, in the classrooms. We see more Hispanic TV news anchors, reporters, publishers, authors, doctors, lawyers, lawmakers. But every child deserves to have a dream and to have a chance to live out that dream. And I think this community has a special role to play in seeing that America meets the challenges of today and tomorrow, because you know all about hard work and personal responsibility and family values but you also know that we will do better if we work together than if we just leave everybody out there to fend for themselves. And that is the central message of this time.

I said at the State of the Union, and I repeat, I think this country faces seven great challenges: the challenge to strengthen our families; the challenge to renew our education for the next century; the challenge to provide economic security for every family that's out there working for it; the challenge to break the back of crime and violence so that crime becomes the exception, not the rule in America again; the challenge to protect our environment; the challenge to guard our world leadership for peace and freedom; and the challenge to make our Government work for all the people again.

Think what this means, all these challenges, to the Hispanic community. Strong families are the foundation of your culture. But every child is vulnerable to the lure of television that no child should watch, to the temptation of cigarettes that shorten our lives—1,000 kids a day will have their lives shortened because they're starting to smoke at an age when it is illegal—to the draw of the gangs and the drugs and all these things. We all have to set better examples. But we deserve help, too. We deserve help.

That's why I fought so hard on the telecommunications bill, for example, to have a requirement that all cable television stations have a V-chip in them so that parents can decide whether their young children shouldn't watch certain programs. That's not censorship, that's parental responsibility.

That's why I fought so hard for a welfare reform bill that would be both pro-work and pro-family. I have no problem with requiring people who can work to work; they should work. The welfare system was never meant to be a system which essentially said to people you can

move out of your house and have children out of wedlock and the Government will support you. But if we're going to require people to work, we have to remember that the responsibilities of parenthood are still the most important responsibilities in our society. So people must be able to succeed as parents as well as workers. That is my test for welfare reform.

Education has been the key to advancement of virtually everybody standing in this room tonight, and our education system in many ways is getting better and better. But it's not quite hooked up to the future as it should be. The Vice President and I are determined to see that every classroom and every library in every school in America is hooked up to the information superhighway by the year 2000. And it will help open the doors of the future for Hispanic children as never before. You're going to have children in isolated rural areas in south Texas within 4 or 5 years able to do research out of a library in Australia or China or India and learn things they never could have learned before. Because we have to bring the miracles of technology to the poor as well as the rich, to the rural as well as the urban, to all Americans. That is a vision worth achieving in our schools.

I would also point out to you that even though the college-going rate is going up, among poor Americans the college-going rate has flattened out—in some cases it's declining—because of the cost of a college education. No young American should ever not go to college because of the cost. That is my goal. Never. Never.

And we are working to increase the scholarships, to have everyone able to get a college loan—is a college loan that you would only pay back as a percentage of your income so that no matter how much you borrow, you can never be bankrupt after you got out of school. You would have to pay it back, but there would be a limit as a percentage of your income. Now, I am proud of the fact that we have given more loans, but we have cut the college default rate in half. If you make it possible for people to repay and then you require them to do so, you can educate more people and cut the college default rate. That's what we ought to be doing in this country.

And let me also say, I know that it's popular today to bash bilingual education and to get into all this language business. Everybody knows that English is the language of the United States, but we do well by encouraging people to take other languages. My daughter just finished her Spanish exam, and I'm glad she's taking Spanish. And I wish more people would. And when children come to this country, whatever their native language, we want them to begin to learn immediately. We want them to develop a facility in English. We want them to keep their native tongue, and we want them to learn while they're doing it. That is all we have ever said. That is all anyone has ever asked. We don't need to make this issue a divisive issue for the American people.

If you think of the question of economic security, this affects the Hispanic community more than anyone else. The minimum wage is going to be at a 40-year low within a year if we don't—in terms of what it will purchase—if we don't raise it. It is unconscionable. For 2 years, I have been trying to get a raise in the minimum wage. It is time to do it. If we say people ought to work, how can we let people work and live in abject poverty? It is wrong, it is not necessary, and we should not do it.

Let me say, we're also trying to make sure that people get the wages they're entitled to. Between 1993 and 1995, the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department, headed by Maria Echaveste, restored more than $77 million in illegally withheld wages to workers in the garment industry, restaurants, hotels, motels, and agriculture, many of them Hispanic. I believe America needs a raise, and we ought to start with a minimum wage. And we ought to do that because it is the right thing to do. I believe it very strongly.

I also believe very, very strongly that we can give people greater security when they know that their jobs have the capacity to get a pension system that they can take then from job to job, when at least they ought to be able to have access to health insurance that they can't lose when they change jobs or if someone in the family gets sick. That's why you have insurance, because someone might get sick. But you have people all over America who are losing their health insurance because somebody got sick; that's why you have it in the first place. Surely, at least, even though we could not agree on comprehensive health care reform last year, surely, surely we can agree to at least protect people who are in hard-working families when they change jobs or when one of their children get sick from losing health insurance.

Let me just say one other thing about security. I think if we're going to have security we have to have very firm, firm laws that protect the workplace in America. Federico said I opposed Proposition 187; I did. I thought it was a bad policy. I didn't want to see children thrown out of schools, sick people thrown out of hospitals. But I do not believe that people who are not here legally should be in the workplace, and a lot of them are being exploited today, exploited in unconscionable ways because we do not enforce laws that are on the books for legal immigration. I am for legal immigration. I am not for punishing children. But I think we have to take a strong stand against people who are not in the workplace legally, because they are being abused, and the whole American wage and hour system and the integrity of work is being abused by the people who do that. And we ought to stand against it. And those of you who believe in immigration, who believe we are a nation of immigrants, I ask you to help me do that, so that we can preserve the support of the United States for a good, strong, legal immigration system that continues to bring us together across our diverse cultures.

I want to say just one thing about the crime problem. I was in Louisville, Kentucky, the day after the State of the Union. And I went into a poor neighborhood where we had put a community-policing program into effect, the city did with some help from the Federal Government. And I saw poor people who never before had any feeling of rapport with the police department actually working on a daily basis with the police, not to catch criminals so much as to prevent crime.

We now know that the way to drive the crime rate down is for neighbors to work with neighbors, to work with police departments. They even set up a citizens police academy in Louisville, where people in the poorest neighborhoods could go down and learn how the police department is organized, how much money was being spent on what, how many police officers there were, how long it took them to get to the neighborhood, how they could be deployed. And it was a beautiful thing to see. All these people who lived in very difficult circumstances felt empowered as citizens because they were literally helping to run the law enforcement program of their community. The policeman was not some outsider who was a source of fear, he was a friend and a partner. And they were driving the crime rate down.

But as long as children can be shot dead on the street from drive-by shootings, as long as children can be enlisted into gangs, and because they're young, taught by cruel older people to use weapons on the theory that they wouldn't be punished or hurt as badly, this country is never going to be what it ought to be. We must go back to the days when crime is the exception, not the rule. That ought to be our goal and our standard, and we should work until we get there.

I thank the Hispanic community for the support we received for NAFTA, for the support we received for the Summit of the Americas, for the support I received in probably the most controversial—perhaps one of the two or three most controversial decisions of my administration, to try and reach out and give some support to the reformers in Mexico to keep the economy from collapse so that we could continue to be good partners and good friends.

Secretary Pena is about to go to Chile to try to implement some of the agreements we made at the Summit of the Americas. These are important things. I ask you—this is something I want to ask you to do. I think Hispanic-Americans just instinctively know that we cannot go into the future as an isolated country; that a part of our community has to be not only American families and communities, people in the private sector and the charities and the churches and the synagogues and the Government working together, we also have to have relations with other countries. I think you know that. And I ask you to remind our fellow Americans when they say, "Well, why would they spend any money on any of that foreign stuff," that foreign aid is only one percent of our budget, only one percent, that our engagement with other countries is a very small percent of all of our tax dollars.

But I will just give you a few examples. One of the reasons that seven members of the Cali cartel were arrested is because the United States and Colombia were partners, because they trusted us, we trusted them, we worked together. Those people had to put their lives on the line—we don't have to do that—to get that done. If we had no NAFTA, if we had no Summit of the Americas, if there were no larger vision about how to relate to the United States, why

should anybody cooperate with us in other areas?

If I bring a terrorist, suspected terrorist back from South Asia, and a poor country in South Asia goes out and arrests somebody out of a neighborhood and sends that terrorist back here to stand trial in America, why should they do that unless they feel that we share the same values and the same interests and the same future? If I ask the Russians to work with me and to absolutely end the threat of nuclear annihilation, which is where we're going, why would they do that unless they feel we have a shared future? I think Hispanics know that kind of instinctively.

This is a big deal for America. We have to be reaching out to the rest of the world because people still trust us. Why in the world were we asked to go to Bosnia, after we, through NATO, had actually bombed there to enforce the previous agreements? Because people know if we give our word, we'll keep it. Because they know we don't want any territory, we don't want to control any people. All we want is for people to live by certain rules of decency and to treat their people with decency and to be freedom loving.

And finally, let me say we're trying to give you the Government up here you deserve, one that costs less and works better. And I said in the State of the Union and I'll say again, the era of big Government is over. Your Government today is the smallest it's been since Lyndon Johnson was President. By the end of next year—this year, '96—it will be the smallest it's been since John Kennedy was President. We are downsizing the Government.

But having a small Government is not the same thing as having a weak Government. It can be smaller; it can be less bureaucratic. We can be giving more power to State and local governments, more power to people in the private sector, more power to groups that can solve social problems better at the grassroots level. But we don't need to walk away from America's challenges.

We still have an obligation, I believe, through the Medicaid program, to help poor children and families with children with disabilities and elderly people who need to be in nursing homes. I believe that's our obligation. We still have an obligation to help people make the most of their own lives through education. We have to do more on that. We're going to have—you know, the average person in a 4-year school today is 26 years old. That's the average age. In the community colleges of this country, it's older. The average person who's 18 years old today will have to go back and get a better education even if they go on to college and get a degree. This will become the work of a lifetime. We have to stay together.

If this is going to be the age of possibility for every American, for every Hispanic child to live out his or her dreams, we have got to say, all right, the era of big Government is over, but we are not about to go back to the time when everybody was fending for themselves and everybody was on their own.

Families work because people work together. People move to cities and towns because they could do more together than they could if they were living apart. And the same is true of our country. I think you know that. Impart your wisdom, your feeling, your conviction to the rest of America so that we can go forward together.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

Audience member. Say hi to Hillary! [*Applause*]

The President. Thank you. Thank you.

Sonja Hillgren. Wait one minute. And now I understand that he noticed his picture was not up there, and now your picture will go up because you are now a member.

The President. I just have one question. Does this mean I get to ask questions, instead of answer them? Because if it does, I've got a wonderful backlog built up. [*Laughter*]

Thank you very much. And let me say I want to come down and shake hands, and then I know you've got a busy evening and I thank you for letting me leave early. But I've got a little family values to tend to. This has been a long day in my family, and I'm going to take care of my wonderful wife and my daughter. So I'll see you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:35 p.m. at the National Press Club. In his remarks, he referred to Andres Tobar, convention chair, and Louis Rossi, president, National Association of Hispanic Publications; Raul Yzaguirre, president, National Council of La Raza; and Jake Alarid, national commander, American G.I. Forum of the United States. Sonja Hillgren was president of the National Press Club.

The President's Radio Address
January 27, 1996

Good morning. Before I speak about the challenges we face today, I'd like to take just a moment to remember together a tragedy that 10 years ago tore at our Nation's heart.

On January the 28th, 1986, the seven courageous Americans of the Space Shuttle *Challenger*, parents and scientists, pilots and our first teacher in space, gave their souls back to God. Like the generations of American explorers, their sacrifice was made not in the name of personal gain but in the pursuit of knowledge that would lead to the common good.

A decade has passed since that terrible day. The families of the *Challenger* crew have slowly and bravely rebuilt their lives. The students Christa McAuliffe taught have now grown into adulthood. Countless shuttle missions have ventured beyond Earth's borders and returned safely to the home we all share. A decade has passed, but their bravery, their commitment, their patriotism remain constant, as fixed as the North Star. We will forever honor their memory and forever remember the name of their ship, *Challenger*, for America was built on challenges, not promises.

Earlier this week, I had the privilege of delivering the State of the Union Address and discussing the challenges we face today, only 5 years from a new century. As I said, the state of our Union is strong. We are entering an age of possibility in which more Americans from all walks of life will have more chances to build the future of their dreams than ever before. But we also face stiff challenges, challenges we must meet and meet together if we are to preserve the American dream for all Americans, maintain America's leadership for peace and freedom, and continue to come together around our basic values.

These are the seven challenges I set forth Tuesday night: to strengthen our families; to renew our schools and expand educational opportunity; to help every American who's willing to work for it achieve economic security; to take our streets back from crime; to protect our environment; to reinvent our Government so that it serves better and costs less; and to keep America the leading force for peace and freedom throughout the world.

We will meet these challenges, not through big Government. The era of big Government is over. But we can't go back to a time when our citizens were just left to fend for themselves. We will meet them by going forward as one America, by working together in our communities, our schools, our churches and synagogues, our workplaces across the entire spectrum of our civic life.

As we move forward with tomorrow's challenges, we also must take care of yesterday's unfinished business. First, we must balance the budget. In the 12 years before I took office, the deficit skyrocketed and our national debt quadrupled. I came to Washington determined to act, and we did. In the first 3 years of our administration, thanks to the Deficit Reduction Act of 1993, we cut the deficit nearly in half. In fact, our budget would be in balance today were it not for the interest payments we have to make on the debt that accumulated in the 12 years before I took office. Now it's time to finish the job.

As you know, for some time I've been working with Republicans and Democrats in Congress to forge a balanced budget that protects our values. Though significant differences remain between our two plans, Republicans and I have enough cuts in common to balance the budget in 7 years and to provide a modest tax cut without devastating Medicare, Medicaid, education, or the environment, and without raising taxes on working families.

So again last Tuesday, I asked Congress to join with me to make the cuts we agree on. Let's give the American people the balanced budget they deserve, with a modest tax cut and the lower interest rates and brighter hope for the future it will bring. My door is open. Let's get back to work.

There have been some hopeful signs this week that we can work together. Last night the Senate ratified the START II treaty which, when Russia ratifies it, will enable us to make continued dramatic reductions of our nuclear arsenal and remove further the nuclear cloud from our children's future. And last night Congress passed legislation to keep the Government's operations

open until March. It's a good step, but only a first step.

And while we are balancing the budget, there is another piece of business Congress must take care of right now. Like each of us, our Nation is only as good as its word. For 220 years, the Government of the United States has honored its obligation and kept its word. Through the Civil War, two World Wars, and the Depression, America has paid its bills and kept its word. When we borrow money, we promise to pay it back, and we pay it back, no matter what. Our strong economy is built on the bedrock of this commitment. The world's economy relies on the full faith and credit of the United States, and it's one thing that enables us to keep all of our interest rates down so that we can afford to borrow and grow and live.

From time to time, to keep its word, Congress has had to pass debt ceiling legislation so the Government can meet its obligations. Congress has always done this when necessary. But this Congress, especially some in the House of Representatives, are trying to use the debt ceiling as a way to get its way in the budget negotiations.

Since November, Congress has failed to act on the debt ceiling. To prevent our Nation from going into default, the Treasury Secretary, Robert Rubin, has been forced to take extraordinary actions, and so far he has been successful. But our options are running out.

What could happen if the United States Government failed to meet its obligations? Our unbroken record of keeping our word could end with taxpayers bearing the costs for years to come because interest rates would go up on United States obligations. And interest rates could also go up for businesses, consumers, and homeowners, many of whom have interest rates that vary according to the Government's interest rates. And for tens of millions of Americans the unthinkable could happen: The Social Security checks they count on would not be able to be mailed out.

My fellow Americans, we are a great country. We have never—never—broken our word or defaulted on our obligations in our entire 220-year history. We've never failed to pay Social Security for senior citizens who've earned it.

So Congress should act responsibly and stop playing politics with America's good name. Let our Government pay its bills. In order to avoid endangering the March 1st Social Security checks, Congress should pass a straightforward, long-term debt limit immediately.

We have worked hard after years of wasteful spending to restore confidence in the way our Government does America's business. Americans are just beginning to believe again. This is no time to turn back. I urge every Member of Congress to reflect upon the gravity of this matter and to remember what the American people want from us is something quite simple: to put partisanship aside, get the job done, and work together for the common good. That is what we must do today and what we must do on the question of the debt limit.

Thanks for listening.

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

Remarks Announcing the National Campaign To Reduce Teen Pregnancy

January 29, 1996

Thank you, Secretary Shalala, Dr. Foster, to the distinguished American citizens who are here behind me, and all of you who are out here with them. I thank the Members of Congress who are here: Senator Pell, Senator Murray, Senator Chafee, Congresswoman Clayton, and Congressman Stokes. Thank you all for being here and for your interest in this important issue.

In the State of the Union Address I said that I felt our country was facing seven great challenges that we had to meet together as a community, challenges that we could not solve if our people were simply left to fend for themselves. I do believe that we are moving into a period of enormous possibility for our people. I honestly believe that for Americans who are positioned to take advantage of the world that we're living in and the one toward which we

are going, there will be more opportunities to fulfill their dreams than ever before in our history.

But I also know that many, many Americans, indeed, millions of Americans will be blocked from that age of possibility unless we succeed in meeting all these challenges. And the very first one that I started with in the State of the Union is the one I want to talk about today, our obligation to cherish our children and strengthen our families.

Secretary Shalala talked about the efforts we're making in welfare reform and how it relates to this. And we've talked elsewhere about what we're trying to do to discourage young people from smoking because that presents, by far, the greatest health damage that they face today.

This morning we want to talk about teen pregnancy, because it is a moral problem and a personal problem and a challenge that individual young people should face and because it has reached such proportions that it is a very significant economic and social problem for the United States. The rates here, of course, are mirrored in many other countries in the world, but they're also causing the same kind of problems elsewhere, and that doesn't make it right.

Teen parents often don't have the education they need, don't have the self-awareness they need, don't have the self-confidence they need to make the most of their own lives in the work force or to succeed themselves as parents.

We know, too, that almost all the poor children in this country are living with one parent, that there are very, very few poor children, without regard to race, region, or income, living in two-parent, married households. We know that there are an awful lot of good single parents out there doing their best, but we also know it would be better if no teenager ever had a child out of wedlock, that it is not the right thing to do and it is not a good thing for the children's future and for the future of our country.

We also know, finally, that we all have to work together to solve this problem and that the people who deserve the lion's share of credit are people like those who are behind me today, people who are giving their lives to try to give our young people things to say yes to, to try to give our young people a sense of self-confidence, a sense of identity, and a sense of the future so that they can make good personal decisions about their own lives.

Members of our administration have been meeting with citizens like these folks from all sectors of our society and from all over the country to determine whether we could help to support the establishment of a new national organization that would expand upon and reinforce and elevate these community-based efforts.

This is not a problem which can be solved in Washington. This is not a problem that can be dealt with by a politician's speech, no matter how statesmanlike. This is a challenge that has to be dealt with one-on-one-on-one throughout this country. But there are things, as these people have told me today, for political leaders to do; there are things for business leaders to do; there are things for people in the media to do; there are things for the health care system to do. And I am very pleased that from the grassroots we have gotten input about how you ought to design the right kind of national campaign against teen pregnancy.

And today I am pleased to announce that a group of very prominent Americans will agree to become the first leaders of a National Campaign To Reduce Teen Pregnancy. A dozen are ready to begin the effort, including leaders in the field of helping our young people, like former Surgeon General Dr. Koop and David Hamburg of the Carnegie Corporations. Others who have agreed to play a role include the president of Drew University and the former Governor of New Jersey, Tom Kean; former New Hampshire Senator Warren Rudman; Ogilvy and Mather chair Charlotte Beers; Whoopi Goldberg; former mayor of Atlanta, Congressman, and U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, who is now the cochair of the Olympics in Atlanta; and the president of MTV, Judy McGrath.

I'd like also especially to thank Dr. Isabel Sawhill who is here with me now, now with the Urban Institute and used to be a part of this administration, for her serious efforts and leadership in spearheading this and getting all these folks together and trying to make sure that this effort will be rooted in America's communities.

This will be a serious bipartisan effort to address this issue. We all know it ought to be an effort that goes on year-in and year-out; it ought to be completely beyond partisan politics. Many of the people who have agreed to meet, to serve, will be meeting tomorrow in New York.

And within the next month this group will be up and running. When it holds its first board meeting the National Campaign To Reduce Teen Pregnancy, I hope, will be coming to the White House to discuss how we can work together and how we can all do our part to advance this important work.

Because Government does have to do its part, again, as I said in the State of the Union, we don't have a big Government anymore; it's much smaller than it was when I took office. But we don't want a weak Government, and we don't want to go back to the time when the American people were left to fend for themselves. We need to go forward in a sense of the spirit of partnership. And I have asked Dr. Henry Foster to serve as my senior adviser on this issue and to be my liaison to this national campaign, to make absolutely sure that we have done everything we can do to support this effort.

In his career as a doctor and through his "I Have A Future" program in Nashville, Dr. Foster has dedicated his energies to dealing with this complex, profoundly human problem of teen pregnancy, and he's had a remarkable amount of success. In this new role he will work in partnership with community-based organizations all across America to help give our young people the strength and the tools they need to lead responsible and successful lives.

Ultimately, I believe what is needed on this issue is a revolution of the heart. We have to work to instill within every young man and woman a sense of personal responsibility, a sense of self-respect, and a sense of possibility. Having a child is the greatest responsibility anybody can assume, and it's still every American parent's most important job. I don't care what else they're doing. And it is not the right choice for a teenager to make before she or he is ready. This message has to be constantly enforced and reinforced by community organizations and by other groups who are in a position to help our children make good choices.

The last point I want to make is that everybody can play a role. And those of us who are older and no longer subject to the drama that these children live with every day find it easier to make these speeches, perhaps, than young people do, but young people are more likely to be more effective in doing it. So I want to say a special word of thanks to one of the people who met with me today, the young gentleman here to my left, Collin Sears. He is demonstrating the kind of contribution one person can make. He has worked at Baltimore's Young People's Health Connection since he was in middle school, teaching other young people to make the right decisions and to take responsibilities for their lives.

You know, he said—and when we were in the meeting, he was asked what was his most effective argument. And he said, "Well, I really have three strategies that I use," and he laid out his strategies. Afterward I couldn't help thinking, if he'd been here helping me to lobby Congress on the budget, it might all be solved. [*Laughter*] I was absolutely carried away that he had, sort of, thought through how he ought to get inside the mind and heart of each young person with whom he was dealing. We need to lift people like him up. We need to lift programs up, like the Best Friends program here in Washington, DC, and I know we have some participants here. We need to lift these comprehensive efforts up, where these people are actually out there now literally giving their lives to help young people secure a better future for themselves, and we need to do it together.

Let me say that there are a lot of things I would like to see done in this country over the next 4 or 5 years. But you just imagine what a difference America could make and what a different America we would have if we could cut the teen pregnancy rate in half. Just imagine how it could change the whole face of the country and the whole future of America and how our young people think about that future.

That is really what this is about. It is an effort worth making. It ought to be completely bipartisan. We ought to commit ourselves to do it for as long as it takes, year-in and year-out, and we ought to root it in our communities and recognize that every one of us has a role to play and a responsibility to play it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:53 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to comedienne Whoopi Goldberg.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for Bulgaria
January 29, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

On June 3, 1993, I determined and reported to the Congress that Bulgaria is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This action allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Bulgaria and certain other activities without the requirement of a waiver.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

January 29, 1996.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin of Russia and an Exchange With Reporters
January 30, 1996

Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission

The President. Let me say that we are delighted to have Prime Minister Chernomyrdin here. He and the Vice President have had very good meetings, and the relationship that they have established and the work they have done I think has played a major role in the continued strengthening of our partnership with Russia. And I'm very pleased at the progress of this meeting, and I'm very pleased again to have him here in the United States.

Prime Minister Chernomyrdin. Thank you, Mr. President. We have just held the sixth session of the commission, so we made some significant progress. And I believe that it is due to the organization of your side that it was possible to have some results. Perhaps for the lack of time, we don't have as many results as we could have. Well, I think that this is due to the Vice President, Mr. Gore, that we have this success.

The President. He thought it was due to you.

Russia

Q. President Clinton, are you concerned and are you going to speak about some of the anti-reform forces that seem to be operating in the former Soviet Union?

The President. Well, we're going to have a discussion about where things are in Russia on a number of issues, but I personally am convinced, by the assurances that I received from President Yeltsin on our telephone call last week and the record that the Prime Minister himself has established, that Russia is firmly moving forward on reform. And I believe that Russia will receive the support of the International Monetary Fund and the other international institutions as well as the United States and other allies. I think we'll keep moving in this direction.

They had a good year in 1995: They had inflation down; production was stable; the ruble was stronger. I think that they're seeing some real economic growth there, and it's a record they can be proud of.

Chechnya

Q. What about Chechnya? Are you going to discuss that, and do you have continuing questions about it?

The President. I talked to President Yeltsin about that last week, but we'll have a few words about it.

Welfare Reform

Q. Do you plan to veto a Senate version of the welfare bill, the next welfare bill? There's

some talk that conservatives will want to send you a tougher bill than the one that you vetoed last year.

The President. You mean a bill that would be tougher to veto, not a tougher bill. [*Laughter*] The Senate—the version that passed the Senate is a better bill than the bill that they sent me. But in fairness also to the congressional leaders, we discussed welfare reform extensively in the context of the budget negotiations. And I suppose whether they decide to send a separate bill in part depends upon whether we can reach a comprehensive agreement on the budget. But we had reached some understandings that I think would give us an even better bill.

Now, the Republicans, to be fair to them, are not bound by any of the discussions we had in the budget because we had a general agreement that nothing was agreed to until everything was agreed to. But we had certainly moved well beyond that bill in our discussions and made some critical improvements, particularly in the question of child care for women who would go into the work force and on the question of how to handle the families of children with disabilities, those two things.

We made some real movement beyond the Senate bill. So I would hope if they do send me a separate bill, which of course is their perfect right to do, that it would reflect the discussions that we had here in the budget negotiations.

"Primary Colors"

Q. Who do you think wrote "Primary Colors?"

The President. I don't know. I haven't read it.

Q. Are you going to?

The President. I don't know. I've got a lot of books to read. I probably will. I'm going to have a lot of book-reading time this year, because I'm going to be traveling a lot. But I haven't read it, and I have no idea who wrote it. I mean, you all find out everything in the wide world. The least you could do is tell all of us who wrote that book. I must say, I admire the publisher and the author. It's the only secret I've seen kept in Washington in 3 years.

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

Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission

Q. Mr. President, can I ask you a question?

The President. Yes, but before, let me make a brief statement.

It is a real honor for us in the United States to have Prime Minister Chernomyrdin here again. I very much appreciate the work that he has done with Vice President Gore and the progress that they have made on many specific issues and, in general, in strengthening the ties and the partnership between the United States and Russia. So they've had another good meeting. I think that the Russian people and President Yeltsin will be very well pleased with the results. And I just want to say, for my part, how much I appreciate the time and the effort and the skill that the Prime Minister has brought to this work.

Q. Mr. President, this $9 billion, that's important for Russia money-wise and important as a sign of support, recognition. Can I report back home that you support Russia with this $9 billion loan?

The President. Yes.

Q. Unconditionally?

The President. As far as I know, they've worked out—they either have worked out or we are in the process of seeing worked out the differences between them. So I believe that the loan will go through, and I believe that it should.

Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. Are you going to visit Moscow in April?

The President. That's where we're going to have our meeting, isn't it? I told President Yeltsin I'd be there, and I intend to be there. I'm looking forward to it. And as you know, our United States Senate just ratified the START II treaty. And I'm hoping that the treaty will find favor in the Russian Duma. And then I'm really looking forward to our meeting in April and moving forward with a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and a number of other issues.

I think that the leadership that President Yeltsin has taken in bringing together to discuss these issues is very important for the safety of the world and in reassuring all the countries and the people of the world that aggression of governments against one another is no longer an option. We have to work together to make all of our people safer and all of our people more prosperous.

Q. Mr. President, would you say that the general business between America and Russia is usual?

The President. Excuse me?

Q. Business between America and Russia is still as usual?

The President. I think that cooperation is there, the partnership is there, and I feel good about it. Perhaps the Prime Minister should comment.

[*At this point, Prime Minister Chernomyrdin answered the question in Russian, and a translation was not provided.*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:40 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Boris Yeltsin of Russia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the Budget Negotiations and the Debt Ceiling and an Exchange With Reporters

January 30, 1996

The President. I'm glad to have these Members here, and we are about to begin a discussion about how we can make progress in our effort to get the right kind of balanced budget. Let me also say I think it is terribly important that Congress pass a clean debt ceiling and do it immediately, so that we can honor the full faith and credit of the United States and so that those Social Security checks can go out at the first of March. It's getting close, and we just have a month left, and I think it's imperative that this be done. But in the meanwhile, we're going to keep working on the budget, trying to find a solution that both parties can embrace and that I can sign.

Q. What about the House saying it's going to adjourn for a month at the end of the week? Are you going to be able to make any progress while they're gone?

The President. Well, I can only tell you that I think that we've got to deal with the debt ceiling. I'm more optimistic—I think we can clearly make progress on the budget whether they're in session or out of session. It depends upon who's available to meet and what kind of conversations can be held over the telephone. So I'm not so concerned about that, but it is imperative that we understand what the timetable is on the debt limit and that we not play games with that. That's an emergency. We can deal with the budget over the telephone. But Congress has to be here and actually pass an act to lift the debt ceiling.

Q. Mr. President, some Republicans say that it was your Treasury Secretary who played games and said that the debt ceiling was going to run out the last time, and that in fact it didn't, and that there are ways to kind of correct this that he's talking about.

The President. No, he didn't play any games. He was deft and adroit and did the best he could to keep this country afloat. And he has notified them that he is out of options, just like he notified them before that we had some options. And I don't think anything has happened to change his mind. So he has explained to them what the situation is; that's what it is.

This country has not one time in its entire history refused to honor the obligations that it has committed to. And I don't believe we should now, and I don't believe we will. But I want to urge Congress to deal with this in a prompt manner.

Q. Why won't the Social Security checks go out? What—is this a separate——

The President. Because if the country cannot honor its debt obligations, it won't be able to keep its cash flow up.

Welfare Reform

Q. Would you sign the Senate welfare bill?

The President. Well, let me say, as you know, we got the bill out of the Senate, and it was much improved over the House. Then they didn't send it back to me. I think the discussion is recently moot because we made some advances beyond the Senate welfare bill in our budget negotiations.

And the Republican leadership is not bound by anything that we agreed to in the budget negotiations, because we had an understanding that nothing was agreed to until everything was. But I thought we had reached a common understanding that, among other things, there ought to be more money put into the child care portion of the Senate bill and that there should be a little more sensitivity to what might happen to families with children with disabilities.

And so I would like to see at least the common understanding that came out of our discussions in the budget negotiations incorporated into that bill, and I would imagine they would be. But I don't know any more than you do about that. I know what I read this morning.

Imia/Kardak Islet

Q. Mr. President, you were on the phone with the leaders of Greece and Turkey this afternoon?

The President. Yes, I was.

Q. Could you tell us about what the situation was there? Have you been able to make any progress on that?

The President. Well, I talked to the President and the Prime Minister of Turkey and the new Prime Minister of Greece and asked them to move their forces away from that little island and to find a diplomatic solution to the issue. And I heard them out at some length, and we discussed some options. And then the Secretary of State, Secretary of Treasury—I mean, the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have all been involved in this. We have been working hard on this today.

Greece and Turkey have too much in common, too much to gain from getting along with each other, and we have too many other important issues in that area that affect both their interests for this small piece of land to be allowed to develop into a crisis for the two of them. So the United States is doing everything we possibly can, and I have some hope that the crisis will abate over the next 24 or 48 hours. But there's still one or two issues remaining in the air as we speak.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:16 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House, prior to a meeting with congressional leaders. In his remarks, he referred to President Suleyman Demirel and Prime Minister Tansu Ciller of Turkey and Prime Minister Konstandinos Simitis of Greece. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on the United States Air Force Operating Location Near Groom Lake, Nevada

January 30, 1996

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

Consistent with section 6001(a) of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (the "Act"), as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961(a), notification is hereby given that on September 29, 1995, I issued Presidential Determination 95–45 (copy attached) and thereby exercised the authority to grant certain exemptions under section 6001(a) of the Act.

Presidential Determination No. 95–45 exempted the United States Air Force's operating location near Groom Lake, Nevada, from any Federal, State, interstate, or local hazardous or solid waste laws that might require the disclosure of classified information concerning that operating location to unauthorized persons. Information concerning activities at the operating location near Groom Lake has been properly determined to be classified and its disclosure would be harmful to national security. Continued protection of this information is, therefore, in the paramount interest of the United States.

The Determination was not intended to imply that in the absence of a Presidential exemption RCRA or any other provision of law permits or requires the disclosure of classified information to unauthorized persons, but rather to eliminate any potential uncertainty arising from a decision in pending litigation, *Kasza v. Browner* (D. Nev. CV–S–94–795–PMP). The Determination also was not intended to limit the applicability or enforcement of any require-

ment of law applicable to the Air Force's operating location near Groom Lake except those provisions, if any, that would require the disclosure of classified information.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 31. The Presidential determination of September 29, 1995, was published in the *Federal Register* at 60 FR 52823.

Remarks at the National Prayer Breakfast
February 1, 1996

Thank you very much. Senator Bennett, Vice President and Mrs. Gore, Mr. Speaker, Senator Nunn, and Members of Congress who are here, and members of the Supreme Court, Joint Chiefs, other public officials, to our guests from around the world and my fellow Americans: Let me begin by saying that most of what I would like to have said on my best day was said better today by Sam Nunn. All during his speech I kept saying to myself, I'm gladder today that I prayed for him not to leave the Congress than I was the day I prayed for it. But I also know with a heart and a mind and a spirit like that, there is a great, powerful service still awaiting Senator Nunn in whatever he should decide to do.

I thank Sam Nunn and Alan Simpson and my neighbor Sonny Montgomery and all those who are here who are retiring from the United States Congress this year for the service that they have rendered to their constituents and to the American people.

I never hear it done here, but I think we all ought to give a warm round of applause to all these people who work their hearts out every year so that we can have this prayer breakfast, Doug Coe and all of his associates. I am grateful to them. [*Applause*]

And Hillary and I join all of you in praying for Billy Graham and for his wonderful wife, Ruth, and for their family.

I'm still glad to be here, even though I don't think I need to say much now. I know one thing: We've got a lot to pray about here in Washington. We've got a lot of conflict. We've got an abundance of cynicism. We have to worry about a loss of trust in our public institutions all across the country.

I disagree with Pete Geren. I think it was Harry Truman who said, "If you want a friend in Washington, you need to buy a dog." I think of what Benjamin Franklin said; he said, "Our enemies are our friends, for they show us our faults." Well, as someone who has had more of his faults shown, real and imagined, than anyone else, I think we all have a lot of friends here in Washington. [*Laughter*]

I was thinking last night about what we really want out of this prayer breakfast. And I was up late reading, and I came across something King David said in the Fourth Psalm. You know, David knew something about leadership and courage and human failing. He said in his psalm to God, "Thou hast enlarged me when I was in distress." "Thou hast enlarged me when I was in distress." So I pray that when we leave here today, by the words of Senator Nunn, the readings of the Scripture, the remarks of others, we shall all be enlarged in spirit, not only for our public work but for our private trials. I look out here, and I see friends of mine in both parties whom I know today have trials in their own families, in challenges of the heart they must face. And we leave here in the prayer that we will be enlarged.

Sam Nunn talked about the family and what Government cannot do. I ask that when we leave here we say a prayer for our families, to lift up those who are working hard to stay together and overcome the problems they face, to lift up those who are helping others to make and to build families. It is a rewarding thing to see the divorce rate leveling off and the teen pregnancy rate going down and the first indications that America may be coming back together around the values that made this a great nation. But we need to support those efforts. There

may not be much we can do here as lawmakers. Hillary said in her book that "til death do us part" has often become "til the going gets tough." It may be that it ought to be a little harder to get a divorce where children are involved.

But whatever we do with the law, we know that ultimately this is an affair of the heart, an affair of the heart that has enormous economic and political and social implications for America but, most importantly, has moral implications because families are ordained by God as a way of giving children and their parents the chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given capacities. And when we save them and strengthen them, we overcome the notion that self-gratification is more important than our obligations to others, we overcome the notion that is so prevalent in our culture that life is just a series of responses to impulses and, instead, is a whole pattern with a fabric that should be pleasing to our God.

I applaud what Senator Nunn said about our children, for with them it is more true than in any other area of our life that it is in giving that we receive. I ask that we pray for those who are trying to make strong our communities and our Nation and our Nation's connection to people of like minds and real needs around the world. For that, too, is a part of family life. We would be a better country if our communities and our country acted more like the best family, where we all played our part, including the Government, where we all did for ourselves and tried to help each other. Humanity's impulse is to reach outward to the poor and homeless in need; to the striving who seek a hand up, not a handout; to the stricken from here to the Middle East, to Haiti, to Bosnia; to the Earth, which needs our help in preserving the temple God gave us.

Sometimes I think we forget in America how privileged we are to be looked to, to extend the bonds of family beyond our border. When Hillary and I were served breakfast here today, the gentleman who was serving us leaned over and he said, "Mr. President, I am so grateful for what the United States did in Haiti. I came here 30 years ago from Haiti, but it is still my country, and now it's free."

When I met the foreign dignitaries, I was going through the line and there standing was the mayor of Tuzla. For every American in uniform, he is now our mayor, and we are a part of his family efforts to bring peace and freedom to all the people of Bosnia.

Galatians says, "Let everyone bear his own burden," and then just a couple of verses later says, "Bear one another's burdens." Would God, through Saint Paul, have given us such contradictory advice? No, I don't think so. I think being personally responsible and reaching out to others are the two sides of humanity's coin. And we cannot live full lives, we cannot be enlarged, unless we do both.

So I ask all of you, beyond praying for our families, to pray for us here in Washington to make the right decisions about how we should enlarge and strengthen the family of our communities, our Nation, and our ties to the world.

Finally, I ask you to pray for us to have a more charitable attitude toward one another, leaders and citizens alike. I was aghast and deeply saddened yesterday when I read in one of the newspapers all of us read around here—probably when we shouldn't some days—that a citizen of a State of this country had described one of his Representatives in Congress as a heathen, a Representative who is a genuine, true national hero. But I must say that the citizen would get a lot of ammunition for that just by watching the fights here.

What I want to say to all of you is that the disagreements we have had here in this last year have been very important and not just political and not just partisan. They have been part of the debate America must have as we move into a new era. But we need to conduct them with a great sense of humility. We need to show the right attitude toward those with whom we disagree, even when we feel wronged.

I received a letter a few days ago from a very devout Jew who is a good friend of the Vice President's and mine, and he was talking about injustice. He said, in the matter of injustice, as awful as it is, it is always—always—better to endure it than to inflict it. We have to reach across these divisions.

In these 50 hours of budget discussions the Speaker and I had with the Vice President and Senator Dole and Senator Daschle and Mr. Gephardt and Mr. Armey, in some ways I wish all of you could have seen it, because they were remarkably free of cant and politics, and I learned a lot. I owe them a lot.

Believe it or not, we're not supposed to talk about what happened, but two things that happened—there were two different occasions

where I found myself in the minority but in agreement with Mr. Armey, on two issues. And I thought to myself, I can't let this get out; he'll lose his leadership position. [*Laughter*]

Our friend Sonny Montgomery read that wonderful passage from Corinthians in his first reading. I would ask you to remember, all of you, how that passage is worded in the King James Bible: "Now we see through a glass darkly. Now I know in part." Every one of us is subject to error in judgment as a part of the human condition. And that is why the last chapter of that magnificent verse says, "Now abideth these three, faith, hope, and charity, and the greatest of these is charity." We need a charitable outlook in our feelings and our dealings toward those with whom we disagree, because we do not know as we are known by God.

So let us pray that our families will be stronger. Let us pray that the impulse of our families and those values will help us as leaders to make our communities, our Nation, and our work in the world stronger. Let us pray for a stronger sense of humility in our own efforts and a much stronger sense of charity toward the efforts of others. Let us know always that the spirit of God is among us when we permit it to be.

When Hillary and I went to Ireland a few weeks ago and saw the yearning for peace there in the eyes of the Catholics and the Protestants, we had the honor to meet the Irish Nobel Prize-winning poet, Seamus Heaney, and I had the honor of quoting one of his wonderful lines, in hoping that I really was there at a time when, to use his words, "hope and history rhyme."

This can be such a time, I am convinced, only—only—if we are charitable, if we are family, and if we act according to the spirit of God. This is the day that the Lord has made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:42 a.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to evangelist Billy Graham; Representative Pete Geren; and Mayor Selim Bslagic of Tuzla, Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Remarks Welcoming President Jacques Chirac of France

February 1, 1996

President and Mrs. Chirac, members of the French delegation, to all the distinguished guests here, French and American alike, at the White House today: On behalf of the American people, it is my pleasure to welcome back to Washington the leader of a great nation and a great people, President Jacques Chirac.

Let me begin by saying that I know I speak for all Americans when I express our condolences to the people of France on the loss of our friend President Mitterrand, a leader and statesman whose half-century of public service made a vast contribution to France and to the world.

The friendship we celebrate today, the friendship we strengthen today, was forged in the very infancy of the United States. Two hundred and eighteen years ago this very week, our nations signed a treaty of alliance. Today, our partnership and the ideals at its core—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, *liberte, egalite, fraternite*—are making a difference to people all around the world. From the Persian Gulf to Haiti, from Burundi to Bosnia—France and America, side by side, standing for democracy, for progress, and for peace.

France was America's very first ally. Today, after all these years, France remains among our best allies and best friends. Now, at the dawn of a bright new century, we must build on our legacy of leadership. To expand opportunity for people within our borders, our vision and our strength must extend beyond our borders. We must unite our people around the promise of peace, as our predecessors joined against the peril of war, and that is what we mean to do.

Together, we are raising the flag of an undivided Europe, where the language of democracy is spoken in every land. We are supporting the spread of strong market economies across the entire continent. We are transforming NATO to meet new challenges and opening its door to new members. And I welcome France's his-

toric decision to participate once again in NATO's defense councils.

Together, we are helping Bosnia find its way from war and devastation to peace and reconstruction. I salute France, its humanitarian organizations, and especially its soldiers for the tremendous sacrifices they have made to help the Bosnian people. The United States is proud to work with you to help the peace take hold and endure.

Together, we are leading the fight against the forces of destruction—the terrorists, the organized criminals, the drug traffickers—the forces that threaten our children, our communities, and our future.

Together, we are bringing the great institutions of global cooperation into the 21st century, from renewing the United Nations to revitalizing the G–7, which France will host in Lyons later this year. France and America are partners for progress.

Mr. President, in your Inaugural Address you declared: "France is an old country. But it is also a young and enthusiastic nation, ready to give its best as long as it is shown a horizon instead of walls." So let our two nations and our two great peoples march toward the future together, shaping those new horizons of hope and opportunity for France, for America, and for the world.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:47 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Bernadette Chirac, wife of President Chirac, and Francois Mitterrand, former President of France.

The President's News Conference With President Jacques Chirac of France
February 1, 1996

President Clinton. Good afternoon. Please be seated.

President Chirac and I have just concluded a very good discussion. Let me begin by saying how much the United States appreciates the President's strong leadership and the vital role France is playing all around the world. This is a time for the world's great democracies to reach out, not retreat. Many of the problems we face, including terrorism, international organized crime, and drugs, have no respect for borders. And the extraordinary opportunities we enjoy to shape a safer and more prosperous future for our people can be realized only if we stay engaged and if we work together.

France and the United States are doing that, building on our historic alliance to meet the challenges of this new era. NATO is a cornerstone of that alliance. The President and I spent a good deal of time discussing its present and its future. In Bosnia, all of us can see NATO's critical role in ending a terrible war and helping peace to take hold and restoring stability to the heart of Europe. President Chirac and I reviewed the impressive progress our troops are making. We agreed the mission in Bosnia is moving forward steadily, surely, and as safely as possible.

The Bosnia operation also demonstrates how well NATO can work with Europe's new democracies. Countries that were our Warsaw Pact adversaries less than a decade ago now are serving side by side with our troops for peace. This is a tribute to the decision that we made to reach out to them through the Partnership For Peace and by holding out the possibility of opening NATO's doors to new partners. We agreed that NATO must and will continue its steady progress toward enlargement and will strengthen its relationship with Russia.

Let me say again, I told President Chirac how pleased we in the United States are with France's recent decision to move closer to the military side of NATO, a move that will strengthen our alliance and a move that is very, very important to the United States. I also welcomed the French efforts to build a stronger European defense identity within NATO. This will allow our European allies to deal more effectively with future security problems and spread the costs and risks of our leadership for peace while preserving the basic structure of NATO.

The Franco-American partnership extends well beyond NATO and, indeed, well beyond Europe. We've seen it in Cambodia, where our

cooperation was vital to the success of democratic elections. We see it in Haiti, where French gendarmes are taking part in the international police force and playing a critical role. And in Africa, both our countries today are working to help people realize their tremendous economic and political potential. Today President Chirac and I agreed to work together on preventive diplomacy in Africa to begin to head off conflicts before they start.

Finally, we focused on a series of new threats to the safety of our citizens that demand a coordinated response: the spread of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, international organized crime, drug trafficking, and of course, the threats to the global environment.

I welcome France's decision to end nuclear testing in the Pacific and its strong support for signing a zero-yield comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty this year. That is a project we can and we will work on together, and I believe we will succeed. As I said in the State of the Union, the comprehensive test ban treaty is one of my highest priorities as President. It will dramatically reduce the nuclear threat to every American and to people all over the world. Having France as a strong partner in this crusade significantly increases the prospects for success.

Let me add also that we greatly appreciate France's offer to join and contribute to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Corporation, the organization that will provide alternative energy to North Korea as it freezes and then dismantles its dangerous nuclear weapons programs.

This past year terrorists have taken lives of people in the very heart of Paris and in the very heart of America. The President and I agreed that our law enforcement officials can and must work even more closely together, sharing their experiences and their expertise until we succeed in defeating terrorism. We'll look at new ways to stop the flow of drugs to our streets and the spread of organized crime by backing down—cracking down harder on money laundering and making it easier to extradite criminals.

Finally, let me say again to the President, I want to thank you for your long and consistent leadership in Bosnia, for the sacrifices made by the French there, especially the French soldiers. And I want to tell you how much it means to me and to all Americans that today you presented the Legion of Honor to the families of the three American diplomats who were killed there in the search—ultimately the successful search—for a peace agreement.

This is symbolic of the friendship that the United States has with France. You are our oldest ally. I thought it quite appropriate today that we had your welcoming ceremony on the lawn of the White House in full view of the Jefferson Memorial, where Thomas Jefferson was our first envoy—the symbol of our friendship, our alliance with France.

Now the United States has another forceful and energetic partner for peace and progress in President Chirac. Let me invite him to make a statement, welcome him again to the United States, and then we will take your questions.

Mr. President.

President Chirac. President Clinton has more or less said everything there was to be said, because, anyway, everything that we said he said wonderfully. It was all that.

I just have some brief remarks. First of all, a sentiment of gratitude for the way I've been welcomed here—and I deeply appreciated this—welcomed in the White House and in Congress. And secondly, there was a very fundamental agreement between us on most of the subjects that we talked about. And I think the most outstanding example is Bosnia, where the action undertaken by President Clinton has been decisive for a peace agreement that a few months before that, no one could really have imagined. France was not absent, naturally, from this effort that led to this. And if the country manages to regain equilibrium in peace and come back to peace, this will be, to a large extent, due to the President of the United States.

And I also wanted to mention two problems here which, among others, I'm deeply concerned about. First of all, the question of the necessary reform of the organization of the Atlantic Alliance in order to adapt it to the needs of our time. We can, I think, expect the very best in terms of peace from that organization as long as the organization has adapted to the new circumstances. And secondly, my second point is the fact that we really must understand how absolutely essential it is that we should not disengage ourselves from development aid. Many countries in the world are in the process of being excluded while they're precisely making very substantial efforts in order to try to move towards democracy and the market economy,

so we must help them in that effort. Those were the two messages that I wish to express today to Congress, to the Congress.

Now lastly, I felt very deep emotion in awarding this morning to three wonderful women, wonderful ladies, the Legion of Honor in the name of the people of France and the Republic of France, the three widows of three great American diplomats who gave their very best efforts to help achieve peace and, alas, lost their life in that country of Bosnia.

Well, those are some thoughts I wanted to share with you, but now of course I'm ready to answer questions.

President Clinton. We'll call on an American journalist, and then President Chirac will call on a French journalist, and then we'll alternate back and forth until we run out of time.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

1996 Election and Sanctions on Iran and Iraq

Q. Mr. President, I have a question for each President. You have had a lot of trouble with the Republican Congress, and at the same time you seem to be telling the Democrats it's every man for himself, that you will not campaign for a Democratic Congress, that it's self-defeating. So I'd like you to comment on that.

And President Chirac, the U.N. says that a half-million Iraqi babies have died of malnutrition since 1990. Are you trying to persuade President Clinton to speed up the sanctions on Iraq and Iran?

President Clinton. Let me answer my question first. First of all, who am I to criticize people who ask and report questions, but no one who was in the conversation thought that that's what I said. I made it very clear that I want more Democrats elected to Congress; I will work for them. I worked hard for Senator Wyden in Oregon. And I think you'd have to look a long time to find a President who's worked any harder to help his party's candidates for Congress than I have.

I was asked a very precise question. I was asked whether I would go to the American people in 1996 and say, "I cannot do anything as President, I cannot achieve anything as President unless you give me a Democratic Congress." And my answer to that is, was, and I will say again: We have had lots of experience with Presidents trying that argument, and it has never worked—not ever, not once.

The American people want arguments presented to them about their lives and the ideas and the principles at stake. Will I campaign for Democrats? Yes, I have, and yes, I will. And I have organized my affairs so that I will be able to do quite a bit of that. Do I want more Democrats to get elected to Congress? Of course I do. How do I expect it to happen? Not by telling the American people I need it but by saying, "Here's where we stand. Here's what the differences are. Here's what the future is. I hope you will choose the same choice that I'm making."

Q. You don't think you have coattails?

President Clinton. I didn't say that. I said the coattails that come will come because people agree that we have better ideas for them and their lives. That's why. That's the argument. And every time a President in the entire history of the country has tried to personalize the election and say, "I need this for me," it has never worked. The American people vote based on what they believe in is best for themselves and their families. They exercise their judgment. So you have to put forward a set of ideas.

When you put forward a set of ideas and all people say that they agree with these ideas, then you have a good chance to prevail. That's what happened in '92 in a way that I like. That's what happened in '94 in a way that I didn't like. And that's what I hope will happen in '96 in a way that I like. I was responding to the literal way I was asked the question, not to my fidelity to my party or my involvement with the campaign efforts.

Mr. President, you want to answer the question you were asked?

President Chirac. Well, I would simply like to say, my dear lady, that at least the children who—for me, children who die of hunger is something that is unbearable, whatever their nationality. It's something that we just cannot countenance. That being said, I never, never uttered the sentence that you attribute to me. I might have done that, but I didn't.

Now, I think concerning Iraq, because in fact that was what you wanted me to say something about, I think that there is an international organization or an international rule, if you like. There is Security Council, and there are certain requirements that were laid down, in particular Resolution 986. And my wish would be is that that resolution be implemented by Iraq. And if it is implemented by Iraq then, yes, I do

hope that the sanctions will then be lifted so that there should be fewer small children lacking in the basic requirements.

NATO

Q. A question to President Chirac. Pending the necessary reform of NATO, can France take a new further step to work closer to the military committee of NATO, the military side, as has just been said, and then become a full member?

President Chirac. I don't know if everyone has understood or heard the question. I don't know if it has been translated.

No, for the moment, there's not necessary for yet a further step, no. What's important now is that France should talk with its partners about the reform which, in our view, is essential, concerning the military organization of the alliance.

I'd like to say that from looking at that—I'm not talking about the past. I mean, the past is the past. It's behind us. But with some vision of the future, in the way we see the future. We in fact are very close to the thinking of most of our great European partners, both concerning the diagnosis and how we should carry out the reforms. And today I was able to note that this viewpoint was to a very large extent shared by the Americans. And I said, "Well, I am delighted at that."

Budget Negotiations and the Debt Limit

Q. A few questions on the budget, sir. With little sign of life on the budget talks, are your agency heads drawing up plans to lay off or fire employees to grapple with a series of belt-tightening continuing resolutions for the rest of the year? And secondly, could there be a hint of breakthrough in the Speaker's comments today that he's considering a smaller, shorter lasting——

President Clinton. First, let me say the most hopeful thing that has happened is the statement by the Speaker and Mr. Armey and Senator Dole that they intend to seek an extension to the debt limit through the middle of March. And I applaud that. Secondly, there have been a number of statements made which make me believe that the situation is far from gone. I still believe that there is a good chance that if we keep working at it, we can get a balanced budget agreement. So I think the atmosphere is good. I think the attitude has been basically constructive, and I still am quite hopeful about it. So the answer to your question is no, I do not foresee there to be mass layoffs and draconian continuing resolutions.

President Chirac. Would there be a French lady, perhaps? Yes? We also have lady journalists. Please speak French. [*Laughter*]

Middle East Peace Process

Q. It's a question to President Clinton. I wanted to ask him if he thinks a peace agreement will take place between Syria and Israel before the summer, and do you share the opinion of President Chirac that Lebanon should not have to pay the price of peace? And did you talk about this, and how do you see the future of Lebanon after all of this?

President Clinton. Yes, I share the opinion of President Chirac that Lebanon should not be asked to pay the price of the peace agreement. I do not believe that the independence and future of Lebanon should be sacrificed, nor do I think it will be.

Now, having said that, I believe that the only satisfactory resolution for Lebanon over the long run is, first, an agreement between Israel and Syria. I think a good peace agreement between Israel and Syria will make possible the right kind of future for Lebanon. As to when it will happen, I can't say. That is up to the parties and will be a function of developments within Israel and Syria, as well as the progress of the developments over some very difficult issues in the talks.

But I can tell you this: I believe that President Asad is genuinely committed to the right kind of peace. And I believe Prime Minister Peres is genuinely committed to the right kind of peace. And I see their military leaders talking. I see others reaching out, trying to work through the complex issues that are still left to be resolved. And so I'm quite hopeful. But the United States does not impose timetables on others, nor do we project them. All we try to do is to help the parties make peace. The timetable, like everything else, is up to them.

1996 Election

Q. Mr. President, your spokesman frequently tells us that you don't really feel yourself to be in a campaign mode, but yet tomorrow you're heading to New Hampshire. Are you trying to have it both ways?

President Clinton. Sure. Doesn't everyone? [*Laughter*]

Q. And which of these incarnations will we see in New Hampshire tomorrow? And will you answer Senator Dole and the other Republican leaders or candidates who have been saying since the State of the Union that you've been talking from the right but governing to the left?

President Clinton. I think that's self-evidently not true. Of course, you know, sometimes I think it depends on how they define the left. I'm still a little to the left of Attila the Hun, I guess. It depends on how they define left and right. [*Laughter*]

But I believe that the most important thing I can do this year is to do my job. And I believe it is my first responsibility. I believe that I can present myself to the American people as a candidate without completely undermining my ability to do my job. And that's what I'm going to try to do. But it would be inappropriate for me not to go to New Hampshire and Iowa before the first caucus and the first primary and to give an accounting to the people there in a more direct fashion. That's what I'm going to do. I don't know that the arguments I will make and the statements I will make to be that much different than I would if I were here in Washington, but I think they're entitled to see the President show up there, and I'm going to show up, try to convince them to be for me.

President Chirac. I'd like to add something of this particular issue, if I may. If I've understood carefully, if the interpretation has been correct—and I have no doubt about that—President Clinton has said that he was to the left to Attila. Well, I didn't feel that this was aimed at me, quite honestly—[*laughter*]—whatever certain French journalists may feel about the subject.

President Clinton. I'm not at all sure I'm to the left of President Chirac. [*Laughter*] That was good. [*Laughter*] That was good.

Thanks.

Q. I have a question for both Presidents. My first question to you, Mr. President. It seems—in English for President; and then French, President Chirac. [*Laughter*]

President Clinton. Are you trying to have it both ways? [*Laughter*]

President Chirac. Yes, all your friends already know you speak English, so now you speak French, right? [*Laughter*]

Isolationism

Q. Mr. President, it would appear that your understanding, agreement with President Chirac, it seems that you get on with him much more than Mr. Chirac can get on with the Republicans in the Congress who tend to be isolationists. Would you agree with that, and would President Chirac agree with that statement?

President Clinton. Well, I hope he wouldn't agree with that statement, because it would not be in France's interest to get involved in our domestic politics. But let me say the United States, throughout our history, because of our relative geographic isolation from the turbulence that has gripped Europe in the 20th century, that gripped Asia in the 20th century and before, has often had periods of isolationism. We departed from that at the end of World War II, to wage with you in partnership the cold war.

So it should not surprise anyone that, at the end of the cold war, when the imminent threat of a standoff with a nuclear superpower has lessened, that the historic isolationist impulses have reasserted themselves. I think the more important thing is that there is a struggle within both parties not to let that happen.

As President, I can speak with one voice; even though the Republicans may vote together almost all of the time in the Congress, that is not possible for them or even for my Democratic allies in the Congress. So I believe one of my most important jobs is to try to persuade Americans of both parties not to return to isolationism, not to abandon our responsibilities to international development, something the President called on the Congress to meet today. And I would like to see this become America's commitment, and not a partisan one.

I will say, I have received a lot of support from Republicans for my foreign policy initiatives, even though most of them oppose what we were trying to do in Bosnia, for example. I don't want this to become a partisan issue; I want America to be Europe's partner for peace and democracy and freedom without regard to which party is dominating our politics here. We are building a new consensus for that, and our building job is not over. But I don't think that it should become a part of France's concern in terms of the internal politics of the United States.

President Chirac. Yes, I certainly wouldn't wish to interfere in any way in domestic policy of the United States. While I can say that I get on very well with Bill Clinton, I say that I also got on very well with George Bush. So you can draw whatever conclusions you like from that.

Flat Tax

Q. Mr. President, a lot of people are probably interested in your opinion of the Malcolm Forbes success in the polls, at least, and specifically, how do you see his flat tax? Is this something that you're looking at and something that you would endorse, because it certainly appears to have a following out there?

President Clinton. First of all, I don't know because I can't answer the question of why he's doing well, except that I know only what all of you tell me, you know, through the media I read about it. But I think that he has obviously been able to have a commanding financial lead in advertising his positions, and they're sharply formed and clear.

And I think the flat tax has a lot of appeal to a lot of Americans for two reasons. Number one, it seems to be simple, and a lot of people find the Tax Code complex. It gives them a headache to think about. And number two, it has a superficial fairness, and even if it's not fair, people say, "The system we've got is not fair, so maybe I would trade one unfair system for another one just for more simplicity." And of course there are some, thirdly, who believe that it would actually promote greater economic growth. I think that's a relatively small number of people.

My problem with the flat tax is twofold. Number one, I think that every one I have seen—every one I have seen—is projected to run a huge deficit for the United States Government. And when you close the gaps that would be necessary to avoid running a deficit, to make it revenue neutral, every one I have seen raises taxes on Americans with incomes under $100,000. That is a level of unfairness I think is inappropriate.

Now should we do things to simplify the Tax Code? I think we should. We now have, oh, 57 percent of our filers file the standard deduction at 15 percent. We're trying to get millions more people filing their Federal, State, and local taxes together. We're trying to offer more people the opportunity to file electronically, file over the telephone. There may be other things we can do to make the system both fair and simpler.

But I have seen no flat tax proposal which I could support, because I can't support going back to the early years of the eighties where we have some supply side theory that explodes the deficit. That's what we're paying for now. And I can't, in good conscience, support a system that would raise taxes on all Americans with incomes under $100,000.

Foreign Aid

Q. You said that it's important that—it's a bad thing if the developed countries reduce their aid to the underdeveloped countries. You said this, President Chirac. Do you think that President Clinton understood and heard your message?

President Chirac. Yes, I did have the feeling that he really got the message. I didn't at all feel that I was preaching in the desert.

President Clinton. I agree with him entirely. I am opposed to the reduction of United States support for the IDA. Most Americans—when the Congress does that, they are playing to a popular feeling in the country that the United States spends a fortune on foreign aid. In fact, the United States only spends about one percent of its budget on foreign aid. There is no other rich country in the world that spends a smaller percent of its budget on foreign aid than we do.

Now, we can justify being a little below other countries because we spend a higher percentage of our income on defense with global defense commitments in Europe, in Japan and Korea, and elsewhere in ways that benefit the whole world, and south of our border. So we could be forgiven, perhaps, for not spending the same percentage of our income and our budget on foreign aid as other countries because of what we do for global defense. But we shouldn't be going lower. And I agree, I agree with President Chirac on that.

And then, to go back to the question we were asked about isolationism, it seems to me that the biggest short-term danger we have in isolationism is on the question of not contributing that small amount of money in assistance programs which will prevent problems from occurring. I have received the support I needed from the United States Congress and from the American people to move in Haiti, to move in Bosnia,

to be active in the Middle East and in Northern Ireland, to do what had to be done, even in crises times, in other places. But the problem is that even in this time of balancing the budget, this is such a small part of our budget. President Chirac is absolutely right in emphasizing this to all the developed countries in the world.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, just a short time ago, Susan MacDougal's attorney told me that he has filed a request today to have you subpoenaed to testify. And that would be to substantiate Susan MacDougal's claims regarding David Hale and the loan. What do you think of this request, and would you want to testify on this matter if it comes to a subpoena?

President Clinton. I can't comment on it, because I don't know what the facts are. I'm sorry.

You want to ask one more question?

Q. He has issued it, though.

Bosnia

Q. This is a question to both Presidents. It was said that the military American presence in Bosnia would be limited to one year. And you certainly talked about this. So what would be advisable? What should one do at the end of one year?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, before I said that to the American people, there was a peace agreement in Dayton with a military annex that set forth precisely what the mission would be. And if I might compliment the Presidents of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia, they actually involved NATO's military leaders in developing this annex. And they said, here is what we want the military mission to be—not the economic development mission, not the civilian police mission, not the political mission—the military mission. We want you to separate the forces. We want you to maintain free movement within the country. We want you to help, insofar as you can, to facilitate that movement, and to give the parties time to let peace take hold.

And the judgment of the military commanders was that this particular mission, the military mission, should go on for no more than a year, that after a year people should be able to worry about the other things, the political, the economic, the civilian law enforcement, police-type work that had to be done. And so I believe the world community will have to find mechanisms to do that.

But at the end of the—we said about a year, the military mission, as defined in the Dayton talks and ratified in the Paris peace signing, can be completed. That's what our military people said. So all I did was to reflect the military opinion of our generals and NATO's generals.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

President Clinton. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 114th news conference began at 5:12 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. President Chirac and the French journalists spoke in French, and their remarks were translated by an interpreter. In his remarks, the President referred to President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria; Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel; Republican Presidential candidate Malcolm S. (Steve) Forbes, Jr.; President Alija Izetbegovic of Bosnia-Herzegovina; President Franjo Tudjman of Croatia; and President Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia.

Statement on Congressional Action on Telecommunications Reform Legislation

February 1, 1996

I wish to congratulate the Congress for passing the Telecommunications Reform Act of 1995. As I stated in my State of the Union Address, America needs this legislation and this kind of bipartisanship to build our economy for the 21st century, to bring educational technology into every classroom, and to help families exercise control over how the media influences their children.

For the past 3 years, my administration has promoted the enactment of a telecommunications reform bill to stimulate investment, promote competition, provide open access for all citizens to the information superhighway,

strengthen and improve universal service, and provide families with technologies to help them control what kind of programs come into their homes over television. As a result of this action today, consumers will receive the benefits of lower prices, better quality, and greater choices in their telephone and cable services, and they will continue to benefit from a diversity of voices and viewpoints in radio, television, and the print media.

I want to thank the bipartisan leadership of the conference that produced this landmark legislation—Senators Pressler and Hollings and Representatives Bliley, Dingell, Fields, and Markey. I also want to thank all those in my administration from the Justice Department, the Commerce Department, and the Education Department for their hard work on this bill over the past 3 years. And I want to give a special thanks to Vice President Gore who began talking about the information superhighway nearly 20 years ago and who I know is very proud to see this legislation enacted today.

With this legislation today we are building the information superhighway that will lead all Americans into a more prosperous future.

Remarks at a Dinner Honoring President Jacques Chirac of France
February 1, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. President Chirac, Mrs. Chirac, members of the French delegation, to our distinguished guests from France and the United States, Hillary and I are delighted to welcome a great friend of our country to America's house.

As President tonight I am thinking of the experience of one of my most illustrious predecessors, Thomas Jefferson. As every American knows, when Thomas Jefferson was Minister to France, he developed a fondness for everything French. When he returned home, his political opponents tried to turn the American people against him by accusing him of excessive Francophilia. [*Laughter*] Patrick Henry struck the harshest blow. He denounced Jefferson, and I quote, for "abjuring his native victuals" in favor of French cuisine. [*Laughter*] Somehow Jefferson overcame the attack and went on to become President. And thank goodness, today Americans consider a good French meal to be a supreme treat, not high treason. [*Laughter*] Still, I feel compelled to make full disclosure to our French guests: Our extraordinary White House chef, Walter Scheib, is an American. [*Laughter*]

A decade before Thomas Jefferson went to France, France came to the aid of American people. Dozens of ships carrying cannon, rifles, mortars, and clothing crossed the Atlantic to supply those who were fighting here for our independence. At Yorktown, General George Washington's troops were one-half French. And together with the French fleet, they decided our great revolutionary struggle in freedom's favor there. So it is not an exaggeration to say that the American people owe our liberty to France.

Today, freedom-loving people all over the world still look to France not only for its strength but for its values, the tolerance, the freedom, the progress. We see that in Bosnia where the heroism of France's soldiers and the determination of its President are helping peace to take hold. We see it in Africa where France is battling poverty and disease to bring hope to millions. We see it in Europe where French leadership is transforming Jean Monnet's vision of an undivided continent finally into a reality. And we see it in the struggle that France is waging against the forces of destruction in the modern world, against the terrorism, the organized crime, the drug trafficking, forces from which none of us are immune.

Mr. President, I am grateful to have you as our partner in facing all these common challenges. I have long admired your political tenacity, and I have a suggestion that in France they should begin to call you "Le Comeback Kid." [*Laughter*] I also think all of my fellow Americans should know that, as far as I know, the President is the only foreign head of state who once worked behind the counter at a Howard Johnson's restaurant. [*Laughter*]

I know the deep affection he developed for our Nation lives on and that he still takes vaca-

tions in California. Today he gave me some good advice; he suggested that I should spend a little time out there in the next few months. [*Laughter*]

Most of all, Mr. President, let me say I admire the course you have set for France and the strength and determination which you are bringing to pursuing that course. Our nations have a special responsibility to lead by example and by action. Under your leadership, France is meeting that responsibility. And the United States is very, very proud to be a partner on the verge of a new century with our very first ally.

And so let us all raise a glass to France, to its President and First Lady, and to our enduring alliance. Long live our two nations.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:36 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

Remarks to the Community in Concord, New Hampshire
February 2, 1996

Thank you very much, Mayor Veroneau, Superintendent Sokness, to my host principal today, Mr. Cogswell, thank you. We had a wonderful time at your wonderful school. I want to thank the two people who spoke just before me. It's great to be back in Concord, great to be back in New Hampshire, great to be reminded of what makes our country work.

Cullin Wible, I thought, gave a good talk today for a person of any age, but a remarkable talk for a high school junior. We ought to give him another hand. [*Applause*] It was good. But his service in helping the other students to fully access the learning that can come with being able to use technology is even more important than how well he spoke. And that is symbolic of what we need more of in America, people helping each other to bring out the best in themselves.

I also want to say that I am truly amazed and genuinely admiring of the remarkable work that Stephen Rothenberg has done with his students, in bringing the computers into the classroom and getting private businesses here to help to give more equipment to young people who otherwise never would have been able to afford to have any high technology equipment, especially things they could take home; in letting people work together to put out that remarkable newspaper and taking it to the community, even beyond the school; and in realizing that every child has a contribution to make and a gift to develop. You know, if we had every teacher in America that committed, that innovative, that creative, and every community providing the kind of support I've seen today, our country could cut its social problems in half in a matter of a few years. I thank you, Stephen Rothenberg; you did a great job.

I am delighted to be back here. I want to thank all of you for coming out, from Merrimack Valley, from Pembroke, from Hopkinton, and of course from Concord. Four years ago, I visited Concord High School, 4 years ago this month. I had a horrible cold. I could hardly speak. I'm glad to be in somewhat better voice today. I'm glad to see all the people from the Second Start program again. [*Applause*] Thank you.

You know, every 4 years this State performs a very valuable function for the rest of the country. In the New Hampshire primary system you have the opportunity, face-to-face in small groups and community meetings and real settings, at work and in school, to hold people who would seek the Nation's highest office accountable to the citizens who are ultimately in control of our destiny. You can ask about issues, and you can teach people who come from different lives and different experiences what it's like to see the entire American experience.

In your tradition of town meetings and quiet conversations and genuine dialog, you rebuke the loud slogans and the harsh conflicts and so much of modern political life which sheds more heat than light. I know that, 4 years ago, I think the most valuable experience for me in New Hampshire was not just surviving and going on to be nominated and win but what I learned about America from the people of New Hampshire, including a lot of the students

of New Hampshire who told me what their families' lives were like in those difficult days.

I'm thrilled to be here at this Capital Center for the Arts. I know that Bob Hope and George Burns have been here, and I can't promise to be as funny as they were. [*Laughter*] But I can tell you, once I found out that they had been here, I wanted to come, because if they have been here, this is obviously a good place to extend your career. [*Laughter*]

I also want to say a word to you of support for this incredible project, this beautiful, beautiful facility, this breathtaking ceiling that I just learned before I came out took 3,000 hours of volunteer labor. When this theater was condemned in 1989, you could have shrugged your shoulders and gone about your business; if you had done that, we would be holding this meeting in a parking lot today. But community leaders did not do that. Individuals, large companies, small businesses, the government, everybody decided they would work together to turn this challenge into an opportunity, and this grand theater is the result.

To all of the members of the board of directors and all those who worked together to save this wonderful landmark from the wrecking ball, let me say, congratulations, job well done. Thank you for giving America an example of citizenship at its best.

Now, I want to say today, I obviously came to talk to you about education and our challenges in education. But I want to make a larger point to begin. If you think about what Steve and Cullin and the Walker Elementary School and all the businesses that put ads in the newspapers and all the people who supported putting that project together and then putting the community into the information superhighway this week through the schools, what they have in common with all the people that worked to restore the theater, it is clearly one thing: It is a strong sense of community and a willingness to work as a team in ways that help individuals to develop their own abilities but make life better for everybody. That, it seems to me, is the fundamental lesson of America, and that is the fundamental thing we have to reassert today.

If you think about what works in a society, it's not all that different from what works in any kind of contest: You've got to get all your players on the field; you have to make sure they're well prepared; you have to reward them when they succeed; there have to be rules that people follow; you have to trust the other people to follow the rules; and you have to work as a team.

And that is what I think the great issue is in America today. There is no question of whether the Government can solve all of our problems; no one thinks that. No one ever really thought that, but no one seriously asserts that. But neither can we say to our people, this new global marketplace is so wonderful we're just going to leave all of you to fend for yourselves; good luck; call home once a year and see you later.

What works in all human endeavor is this kind of teamwork, what we celebrated at the Walker School today and what we enjoy having the privilege to sit in this place today. And the questions we should be asking on the edge of the 21st century are: What are the great challenges we face? How can we help all Americans to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities? How can we come together instead of being driven apart, because we know when we work together we all do better? How can we continue to make the world a safer and freer place so that our children and our children's children will be able to reach out in this global community in a way that enhances their own lives and lifts those of human beings all across the globe?

Those are the kinds of questions that I tried to ask and answer here 4 years ago, the kinds of questions I had the privilege of dealing with again in my fourth State of the Union Address just last week. As I said to Congress, and as the speakers before me illustrated, we are living in an age of enormous possibility. We have moved from, essentially, an industrial society to one that is dominated by information and technology. We have moved from a world that was organized around two great powers in the cold war into a world where virtually everybody in the world, with a couple of exceptions, have rejected communism. Everybody understands that free people ought to have free economic choices and be able to compete, and we are moving into a global village. And all these changes in the way we work and live have opened up possibilities for people that would never have been imaginable just a few years ago.

Now, that is the good news. And it is a wonderful thing. You can see it manifest in a lot of ways right now. Do you know our country,

for example, has produced more self-made millionaires—not people who inherited money, not people who were born with money, people who made it on their own—in each of the last 3 years than in any previous years in the history of America? Why? Because the world is opening up and people who are in the right place and have the right skills and have a little courage and a little energy may really have unparalleled opportunities. And that's exciting.

But as the families of New Hampshire or any other State also know, that anytime you have this kind of big change you not only have great opportunities, you also have challenges. Four years ago when I came here, the challenge was people were literally out of work, didn't know when they would get jobs again. Banks weren't making loans to small businesses. Businesses weren't being started. Businesses were failing at a greater rate than they were starting.

Now a lot of that has been overcome, and I'll say more about that in a minute. But still, because of the changes in this economy a huge number of American families are working harder and harder just to keep up, longer hours without a pay raise, feeling greater uncertainty about whether they'll keep their jobs or their health care for their families or have a pension when they retire or will be able to afford to send their children to college.

So you may think this doesn't make sense. How could things be so good and people be worried? The truth is, it makes perfect sense. When you upset an established pattern and you open all kinds of new possibilities, the people that aren't very well-fitted at the moment for those possibilities are likely to get pushed down. It happened 100 years ago when people moved off the farm into the cities and on the factories. A hundred years ago we became an industrial society. We had all kinds of people doing very well and other people virtually starving in tenement houses in our cities.

Anytime you have a period of big change this happens. You young people should be happy. You're going to live in an age of greater possibility than the world has ever known. And if our generation does its job right, you won't have to worry about anybody blowing the world up, you won't have to worry about people going to war for foolish reasons, you won't have to worry about a lot of things that have dominated the last 100 years. That is wonderful.

But if we're going to keep the American dream alive for everybody, we've all got to think, well, now that all these changes are going on, how can we plug everybody into it? That's why I wanted to go to that classroom at Walker School today. I know every one of those children I visited did not come from a wealthy home. I know not all those children have computers in their own homes. I know this teacher and this student had to work hard to bring the benefits of the technological revolution to all children. That's why I wanted to be there, because that is what we have to do as a country. That is the fundamental challenge before us.

You can look at New Hampshire. Four years ago when I was here, the unemployment rate was over 7 percent; today, it's almost down to 3 percent. Four years ago when I was here, businesses were closing faster than they were opening; today, new businesses are increasing by 8 percent a year. That's a very healthy rate. For 3 years now we've had more new businesses formed each year than ever before in American history. That's a good thing. So what we have to do is to take this energy that's out there that we've got going in our economy now, figure out how to spread those opportunities to everyone. It's one of our great, great challenges.

If you look at how the world is, 4 years ago when I was here, we were worried about a lot of problems in the world. But now we see from the Middle East to Northern Ireland, to Haiti, to Bosnia, the United States has been a force for peace and freedom and dignity. Perhaps more important to the people who live right here, for the first time in the last 2½ years, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not a single nuclear missile pointed at an American city, an American family, an American child. That is not being done anymore. That's a good thing.

Maybe most important of all, we really do seem to be trying to come together to find more teamwork, more common ground around shared values and to move away from destructive conduct. We've had now for 2 years in a row the crime rate, the welfare rolls, the food stamp rolls, the poverty rate, and the teen pregnancy rate and the divorce rate going down in America—2 years in a row. That's a good thing. That's a good thing.

How does all this happen? It happens when people start to work together. Now, you have to decide, all of you, how you want to move

into the future and what you think the challenges are. And I came here to say to you that I believe that my role as President is to work not only through the Government but just through the Presidency, through direct appeals to the American people in all walks of life, to try to bring us together to solve these problems in the best way.

I said in the State of the Union, I'll say again: The era of big Government is over. Big, centralized bureaucracies are going to move more and more and more into the past. That is a part of the new technological changes we face. Technology alone permits that.

But you need to be sort of skeptical when people tell you that that's the real big problem. The Government of the United States today is the same size it was in 1965. When I came here in '92, I said we would reduce it by 100,000 and put 100,000 police on the street. We did that, except we've reduced the size of the Government by 200,000, and probably nobody has noticed. Why? Because of technology, because of the increasing productivity of the Federal workers who are doing a better job, because we did a humane job of helping those who leave to start new lives in other productive ways, we didn't just put them out on the street.

But the point is, big bureaucracies are not going to be a part of the future of what you think of as the Federal Government. But we still have a responsibility to try to give you a Government that costs less but still does better and that helps you to do your job in the appropriate way, that helps people to work together, that helps people to make the most of their own lives.

In the State of the Union Address, I said that we had seven great challenges, and I'd like to talk just a moment about them, and I'm going to take education out of order, because I'm going to wait until the last for that.

Our first and most important challenge as a people, if we move to the future, is to do a better job of helping all of our children get off to a good start and strengthening our families. If we had strong families in every community in this country, and kids—every child—had a start out of the blocks that was good and adequate, we wouldn't have half the problems we have. You all know that. There are things the Government can do, but most of those things have to be done by people working together and by changes of the heart.

The second thing we have to do is to try to help every American achieve economic security. As I said, we've got almost 8 million more jobs in the last 3½ years. Unemployment is down, but an awful lot of Americans are still working harder and harder just to keep up. How are we going to change that? How are we going to change that? Well, first of all, people ought to have access to an affordable pension they can keep when they change jobs. They ought to have access to affordable health care they can keep when they change jobs.

Your parents, all of you students here, if they lose jobs or they have to change jobs, they ought to have access to lifetime education. Education is no longer the province of childhood. The average age of a college student at a 4-year college today is 26. The average age at a 2-year community college is much higher. We have to view education as the effort of a lifetime, and it has to be seen not with fear by people my age but with hope. It has to be seen as the instrument of growing and going into the future. And it has to be available to people whenever they hit a rough patch in life's road.

We have to, in other words, define a new way of people being secure when the economy is changing as much as it's changing and most of the jobs are being created by small businesses. And we've got to do that.

The third thing we have to do is to keep on with our efforts to take the streets of America back from the forces of crime and drugs and gangs that have made them too unsafe in so many places in America. The crime rate is coming down, but it is still too high in most places, and we've got to keep working on that.

The fourth thing we have to do is to leave our environment safer and cleaner than we found it and while we grow the economy. I say that in this beautiful State where people love the woods and the rivers and all of nature's bounties. There are still people who do not believe you can grow the economy unless you chew up the environment.

But I don't know if you saw it—one of our major news magazines had a huge cover story not just a couple of weeks ago after we had these bitter winter storms, saying that ironically these bitter winter storms were due to global warming, not to global cooling, because the pattern of global warming is leading us to increasing extremes of temperature. We're getting more rain in many parts of the world, but it's

coming in shorter and shorter spurts and floods, instead of regularly over time. We had a 500-square-mile block of ice break off from Antarctica; it began to float into the ocean. If this continues, slowly it will raise the water levels and mess up the whole environmental balance of the Earth.

Now, you may think that's an esoteric issue. It's going to affect these young people, their lives. The strength of American agriculture, for example, will be affected by whether or not we can find a way not to destroy the atmosphere with greenhouse gases, not to have too much global warming; in addition to which we have to be concerned about the quality of drinking water, the quality of the water in which we swim and fish, the quality of the air, all the basic things. This is a huge deal. And this is a great economic opportunity for America if we understand that there are opportunities through technology and through innovation to preserve the environment, it will create more jobs than it will cost. But we have to make that decision.

As I said earlier, we have a challenge to keep downsizing the Government, but not to give our country a weak Government but to give our country a small Government, a less bureaucratic Government, and one that focuses on helping the people who need help through no fault of their own, empowering people to make the most of their own lives, and being good partners to put together the kind of teams that solve the problems and seize the opportunities we discuss here today.

I'll just give you one example. The Small Business Administration, since I've been President, has cut the budget by 40 percent and doubled the loan volume to create more small business. That's the kind of thing you should be able to get out of your Government.

Finally, let me say that I know, because we have so many things going on here in our country and families and communities have so many challenges, it is tempting to say, "Well, we don't have to worry about the Russians anymore, and we're taking down our nuclear arsenals as quick as we can. So why don't we just forget about the rest of the world?" We can't do that. We can't do that. The drugs that come into this country come from other countries. If we want those other countries to cooperate with us in stopping the drugs—and literally a lot of those people we are asking every day to put their lives on the line—we have to work with them to help them solve our problems together.

The terrorists that are sweeping across the world, many of those who have acted in this country come from other countries. If we want other countries to risk their lives to get those terrorists and send them here so I can make sure that they're tried, and if they're convicted to go to jail or punished in a proper way, we have to work with those countries.

If you want America to be able to sell, we—now our exports in America are at an all-time high. And for the first time in many years, we are growing our exports faster than our imports are growing. If you want that, we have to be involved with other countries. So that's a big part of our challenge.

But let me say, overarching all of that is the challenge we have for all of you. For the world in which we are living and the one toward which we are going, being dominated by information and technology means that all of us have to know things, all of us have to have high levels of literacy, all of us have to be able to reason, all of us have to learn things about basic math. But even more important, all of us have to be able to keep learning things, learning and learning and learning for a lifetime. And therefore, the challenge to America to give every single citizen the educational opportunities they need in some ways is the linchpin of our whole future because of the age toward which we're going.

If you look at the industrial age, the one we just came out of, there are a whole lot of people just a little older than me and even people in my generation—I realize to you that sounds like a lifetime away, you can't imagine being 50 years old, but you will be someday—who were able to get very, very, very good jobs on a high school education, or maybe they just had a 10th grade education or 11th grade education. But they went to a city; they went to work in a factory; they got a good job; they thought it would be there forever. They thought they would be able to send their kids to college, have a nice home, take a vacation every summer, always have their health insurance covered, and they would retire with a good retirement along with their Social Security. And it didn't matter if they didn't have a good education.

Today, more and more of our jobs, particularly those that pay well and have some amount of stability, are knowledge-based jobs. And

therefore, we have got to do everything we can to up our educational opportunities.

Now, in America, most education is handled at the local level, from preschool and kindergarten through high school. Most colleges and universities, almost 100 percent of them, are public at the State level or private. What is the National Government's role? Well, we have some things that we should be doing.

We, for example, send funds to New Hampshire every day to help schools deal with the problems of children who come from very poor homes and may need some extra resources or school districts that themselves have a property base that's not adequate so they don't have enough money to deal with the schools, with all the kids that come in there, and they need a little extra help. That's important.

We're doing what we can now at the national level to get people in the telecommunications industry all over America to do what Concord just did. Our goal, I will say again—our goal is to make sure that every classroom and every library in the United States of America and every school is on the information superhighway by the year 2000, every single one. You have to do that.

Beyond that there are things that schools have to do for themselves. We ought to have the highest standards of excellence. And we ought to measure whether we're meeting those standards. And we ought to be willing to change if we're not. And I think every State should be willing to give teachers and parents more flexibility in how they work with the education system to make sure those things are done. I also believe that every school, beginning in elementary school, should teach good citizenship, good character, and good values. I think that is not inconsistent with saying those things should be done in the homes and in our religious institutions. There are certain essential characteristics that it takes to make up a good American citizen, and I think they should be communicated to our children and done at an early time.

Finally, let me say that we need—we know now we need more than ever before to give 100 percent of the people who get out of high school the opportunity to go on to college and that money should never be an obstacle. You know, all the young people here probably know this, but every 10 years our country does a census, and we not only count how many people are living in the United States and break them down by gender, by race, by State, by neighborhood, we also do a lot of other things. We break them down by income and educational level, and we try to find as much as we can out, and then we can look at this census and look at the one before and see how America is changing.

And I want every young person in the audience to listen to this, because it's very important: In the 1990 census, last time we counted everybody, we found that there was a huge break in income in the 1990 census compared with the 1980 census, that came among people who had at least 2 years of education after high school. People who had at least 2 years of education and training after high school tended to get jobs where they made a decent living starting out and then they had a chance slowly to get raises. People who didn't tended to get jobs where they didn't get a raise or even suffered declines in income, especially compared with inflation, and where they had less stability. And this really hit younger people.

So whether you like it or not, if you're a young American, you need to be thinking about what you're going to do after high school to get enough skills, to get enough knowledge, to develop the capacity to learn for a lifetime so that if you go into the work force you can succeed in this exciting but very challenging new world.

In the last 3 years we have done a number of things to try to make it easier for people to go to college. We redid the student loan program so that you can borrow money on better terms and pay it back on better terms. And no young person should ever refuse to get a loan to go to college for fear of not being able to pay it back, because now you can always pay it back as a percentage of your income so the payments will never break you. And that's a very good thing to do.

I might add, we also were able to cut the student loan default rate nearly in half. So this does not mean that we should be weak and not make people pay their loans back, but you just shouldn't ask people to do something they can't do. We should always encourage people to do it.

We've increased the number of scholarships and, of course, with a lot of support in States like New Hampshire where I thank both the Republicans and the Democrats who have sup-

ported our national service program in New Hampshire, we've got 25,000 young Americans out there working in their communities to solve the problems of their communities and earning money to go to college.

In the State of the Union, I challenged Congress to go further, to make more college opportunities available, to help one million young Americans work their way through college with work-study funds, to give a $1,000 merit scholarship to every single high school graduate in America in the top 5 percent of every high school class in the country, and to give every family a tax deduction of up to $10,000 a year to defray the costs of tuition at colleges and universities.

If we can do these things, if we can hook all our schools up, all our classrooms, all our libraries to the information superhighway, and you have enough computers and good software and well-trained teachers and a supportive community, if we can have schools that hold themselves to high standards and measure whether they're meeting them, if we can make available college education to all Americans, these are the kinds of things that will make a profound difference in the future of our country. And we will do it together or not at all.

You know—again, let me end with where I started. Going to the Walker Elementary School and watching those students put together that Walker Talker newspaper and then watching them put it into the Internet so people could pull it back, having their own Web page where people could actually say, "What is in there that I want to read," it showed again, knowing that there were people in the community that gave equipment so that students without regard to their income could have access to technology in their homes, it proves not only that technology unlocks doors in ways we couldn't have dreamed of 4 years ago, it proves that the modern world will have to be solved by old-fashioned common sense and old-fashioned American hard work and cooperation.

Walker Elementary School—I guess you know this, but I learned this morning, so I rewrote this so I could say this—that school stands on ground that is literally sacred to America's democracy. In 1778, the people of New Hampshire gathered there with their elected representatives and voted to ratify the Constitution. And New Hampshire was the last State to vote—not the last, but the ninth State, so the necessary ninth State we needed for enough States that made the Constitution real in the lives of the American people. And I think that's wonderful.

Well, it's a long way from 1788 to today. And the church where they met is gone; the school is there. But you think about it: In that spot where over 200 years ago our Constitution moved into history as the most important document for freedom ever, in any country, among any people, on that very spot a student now can log on to the Internet and read the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, all the records from those revolutionary days.

These revolutionary ideas that we now take for granted still count for something. We have to promise ourselves that in every place like Walker School across America revolutionary new ideas will never be a stranger, and that we can incorporate them all, we can take the best of them all if we are able to stay fast and true with our old-fashioned American values and way of doing things.

I believe this country can face every single challenge that it has. We can have better education and stronger families. We can have a cleaner environment and safer streets. We can have access to health care for all Americans. We can do all these things if we work together.

If you think about what we are here celebrating today, if you think about what these two fine gentlemen behind me represent, they represent the way America has met every challenge in the entire history of our country. And all we have to decide is that that's what we're going to do. I say again, the young people in this audience will live in the age of greatest possibility in human history. The young people in this audience will be able to do things that people their age a generation before could never have even imagined. But it's like everything in life; it is not free.

And this new age, with all of its benefits, carries significant new challenges. We have to meet the challenges if we want the benefits. We can only do it if we do it together. Based on what I saw today, that's exactly what I believe is going to happen in America.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:25 p.m. in the Capital Center for the Arts. In his remarks, he

referred to Mayor William Veroneau of Concord; Curt Sokness, superintendent of schools; Clint Cogswell, principal, and Stephen Rothenberg, sixth grade teacher, Walker Elementary School; and Cullin Wible, Concord High School student.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on the School-to-Work Program in Nashua, New Hampshire

February 2, 1996

[*Marie Devlin, director, Southern New Hampshire School-to-Careers Partnership, opened the roundtable by describing the nature of the partnership.*]

The President. I just have a few brief remarks I'd like to make. First of all, let me thank all of the people at Sanders for making us feel welcome today and for the good work that they do for our country, and I congratulate them on all of the many things they do, as well as their participation in this program.

As Marie said, I have been interested in this whole concept of how we move young people from school to work for years and years, going way back before I ever even thought about running for President. Many years ago, my wife actually served on a commission that was funded by the Grant Foundation in New York to look at the movement of young Americans from school into the workplace, and particularly those who did not go on to and finish 4-year colleges.

This group found that our country was really the only advanced economy in the world that didn't have a systematic cooperation between the education system and the workplaces of our country to move young people into the workplace in a seamless way that continued their training and guaranteed that they had a much better chance to get a good job with a growing prospect of success, both in terms of pay and promotion and stability of work. This was about 10 years ago.

So for about 10 years I have been really concerned about this, and when I became President, I asked the Congress to pass this law—and it passed with overwhelming bipartisan support—to provide funding for a few years to give every State the chance not to set up a program but to set up a partnership, a network that would build systematic linkages between workplaces and schools and colleges and community colleges and other training systems so that every young person in our country who finishes high school would be able to go into some line of work which would also carry with it future education and training. I think it's going to make a big difference.

I was very alarmed—I think every American is—by the dramatic divergence in the earnings capacity of young Americans based on the level of education they have, and it happened because we simply did not have a system, particularly for taking care of the young people who didn't go on to the 4-year colleges and into the degree programs. And that's what the school-to-work program is designed to do, to kind of let people like all of you form partnerships to fill that big vacuum. And I hope we can keep the funding up—but we never intended to fund it forever—but I hope we can keep the funding up long enough to get every State in the country to have the kind of network New Hampshire does.

I can say this: In only a year and a half, we now have about 42,000 employers and 116,000 young people participating in this program nationwide, and more will come quickly. So I congratulate you on what you've done in New Hampshire, and I'd like to spend the rest of my time just hearing from all of you about how this actually works for you and how you relate to it.

[*At this point, Ms. Devlin introduced Diana Abbene and another student who described their experiences in the Sanders Lockheed Women in Technology program to enable young women to meet women engineers and see the types of opportunities available in the engineering field. Ms. Devlin then introduced a student intern at Parkland Medical Center and a student intern at the Salem police station who described their experiences.*]

The President. It's different from television, huh?

Participant. Yes. And my mentor, Eric Lamm's here——

The President. Where is he? Stand up there, Mr. Lamm. Thank you.

Participant. I just want to thank the Salem police station a lot for opening the doors and having the opportunity for me to go in and experience what a lot of other kids don't get to experience.

The President. And did it change your view of law enforcement then?

Participant. I always wanted to do it since I was a little kid, so I just wanted—I wanted to go in there and see if this is what I really wanted to do. So yes and no. It didn't, but it did.

[*Ms. Devlin introduced student Joshua Holmes who described his experience at Brooks Automation where he served as a mechanical assembler.*]

The President. That's terrific.

[*Ms. Devlin introduced the father of a student intern who described both the opportunities and the real work experience the program had given to his son and thanked Brooks Automation and mentor Nelson Shaw for the opportunity.*]

The President. Are they here?

Participant. Nelson is here.

The President. Who's here? Stand up. Thank you very much, sir.

[*Ms. Devlin introduced participant Greg Ahearn, vice president of an electric company, who described his company's experience with taking student interns and how much he had come to depend on his current intern, Jeremy deGagli.*]

The President. Is he here?

Ms. Devlin. Jeremy, could you stand up, please? This is Jeremy deGagli.

The President. Good for you.

Mr. deGagli. Thank you.

The President. That's great. Thank you for doing it.

[*Ms. Devlin introduced a participant from Sanders Lockheed who described her experience mentoring several of the young women in the program.*]

The President. Diana implied that a lot of the benefit was just for young women to see if there were careers that there are actually women involved in and succeeding in that they might not have even imagined beforehand. Do you find that?

[*The mentor explained that there were few women in the engineering field and expressed her hope that the school-to-work program would encourage more women to become engineers.*]

The President. Let me ask you one other question. This is just related to that. Can you be a little more specific in telling me what the educational benefits are of working here and how you can continue your education, what the company does?

[*The mentor explained that Sanders Lockheed fully reimbursed tuition for higher education.*]

The President. The reason I asked you that is one of the issues we are now debating in the context of the balanced budget amendment and what any tax cut should look like and whether there should be one is, I've been urging the Congress to focus on things that will generate higher incomes and greater stability among working people and reward companies for really investing in their people.

The old deduction that companies got for paying for their employees' tuition I think is about to expire, plus which it had certain limits in it. One of the things that I've been urging them to look at is whether or not we ought to have a more generous tax break, both not only to companies but to employees. There's a general rule in the Tax Code that anything that's deductible to a company is taxable to an employee over and above a certain amount. And it seems to me that we have a huge interest in the United States in seeing that people who are already in the work force continue their education and that the tax system ought never to penalize that, I mean within reasonable bounds.

Anyway, that's what we're—one of the things we're looking at as we try to put this whole budget agreement together. I don't think there's a big partisan difference on it. It's not like we're fighting about it; we're more trying to figure out what the right thing to do is and what the best way to encourage employers and employees to take whatever opportunities the employer can possibly afford in terms of time off and the costs of education to go forward. That's why I asked you about it.

It's a big issue, folks. The head of United Technologies gave a speech the other day in which he said he thought that the most urgent

economic issue in the country today was the question of educating the people who are already in the work force, because we couldn't go on as a country where half our people were doing pretty well and half our people never got a raise. And so we had to change the whole—he was arguing that we ought to change the whole tax system so that there would always, always be an incentive for employers to help their employees get more education. Anyway, that's why I asked.

[*Ms. Devlin described the Teacher in the Workplace program to give teachers experience working in local companies, after which they would be able to tailor their curriculum to help students see the meaning and relevance of what they were learning. She then introduced a teacher who participated in that program, and he described his experience.*]

The President. Thank you very much for that testimonial. [*Laughter*] He was great, wasn't he? You know, I was just sitting here trying to—one of the things that I have to concentrate on all the time is how to explain things in simple, fairly quick terms, because usually I don't get to communicate with all of you like this. Usually I get 8 or 9 seconds through them. So if someone were to ask me, say in a sentence what does all this amount to, you just sort of said it.

Let me just—because I think it's important—for 50 years, more or less, after World War II, for most of that time, there was a clear distinction between the school and the workplace. And within schooling there was a clear distinction between academic programs and vocational programs. What this is really about is erasing those distinctions, merging the school and the workplace, and merging the academic and the vocational.

For one thing, we have no choice, because a lot of these vo-tech programs require now—a vocational program—a high level of technical sophistication, and they are academic in the best sense. And for another we now know that there are a lot of people who learn by doing, not because they have a lower IQ, but because that's the way their minds work. And there are a lot of people who just learn by doing better than they learn by reading, hearing, and speaking.

And I couldn't help but be moved by what Josh said here when he was describing his own experience, that through a series of work experiences he came to think of going to college. It used to be always the other way around. No telling how many people we deprived of the opportunity to develop themselves because we had this artificial barrier between school and work and an artificial barrier between what was academic and what was vocational. And really that's what this school-to-work program is designed to give every State a chance to set up this kind of network to get rid of those barriers. And you said it very well, sir, and I thank you.

[*A teacher advocated more in the way of communication between the companies and schools and advocated tailoring the curriculum to advance those goals in the classroom.*]

The President. Let me just echo that. I wanted to say a special word of thanks to Mr. Ahearn and the other companies who are doing this who don't have hundreds and hundreds of employees. Most new jobs in America are being created by people like you. The Fortune 500 companies have reduced employment in every year—aggregate employment in every year since 1980, every year. But to give you an idea—this is another role model issue—last year there were more new jobs created by businesses owned by women alone than were reduced by the Fortune 500 companies.

So people like you, we can grow our economy on small- and medium-sized businesses and on doing work to support bigger operations like this one. But that means that, for this program to work, we can't depend only on the Sanders and only on the big medical centers and only on the large employers to participate. We have to have the city police departments and the other—the more moderate-sized and small-sized employers participating too.

[*A participant discussed the opportunities that the construction business and skilled trades could offer to young people.*]

The President. Absolutely. And of course the constructions have the best and deepest tradition in our country of taking people in as apprentices. But let me say, based on my own experience, anybody who thinks that construction doesn't require some intellectual capacity has never built a house. [*Laughter*] I did once, and it was quite a challenge.

Participant. Also, just sitting here today, I mean, probably 99 percent of the people look up at the ceiling and don't get excited. But

I'm in this room, I'm excited about this ceiling. [*Laughter*]

The President. You might have lost your mind on the higher floors up there, it's so exciting. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Devlin. I wonder if we could hear a little bit more from the students. I imagine they were a little nervous with some of their opening remarks.

The President. They did well, though, didn't they? Didn't all the students do well? They spoke well.

[*Two students discussed their experiences as interns at Sanders Lockheed and how it made their school experiences seem more practical.*]

The President. Is anybody here of your family?

Participant. Yes. Both my parents are here.

The President. Where are they? So they must have been pleased by that. [*Laughter*] Would either one of you like to say anything about the program?

[*A student's mother stated that the initiative was an excellent opportunity.*]

The President. That's great. Thank you.

[*One student explained how her experience as an intern at the hospital had broadened her view and how she was now considering the full range of medical possibilities from pediatrics to geriatrics to just regular middle-aged people.*]

The President. We're getting used to it, all us regular middle-aged people. [*Laughter*]

[*The student then described her experience as an intern in the maternity unit and said that it convinced her that she wanted to go into obstetrics.*]

The President. And you said you saw triplets born?

Participant. No, I didn't see triplets—they were born in Massachusetts, and they were transferred to New Hampshire, and I took care of them and I really liked it.

The President. How much did they weigh when you got them?

Participant. Two of them were 3, and one of them was 4 pounds.

The President. That's pretty good for triplets.

[*A student further described his experience as an intern with the Salem Police Department and said that he started by doing paperwork but later got to ride in the police cruisers.*]

The President. It's important, I think, that when you do these things to learn the parts of the job that may not be so exciting. Because, if you think about it, all police work could ultimately be futile, except if you were protecting somebody in that moment, if they didn't keep records. Because any action they take that ultimately may have to be validated in a court of law requires some records. I don't mean just crimes, even if it's an accident, just for an insurance company to pay off.

So I think it's important to learn, you know, no job can be one constant cheap thrill from morning to night—even mine. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Devlin. We would like to take an opportunity now to let those of you in the audience, if you have questions of the President or of any of us at the table to please stand and ask a question.

The President. Or if you want to say anything about your program; I know there are a lot of other employers out here. Anybody else? Anyone want to say anything?

Participant. Mr. President, we have another program where we've worked with high schools and technology, and that's U.S. First, and I think you know about that.

The President. I do.

Participant. It's been very active and it's been wonderful working with the high school students and——

The President. Thank you for doing that.

Participant. Mr. President?

The President. Yes. Sorry, sir. [*Laughter*]

[*A participant from a marketing company described his experience with student interns and said that he thought it was a very good thing for the students to learn technology and problemsolving skills, and to deal with real-life situations.*]

The President. Thank you. Anyone else?

Ms. Devlin. A young lady over here.

[*A participant from a chemical company said that her organization worked with young people who were employed while attending school and said that this part of the School-to-Careers program helped motivate young people to complete high school.*]

The President. Thank you.

[*A participant asked if the school-to-work program would be affected by the budget and how.*]

The President. The answer is that it could be affected, because there is a big debate in Washington now, and let me—between the position I've taken that we ought to be doing things like this. Let me state fairly the Republican congressional position, or at least some of them, and I'll try to state their position as strongly as I could. Their view is that this is something everybody ought to do anyway, and we're up to our ears in debt, and therefore, the Federal Government shouldn't spend any money on it. That's essentially their argument.

But my counter is that this is precisely the sort of thing the National Government should be doing. That is, we're not telling anybody how to run a school system; we're not telling anybody how to run a training program; we're not telling anybody how to do anything. We're saying what we can do at the national level better than anyone else can do is to identify what—that is, we can see if there is a national problem, a national challenge, a national need, we can see it. And all we've done is to give a little seed money to States like New Hampshire and then to big community programs so that you can set up the infrastructure to try to put these partnerships together. So my view is, this is precisely the thing we ought to be doing, helping people to make more of their own lives and helping people to solve their problems at the community level, not setting up a Government bureaucracy but trying to be a catalyst to help people solve a problem at the grassroots level that is nevertheless a national problem and therefore needs a national response.

I'll give you another example that we're going to be talking more about tomorrow in New Hampshire; that's the crime bill where we have a program that provides matching funds to communities to hire 100,000 more police officers. We did that because even though there are a lot of people like you who want to be police officers, the violent crime rate tripled in 30 years, and the number of people on the beat only went up by 10 percent. That had the perverse impact of actually taking police off the beat. Why? Because as population goes up, as crime goes up, you need more people in cars covering a wider territory. And as it got more dangerous, you had to put two people in cars, instead of one.

So we said, "Okay, we're not going to tell people do they hire Juan or George or how to train them or where to deploy them, but there is a national need for this." That's the debate we're having. That's why I have tried to say that I would support a balanced budget plan, but we shouldn't cut any educational investments, because we know, as a practical matter, that the level of incomes Americans enjoy and their ability to have a stable workplace environment and a stable career depends upon the level of education with which they come out of high school, whether they can go on after high school, and whether later in life, if they need it, they can get further education.

So my view is, we shouldn't cut these things. But I think I've given you the fair argument on the other side. The fair argument on the other side is, "We have to have a national defense, and that's something only the Federal Government can do. So if there's anything else we're doing, we have a debt, you ought to cut it all." I mean, that's basically their argument. I think we can find a happy middle ground here, and we're working on it.

Now, you should know also—I don't want to bore you with a lot of details here. The balanced budget debate is over a 7-year balanced budget plan. In addition to the 7-year balanced budget plan, we actually have to pass an annual budget every year. So both of us now are trying to reach agreement on the remainder of this year's budget in a way that would be consistent with the overall balanced budget plan that we both presented. That is, we haven't reached agreement on the plan, but both of us say we've got to balance the budget in 7 years now. I have argued for an increase from their position in investments in education, training, technology, research, and the environment, and saving money in some other ways so we can stay on the same budget project.

But that's just so you'll know—the reason I said that is I want all of you, as this debate unfolds, whenever there's a debate about anything that we do in Washington, you should ask yourself the question and debate it just the way I debated it. And think I gave you a fair statement of the Republican congressional position. Sometimes you might think they're right, sometimes you might think I'm right. But that's the kind of debate we're having in Washington about what we should and shouldn't do with the money you send us up there.

Thank you.

[*A participant supported the Goals 2000 program for what it offered both teachers and students and praised the school-to-work program for giving a very practical aspect to education.*]

The President. Thank you. Actually, the Goals 2000 program grew out of work that the Governors did before I became President. It started in 1989 when the Governors met with President Bush at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. And at that time, I was the designated representative of the Democratic Governors. And along with the designated representative of the Republican Governors and a couple of other people, we stayed up all night long, hammering out these national education goals.

So the idea was, we should have national goals, they should be—in as far as possible, they should be measurable goals, then every State should agree to a recognized and accurate system of measuring whether we're meeting the goals so they would know how all of the students were doing, and school districts should as well, but that the Federal Government should in no way be involved in telling schools how they should meet those goals. And any of the funds we put out, we should put out at the grassroots level to support all kinds of experimentation, the maximum level of flexibility and creativity for people. Let's say, now, what is high standards in math and science, for example, or a dropout rate not to exceed 10 percent in the aggregate of any given class. And then you say, "Well, how are you going to measure that?" And you agree on how you're going to measure it, and then all the rest is up to the local school districts, the schools, working with the States. That's what I believe the system ought to be, and that's what we've tried to design, and I thank you for that.

[*At this point, Ms. Devlin thanked everyone for coming and asked the President for closing remarks.*]

The President. The only thing I'd like to say in closing is, I would like to thank the employers who participate in this very, very much. I would like to thank the educators who support it and make it work. And I would like to thank the students and their parents who participate in it.

And if I could just say one thing, I hope that all of you will continue to support this program, and I hope there will come a time when every student in the State of New Hampshire and every student in the United States who would like to be a part of this program has a constructive opportunity to do so. It's not a program; it is a partnership. I will say again: We have got to abolish the line between what is academic and what is vocational and learning, and we've got to abolish the line between school and work.

Learning is now going to be a lifetime endeavor, and learning should be seen as a dignified form of work, and we should all get together and help each other to do it. And you have set a superb example here, and I am very grateful to you.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The roundtable discussion began at 4:40 p.m. at the Sanders Lockheed Co.

Statement on the Circuit Court Decision on Replacement Workers
February 2, 1996

The right of workers to strike has long been one of America's envied freedoms. Last year, I signed an Executive order prohibiting Federal contractors from permanently replacing workers who exercise their legitimate and historic right to strike.

This Executive order—which furthers the economic and efficient administration of Federal contracts—signals the kind of productive labor-management relationships that are needed in today's economy.

I regret today's decision by the DC Circuit Court overturning this order. I strongly believe that this Executive order is economically sound, fair, and legal, and accordingly I am instructing my Justice Department to take all appropriate steps to have this decision overturned.

NOTE: Executive Order No. 12954 concerning economical and efficient administration and completion of Federal Government contracts was published in the *Federal Register* at 60 FR 13023.

Remarks to the Community in Salem, New Hampshire
February 2, 1996

Thank you very much. I don't know about you, but I think Larry's got a real future in this speaking business. [*Laughter*] I thank him and Joe and Mike and Cheryl for welcoming me here. I thank your superintendent and your high school principal for making me feel welcome, and your students. And I thank the Salem band for playing. They did a very good job. I thought it was the Marine Band playing when I first heard. They did a terrific job.

You know, it is true that 4 years ago when I first came here I walked into a room with Larry and six other people and I thought I had a crowd. We spoke to about 120 people then, and I was overwhelmed by the multitude. Tonight there are 3,000 people here and 2,000 more, apparently, who wanted to come and couldn't. And I can only say to all of you, thank you from the bottom of my heart. I am very grateful to you.

Just before I got off the plane today, when I was flying up here, my staff gave me a list of all of the scheduled stops I made in New Hampshire just from January 1st until February 18th, 1992, not counting the ones in October, November, and December, just the ones in those 6 weeks. There were 75 different stops on that list.

I'd like to say something to all of you as this campaign season begins again that I have said repeatedly to people in the White House for the last 4 years. The New Hampshire primary serves two purposes, not one. The obvious purpose that you think about and like and your leaders without regard to party have worked so hard to protect is that you have the first primary in the Nation. You get the first say. You have a disproportionate impact on who is nominated by each party.

But what you should not underestimate is the other purpose that you serve, and perhaps in the long run, an even more valuable one for the United States because New Hampshire is a small State with a lot of communities and because it is the first primary. When I came here and went to town after town after town, to school after school after school, to business after business after business, and I sat across tables and I sat around coffee shops and I listened to people, and they asked questions and they told me of their experiences and I heard what they had to say, I learned more about my country than I ever could have learned in any other way.

No one ever runs for President knowing enough about America to be President; New Hampshire helps people learn that if you go out and you listen and you reach out to the people and you give them a chance to share with you. And that happens for people whether they win in this State or not. The people always here are unfailingly courteous to the candidates and give them a chance to learn about America. You taught me a lot about America, and I thank you for it.

Let me say, when I came here in 1991 and 1992, the focus in our country and certainly in this State was overwhelmingly on the condition of the economy, on the long recession, on the fact that the unemployment rate was so high, on the fact that so many businesses were going bankrupt and so many people were looking to the future without hope. And I asked the American people, as well as the people of New Hampshire, to give me a chance to serve as President because I had a very clear idea that in order to move into the 21st century the strongest country in the world, we had to provide economic opportunity to everyone, we had to expect more responsibility from all our citizens, and we had to pull together. And whether we liked it or not, even though the cold war was over, we had to continue to be the leading force for freedom and for peace in the world. I believed that then, and I believe it tonight, and that is the path we have taken.

Tonight I would like to do, in an abbreviated fashion, what I attempted to do in the State

of the Union Address last week. I want to give you an account of where we have come in the last 3 years and where I believe we have to go.

Compared with 3 years ago, our economy is stronger, as Larry said. We have, combined, the lowest rates of unemployment and inflation we've had in 27 years. We have almost 8 million new jobs in this economy. We have a million new jobs in autos and construction alone. We have a 15-year high in homeownership. For 3 years in a row, we have broken records in the number of new businesses started in America. Each successive year has been a record high.

All those things are good things. In New Hampshire the unemployment rate has dropped from 7.6 percent to 3.2. For the last 3 years, businesses have been growing in number at 8 percent a year instead of shrinking, as they did before. Business failures are down. New Hampshire has 40,000 new jobs. That is a good record. We should all be proud of it. We have implemented the economic strategy I talked about here in every community: to cut the deficit in half, to expand trade to all-time highs, to invest in education and research and technology, and to sell American products all around the world. That strategy is working. We are moving forward with it. It is expanding opportunity for the American people.

We have also been a stronger force for peace and freedom, even than I had imagined we might be, in the last 3 years. You can look at the Middle East, at Northern Ireland, at Haiti, at Bosnia, and you see the work of America standing up for peace. You look at the fact that we now have almost 180 nations committed not to get involved in the nuclear arms race, at the fact that the Russians and others have detargeted their nuclear missiles so that now there are no more nuclear missiles pointed at any American homes for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age. That is encouraging.

And perhaps most important of all, there is a real sense that Americans are becoming more responsible and are coming together more. The crime rate, the welfare rolls, the food stamp rolls, the poverty rolls, the teen pregnancy rates, all these are lower than they were, and that is a good thing. They're going in the right direction.

Now, having said all that, all of us know that this country still faces some stiff challenges. It is an amazing thing to consider that in the last 3 years, we have produced in the United States in each year the largest number of self-made millionaires our country has ever produced—not people who were given their money, people just like you who earned it. And that's something we can be proud of. But we have to face the fact that in each of those 3 years most Americans worked harder and harder and did not get a raise. Even with 8 million new jobs nearly, most people still are working harder just to keep up. In this global economy with all of this technology, the pressures operate to hold people's wages down and many big companies keep laying people off so that there is a greater sense of insecurity.

A lot of people don't feel that their employer would treat them the way the employer at Methuan mills did if something bad happened. A lot of those employees are here today, and I thank you for that. And as you know, the Feuersteins were guests of Hillary at the State of the Union Address. I was honored to have them there.

But a lot of people feel that, even at work, they're not important like they used to be, that maybe they could just be discarded. Millions of American families still work harder and harder, and they don't have access to health care. That's one thing I tried to do that I didn't get done, and I'm not ashamed that I tried and neither is the First Lady.

Millions of Americans work hard and don't have access to a pension, or they can lose it if they move from job to job. There is a lot of anxiety out there as well as all this opportunity. And even though the crime rate is coming down, we know it's still too high. Even though these other indicators I mentioned are coming down, we know we still have serious social problems.

So I say to you as you look ahead, the issue is, what should we do now? I would argue we should build on the successes of the last 3 years and keep going in the right direction until we have dealt with these problems in an adequate fashion, until we have seized our opportunities, until we make maximum use of what is before us. That is what we ought to do. What we should not do is take a change of course and follow a direction that we know has no chance of working. What we need to do is bear down and go forward.

There are those who say that this is a question of should we solve these problems through big Government or not. That, my fellow Americans, is a myth. When I came here 4 years ago, I said if you will vote for me, I will reduce the size of the Federal Government by 100,000 and put another 100,000 police officers on the street. Well, we're putting another 100,000 police officers on the street, but we reduced the size of the Government by 200,000, and it will soon be 300,000, and it's the smallest Government we've had in 30 years. There is not a big Government issue out there anymore.

The real issue before us, as I have seen as I've traveled around New Hampshire today—and I have gone into factories; I've looked at apprenticeship programs; I've been in an elementary school and looked at a computer program; I've seen the Concord schools hooked up to the Internet this week. In March, 20 percent of the schools of California at one time will be hooked up to the Internet. By the end of this decade we are going to see every schoolroom and every library in this country on the Internet and the information superhighway. I know that.

And big Government is not doing these things. The question is not whether we should have big Government or not. The question is whether we are going to go forward by working together, in which every part of our country and every element of our society, including your Nation's Government, does its part, or whether we're going to go back to a time when people were told to fend for themselves.

If you look at this room tonight, if you think about this community, if you think about any endeavor you have ever been involved in that really worked, what works is when people work together, when everybody has a chance to fulfill their God-given abilities. When everybody works together, we all do better individually. That is the issue before the American people: Are we going forward together as a community to solve our problems?

When I came in they gave me a cap for your football team, State champion. It had 12 and 0 on it. And I imagine like every good team, the team has some stars. But let me say this: There's not a halfback in America that can run without a line. You can't do it. If you watched the Super Bowl, it was a great football game. There were some great stars out there. It was a contest of teamwork.

And that's the way nations are. You've got to get all of your players on the field. Then you've got to make sure they're properly trained. Then if they do what they're supposed to do, there has to be some kind of reward. And the only way it ever works is if they're all working together. That is the issue for America today.

Whenever a country goes through a period of sweeping change and all of the balls get thrown up in the air, there will be winners and losers. But for a nation to be everything it ought to be, everyone has to have a chance to win. And that can only happen if we go forward together. That is what I want you to believe.

First of all, this country has one big piece of unfinished business. We have cut the deficit in half in 3 years, and that is good. We never had a permanent deficit at a high level until the 12 years before I became President. We are turning that around. We are coming down. But we have to finish the job. We have to adopt a credible balanced budget plan.

What will happen? Just think what happened in 1993 when we cut the deficit in half. What happens? If people know you're going to balance your books, interest rates go down. Car payments go down. Home mortgage payments go down. Credit card payments go down. Businesses find it easier to borrow money. They invest. They create jobs. Families find it easier to make ends meet. This is an important thing to do, and we must do it.

What I want you to know is that after more than 50 hours of negotiations, after weeks and weeks among the Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress and the Vice President and myself, we have identified more than enough savings that are common to both of our approaches—more than enough—to balance this budget in 7 years, according to Congress's own scorecard. More than enough.

There are differences which remain. Most of those differences, in my view, relate to what our obligations as a Nation are to bind our community together. But those differences are not an excuse not to balance the budget. They are not an excuse for a work stoppage between now and the November election. We are all paid to work every day between now and November, and our first job is to finish the job of balancing the budget. We ought to do it.

I can assure you that we can do this while maintaining our obligations to our parents, to our children, to the truly poor and the families

with children with disabilities, and to the future, in terms of our investments in education and in protecting the environment. We can do that. We could even do that by taking the savings we have in common and, in addition to doing all that, we could have a modest tax cut.

But we have to do it. The time has come to say, look, we've got enough in common to do this one big job, balance the budget. We have differences over the shape of the Medicare program. We have differences over the shape and obligations under the Medicaid program. We have differences about our obligations to protect the environment. We have differences about what the Nation's obligation is to open educational opportunity for all. But we have agreed upon enough savings to balance the budget. It is unconscionable not to do it. We must do it, and we ought to do it right now and not wait.

But let me say to you, even if we do that, this country clearly has challenges as we move into this new age. Why do we have these challenges? First of all, because any time you have a big upheaval in the way people work and live, the established patterns of life will be disturbed, and a lot of people will seize new opportunities, but others will be dislocated. Go home and pick up any history book and look what happened in America when we moved from farm to factory, when we moved from being a rural country to a more urbanized one. Vast fortunes were made. People who had nothing did very well. But a lot of people were uprooted and despairing. This always happens when you change the way people live.

We are now moving into a world dominated by technology and information. It is exploding. And the good news is, as I saw today—I was in Nashua at the Sanders Lockheed plant. It's unbelievable. You know, they're making satellites that are going to be put up in the sky for literally 10 percent of what it cost us to put a satellite up just 3 or 4 years ago. And within a matter of a year or so you'll be able to have a portable telephone and, literally, you can talk to anybody anywhere on the face of the Earth. In the remotest jungle, in the remotest desert, in Antarctica, you'll be able to pick up the telephone and call somebody. This is incredible.

But we also know that with all of these open borders and with all of this competition, it keeps the pressure down on prices, but it also makes it hard for people to get a raise. And we also know if more people can do more and more and more and more work because of technology, it means that big units can do the same amount of work with fewer people. That means we've got to create more jobs with small businesses. It means we have to be more attentive to what it takes to get people's incomes up and to give them health care, pensions, and access to education for a lifetime. That is what we have to do.

So it also means that when things are changing and people are being subject to just literally thousands and thousands and thousands of messages bearing down on them every time they turn the television on, every day when they wake up, every night when they go to bed, we have to work harder to preserve our most essential values and our most important institution, which is the American family. We have to work at that. We have to make conscious efforts to do it.

And so I ask you to look with me ahead. This country has made a decision that we've got to eliminate the deficit. We're going to keep the deficit coming down regardless. We ought to pass a plan that clearly balances the budget because of the confidence it will give the American people and because it will drive interest rates down and keep growth going. We ought to do that.

But let's look ahead. First of all, we have got to make a national commitment to renew our efforts to improve childhood and strengthen families. That's what we did when we passed the Family and Medical Leave Act, and I am very proud of that. I believe that's what we did when I insisted that the telecommunications bill which was passed just yesterday in the Congress, a piece of legislation which also will create tens of thousands of high-wage jobs in America, require that all new cable TV sets be equipped with a V-chip so that parents can decide which programs their young children should watch and they won't be exposed to excessive violence and other things they believe are destructive.

I believe that we have to make a commitment as a Nation that every young person will have access to the educational opportunities necessary to compete and win in the global economy, every young person. There are many things involved in that, but beyond hooking up all of the classrooms and the libraries to the Internet, we need to give teachers and parents and people who operate our local schools the flexibility and

the options they need to make whatever changes are necessary to meet high standards of excellence. And frankly, our schools need more support from our parents. They ought to be willing to turn the television off, get the homework done, and see that the work is done in the schools.

Then we have to make it possible for every young person in America who gets out of high school to go on to college or to further education, every one—every one. In the last 3 years, we have overhauled the college loan program so that now it is easier to get a college loan, and as I pledged here in '92, much, much easier to pay it back as a percentage of whatever you earn. No one can be bankrupted by borrowing money to go to college because of that.

Now, I have asked the Congress to increase work-study opportunities so that a million young people can work their way through school every year. I have asked Congress to provide a merit scholarship of $1,000 a year to the top 5 percent of every graduating class and every high school in America this year. I have asked Congress not to abolish the AmeriCorps program which in New Hampshire and so many other States are giving our young people a chance to do good things.

And finally, if there is to be a tax cut, we ought to cut taxes in a way that will grow the economy and increase opportunity for people, and the best way to do that would be to give the families of America a tax deduction for the cost of college tuition. That is where we ought to start.

Now, our third challenge is to face the biggest economic problem we have, to give more economic security to those families that are working harder and harder just to keep up. How can we do that? First of all, we ought to raise the minimum wage. It is too low. If we do not raise it this year, within one year the minimum wage will drop to a 40-year low in terms of its purchasing power, even though there are millions of people out there, principally single mothers, who are raising children on the minimum wage. It is hard to raise a family on a modest income today; it cannot be done properly on $4.25 an hour. There is no excuse for not raising it, and we should raise it.

Secondly, we should protect our workers' pensions and we should make it much easier and less expensive for small-business people to take out pensions for themselves, their families, and their employees. It's important.

The next thing we ought to do is to recognize that it's not just young people who need an education, it's older people as well. The average education of our American people in 4-year colleges is 26 now. The average age of people in the 2-year institutions is much higher than that.

We need a system which enables people every time they're out of work or grossly underemployed to go back and get education and training—every one. The tax deductibility of tuition will help, but it would also help if the Congress would adopt my "GI bill" for America's workers, which gets rid of all these tens and dozens of programs, little programs for training, collapses them all, puts them in one big pot, and gives every person in America when they lose their job a voucher worth $2,600 a year for 2 years to get an education and training worthy of this new economy.

Finally, let me say I will never forget the stories I was told in New Hampshire 4 years ago of the families that had no health care because they lost their jobs or because they had to change jobs or because the husband or the wife or the child got sick. That's what we all thought insurance was for, for sick people. Turns out, for a lot of people it's only good if you're well; if you get sick, you can't have it anymore. Now, you know that's true. Maybe I asked the American people, through the Congress, to do too much in trying to give health care coverage to everybody. But I'll tell you something: It is wrong at least not to make affordable health care accessible to every family. And we can do that.

There is a bill before the United States Senate today, a bipartisan bill with 43 Democrat and Republican sponsors. The chief sponsors are Senator Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas, Senator Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts. And let me tell you what this bill does. This bill does about three simple things. It says you can't lose your health insurance just because you changed jobs. It says you can't be denied coverage and your family can't be dropped just because you or your family has a preexisting condition, somebody has been sick. And it says that self-employed people and small-business people ought to have the opportunity in every State to go into bigger pools so that they can buy health insurance on the same competitive terms that

people who are in large employer units can do. That's what it says.

And we ought to pass it. We ought to pass it now. It was voted out of the Senate committee with not a single opposing vote, unanimously out of the committee in the Senate, and we cannot get it to a vote on the floor because people are trying to delay it because the health insurance industry is against it. The national chamber of commerce is for it. The National Association of Manufacturers is for it. Business and labor are for it. Real people are for it. Let's pass it. No other country would permit this to happen, and we shouldn't either.

The fourth thing we have to do is to maintain our fight against crime and gangs and drugs until crime is the exception, not the rule. It's not enough for the crime rate to go down. It must become the exception, not the rule again, in America. I told you in 1992 when I came here that I would attempt to put 100,000 more police officers on the street, that I would support the Brady bill, that I would support limits on assault weapons and protect other weapons.

Now, I know that New Hampshire is a big hunting State, just like the State that I was born in and spent most of my life in and was Governor of for 12 years. But I want to tell you, it has now been one year and then some since we passed the crime bill with the assault weapons ban. And we just had a big deer season in New Hampshire, and there was not a single, solitary deer hunter that lost his weapons. We told the truth about that. It was an assault weapons ban, not a gun control operation. We told the truth about that.

We took some dangerous weapons off the streets of our cities. We protected the police. We protected innocent citizens. Forty-four thousand people with criminal records have been unable to buy handguns because of the Brady bill, because we did the background check. It was the right thing to do. But the most important thing of all is the crime rate is coming down and crime is being prevented because of the community policing strategies adopted with our help, putting 100,000 police on the street, and we need to finish the job. We need to keep going for 2 more, 3 more years, until we've got them all out there. It is the right thing to do.

Our fifth challenge, and you've been talking about it a lot lately in New Hampshire, the Vice President was just here, is to maintain our commitment to preserve and enhance the natural environment. I had thought that there was a general consensus in our country in both parties, including all political independents, number one, that there were still problems out there, and number two, that we had to find a way to grow the economy while protecting the environment. We could no longer sacrifice the environment and say that's the only way we can create jobs.

Let me just remind you of the facts. I know this is the 1990's. But when I became President, immediately I found that we had people dying because they ate food contaminated by the *E. coli* virus. And I discovered that in the 1990's, we were still testing meat in the way we've been testing it for 60 years, the same way dogs do. We were sniffing the meat and looking at it. It sounds funny until you think about what it could be if it were you. So we changed the meat requirement standards and the meat testing standards, and we got new technology coming in to make sure the American people are safe.

In Milwaukee just a few years ago, 100 people died drinking water contaminated with cryptosporidium.

If you think about the weather that our people have endured, the bitter snowstorms, the deep floods, the summer fires out West, and one of our major news magazines had a cover story just a couple of weeks ago saying that the snowstorms were due in part, believe it or not, to global warming. Why? Because when you upset the climatic balance, you have more extremes in weather, including harder winters as well as hotter summers. Nineteen ninety-five was the hottest year in the Earth's history, as long as we've been measuring it with this way of temperature.

So I tell you, my friends, the jobs of the future and the incomes of the future and the high-tech opportunities of the future are going to go to those who can find a way to work to preserve what God has given us, not to tear it up. That is a fact; we've got to do it.

Our sixth challenge—I won't say a lot about this, but I know I have to mention it, because I know I have so little popular support for this. The United States at the end of the cold war, especially since the Russians have now detargeted their missiles and they don't point them at us anymore, and because we have so many challenges here at home, is often tempted

to think, well, we don't really have to get involved with our friends and neighbors. We don't have to be involved in Bosnia. We don't have to be involved in Haiti. We don't have to even take our time with the Middle East or in trying to solve the Irish problem. We don't have to really work on all of these other things, getting a comprehensive test ban treaty, which I believe we'll get this year, to end nuclear testing forever. Why do we have to do that?

Well, let me just remind you of something. First of all, we do have security threats. We have all of these terrorists from overseas that can come into this country, as we have seen. Do you want the countries they come from to give them up and send them here for justice? Don't you want countries to say there's no place you can hide if you're a terrorist; if you come to America and blow up a building and kill innocent people, you can't go back home and hide?

Well, if we want those countries to cooperate with us, we have to cooperate with them. When people bring all this cocaine into this country or heroin into this country, it's not grown here in America. It comes from somewhere else. If we want those countries to literally—their leaders to put their lives on the line to go after those drug cartels, we have to work with them in other ways.

The gentleman I just named our new drug czar, General Barry McCaffrey, a four-star general, has been commanding our Armed Forces south of the border. He has been protecting our national interests in all kinds of traditional ways, but he's also been very identified in a fight to stop drugs coming into the country, working with our civilian law enforcement agencies and with foreign governments.

Do you know in the last year we have seen arrested seven of the eight top bosses of the Cali drug cartel, the biggest drug cartel in the world. But right next door to Colombia, when Ecuador and Peru got in a fight, who did they want to help come mediate it? The United States. I just had 10 soldiers down there and we had lots of people from other countries and a lot of you may have never read about that, but if I had said to them, "Oh, I'm sorry, we can't be bothered with that, that's not our problem," then they might say, "Well, the drugs on your street are not our problem."

The security threats of today and tomorrow are worldwide problems. The organized crime, the drug trafficking, the terrorism, the weapons of mass destruction, the people that broke open that vial of poison gas in the Japanese subway, these are worldwide problems, so I ask you—we should be preoccupied with solving our problems at home, but I ask you at least to support me when I make a judgment that it is in your interest and our children's future's interest to have America lead the cause for freedom and peace in the world.

And there is one last challenge, and it may be a work that will never be done. But we have to keep working to give you a Government that you feel you can trust and have confidence in. You know, when I came here running for President, I said there are at least four things we ought to do to make the Government more responsive. And believe it or not, two of them have been done. And this Congress did them, and I applaud them, and they did it on a bipartisan basis.

I said we ought to make the laws that Congress applies to the private sector apply to Congress. They did that. Congress ought not to accept these lavish gifts from lobbyists, and they should have to disclose—lobbyists should have to disclose how much money they spent, where they get it from, what they spent it on, and what they're trying to do with it. They did that, the lobby vote. That's a good thing.

We have two down and two to go. The third is the line item veto. Where is it? I want it. And they say we're going to get that this year. I certainly hope so. And the fourth is campaign finance reform.

So I ask you to join me in embracing those challenges. And I ask you to think about one other thing. This country is in better shape than it was 3 years ago, but this country still has a lot of challenges. This country needs the right President. I'm glad you think I am the right President, but this country is around here after 220 years, still the great hope and shining beacon of the world, because of the values embedded in the Constitution, because of the values embedded in the hearts of the American people, because of the character and strength and determination and plain, old-fashioned good citizenship of the American people. And I tell you, cynicism is a luxury you cannot afford. Pessimism is unwarranted based on the evidence. And not participating in the public life of your nation is a cop-out that will become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Sometimes I think the greatest moments of my life now are when I am able to represent you when I go overseas, because when I get in Air Force One and go to another country as a force for peace in Northern Ireland, when all those people—you saw it on the television—were in the streets screaming, they weren't screaming for Bill Clinton. They weren't even screaming for the President of the United States. They were cheering the United States. They were cheering America and everything we stand for.

And when I go other places and I talk to foreign leaders, they sometimes say to me, "I read all these surveys in America about how pessimistic people are, about how they don't have faith in their institutions," he said. And foreign leaders all over the world, they say, "How could this be? Your country has a lower unemployment rate than other countries, your country has created—" all the jobs that have been created in the seven biggest economies in the world, net, in the last 7 years is the number that have been created here. The rest—some created a few, some lost a few, they're net out zero. We have all the jobs, net. Our deficit today is a smaller percentage of our income than any of our major competitors.

Our country is admired and trusted. Just a few years ago we thought we might go to war with Russia. When this issue in Bosnia came up, I met with the President of Russia, and he said—the President of Russia said—he looked at me and he said, "Bill, I will send as many Russian soldiers as you want to serve under whatever American general you name." That is a great gift. That is a gift.

And so I leave you with this challenge. You live in a great country. Sure, we've got some problems. We're human beings. Yes, we make some mistakes. We're human beings. We are not a superhuman race of people. But there is no country on Earth where so many diverse people get together and work together so well, no country on Earth with more resources to deal with the challenges it faces. And we cannot afford to be cynical or skeptical or pessimistic about our future.

I am moved by you being here more than any words I can say, just because you're here and you're enthusiastic and you're full of energy. And what I want you to do is to leave this place tonight, and when you wake up tomorrow and the next day and the next day and the next day, you tell your fellow Americans, "You don't have a right to be cynical, you don't have a right to be pessimistic. This is the greatest country in human history, and we're going to make it greater."

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:38 p.m. in the Back Gymnasium at Salem High School. In his remarks, he referred to Larry Belair, Salem town moderator; Joe Keefe, Mike Garofalo, and Cheryl Breton, Democratic Party chairs of New Hampshire, Rockingham County, and Salem, respectively; Henry LaBranche, superintendent, Salem School District; Patrick Cobin, principal, Salem High School; Aaron and Louise Feuerstein of Malden Mills Industries, Inc., who continued to pay employees after their Methuan, MA, textile factory burned in December 1995; and President Boris Yeltsin of Russia. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

The President's Radio Address
February 3, 1996

Good morning. I would like to talk to you this morning about how we can meet one of the challenges I outlined in my State of the Union Address: providing greater economic security to Americans who work hard, and especially how we can ensure that those Americans have access to health care, because millions and millions of working Americans and their families don't have access to health care.

There can be no doubt that we do live in an age of great possibility, a time of exploding technology and information, a time that will enable more Americans than ever before to fulfill their dreams. But this new economy, with so

much opportunity, also has very stiff challenges, as most Americans know. Our news is not all good. While this new economy has produced a record number of new businesses in each of the last 3 years and nearly 8 million new jobs, too many of our fellow citizens are still working harder and harder just to keep up. They are rightly concerned about the security of their families. They are worried about job security. They are worried about never seeming to get a raise. They are worried about access to education, the security of their pensions, and access to health care.

Our challenge is to make sure that all Americans can be winners in this time of change. How are we going to do it? First, we have to keep our economy growing. That's one reason we should balance the budget: It will keep interest rates coming down, bringing in more investments, generating more jobs. After many weeks of negotiations, the Republicans and I already have agreed on more than enough cuts that are common to each of our plans to balance the budget in 7 years and still provide a modest middle class tax cut; to maintain our obligations to parents and children and to the future through the Medicare and Medicaid programs and through our investments in education; and to protect the environment.

I urge the Republicans in Congress to keep working with me so that we can actually pass a balanced budget. We have the savings in common, we can do it, and we owe it to the American people to do it.

Second, we have to work together to create more new high-wage jobs in the new industries of the future. That's why I was very pleased that just this week Congress passed landmark telecommunications legislation, legislation we have been working on for more than 3 years. It will create a lot of high-wage jobs. It will give consumers more choices in communications and in entertainment. It will help to unlock the power of the digital revolution. This legislation was passed the way we should deal with all our challenges, with Members of both parties working together and working together until they got it right.

The third thing we should do is raise the minimum wage. Millions of people are raising children on the minimum wage. But if we don't raise it within a year it will be at a 40-year low in its purchasing power. We can't build a new economy with that kind of income to raise children on.

And fourth, we must make sure that every working American has the personal economic security to make the most of his or her own life and to support a family. That means lifetime access to education and training. It means portable, secure pensions. And above all, for people with families especially, it means access to health care.

Our Nation is the only leading economy in the world where insurance companies are allowed to deny you coverage or raise your rates just because you're sick. If you have a preexisting condition like diabetes, high blood pressure, or heart disease, an insurance company can simply turn you down. If you are healthy but your child has asthma, your child can be denied coverage. And in some cases, if you're pregnant and you move to a new job, that can be enough to turn you away.

Many millions more people simply lose their health coverage as they move from one job to another. Believe it or not, between 1991 and 1993 some 64 million people went without health insurance for some period of time. For working families that's like walking on a tightrope without a net below.

We shouldn't put obstacles in the way of people who want to move to better jobs. We certainly shouldn't put additional burdens on people who lose their jobs that they want to keep. At the very least, our first step should be to make sure that working people who have health insurance can take it with them from job to job.

The State of New Hampshire, where I am today, is one of 42 States to take some action to try and solve this problem. But only if we take national action will we truly be able to give working people access to health care. There is bipartisan legislation that would protect these working families, sponsored by Senator Nancy Kassebaum, a Republican from Kansas, and Senator Edward Kennedy, a Democrat from Massachusetts. The bill would require insurers to cover men and women who have lost insurance because they change or lose their jobs. It would limit the ability of insurance companies to exclude you from coverage if you have a preexisting condition. And it would help small businesses and individuals pool their resources to buy insurance at cheaper rates. It could help as many as 25 million Americans each year to

have or to keep their health insurance. It's good common sense, and it's the right thing to do.

The Kassebaum-Kennedy bill has 43 cosponsors from both parties in the Senate. It passed through its committee unanimously. It has the support of the National Association of Manufacturers, the chamber of commerce, and the national small business union. It is supported by doctors as well as consumer groups. It should pass easily.

When I challenged Congress to pass this bipartisan health care reform in my State of the Union Address, nearly every Member of Congress jumped to their feet and applauded, but now the bill is stalled. It turns out that some Senators have quietly been working to keep this bill from coming up to a vote even though it passed out of the committee unanimously. Why are they doing it? Because that's what the insurance industry wants them to do. And the insurance industry is lobbying hard against the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill.

This health reform, however, is sensible. It's straightforward. It's fair. It is genuinely bipartisan. It will help to give peace of mind to literally millions of American families. I call on every Member of Congress who stood up for this bill when the cameras were on to stand up for it now, to pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy health reform bill and to pass it without delay.

If we believe that hard-working people deserve a chance to better their lives without sacrificing their health insurance, then we must pass this bill now. If we believe it's wrong to deny health coverage to a person just because he or she is sick, then we must pass this bill now. If we believe a sick child should not be denied health care while her healthy brothers and sisters are still covered, we must pass this bill now. This bill is an example of what we can do when we put aside partisanship and work together for the common good. Millions of lives will be changed for the better when it becomes law. We shouldn't let any special interest get in the way now. Let's work together and pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, and let's do it now.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:45 p.m. on February 2 at the Sanders Lockheed plant in Nashua, NH, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on February 3.

Remarks to the Community in Manchester, New Hampshire
February 3, 1996

Thank you very much. Hello. Thank you very much, Sergeant Robidas, for your introduction and for your fine work. Thank you, Nancy Tessier, for your work at the Beech Street School and for your support of community policing. Chief Favreau; to the Concord police chief, Dave Walchak, who is a great honor for New Hampshire, he's the president of the International Association of Police Chiefs, and we're glad to have you here.

I want to thank the others who have been with me today: your United States Attorney, Paul Gagnon; your U.S. Marshal, Ray Gagnon; the Hillsborough County attorney, Peter McDonough. And I thank Father Adrian Longchamps, who met with me today. I want to thank the police officers in particular who visited with me just a moment ago at the community station, Tyrone Guyse and Nick Willard. And I want to say to Mr. Byron, the police officer who is standing here to my right—right before I came up here he said, "Mr. President, this is the best job I ever had. I love doing this work."

I want to thank two others who are in our group today: Pauline Coat, the executive director of the Manchester Neighborhood Services, and in some ways the linchpin of this whole experiment, Alice Septin, who is the head of the Take Back Our Neighborhood Corporation. Let's give her a big hand. [*Applause*] Thank you, Alice.

I thank all the community police officers who are here, all those who participated in Operation Street Sweeper. I thank the D.A.R.E. students and the people in the D.A.R.E. program who are here. Let's give them a big hand. [*Applause*] And I thank the AmeriCorps members who are

here from Salem, for their work and their progress. Thank you very much.

It is wonderful to be back in New Hampshire, great to be back in Manchester, and great to be talking about an issue that I discussed a great deal with the people of New Hampshire back in 1992 which is now a reality on the streets of Manchester and throughout the United States.

Let me begin by saying that, as all of you know, in my State of the Union Address I tried to outline for our country what I believe the challenges are that we face today and those that we will face in the years ahead, and what I think we all have to do to meet those challenges and how I see the Nation's Government's role in working with the American people to meet them. This is an age of great possibility. There are more good things available to more people here than ever before. But it is also an age of very stiff challenge. More and more people have to work harder just to keep up in this new economy. We still have too much crime and violence. We still have a lot of other problems.

So the great challenge for us is how to expand opportunity to more Americans, how to bring this country together around our core values, how to maintain our country's leadership for freedom and for peace. The first thing we have to do is to finish the work of yesterday. That means we have to pass the right kind of balanced budget plan that eliminates the deficit but also protects our obligations to our parents, to our children, and to our future through our investments in the programs of Medicare, Medicaid, environmental protection, and educational opportunities. And let me emphasize again, with all the work that I have done with the Republican congressional leaders and the Democratic congressional leaders there are now more than enough savings that are common to both our plans to pass that kind of balanced budget plan, and I hope we will do it and do it soon.

After we do that we will still be left with the challenges we face. And I have identified seven that I think are the greatest challenges for our country, of which taking back our streets and making America safe is one and, in some cases, the most fundamental. We have to do more to strengthen our families. We have to do more to provide educational opportunity for all. We have to do more to provide economic security to people who are working hard but aren't getting raises and don't have access to health care and stable pensions and lifetime education and training opportunities. We have to do more to clean our environment and protect it and to grow the economy while cleaning up the environment instead of destroying it. We have to do more to fight the problems we face to our security—terrorism, weapons of mass destruction—working in concert with others for peace. We have to change the way the Government works to increase your sense of confidence in it.

When I ran here in 1994, I identified four things I thought ought to be done to reform the way the Government works. The Congress has done two of those things this year, and I applaud them. They passed a very tough reform bill on lobbying to limit what Congress can take from lobbyists and to require lobbyists to disclose how much money they spend and on what. That was a good thing. They passed a bill to require Congress to live under the laws that are imposed on the private sector. That was a good thing. I believe your former Congressman was one of the original sponsors of that legislation, Dick Swett. That was a good thing.

Now, there are two other things we need to do this year. We need to pass the line item veto that they have pledged to pass for me, and we need to pass meaningful campaign finance reform. It is very important. It can be done. It ought to be done.

But there's one other thing I want to say. A great part of this debate in Washington is about what the National Government's responsibility is. And the way you've heard this debate over the last 15 years has often been big Government is getting in the way of the American economy; big Government is undermining the independence of the American community; big Government is weakening, not strengthening, the American family.

I have to tell you that I think that is the wrong debate. The era of big Government is over. Our administration has eliminated 16,000 pages of Federal regulations, hundreds of programs, thousands of unnecessary offices. The Government is over 200,000 people smaller today than it was the day I took the oath of office as President.

But the issue is not big Government versus small Government. The issue is what is your responsibility through the National Government

to work to help people make the most of their own lives, to work to help communities solve their own problems and meet their own challenges. That is the issue.

And if you look at the challenge we have to take our streets back, to make them safe again, I am very gratified at what we are doing, but we've got a long way to go. I'm gratified that the crime rate is down here. I am gratified that the crime rate is down all over America. I think it's wonderful that New York City had the biggest drop in crime since 1972. I think it is wonderful that Houston has the lowest murder rate it's had in 19 years. I think these are good things.

But we all know that our job will not be over until crime and violence are the exception, not the rule, until every neighborhood can say what I heard the people in this neighborhood say to me a few moments ago: that people now can walk outside and walk down the street and they don't have to be afraid; that the police are there at the play yard talking to the kids, and they know them by name; that people feel secure.

You can't eliminate the darkness that lurks in human nature. There will never be a time when there is absolutely no crime in America, when there is absolutely no violence. But we can go back to the days when it's the exception, not the rule, and people have their freedom on the streets of this country.

Now, my philosophy has been all along that if we could identify a national challenge and an idea that works, it was a legitimate thing for the Government in Washington—your Government—to define the "what", what is the challenge; and then to help people to meet that challenge. But the people at the grassroots level should define how to do it; that people in Washington should not be telling people how to do it. That's what we do here. In our education reforms we said, okay, here are some national standards we ought to meet; you figure out how to do it. In welfare reform we said we want to move people from welfare to work, we want people to be better parents and effective workers and break the cycle of dependence, but any State that's got a better idea about how to do it, we ought to give you permission to try.

We did it in health care. We said if you can find a way to slow health care costs and expand health coverage to people who are working through the Medicaid program, we'll give you a chance to determine how to do that. And we've given more permission to more State and local governments to do more things in the last 3 years than the previous administrations did in 12 years before me. I believe in giving States and localities and private citizens the right to determine the "how."

But the "what" in the case of crime is a national problem. Crime and violence is a national problem, and we know that community policing, which you celebrate here in Manchester, is what is working everywhere. Just a couple of weeks ago one of our major national news magazines had a cover story on turning the corner in the war against crime. And the police commissioner from New York City was featured on the cover as a stand-in for all the police officers everywhere and their community supporters who are working to make projects like this work.

Consider what has happened. The streets of New Hampshire are safer today because under the crime bill that we passed providing for community policing, there are 132 new police officers in communities all across this State. But they aren't just there as police officers, they're also changing what they're doing. They are working with community groups, like the community groups in this neighborhood. They are working not just to catch more criminals but to prevent crime from occurring in the first place and to make streets inhospitable places for the return of crime and drugs and gangs and violence. And it is working. We need to do more of it.

I heard the story of a 9-year-old girl who told an officer working in one of your community substations that her mother now allows her to play outside because the police had made it safe. Isn't that the story you want every child in America to be able to tell? Shouldn't every child in America be able to tell that story?

I was very moved by the grit and the determination of the people that I saw in the community substation today and by their sense that they could make a difference. One of the things that I constantly battle as your President is the feeling too many Americans have that their efforts won't make a difference anymore. Too many people seem to believe that we can't do better. And if one message comes out of this trip I took to Manchester this morning, should go out all over America is, when it comes to crime and violence we can do better. You have

done better in Manchester. People are doing better all over this country.

We can take our streets and our neighborhoods back, but it will require a partnership between people in law enforcement, community leaders, and grassroots citizens. We have to do it together. No one can do it alone, but together we can all do it. And that is the central lesson the United States has to face today.

I want to be absolutely frank in saying that while I think it would be a disastrous mistake for the Congress to reverse course on the crime bill and not to continue until we have put the full complement of 100,000 police officers on our streets—in just a little over a year and a half we're already a third of the way home—Congress must not turn around. I want to be frank in saying to you that we could put all these police officers out in departments all across America, and if we didn't have community leaders who were prepared to take their streets and neighborhoods back, if we didn't have schools that were prepared to support the police, if we didn't have parents like those that help this substation here get decorated for Christmas and support them, we could put the police officers out there and we still wouldn't succeed.

It requires both a commitment to putting the police back on the street and in the neighborhoods and a commitment from citizens to win the war against crime. Every American should be challenged to join a neighborhood watch group; if you see somebody in trouble, to pick up a phone and call for help; to spend a few hours every week helping out young people who need a helping hand from a caring adult through a Boys Club, a Girls Club, a D.A.R.E. program, or some other constructive way to get our kids off to a good start in life.

Neighbors helping neighbors, friends sticking up for friends, parents teaching children the difference between right and wrong, establishing bonds of trust between police officers and people in the communities, all these things must also be done. But the good news is it can make a difference. And what we celebrate today, I believe, is a model of the kind of partnerships we need in America.

You have a President and a National Government that says, here is the problem: There is too much crime and violence. We know something that works everywhere it's been tried and done right, community-based policing. So we will pass a bill to provide incentives to help communities hire these police officers. But they must decide—we said the "what"; they have to decide the "how." We make no judgments about who gets hired, about how they get trained, about how they're deployed, and we can't begin to say whether or not there is a community group supporting or working with them.

So it never works unless you supply the "how." You fill in all the blanks. You take your communities back. You make the most of the potential. You give your children a chance to live up to their God-given abilities. That is the model America must adopt for dealing with all the great challenges we face today: partnership, working together. There is no more issue of big Government. But I am telling you, we cannot afford to say we're going to go back to the time when everybody just fends for themselves. The only way we're going to solve the problems we've got today is to work together, where everybody plays their role. We do it, and we make a difference.

And let me just say, a critical component of this is building some trust again between law enforcement officers and people in the community. One of the most painful experiences I've had as President was the loss of trust I felt in a lot of places like New Hampshire and my home State of Arkansas, when the law enforcement officers came to us and they said, "If you want us to do the job you have got to pass the Brady bill and you've got to give us the ability to get these assault weapons off the street where people can't be sprayed innocently while they're walking up and down the block." We've got to do it.

But then when we tried to do that we found that in a lot of States, like New Hampshire and Arkansas, where half the people have a hunting or a fishing license or both, there were a lot of people who said, "Well, this is going to take away my gun. This is going to be a terrible thing. This is going to erode the right to keep and bear arms. This is going to undermine our hunting culture." And frankly, it's hard, with as much distrust of Government as there was out there, to break through that. But now, I've been here in New Hampshire, this is my second day, and I've heard all of these fellas bragging on the deer season we just had, and not a single person lost their deer rifle. But we've got 44,000 people with criminal

records who did not get handguns last year because of the Brady bill.

So we are trying to help our police officers be safer and keep these assault weapons out of the hands of gang members, but no one has lost a weapon—a sporting weapon, a hunting weapon. And maybe now that time has passed, we can rebuild the bonds of trust there, too, because the overwhelming majority of sportsmen in this country—sports men and women—are honest, good, law-abiding people, and we need everybody working together to whip this problem of crime and violence.

And now—I saw it today and I heard all of you talking about the bonds of trust increasing in this community; that's what we need more of in America. You know, most people are good people. Most people get up every day and do the best they can to do the right things. And we all look at each other sometimes with too much distrust. Again I say if we can overcome that, we can solve any problem.

But I hope all Americans will look to Manchester, and we'll look to other communities where the crime rate is going down. And I hope they will say, "Number one, we don't have to put up with this anymore. We don't have to put up with streets where our kids can't walk safely. We don't have to put up with neighborhoods where good, decent people don't want to live anymore. We don't have to move away to feel safe in our own homes. There is another way and a better way. But, secondly, that better way requires both more police officers in my community and my neighborhood walking my streets, and my personal involvement and my trust, and our sense of partnership and community."

If we have that, we can not only take our streets back and make our country safe, we can deal with any other challenge the American people face. If you look at our whole history, there has never been a single, solitary time when America failed when America worked together. And that's what we have to do today.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:20 p.m. at St. Cecilia's social hall. In his remarks, he referred to Sgt. Ronald (Red) Robidas, community policing commander; Nancy Tessier, principal, Beech Street School; and Peter Favreau, Manchester police chief.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on Small Business in Merrimack, New Hampshire

February 3, 1996

[*Tony Halvatzes, president, New Hampshire Hydraulics, welcomed the President and briefly described how the Small Business Administration had helped him expand his business.*]

The President. Tony, I'd say you've seeded this crowd pretty well. That's what all of us politicians try to do; we try to go to crowds where the people are going to cheer for us. You did a good job.

Mr. McGowan, do you want to say anything?

[*Patrick McGowan, Regional Administrator, Small Business Administration, discussed making the SBA program more user-friendly and introduced the first participant.*]

The President. Tell all the people here about your business, first.

[*The participant described her business and how the Government shutdown had affected her SBA application. Another participant indicated that small businesses were often financially unable to provide all benefits they would like for their employees and said a national health care bill would help small business. A third participant said that he had to turn some business away because of the limited size of SBA loan guarantees for small businesses.*]

The President. So it would help you if the SBA could guarantee a larger sized loan?

[*The participant responded that the SBA limit was $750,000, aimed at very small businesses, but that when a small business began to grow, the owner was left wondering whether it would still receive help.*]

The President. And what would be the size loan that you think that we ought to look at? Let me back up and say—you know how the SBA program works, the SBA loan guarantee program works, and one of the things that I'm proudest of about our administration and all this work we've done to try to give the American people a Government that costs less and does more is that we have reduced the budget of SBA by about 40 percent and we've doubled the loan volume.

But one of the things that we were compelled to do, given the budgetary situation we were in, is to go from a maximum loan of, I think it used to be $1 million, down to three-quarters of a million. But what I gather you're saying is that you need a bigger one even than that. You think there should be some sort of a program for nonbankable loans for a modest sized business that goes up to, what, $2 million?

[*The participant said that $2 million would serve to get small businesses over the hurdle to the point where they would be bankable without an SBA guarantee. Mr. McGowan indicated that SBA limitations were partially a result of success, because SBA had gone from 26,000 loans to 56,000.*]

The President. But I think, you know—again, this is the sort of thing that I hope will come out of this budget debate. That is, it seems to me that you can conclusively demonstrate that the SBA has done what the taxpayers wanted. We've cut the cost of operating the program. We have now more than doubled the loan volume, you just heard him say that. And the only reason we had to change the ceiling is because we wanted to accommodate as many people as possible. So it may be possible now to go back and say we ought to have a bigger loan volume ceiling because our administrative costs are very, very low. And we have—the form used to be an inch thick and it used to take 5 or 6 weeks to approve. And now with the LowDoc program it's just one page, either side, and we try to give just a couple days' turnaround, and it's been very well received.

[*The participant noted that although the SBA application fees had increased, the higher fees were not a problem as long as the program continued.*]

The President. By increasing the fees, what that's enabled us to do is to run the program and continue to maintain a high volume of loans while we're reducing the deficit. And by charging—getting a little more of the fees we can still fill that gap between the banks, you know, where you can't get the bank loans, and still the borrowers come out ahead net, financially.

So we went out and sampled, sort of, the small-business community and asked them, how about this, because this way we can keep volume up even as we're bringing the budget deficit down. And I'm glad you said that, because you're the first person I've had a chance to ask since we did it. I didn't know if I'd be dodging hydraulic equipment or not. [*Laughter*] Thank you.

[*A participant suggested that SBA should assist small businesses when they were just starting up and capital was hard to find, in a manner similar to the small loans made to locally organized entrepreneurs in foreign countries.*]

The President. If I could just interject here, the general title of what she's talking about, getting very small loans to start businesses, is microenterprise loans. For many years our Government—which believe it or not only spends one percent of your tax dollars on foreign aid, contrary to popular belief. We have the smallest foreign aid program as a percentage of our budget of any advanced government in the world, but we have gotten a lot out of it, because, among other things, there's a country in Central America where, a few years ago, in cooperation with some American religious groups that were operating development programs, we put $1 million into a small loan program. The average loan program was $300.

Now, in that country, in terms of the per capita income it would probably be about, say, a $2,000 loan here; that would be about the equivalent. But anyway, over the next few years that $1 million generated enough business loans to create 43,000 jobs, which is one percent of the total employment in that country. Everybody paid the loans back with interest. There's now $4 million in that account that started off at $1 million. My premise is, if we can do that in another country, we ought to do that in our country, and that in the inner cities, in these very isolated rural areas where the per capita income is low and the unemployment rate is high, I believe we should be making those kinds of loans.

So we have—another part of our economic outreach to small business was a fund called the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, CDFI. And if it survives this budget round, what we're going to try to do is to get banks to establish themselves with branches in areas where there's very high unemployment, low per capita income, and make these kinds of loans to try to set up businesses. They can also make conventional small-business loans as well.

But I think for a little bit of money, you can do a huge amount. We established a bank like that in a rural part of my State when I was Governor, and my wife went on the board of the bank, and we modeled it after the only American project I know of, which was a bank in Chicago which helped to redevelop the south side of Chicago by making small loans to individual carpenters, individual electricians, individual builders, and then they went in and took all this decrepit housing, rebuilt it, and got middle class people and poor people to live together, and totally turned around a neighborhood. So I'm glad to hear you say that, because there's not enough Government money to rescue the inner cities and the isolated rural areas, but free enterprise could do it if we did it in this way.

You're the first citizen that had never had a direct contact with this program overseas that ever suggested it, but it looks to me like if we're financing small businesses in another country like—we ought to do it here in our country. We ought to give the Americans the same break that other people have.

Thank you.

[*A participant voiced her concern that States and local businesses could not afford to support the arts and asked if the Federal Government could help.*]

The President. Well, you making that argument to me, you're preaching to the choir, because I agree with you. But I would like to put it—just briefly, I'd like to put this in proper context. Let's just take this as an example of the budget debate we're having in Washington everywhere. You should know, first of all, that the deficit has been cut in half in the last 3 years. What makes the deficit go down in a hurry is if you have a combination of real discipline on the money you spend and a growing economy, because if you have a growing economy, then unemployment's less, the Government has to make fewer payouts. For example, in the last 3 years the welfare rolls are down; the food stamp rolls are down; the poverty rolls are down. We're not paying out as much money because the economy is in better shape, more people are working, and we have pretty tight controls on the spending.

We have reduced the size of the Government by 200,000 since I've been in office. Your Federal Government is now the same size it was in 1965. We have cut 16,000 of the 86,000 pages of Federal regulations, including half the Federal regulations in the SBA; 50 percent have been slashed. So we're trying to get rid of all of the inessential things and all of the waste.

Now, there's a big debate now of what should the National Government do. And you can make an argument, once you get beyond national defense—defending the country, you can argue that nothing else should be done, or you can argue that it should be done. How do you decide? I believe we have to ask ourselves: What should be the role of the Federal Government? My view is, when you move beyond national defense, our role ought to be to focus on problems that are national in scope, but if they have to be dealt with at the local level we should focus on helping individuals and families make the most of their own lives or enabling communities to address these challenges.

Now, the reason I have favored continued Federal funding of the arts is that once you get out of the really big cities where there is a massive amount of wealth and a huge population base to attract the orchestra, the art gallery, the you-name-it, once you get out of that where they don't have a big population base, isn't it still a good thing nationally for people in small rural towns in north Arkansas or northern New Hampshire to have a traveling artist or to hear musicians directly or to be exposed to these things? I think it is. It's a tiny part of our national budget.

So what I have proposed is sort of a split in your position and theirs. I said, we can't increase this right now until we get the deficit under control. So let's just flat-fund it, but let's keep it flat for several years so at least we can tell the local arts council in Merrimack, okay, this is what New Hampshire will get next year, the year after, and the year after, and you can plan accordingly. And that's what I hope we

will do, and I think there's a fair chance that's what will happen.

Q. I understand, Mr. President, that only 68 cents per family, per year, is spent on the arts by the Federal Government?

The President. That's right. Most of your money—let me just say where most of the money goes. Most of the money goes to Social Security, national defense, Medicare, interest on the debt, you know, from accumulated debt. In the past, we quadrupled the debt in the 12 years before I became President. If we didn't have to make interest payments on the debt that was run up in the 12 years before I took office, the Federal budget would be in surplus today—not balanced, in surplus. So we've got to get the deficit down. You've got to get the debt down, because otherwise the interest payments eat you alive, just like your home mortgage payments or anything else.

Those things are the lion's share of the budget. Everything else you think about being in the Federal budget—I mean, the national parks, the highway system, you name it, everything else, the Labor Department, small business—is only about a third of the budget, actually, slightly less. So you're right, the arts funding, it's quite small.

[*A participant thanked the SBA for helping her business become a success.*]

The President. Tell them a little about your company. This illustrates another point I've been out here on the stump making in New Hampshire and around the country. There is still a huge debate in Washington that I believe we should have resolved by now about whether you can grow the economy without hurting the environment. There are a lot of people who still assert that you have to have a certain amount of environmental degradation to have an acceptable amount of job creation.

I think you can argue that your business is good for the environment, right? Because what you're doing here is you're recycling, you're repairing, you're minimizing the use of raw resources. I think that—my own view is that in the United States and every other advanced country in the world, we have to find ways to try to grow the economy while we nourish the environment. That's what her business is about. So just give them a couple of minutes about that. I think that's important.

[*The participant described her company, which produced tote bags made of natural materials to replace plastic bags which would otherwise go to landfills. She then asked if welfare could be reformed in a way to provide the semiskilled and unskilled workers needed for her business.*]

The President. I agree with that. Let me give you one—first of all, now that the New Hampshire unemployment rate is down to about 3.2 percent, all the economists say that at any given time in a country like ours 3 percent of the people will be walking around somewhere. That will be—you know, they'll be moving home with their parents, they'll be moving to another State, something will be happening.

So when you get an economy down to 3 percent or a little below—there are two or three States that have unemployment rates below 3 percent, but it's very difficult to get below 3 percent, so the labor markets get very tight. So then the question is, how do you move people from welfare into the work force? I think the rules have to be changed to put time limits on welfare for anybody that can go to work that has access to a job. I think they are entitled to some support. I think that the problem is, if you take a job and you have very low wages and there is nobody giving you any child care help, you may actually lose ground. Or if your child loses Medicaid health insurance coverage because you go to work, that's tough.

But one of the things that—this started in Oregon—we have given 50 experiments freedom from Federal rules and regulations in 35 States to try to move people from welfare to work. One of the things that I think all of the low unemployment States should consider doing is what Oregon has done. We gave them permission to do this. They have the right to take the cash value of the monthly welfare check and the food stamps and give it to the employer for 6 to 9 months as an income supplement to hire people off welfare. So people have to work for the money. They're going to get the money anyway, but now they have to go to work for it, and it's recycled through the employer.

You have to give them, I think, a little more than that. But you would have to anyway just to meet the minimum wage requirements. But still, it's a subsidy that you get for 6 to 9 months, than you can decide whether to keep the employee or not. But then by that time,

the employee's acquired work experience, the confidence of going to work every day, something you can put on a resume. And I think it is probably the quickest, easiest way to move people from welfare to work in areas that have low unemployment.

In areas with high unemployment it won't work, and people would be upset because they'd be, you know, you'd be picking employees over another. But once the unemployment rate gets pretty low in a given area, I think it's one thing that would really make a huge difference. And I think we've got four or five States that are trying it now, and I'm trying to urge everybody to do it. When I spoke in Vermont last year, I spoke to the Governors, and I said, there are five things that if you will do with your welfare proposal, these five things will give you immediate approval. And that's one of the things that I'd like to see done. And that would give small-business people like you the opportunity to deal one-on-one with people who are moving from welfare to work, you'd be able to teach them things about the work force, you'd be able to—you know, even if at the end of the period you decided you couldn't keep them, it could make a big difference in their lives. So that's one of the things.

And if the version—if what I'm asking the Congress to do or some variation thereof passes in welfare reform legislation, then the States would automatically be able to do this. They wouldn't even have to ask us for permission. I wish they didn't today, but under the present law they have to.

[*A participant explained that one of her employees, who was an unwed teen mother, was told that she had to go on welfare in order to receive health insurance for her baby. She asked if the programs could be split.*]

The President. Yes. As a matter of fact, this is—ironically, again, these are just glitches in the law. That's why I'm trying to pass a law, because otherwise you have to do it State by State. If that same woman had gone on welfare for 30 days and then come to work for you, she could have kept her Medicaid for, depending on what the State does here, but for a minimum of 9 months, a transitional period, because we never want to discourage anybody.

You can't ask anybody to hurt their children. In the perverse world we live in, a lot of small-business people can't afford health insurance. So if you're on welfare, your kid has Medicaid. And then if you go to work, you lose the health insurance for your kids, and if you make $4.25 an hour—which is what the minimum wage is, I think it should be higher, but there it is—and your child gets sick and you don't have health insurance, then all of a sudden your income is much lower than it was if you were idle.

So under the law now, that young woman, had she drawn one welfare check, could have then come to work for you and in every State gotten to keep that Medicaid coverage for her children for some time, for her child for some time, and in some States over a year.

So what we're trying to do is—let me just give you—one of the things that we could give a State permission to do is to let someone immediately go to—you're the first person who has ever told me about this incident; I've never heard this example before—but we could give, easily give the State permission to just tell people like you, you can hire them before they ever have to go on welfare, but if they would have been on welfare otherwise, maybe their income level, we'll deem their income level to be what it would have been and for a few months they can be covered. If our welfare reform legislation passes, then the Federal Government would be out of that and the State could just make a decision to do it, which is what I would like to see happen.

The real problem in all this welfare business is—besides developing sort of the self-esteem and sense of responsibility of people on welfare—most people on welfare would like to work, and most people on welfare are not better off financially not working. The problem is that welfare, real welfare payments in almost every State in America are lower in terms of what they'll buy than they were 20 years ago. Welfare, per se, is not a good deal. What helps you is the Medicaid for your kids and the fact that if you're home you don't have to hire anybody to do child care.

Those are the big barriers to moving people from welfare to work. And if we can overcome them, if we could have very tough requirements requiring people to work if they want to get any help, I think that's what we ought to do. But I see all your employees have got their kids here today; what we want for America is for everybody to be successful as a parent and successful in the workplace. And we don't want

people to have to choose one over the other. We want people to succeed at home—that's the most important job any of us have—and to succeed in the workplace.

[*A participant stated the need for a program that would allow minimum wage employees to work and have child care.*]

The President. Let me just make a suggestion, all of you in this. This is something that you might—you don't have to have a specific answer, but if you feel this way and if the small-business community in New Hampshire feels this way, one thing you could do is just write your Senators and your Members of Congress and tell them that. Because we're having two debates over tax cuts in Washington. One is: How big a tax cut can you afford if your first job is to balance the budget? But the second is: Let's assume we agreed on how much we could afford; what kind of tax cut is best?

My belief is that the best kind of tax cut is the kind that helps people raise their children or educate them, or that helps businesses deal with the family-based problems or the education problems they have with their own employees. So I would—for example, I'd be more than happy to have a really significant increase in the financial incentives we give to small businesses to help their employees with child care. And I think most families with children would be better off having a tax deduction for the cost of sending their kids to college than having what would be a much smaller across-the-board tax cut. But these are the decisions that we have to kind of grapple with.

And let me give you another example. The White House Conference on Small Business said we ought to do something to make it cheaper and easier for smaller businesses to take out pension plans for themselves and their employees. So we've got a bill in Congress now that would make it possible for businesses with 5, 10, 6, 15 employees less expensive and more reliable to take out pension plans for the owners and the employees.

These are the kinds of things we're going to have to do if more and more jobs are going to be created by you and more and more jobs are going to be abolished by big companies. Because big companies could do this on their own: They could have good health care, they could have a good pension, they could have continued education benefits. But people will still need them if they go to smaller companies. So if the big companies aren't going to be there to aggregate the money, then the Government has to come in and help give some incentive or support to small business to do the same thing.

[*A participant suggested a low cost loan fund to help textile businesses adversely affected by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).*]

The President. You know, first of all, I'll look and see what the possibility of that is. That's a good idea.

NAFTA was the first trade agreement ever that actually required any country to meet certain labor standards or environmental standards. And one of the—we have slowed down some of the compliance with NAFTA, like on truck safety and all, because we think it's so important to see that these standards are met. And in fairness, they are very difficult to impose and enforce, as you know. I honestly believe that it's a good idea. I don't think we should be subsidizing people to live substandard lives there. What we want them to do is to raise—lift our standard of living.

[*A participant asked that the American workers get a fair share under NAFTA.*]

The President. Thanks. [*Applause*] Yeah, give him a hand.

Q. We are big supporters of you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

Q. So you are not going to lose our vote over this, but we think it's a critical issue.

The President. Thank you. I appreciate that.

[*A participant discussed problems that small businesses incurred in paying taxes on projected profits from long-term manufacturing contracts.*]

The President. Let me ask you something. Could you write that up for me, or have you written it up for me? I would be glad to look into that. [*Laughter*] You know exactly what happened. What happened was they had all these big companies with multiple, multiyear contracts so they were always rolling their costs over to look like they were complying with this contract and that one and the other one, and never paying the taxes on the profits they were earning.

Q. I understand, and that door should have been slammed shut, and I'm glad to see that it was.

The President. But what we ought to be able to do is to say that, at least in the years when you realize no net gain, in the early years of a contract, you shouldn't be subject to taxation.

[*The participant stated that when his business incurred 50 percent of its costs, it had to pay 50 percent of the tax on 50 percent of profit that was years away.*]

The President. That's why people want to change the tax system. That's good. Thank you.

Let me ask you a general question, if I might, and get you to comment on it. When I was here in 1992, the biggest problem small businesses were having was that all the banks were shutting down, so nobody was making any loans. And you didn't have any bank failures last year, and that's good.

One of the reasons we really tried to turn up the capacity of the SBA to make loans is, we were afraid as the banks worked their way out of the last recession, with the particular impact it had on the banking industry, and more in New England than almost any other place in the country, if we could find a way to give more SBA loans and—even while doing our part to cut the costs of Government, that would make a real difference.

We also were asked to do two other things. One was to increase the expensing provision. I'd be interested to know if it has benefited any of you. You know, we—the expensing provision when I took office gave you the right to expense $10,000, now it's up to $17,500. The NFIB asked for $25,000, and I tried to get that in '93, and I think that may well come out of this present tax law. Would that make a difference to you? Is that an important part of the Tax Code as far as you're concerned?

Is the bank loan situation now measurably better than it was in 1992, and if not, what else can we do about it? I'd like to ask those two questions.

[*A participant stated that the bank loan situation had improved and agreed that expensing would make a big difference.*]

The President. But it has—when we write——

Q. It hasn't yet——

The President. ——17, you haven't felt it?

Q. No, not just filing taxes—I mean——

The President. So you wouldn't—under the old system?

Q. Right.

The President. But for you, it's not enough money to make any difference, is it?

Q. For me, no. It's not.

The President. It's too small to make any difference one way or the other, isn't it?

Q. What I found—definitely the banking industry is changed. And I'd just like to say one thing that I think we can forget is, SBA isn't a handout. We're paying back our loans.

The President. Absolutely.

Q. And we're keeping people employed to pay taxes and that type of thing, where without the SBA a lot of jobs could be lost and that type of thing. So I don't, you know, I just hope it's not a handout type thing.

The President. Yes. I think the taxpayers, including the taxpayers in this room, should know that at any given time nationwide we have under 10 percent of our loans in arrears and ultimate failures are under 1½ percent. So our record at the SBA for making loans that default is about the same as any conservative bank in America. But we take a chance on people with a new idea that can't quite get there.

Pat, what were you going to say?

[*Mr. McGowan stated that SBA had increased the number of loans to women-owned businesses in that region. A participant then praised the Boston SBA office for increased productivity with a reduced work force.*]

The President. You know, when I tell people that the Federal work force is over 200,000 smaller than it used to be—just folks, you know. When I go home and tell people that, they have a hard time believing it. But the reason is—there are two reasons for that. One is, we had the money to give humane severance programs to the people who left the Federal employment. That is, we gave them good early retirement packages or good early-out packages and time to work out a new education program or a new line of work.

The other reason is that the people that are left are doing a better job. I mean, there's a dramatic increase in productivity of these Federal workers that are left. And I know it kind of contradicts a lot of people's preconception about the Government, but I think it's interesting that you can cut the Federal work force that much and literally nobody knows it hap-

pened because there's been no undermining of the quality of service that these Federal employees have given. I think it's really—and I thank you for saying that about it.

[*A participant suggested a tax incentive for something other than a fixed asset, such as payroll taxes.*]

The President. Let me just say, that's an interesting point. Small-business people in America, particularly when they first start, is the only economic unit that's in the same position as most American families are; most American families now pay more tax on the payroll than they do on the income tax. And the problem with the payroll tax is you have to pay it whether you make any money or not.

Now, since it supports the Social Security system that, no matter what they tell you, is still solvent until the year 2019—we are going to have to make some changes in Social Security for when the people my age, the big baby boomer generation, retires because you'll have fewer people working and more people drawing. But we have to have some mechanism of keeping the system funded—but it really—I think that's a good point because the payroll tax is something—since you have to pay it whether you make any money or not is an extraordinary burden on both a lot of middle class families and small businesses.

Q. Mr. President, we want to thank you for coming here and sitting with this forum today. Tony has probably got another shift coming in the door here in a little bit, but we want to thank you for listening to the issues, and it's been a great opportunity.

The President. Let me say too, I thank all of you for your support of the SBA. I thank you, Pat, and Administrator Phil Lader and his predecessor Erskine Bowles. I put two people in charge of the SBA; one of them, Erskine Bowles, spent 20 years starting small businesses—it occurred to me that for a change we ought to have somebody in there that had actually done that—and then Mr. Lader has spent most of his life running them. And it makes a big difference if you have people that have actually lived with this and know what they're doing. I'm very proud of them and all the people that work at SBA. I thank you for your support. It looks to me like from your example that's money well spent.

Thank you. Thank you all.

NOTE: The roundtable discussion began at 1:40 p.m. at the New Hampshire Hydraulics Co. In his remarks, the President referred to the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB).

Remarks in Manchester, New Hampshire, on the Death of an American Soldier in Bosnia

February 3, 1996

I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of an American soldier this morning in Bosnia. This is the first fatality suffered by American service personnel in Operation Joint Endeavor. Hillary and I join all Americans in extending our deepest sympathies to his family and his friends. Our prayers are with you this afternoon and so is the pride of the Nation, for he gave his life in the noblest of causes, the search for peace.

I have been clear since before this operation began that our mission to secure peace in Bosnia would entail some risks. We have done everything we could to minimize those risks, and all Americans should know that we have provided our troops with the best training, the best equipment, to confront the challenges they face in Bosnia, and they are very well-led in a careful implementation of their mission. We will continue to take every precaution we can to protect our troops as they work to secure an enduring peace in Bosnia. And all of our troops should know that today our thoughts and our sincere gratitude are with them, especially on this difficult day.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:30 p.m. at the Manchester airport. In his remarks, he referred to Sfc. Donald A. Dugan, USA.

Statement on the Death of Donald A. Dugan
February 3, 1996

I deeply regret the death today in Bosnia of an American soldier who was killed this morning when he stepped on a landmine. This is the first fatality that U.S. forces have suffered in Operation Joint Endeavor.

Hillary and I join all Americans in extending our deepest sympathies to his family. They should know that he died in the noblest of causes, the pursuit of peace.

Since before Operation Joint Endeavor began, I have said it entails real risks. But our commanders have provided our troops with the finest training and equipment to confront the challenges in Bosnia. We will continue to take every precaution to protect American troops as they continue to perform this critical mission of securing an enduring peace in Bosnia.

Remarks at the National Governors' Association Dinner
February 4, 1996

Good evening. Governor and Mrs. Thompson, Governor and Mrs. Miller, ladies and gentlemen, welcome back to the White House. It's always a delight to have all of you here. I look forward to it every year, but I especially look forward to it this year.

As all of you know, we are living through a time of enormous change and great opportunity. I rather think the Founding Fathers would enjoy what is going on here today because we are debating a lot of first principles of American government: what should government do, which level of government should do it, what are our ultimate objectives. These are questions that Governors live with in a very practical and immediate way every single day. And they are questions that, frankly, I have relished being a part of this public debate in America.

We are obviously moving into a time that is very different from any the American people have ever lived in before. Our economy is changing. We are now clearly in a global village that will be dominated for the rest of our lifetimes by information and technology. That requires certain changes in government as well.

I believed when I came here, and I believe more strongly today, that the great questions before us are how we can make the American dream available to all Americans who are willing to work for it, how we can come together to deal with our challenges and our problems as one community amidst all our diversity, and how we can maintain the leadership of our great country for peace and freedom throughout the world.

We have many challenges, and I tried to deal with those at some length in the State of the Union Address. One of our greatest challenges is to give the American people a Government that commands their confidence and that does its part in meeting our common problems. We have reduced the size of the Government in the last 3 years; it's now as small as it was in 1965. Next year it will be as small as it was when President Kennedy was living in this house. We have also given an unprecedented amount of power back to State and local governments and to individual citizens. We are about to do some more of that. And that is obviously what you are here to work on and try to reach common agreement among yourselves first, and then with the leaders of Congress and the White House. I am looking forward to this.

The thing I wish more of our citizens knew is how hard we are working to do the right thing over great issues of high principle. This is not a normal political debate. It is a profoundly important discussion of the direction our country will take and what all our responsibilities will be in seeing that that direction is achieved in a way that benefits all the American people.

I am looking forward to our discussion tomorrow morning, to all the times that we have together, and I know that all the members of the Cabinet and the White House are as well.

To each and every one of you who has participated in trying to formulate the new policies and trying to reach across partisan and other divisions to reach common ground, I thank you again for that. To each and every one of you who has had a good working partnership with our administration, I thank you for that.

I look forward to further progress. I do believe that the American people are now living and will move into a future which is characterized by greater possibilities for more people than have ever lived in this society. And what we have to do is to make sure that we can go forward together and that every single one of our citizens who is willing to do what it takes can realize those possibilities in his or her own life and that all of our children, without regard to their race, their income, their region, their station in life, have a chance to be a living embodiment of the American dream.

If we keep that as our goal we can bridge our differences. And when we leave here, and when the work of this year is done, we will be much better prepared to reap the benefits of that age of possibility. It is in that spirit that I ask you all to stand now as I offer a toast to Governor and Mrs. Thompson and to all the Governors and their spouses and to our beloved United States.

[*Following the President's toast, the dinner, and the entertainment, the President spoke again. His remarks were joined in progress.*]

The President. ——Gary Morris, thank you, Gary Hooker. We are doubly blessed tonight that Gary joined us because he just got married, and he's still here. And his wife, Elizabeth, is here. Thank you for coming. Please stand up. This man has a great gift, and I'm so glad he shared it with us tonight.

You're all welcome to stay awhile; music will be out in the foyer. It's been a wonderful evening for Hillary and for me. And again, you're welcome, and I look forward to seeing you tomorrow.

Thank you. Thanks again, it was great.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:57 p.m. on the State Floor at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to chairman of the National Governors' Association Gov. Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin and his wife, Sue Ann, and vice chairman Gov. Bob Miller of Nevada and his wife, Sandy; singer Gary Morris; and musician Gary Hooker.

Remarks Prior to a Roundtable Discussion With the National Governors' Association

February 5, 1996

Good morning. Governor Thompson, Governor Miller, to all the Governors, welcome back to the White House and back to Washington for the annual meeting of the NGA. I know that you have been working very hard in a bipartisan fashion to try to reach agreement on a number of issues that are important to your people and to us here in Washington, including Medicaid and welfare, issues of education and training, and I look forward to discussing those.

I do want to say that all these issues have to be seen in light of the most important issue still facing us here today, and that is the Federal budget. As required by law, today I am submitting to Congress my proposed budget for fiscal year 1997. It balances the budget in 7 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office's economic estimates. I want the Governors now to work with us to balance this budget, and I am very hopeful that we can achieve a balanced budget this year.

The plan I propose cuts hundreds of programs, continues our efforts to downsize the Government, but it protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment and cuts taxes for working families. It reforms welfare and addresses our challenges to renew schools, provide economic security, and preserve the environment with the initiatives that I announced in the State of the Union, including those on the environment and the educational initiatives of a $10,000 deduction for college tuition, more merit scholarships, and a million young people able to work their way through college in work-

study. It includes the health care reforms that have historically received bipartisan support in the Congress, including requirements that people can't be cut off their insurance when they change jobs or when someone in the family gets sick.

As you know, the Republican congressional leadership and I have spent many months discussing this budget. We have spent well over 50 hours together in small meetings. Now, in common, our plans have $700 billion in specific spending cuts. That is more than enough to balance the budget in 7 years and to provide a modest tax cut. I hope we can set aside partisanship and divisions, as you often do in the NGA, and provide a balanced budget plan to the American people in the near future.

You know how important this is. You have seen some of what happens when we have Government by continuing resolution. It really leads to irresolution. We have Head Start programs all over the country now staggering from month to month, school boards across the country actually planning for some layoffs because we do not have a final budget passed by the Congress.

I know you all have a stake in resolving this matter. I know we're going to discuss at least two issues today that if they could be resolved would help us to pass a balanced budget. And I am looking forward to it, the discussion of Medicaid, which I would like to say just a few words about—more when our private discussion starts. We want to restrain the cost of Medicaid. Our budget proposal has a rate of increase for Medicaid which is far below the projected rate of increase of overall health care costs. We know to achieve this we have to give the States far greater flexibility on how Medicaid will work. We also know, in this administration, that we must maintain a commitment, a national commitment, to seniors, to pregnant women, to poor children, to people with disabilities, that they will receive the quality health care they are now receiving.

Second, I believe we're close, Congress and I, to an agreement on sweeping welfare reform that is very consistent with what the Governors have advocated for years. It would reward work, require family and responsibility strengthening. It would advance the values of the United States instead of undermining them. I know that you have some new proposals on that today, and I look forward to hearing them. I do believe we're quite close on welfare reform with the Congress. I do believe it is terribly important, and I hope we can do it, again, just in the next few weeks.

Third, I hope we have a chance to discuss how we should overhaul our Nation's job training system. More and more business leaders I speak with around the country tell me that they believe that in order to break this cycle of stagnant wages and job insecurity that is gripping about half our work force, we are going to have to do more to upgrade the skills of the existing work force. We're going to have to do it in a more innovative way. The "GI bill" for America's workers that I proposed would provide a collapsing of these scores of Government training programs the Federal Government has into a voucher that workers could receive directly and take to their local community college or other approved institution. I know we have some differences of opinion on that, but I do believe that in this case people are most likely to know their own best interests as long as they are protected from fly-by-night operations by our common endeavors.

At any rate, it is clear to me that unless we do something substantial to upgrade the skills of the existing work force, it's going to be difficult for them to break out of the cycle of stagnant wages and job insecurity that has prevented a large number of American families from enjoying the economic recovery that our country has had for the last few years.

Now finally, let me say something that I think we can all agree on. This is President Reagan's 85th birthday. They're having a big party in California. And I think every American citizen, and I know every American Governor, will join the Vice President and me in wishing him a very happy birthday and sending our best wishes to his entire family.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the Comprehensive Trade and Development Policy for Africa
February 5, 1996

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am pleased to submit the first of five annual reports on the Administration's Comprehensive Trade and Development Policy for Africa as required by section 134 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

This first report examines the trade and development challenges confronting Sub-Saharan Africa, reviews the policies currently being pursued to address those challenges, and presents a policy framework for the United States as it seeks to support and facilitate African initiatives to address these challenges. With this first report, it is my intention to open a wider dialogue with the Congress, and with public and private sector representatives in Africa and the United States. This dialogue will sharpen the focus of the U.S. role in assisting Africa to meet its development challenges and, in the process, to promote U.S. trade and investment in the region. Subsequent reports to the Congress will highlight progress in implementing new initiatives and reflect the necessary evolution of U.S. policy.

The challenges facing Sub-Saharan Africa are difficult and varied. Solutions will not be easy or quick. The most critical element of any development strategy, upon which the success of all other elements depends, is the willingness of the people and their leaders to make the correct, and often difficult, policy choices. It is this point that gives us cause for optimism about Africa today. Increasingly, democratic governments in Africa are implementing market-based economic policies that are placing their countries on proven paths to success.

We must seize this opportunity for partnership with the countries of Africa because promoting trade and sustainable development in Africa is important for the United States as well as for Africa.

My Administration understands that, in a time of shrinking Federal funding, any strategy to support trade and development in Sub-Saharan Africa will need to rely heavily on increased U.S. commercial involvement in the region. American firms and workers stand to gain a great deal by doing business in Africa. By playing an active role, both in direct commercial relations in the region and in cooperation with the United States Government, the private sector will generate significant benefits for themselves and for the United States and Sub-Saharan Africa as a whole.

I invite the Congress to work closely with my Administration in forging a constructive partnership with the people and leaders of Sub-Saharan Africa to pursue the trade and development objectives that are so clearly in our mutual interests. The people of the United States have a vested interest in Africa's future, and I hope that this report will mark the first step toward a closer dialogue between the Administration and the Congress on this important issue.

I am also pleased to transmit the report prepared by the United States International Trade Commission that my Administration requested on U.S.-African trade and investment flows and the potential for growth.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; William Roth, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, House Committee on International Relations; and Bill Archer, chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means.

Remarks at the Democratic Governors Association Dinner
February 5, 1996

Thank you. Thank you for that wonderful welcome. Governor Caperton, thank you for that wonderful introduction. When he started all that business about Jefferson and Truman, I turned around to the guy next to me, I said, "Who's he introducing now?" [*Laughter*] I'm very grateful to you for your friendship. Thank you, Governor Dean and Governor Carnahan, the immediate past chairman; and all of my fellow Governors; and my colleagues, former Governors who are here tonight; to all the officers of the DGA and those of you who work so hard for them, Mark Weiner, Katie Whelan, and the other members of the staff; and most of all to all of you who have come here to support them. I thank you for being here, and I thank you for your support for the Democratic Governors.

If tonight's dinner and its success is any indication, after the 1996 election there will be more than 19 people standing up on this stage. And let me just say, while there will be a great deal of focus in this election year on the President's race, as there should be, there will be a great deal of focus in this election year on the races for Congress, as there should be. And I hope and believe we will make some real progress there.

Remember that no matter what happens, there is an inexorable move to push more basic jobs of the public back to the State level. And if that is so, it matters more than ever before who is the Governor of each and every American State. And I can tell you, given the responsibilities the Governors will have for the foreseeable future, it is more important than ever before that we elect good Democratic Governors to the statehouses all across this country.

It was so cold in Washington for these last 2 weeks, I had to have a break last weekend, so I went to New Hampshire. [*Laughter*] Well, anyway, I got outside the Beltway. For those of you who live here, you'll be happy to know that I not only got a good dose of old-fashioned American values, I saw in action the fine art of snow removal, and I—[*laughter*]

To be fair to the people here in Washington, DC, who have that responsibility, Washington is still viewed by many people as sort of a Southern city. I mean, we have a half-inch snow, they close every school within 50 miles. [*Laughter*] And the kids like it, but it's not so great for the economy.

Let me tell you, I also saw some very encouraging signs in New Hampshire that have more to do with what I want to visit with you about tonight. When I went back to New Hampshire, a place where I made 75 scheduled appearances between January 1st and February 18th, 1992, and countless unscheduled ones, I was profoundly moved to see the number of people who would still come out to an event where you just tried to talk sense and deal with the real challenges before the American people, people who did not want a 30-second sound bite and were tired of negative ads.

We had an event in New Hampshire surrounding the administration's community policing initiative, showing what happens when people in a neighborhood that had been riddled by crime and drugs and gangs decided to take their streets back and had some help from community policemen who had a little office in the neighborhood and rode bicycles and knew the schoolchildren by their names. We saw people telling us that they could walk the streets at night again for the first time in years, and they didn't worry about the safety of their children anymore. And they knew that there was a connection between what we do in Washington and what happens on their streets, in their neighborhoods, and in the lives of their children.

We saw a great State school-to-work program where we got all these people together, and they understood that you didn't have to have a big Government program to have the National Government play a helping hand in bringing employers and schools together so that young people could understand that in the world we're living in there can no longer be an artificial division between the world of work and the world of learning and that they had to be brought together.

I visited a fine company that, among other things, makes some defense equipment we use on Marine One, my helicopter, and other aircraft in the United States military fleet, and works on civilian communications satellites,

bringing young women into this business so that they would understand that engineering is not just a job for boys but girls could aspire to be engineers as well.

I went to a school in Concord, New Hampshire, that is on the site of a church where in 1788 the delegates from New Hampshire became the decisive ninth State to ratify the Constitution of the United States and to make this one United States of America. And on that very spot, this school, which now has an overwhelmingly moderate- to low-income student body, an elementary school—an elementary school was, along with all the other schoolrooms in the city of Concord, hooked up to the Internet. They showed me how they were putting out a newspaper, these fifth and sixth graders; they were selling ads for the newspaper; they wrote the editorials and the news stories, that it was so popular they had converted it from a school newspaper to a community newspaper, and they were circulating it in the entire area of their city from which they had any students, and they now had gotten themselves a home page on the Web for their elementary newspaper. And I saw how business people had loaned them or given them computer equipment so that even the poorest kids could take something home at night and work with their parents and show them what they were doing—partnerships, solving problems, meeting the demands of today and tomorrow.

I met with a lot of small-business people who 4 years ago when I was there couldn't get loans. And each and every one of them had been helped at least once by a Small Business Administration that in this Democratic administration has cut its budget by 40 percent and doubled its loan volume and increased its loans to women businesses by 80 percent, to minority business by two-thirds, and is the best SBA in the history of this country.

I say that because I found that the people there, as always, are conservative, prudent, discriminating, but more and more are interested in real conversations about how we're going to take advantage of these opportunities before us and how we're going to meet our challenges. And they understand that the choice is not the one that we have been shoveled up in election after election after election. It's not some big argument about big Government versus small Government or the horrors of the Government against the joys of the market. The real choice is whether we are going to meet our challenges together or go back to a time when everybody was left to fend for himself or herself.

I would remind you that the whole reason the American people started to live together in communities is because they knew they could do things together they could never do alone. Whenever we work as a team as a country, we do well. This country has never, ever been defeated by any problem abroad or within when we work together. Our only defeats come when we permit ourselves to be divided—when we permit ourselves to be divided. Therefore, we must reject any political message that says, "Vote for me because I'll make you so miserable you will be divided; you will put me in, but I will divide your country." We must say no to that.

After 3 years of working here for you and the American people, doing everything I could every day not only to help advance the cause of our country and its people but also trying to come to grips with the phenomenal changes that are going on in American life, that is the single, simple lesson I bring to you tonight, that you can determine—every single thing we have done is to help the American people make the most of their own lives and work together to solve their problems. That is the great issue of the present day.

This is, to be sure, as I said in the State of the Union, a great age of possibility. Most of us have benefited from it. Otherwise we wouldn't be able to afford to be here tonight. And it is literally true that there has never been a time in the history of our country or the world when there were so many different opportunities for so many different kinds of people to live out their own dreams and to bring their God-given capabilities to fruition. And that is the great joy of this time.

It is also true that, as with any time of great change, there is a lot of uprooting, a lot of upheaval, a lot of uncertainty. There is increasing inequality in income. There is stagnation of wages for those who are not able to take advantage of the age of possibility. There is greater insecurity among millions of working people. And it exists side by side with the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years, highest homeownership in 15 years, an all-time high in trade, an all-time high in new business formation, an all-time high in each of the last 3 years in new, self-made millionaires,

not people who inherited it but people who took advantage of the opportunities this country affords to make it.

And the great challenge we have today is to keep the good things going, to keep the dynamism of our country working in a way that will make us stronger, but to do it in a way that extends the American dream of opportunity for all the American people and that pulls our country together. You can be proud of the work that Democrats did in Washington to cut this deficit in half in the last 3 years.

I met with the Secretary of Agriculture today and—as I try to do from time to time to keep up with how things are going on the farm—and I won't bore you with all the details, and some of you, it may not mean much to you, but corn is at $3.60, wheat is at a 15-year high, and soybeans are at an 18-year high because we have opened new markets for American agriculture all over the world. You can be proud of that kind of thing.

You can be proud of the fact that we have almost 8 million new jobs and a million of them in automobiles and construction alone. You can be proud of the fact that your country has been able to be a leading force in the world for peace and freedom and democracy, from the Middle East to Haiti to Northern Ireland to Bosnia. You can be proud of the fact that the welfare rolls, the food stamp rolls, the poverty rolls, the teen pregnancy rolls, they're all down. You can be proud of that. The crime rate is down. You can be proud of that.

But you also must know that because of the way work is changing so that more and more work is dependent upon information and technology and knowledge and not just what you know but your ability to continue to learn throughout a lifetime, because the nature of the workplace is changing as productivity gains that are unimaginable permit large, centralized bureaucracies and almost mandate them to slim down so that more and more jobs are being created in smaller units and bigger units are doing more with fewer and fewer people. And the nature of the markets are changing, the financial markets and the world markets for goods and services. All these things have caused the upheavals that have caused the anxiety that many American working families feel to exist right alongside of all this good news.

As Democrats we know in our bones that what makes this country great is our ability to hold out the promise of opportunity for everyone who is willing to work for it. And it is our understanding that when we all do well together, each of us individually does better than we otherwise would do; to understand that it is important to support families and childrearing, but that when all of our families do better it helps our family to be stronger.

And so I say again, the central question facing us is no longer big Government or small Government. There is no more big Government. This Government's the smallest it's been since 1965, and by the end of this year, it will be the smallest since the Kennedy administration.

And it cannot be that Government is bad and the market is good because we see now from what's happening to so many of our fellow Americans that the market is a wonderful thing, but it certainly doesn't solve all problems, and it creates some as it changes. We know that as well.

So what we have to do is to ask ourselves, what is it that we are going to do as Democrats to stand for the proposition that we believe in work and family and the future, we believe in opportunity and responsibility, and we know we have to do it as one community. That is what I tried to address in the State of the Union. That is the challenge I leave you tonight.

We clearly have to follow policies that will strengthen our families and raise our children better. We clearly have to do something to address this gnawing economic security. And we must begin by dealing with the conditions of changed work. We have to give people access to a lifetime of education immediately when they need it. We have to make sure that everybody can afford to buy health insurance and they don't lose it when they change jobs or when someone in the family gets sick. We have to make sure that people can get a pension and they can carry it around with them if they're going to change jobs five or six times. We have to make sure that working families have access to decent health care so they can succeed at work and at home.

And if we want to, by the way, reform the welfare system, we have to make sure that we're going to have people succeed as independent workers and good parents. You can't be forced to make a choice in this country. If we have to choose between being good workers or good parents, the country will lose either way. It has to be both. And we can only solve this together.

For all the progress we've made in bringing the crime rate down—I talked to the mayor of my capital city and Governor Tucker's capital city the other day, and he was saying they had the lowest crime rate in 8 years there, and it was dropping like a rock because of community policing. For all of that, you and I know that this is still a country with inexcusable and unacceptable levels of crime and violence. And a big part of people's insecurity is the feeling that they are not free as Americans if they can't walk the streets, if they worry about their children, if they worry about their security in their homes. And I tell you, the Democratic Party must be on the cutting edge of this until we reach our real goal. And our real goal should be to return to the time when crime is the exception, not the rule. That should be the goal in the United States.

The other great domestic challenge we face is to finally break this idea which still has too much of a hold on people here in Washington, that the only way we can grow the economy is to sacrifice the environment. The truth is, if you look at all the information, from brownfields in our inner cities, to cryptosporidium in the water supply of some of our cities, to the problems we had with *E. coli* in the Pacific Northwest, to what everybody knows global warming is doing now, which is making our winters worse, as well as our temperature hotter in the summer, we cannot sustain a strong and growing economy unless we find a way to do it while enhancing the quality of the environment, and the Democrats ought to take the lead in promoting that idea.

And finally, let me say I know that it isn't particularly popular to say, particularly at a time when people have so many of their own problems, but the United States must not withdraw from its world leadership. We must continue to be the world's leading force for peace and freedom, for democracy and prosperity.

The Secretary of Commerce is sitting out there. I don't want to embarrass him, but he is the finest Secretary of Commerce in my lifetime. But he would be the first to tell you that he could not take these trips and sell America's products and sell America's services and get investments for America all around the world if we were not perceived as being willing to lead the cause for peace and freedom, if we were not also working to continue to dismantle the nuclear threat until it doesn't exist anymore, to work with countries to end the threat of biological and chemical warfare, to work with countries to end the terrible scourge of these god-awful landmines that are in the millions in the ground, not just in Bosnia but Angola, in Cambodia, and throughout the world. We have to do that.

You may think it shouldn't be that way, but that is the way it is. Maybe there will come a time in the next few years when regional associations of freedom-loving people will be able to solve all their problems, and we'll just have to carry our own little bit of the load. But for now, people look to the United States.

And if you believe that it matters, then I ask you to understand that we have to make difficult decisions still, and we have to invest some money still in our leadership for these causes. Our economic strategy is working in part because it is going hand in glove with our commitment to peace and freedom and democracy. And we cannot afford to walk away.

And finally, let me say, all of these challenges to be met will require us to generate a higher level of trust and confidence and common sense and civility among our people as they relate to each other and to our governments.

So I end where I began. That's why it's so important who the Governors are. It's why it's so important what is done. We have shrunk the size of Government. We are getting rid of 16,000 of the 18,000 pages of regulations. We have done all that downsizing, and we will do some more.

More importantly, we have dramatically increased child support collections, and we've cut the default rate in student loans. And as I said, we doubled the SBA loan volume. And I could give you a lot of other examples. But in the end, our ability to succeed consists in our ability to readjust the responsibilities of the National Government with the States, with the localities, with the private sector, with individuals, and to build a new partnership for a new era.

Part of that is some changes we still have to make here, like campaign finance reform and the line item veto, which I'm sure this Congress will eventually give me. [*Laughter*] But a big part of it is learning to work together in a way that is affirmative, is positive, that lifts people up.

You know, when I go to other countries, if they're conversant with American politics, very often leaders of other countries will say to me,

"I frankly don't understand why people in America could be so negative feeling. Your unemployment rate is lower than ours. Your growth rate is higher. You have the lowest deficit in the world of any advanced country. All the rest of us look up to you."

Well, we have to pierce that cynicism, because cynicism in the end is a lousy excuse for inaction. It's a lousy justification for failure. It's a lousy explanation for disappointment in life. And I am convinced that if we Democrats go out there in 1996 with a commonsense, compassionate, intense commitment to the family, to the work, to the future of America, to the idea that the Government can play a role as a partner in creating more opportunity and people have to assume more responsibility, and to an uncompromising position that we must do this together—we have no intention of going back to the time when people were left to fend for themselves, because we believe the age of possibility is for all Americans—I believe that our efforts will be rewarded. They must be rewarded in the President's race and the races for Congress and in the races for the statehouses.

By being here tonight, you have shown that you believe this. My challenge to you is that it's a long time between now and November. Don't quit now. Go out and preach this message, and make sure it's clear what we stand for and what we're trying to do.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:12 p.m. at the Omni Shoreham Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to the following Democratic Governors Association officials: Gov. Gaston Caperton of West Virginia, chair; Gov. Howard Dean of Vermont, vice chair; Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri, former chair; Mark Weiner, treasurer; and Katie Whelan, executive director. He also referred to Mayor Jim Dailey of Little Rock, AR, and Gov. Jim Guy Tucker of Arkansas.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association Conference

February 6, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you, Governor Thompson, Governor Miller, fellow Governors and friends. It is always good to be back here, and I very much appreciate what you said, Governor Thompson. I must say, I also enjoyed standing outside in the hall and listening to the last three or four speakers discuss the last resolution. It made me homesick and proud that I once was a member of this body.

Let me begin, Governor, by congratulating you on the work that you have done on Medicaid, on welfare, and on a number of other issues. And let me also thank the lead Republican and Democratic Governors who worked on the Medicaid issue. I see you around this table. You were good enough to work with us in the White House to keep us up with what you were doing, to enter into intense discussions with us, and I'll have a little more to say about it in a minute. But this is, in any case, a very impressive accomplishment that all of you have voted for a new framework that will preserve the guarantee of health care coverage to the people who need it and give the States the flexibility they need to operate the program.

Let me also say, in general, this Governors' conference has, I think, been in the best tradition of the National Governors' Association, as people have worked together in good faith across party lines to find real solutions to real problems.

I'd also like to express my appreciation to Senator Dole for what he said earlier here today, and the genuine spirit of cooperation that he evidenced in his remarks, I must say, was also evidenced in the more than 50 hours we have spent together in discussing the budget. And, like him, I believe we will get a budget deal. I didn't like everything he said about wanting to spend some more time around the White House next year. [*Laughter.*] But then again, I was a little concerned the other night when Gary Morris was singing at the White House, and I discovered that Governor Thompson and Governor Engler and Governor Voinovich were checking out Al Gore's office. [*Laughter*] But it's good for America, this kind of competition.

I also want to say, Governor Branstad, I was encouraged to hear Senator Dole say he thought we'd get a farm bill pretty soon. We've got a 15-year high in wheat prices and about an 18-year high in bean prices, and corn is about 3.60. We need a farm bill, and we need to strike while the iron's hot so we can keep this going.

This has been a good meeting for you, and it's been a good day for me. And yesterday and the day before, when you were at the White House, were good days, because I always enjoy working with the Governors.

As I said at the dinner, I think the framers would be pleased by this great debate in which we are engaged in Washington and in which you are also engaged. It goes beyond the very important questions of what government should do in our society and what we should not do, to the question of which level of government should do certain things and how they should be done. This movement is part of the sweeping changes now going on in our society.

We see that the changes in how we work and live together in a world that is dominated by information technologies and the markets of the global village are changing the way everybody does business. And I'd like for you to take just a minute before we get back into the substance of the issues that you've been working on to step back and look at the context in which this debate is taking place.

We are living in a world that includes dramatic changes in the nature of work, principally defined by work becoming more and more identified by the content of ideas and information and less with physical labor. We have changes in the nature of work organizations: They're more flexible, they're less bureaucratic, and often they're smaller. It's interesting in that all the new businesses that have been created—new jobs that have been created in our country, for the last 15 years the Fortune 500 companies have reduced their aggregate employment in each of those years. In the last 3 years, however, small businesses owned by women alone have created more new jobs than the Fortune 500 has laid off—changes in the nature of work organizations.

And finally, there are dramatic changes in the nature of markets, both financial markets and markets for goods and services. They are more instantaneous in their movement and more worldwide in their scope.

Now, these changes have given our country, with a strong and diverse economy, what I called in the State of the Union a great new age of possibility. I believe that. I believe that more of our people will be able to live out their own dreams than ever before. But these changes have also done what fundamental changes always do. They have led to a great uprooting in the patterns of life and work in America. And there are new challenges to us to preserve the American dream for all citizens who are willing to work for it, to maintain our cherished values and our leadership for peace and freedom.

This is the context in which this debate should be viewed. Look at the economic picture. America in the last 3 years has almost 8 million new jobs, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years, a 15-year high in homeownership, an all-time high in exports, which has in large measure led to those high prices for farm products that I mentioned.

The auto industry leads the world again. We've had 700,000 new jobs in construction. We're number one in the manufacture of telecommunication satellites, and each of the last 3 years our people have set successive records for the formation of new businesses and for the creation of new self-made millionaires, not people who were given their money but people who made it with the opportunities that were there for them in this country.

This is a remarkable thing. But it is also remarkable that, for the first time in our history, all this occurred while more than half of the American people didn't get a raise and felt increasing insecurity about job loss or the loss of health care or pension benefits or the ability to educate their children.

Yesterday I had a conversation with an old friend of mine from a Western State who is a marvelously successful person now in his own right. And by pure accident of history, 40 years ago and more, he and his brother and I attended the same little brick grade school in my hometown in Arkansas. He's a terrific success; he's had a great life. His brother made a great success of his life, but at the age of 49, he has already been laid off twice from two different companies simply because the companies were bought by other companies, not because he was unproductive, not because there was something wrong with him, not because he didn't do what he was supposed to do in life.

The other day I got a letter from a friend of mine that I keep in touch with, a man I went to grade school with. He came from a very poor family. He was the first person from his family who graduated from college. And he told me that after 9½ months of looking he had finally gotten another job. He was an engineer with a Fortune 500 company, who at the age of 49, along with two other 49-year-old engineers, was laid off. They had children to educate, things to do. And this is also a factor of this great churning economy. So we have to see this economy in terms of all of its possibilities and its continuing challenges, which presents a paradox.

You can imagine what the ordinary person feels going home at night after work and turning on the television and hearing how great the economy is and then filtering it through their own personal experience. It just depends upon whether their experience conforms to the statistics, whether they really buy it. Our challenge is to figure out how to set and keep in motion all these wonderful changes and shape them in a way that makes the American dream available to everybody again. It's a great challenge, but we can do it.

If you look at the world, you see the same thing. America has been very fortunate, not only in the trade numbers I mentioned but to play a role in leading the world toward peace and freedom and greater security, not only in the obvious places like Northern Ireland and the Middle East and Bosnia and in Haiti, where tomorrow for the first time in the history of the country they will have a peaceful democratic transfer of power, but in reducing the threat of nuclear weapons, extending the Non-Proliferation Treaty, passing START II, trying to get a comprehensive test ban treaty this year.

But at the same time we know, and we have seen in our own country, that there are new threats of our security that are a function of the age of possibility, where people can move around in a hurry, where people can get information on the Internet about how to build bombs, where anybody can be a neighborhood terrorist because of the high-tech information you can get as long as you've got a computer, where someone in Tokyo can break open a little vial of poison gas and kill hundreds of people.

So we have new challenges, even as we become more secure. And we see it in terms of what's happened to our ability to maintain our basic values. I am profoundly encouraged that the crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate, and the teen pregnancy rate, and even the divorce rate, are down in the last couple of years. I think that is a very good thing for America. But let's face it, we all know they're still too high. And we all know that we pay a price together because they are.

So I say to you that as we debate this great transformation of government, the question we really ought to keep in our mind is: Are the changes we're making going to contribute to making the American dream available to all our people? Are we going to accelerate all the wonderful things that have brought us this age of possibility and meet the challenge? Are they going to help people to solve their own problems? Are they going to help families to solve their own problems? Are they going to help communities to work together to solve their own problems?

That, it seems to me, is the great question of this age. Government should change just like all other big organizations that are changing because the demands are changing, the objectives are changing, we are doing what the framers intended us to do. And in the exercise you have performed here in the last 3 days, by getting together and working hard and dealing with these tough issues and always trying to consider what the human impact of the changes was going to be, you have done what the framers knew we would have to do from time to time if our great country was going to endure.

In the State of the Union, I tried to outline what I think our major challenges are, and let me just briefly recount them here. I think as a people—not the Government's challenges, our people's challenges—to build stronger families and better childhoods for all of our children; to open educational opportunity for every single citizen, for children and for adults for a lifetime; to develop a new economic security for all families that are willing to work for it in a way that supports the dynamism of this economy and doesn't undermine it; to make our streets safer and take them back from gangs and drugs; to make crime the exception rather than the rule in America again; to provide a cleaner and healthier environment for today and tomorrow in a way that grows and doesn't shrink the economy; to maintain our leadership for freedom and peace in the world; and especially for us

to reinvent, to change our Government so that it works better and inspires more trust.

I believe the central lesson I have learned here in the last 3 years is that the genuine debate in America is not between big Government and small Government. We already have the smallest Government we've had since 1965. It's 205,000 people smaller than it was the day I took the oath of office. We're getting rid of 16,000 of the 86,000 pages of Federal regulations; we may get rid of more. It's not between Government and markets. We know there has to be a mix. We know the market can't solve all problems, and we know when the Government tries to solve them all it only makes it worse.

The central lesson I have drawn from the experiences of the last 3 years and from observing what is happening in our country and throughout the world is that what works in the world is what works around this table, that while we can't go forward with the idea that the government can solve all of our problems, we must not go back to an era where people were left to fend for themselves.

We cannot solve the complex problems of the modern world unless we work together in a genuine spirit of community, where everybody does his or her part, and where we sharply define what the role of government is and what the role of the Federal, State, and local governments are, what the role of the private sector is, what the role of people in their family lives is, where we all try to work together to enable people to make the most of their own lives and grassroots communities to rise up.

That is the central lesson that I draw from every experience I have had as President. And that is the perspective I bring to the work that you have done. We know that one-size-fits-all government doesn't work. We know that the American people are not about to get rid of all government, and they shouldn't. And we do know, I believe, that we can't go back to fend-for-yourself, winner-take-all society.

Our National Government shouldn't try to do everything. There are some things that we should do, that we do directly. National defense is the best and clearest example, and our military does it better than anybody else in the world and better than they ever have. We do have, it seems to me, when we have national challenges, a responsibility to articulate a clear national vision, set goals, challenge people from every walk of life to meet the goals, and then do what we can to empower them to succeed.

In other words, sometimes what we have to do is define the "what" and let others, as much as possible, determine the "how." That's what the crime bill does. It was clear to me when I became President that there was something terribly wrong when the violent crime rate had tripled in the last 30 years and the size of our police force had only gone up by 10 percent.

It was obvious, if you went to communities all over the country, that there were places where the crime rate was going down, and the one thing they all had in common was a clear, disciplined, operating community policing strategy. So we passed a crime bill that said we're going to have a goal of putting 100,000 police on the street. You apply for the money and get it, but we're not telling you who to hire, how to train them, how to deploy them, what kind of community groups they have to work with. You decide.

So the Governor of Kentucky and I were in Louisville the other day looking at one of the community policing operations there driving the crime rate down. I was in Manchester, New Hampshire, looking at one of the community policing operations that's driving the crime rate down. Every State here has communities where the crime rate is going down. One of our major news magazines had a cover story with the commissioner of police of New York City talking about the crime rate going down. It said, have we found a way to turn the corner on crime? That is the kind of partnership we ought to have.

I believe Goals 2000 fits that mold. The Federal Government's education programs are far less prescriptive now than they were in the years I served as the Governor before I came here as President. Goals 2000 is consistent with the work done by Governor Romer. It says that we should have national standards, States should agree to meet them, but States and the school districts should decide the "how." And we should give people resources and help to let them decide how, not the Federal Government.

We have also tried to work with you in particular, as Governor Thompson said, with the unfunded mandates law, with the dozens of waivers, and with the common efforts we're now making not only to get rid of the Boren amendment but to get rid of a lot of other Federal requirements that cripple your ability to spend

your time and your money helping your people to deal with their challenges.

We have tried to run this smaller Federal Government better, stepping up the fight against illegal immigration at the border and in the workplace, collecting record amounts of child support, cutting the student loan default rate almost in half, doubling the loan volume at SBA while we cut the budget by 40 percent, adopting customer service standards for every Federal agency. And I'm really proud of the fact that one of the major business magazines just last year which gives awards every year to corporations in America that serve the public the best—in the category for best service over the telephone, competing with L.L. Bean, Federal Express, and a lot of other things, the winner last year was the Social Security Administration. I'm proud of that. We are trying to give the American people a Government that is smaller, that costs less, that works better, and that works with you.

The first thing we need to do now is to finish the work of balancing the budget. We all know there's plenty of blame to go around for what happened in the years before we started working on this 3 years ago. I am proud that the deficit has been cut in half in the last 3 years. It is obvious that we need to finish the job. It is also obvious that this is a job that will never be finished, at least not in our lifetime, because when baby boomers, people my age and younger, begin to move toward their retirement years, the demographic changes in America will impose great new challenges on the budget, and this work of keeping our budget under control will have to be done year-in and year-out for a long time to come.

But we do know that based on the work we have already done, there are savings common to both the Republican plan, the plan that I have put forward, that amount to about $700 billion, more than enough to balance the budget and enough to meet my criteria of protecting the Medicare and Medicaid programs, our investments in education and the environment, and providing a modest tax cut.

We know that there are a lot of policy areas where we do agree, as well as some where we don't. I wish, on the whole, that the American people could have watched Senator Dole and Speaker Gingrich and Mr. Armey and Senator Daschle and Mr. Gephardt and the Vice President, Mr. Panetta, and I over these last 50 hours of discussions we've had, because we tried to do things the way you try to do them here. And we were able to identify significant areas of agreement.

Whichever Medicare program is passed, for example, it will be a program that estimates that we can slow medical inflation in the Medicare program below the projected rate of medical inflation in the private sector by aggressive incentives to seniors to move to managed care. With all the other differences of opinion, that is still there. However the final Medicaid program comes out—and I think you have gone a long way toward influencing that today in a positive and constructive way—we are going to slow the inflation rate in Medicaid well below the projected rate of health inflation in the private sector, because of giving you greater flexibility to move toward managed care and to do other things as well.

This is encouraging. So I believe the first thing we have to do is to finish this job. We cannot in good conscience, even though this is an election year, have a work stoppage between now and November. We have to go on and finish the work of balancing this budget. Let me say again, I was very encouraged by what Senator Dole said today. That is exactly my impression of where things are, and I believe we will get an agreement, and I look forward to continuing our efforts there.

I also believe we can get an agreement on Medicaid. You have done a lot of work which will help us immensely in that regard. You have always said that you could run this program better if you didn't have your hands tied and you didn't have to ask Washington's permission every time you wanted to do something.

We have known for a long time that the initial good impulse of supporting the Boren amendment was a mistake. We have known for a long time that you shouldn't have to ask the Federal Government every time you want to change your payment schedule to providers and every time you want to put in a new managed care program or make some other change. You have come up with a proposal that enables you to have that kind of flexibility and still preserves the Nation's ability to guarantee medical care for poor children, for pregnant women, for people with disabilities, and older Americans. This is a huge step in the right direction.

As you know from our discussion yesterday, I still have some concerns. As you have acknowl-

edged, we have to get any proposals scored by the Congressional Budget Office, we have to clarify—at least I need some clarification on some other issues which we discussed yesterday in terms of the definitions of disability and making sure that there will be someplace where a clearly enforceable right is held for people with regard to the benefits to which they're entitled.

And there are some other issues that we just didn't discuss because we didn't have enough time, like how the people who are now getting Medicaid help to pay their Medicare premiums will be able to continue that so they don't lose their Medicare coverage. But I am convinced we can work these out, and I am very encouraged by the work that you have done.

Let me also say that I think there is one other thing we ought to do on health care, and I'd like to ask for your help on that, even though it's something that has to be done here in Washington. If we cannot follow the other advanced economies of the world and ensure that everybody has health insurance, at least we ought to be able to ensure that everybody has access to health insurance. There is a bill in the Senate now, sponsored by Senator Kassebaum of Kansas and Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts, which would simply say that insurance companies cannot deny coverage for people because somebody in their family has a preexisting condition. And people can keep their insurance if they move from job to job; they can't be cut off.

The bill would also provide incentives for pooling operations to be set up so that more small businesses can buy insurance. I know that California and Florida in particular have had some very good results with efforts in this area already.

It is a good bill. It has 43 cosponsors, Republican and Democrat. It was voted out of the committee unanimously, and it has not been brought to a vote yet because of pressures against it. I think it is quite important that that bill be brought to a vote. It is one thing we could do, a simple bipartisan act we could take, that would increase the sense of security for millions of people in working families who are doing everything they can to do the right thing in this country.

Finally, let me say I applaud the work that you have done, again in a bipartisan fashion, on welfare reform. I know you haven't—I don't think you've voted on that policy yet, but we discussed it some yesterday. I've seen some of the changes you've made. I heard what Senator Dole said about child care, agreeing with you and me on that. That's a very good sign.

Let me just be as simple as I can about this: I think the objective of welfare reform should be to break the cycle of dependency in a way that promotes responsibility, work, and parenthood. I believe that our objective for all Americans should be to make sure that every family can succeed at home and at work, not to make people choose.

If a family has an adult that succeeds at work by sacrificing on the homefront, our country is weaker because our first and most important job, every one of us who has children, is to be good parents. If a family can only work at home when they fail at work, then our economy will be hurt and all of our efforts to promote independence will be undermined.

So everything I have done in this welfare debate has been designed with that in mind. How can we design a system that will be tough on responsibility, tough on work requirements, disciplined, but that will reward family and childrearing as well as movement into the workplace? And I think if we all keep that in mind, that we want a country where people succeed at work and succeed at home, then we'll come to answers in common, like the child care answer that the Governors recommended. We will do that.

In terms of the details of running the program and your not having to come to us every time you want a waiver, I could not agree more with that. I think there have been—a lot of the good ideas that have come out of this in the last 3 years, every one of them, as far as I know, has come from the States. If you just—look, let me just mention one that I have promoted relentlessly since Oregon and a number of other States started trying it, but in the areas where there are not enough jobs today, how are we going to get jobs for people on welfare? In the areas where the markets are tight, how will we give employers an incentive to hire people on welfare? One of the things that you can do now but every one of you will be able to do if we pass meaningful welfare reform, is to make your own decision to cash out the welfare and food stamp benefits and give it in the form of a job supplement to an employer to hire

somebody to go to work, instead of to stay idle and draw that same amount of money.

There are lots of things like this that can be done. You can do it. And I believe we're going to pass welfare reform legislation, and I think when you take a stand here today saying that we ought to—that the Senate bill was a good bill, I thought, and I thought far superior on most points to the one that came out of the conference that I vetoed, but it had some problems and the biggest one for most States was the child care problem. You have addressed that here. And you have said, okay, be tough on people; make them go to work, but don't ask them to hurt their children. That's all any American could ever ask. And I think when you do that, you're going to give us a real chance to pass welfare reform, and I thank you for that.

So I would say, again, I think you've had a pretty good meeting here. I think you have contributed to the climate that will help us to balance the budget. You have contributed immeasurably to helping us to resolve the impasse over Medicaid. You have contributed to the impulse to move to genuine welfare reform. We can do all these things if we do them together. Let me say again, every time this country works together, every time we reach across the lines that divide us, we never fail. We dissipate cynicism; we dissipate mistrust; we dissipate anxiety; we dissipate anger every time we do that.

Abraham Lincoln said this a long time ago: "We can succeed only by concert. It is not 'Can any of us imagine better,' but 'Can we all do better.'" The Governors always attempt to answer that question with a resounding "yes."

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. at the J.W. Marriott Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to the following Governors: John Engler of Michigan, George Voinovich of Ohio, Terry Branstad of Iowa, Paul Patton of Kentucky, and Roy Romer of Colorado.

Message to the Congress on Satellite Exports to China
February 6, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–246), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to waive the restrictions contained in that Act on the export to the People's Republic of China of U.S.-origin satellites insofar as such restrictions pertain to the CHINASAT project.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 6, 1996.

Message to the Congress on Satellite Exports to China
February 6, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–246), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to waive the restrictions contained in that Act on the export to the People's Republic of China of U.S.-origin satellites insofar as such restrictions pertain to the MABUHAY project.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 6, 1996.

Message to the Congress on Satellite Exports to China
February 6, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–246), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to waive the restrictions contained in that Act on the export to the People's Republic of China of U.S.-origin satellites insofar as such restrictions pertain to the COSAT project.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 6, 1996.

Remarks to the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
February 7, 1996

Thank you very much. I assure you, when I was attempting to help Anne's institution get that foundation grant, I had not imagined that one day I would reap this benefit of that fine introduction. [*Laughter*]

Let me congratulate Mike Adams on his successful term as chairman and for his kind remarks and for recognizing the brilliant work of our Education Secretary, Dick Riley. I know of no person who has had that job who has done as much in so many areas to have a positive impact on the education of the American people. And we are all in his debt, most of all the President, but all of us are in his debt for the fine job he has done.

And I do want to thank Anne Die again for that wonderful introduction and for the kind remarks she had about Hillary and about me and what we did together. I must say, as I said in the State of the Union Address, after 3 years the central lesson that I have learned as President is that in meeting our challenges we have to do what we did instinctively at home; we have to work together more. And the role of Government should be seen in the context of an instrument of helping us work together to meet our common challenges. I enjoyed doing that then, and when it's possible, I like doing it here. [*Laughter*]

I'm also delighted to see David Warren again. We first met, as he may have said publicly before, in 1970, about 26 years ago, when we both worked on the Senate campaign of Joseph Duffey in Connecticut. And neither one of us had any gray hair then. [*Laughter*] Now Joe Duffey is doing a fabulous job for the United States as head of the USIA, and he has less gray hair than either one of us. [*Laughter*] Our only consolation is he also has less hair than either one of us. [*Laughter*] Anyway, it's been a busy 26 years for both of us, and I'm proud of the work that he does for you.

For 20 years this association has given voice to the concerns of higher education. You have demonstrated something that America knows about itself but sometimes forgets, and that is that there is strength in diversity. You come from every corner of our Nation. You represent every field, from the sciences to the liberal arts to businesses and all kinds of institutions, from church-related schools to historically black colleges to women's colleges. You have shown enormous strength and perseverance in our common efforts to keep the doors of college education open to all Americans.

Your Alliance to Save Student Aid is doing wonderful work, and I may be preaching to the choir, but every now and then even the choir needs to hear that. It is doing wonderful work. I know how hard you have fought to save the right to choose the direct lending program. And I tell you what I have told the Members of Congress: This is no time, for whatever reason, under whatever circumstances, to cut back on any kind of student aid. We need more of it, not less of it.

If I might, I would like to take just a few moments today to try to put the struggles that you and I are engaged in, to not only keep open the doors of college for all Americans but to widen those doors, in a larger historic context. In my State of the Union Address I said I thought that America had entered a great age of possibility, and I believe that. I believe that the American people who are poised to take advantage of it will have more opportunities to live out their dreams than any generation of Americans ever has. We also know, perplexingly, that this is an age of great challenge in which huge numbers of Americans feel deeply frustrated and worried that not only they, but their children, will not have the chance to live out their dreams.

How could both these things coexist at the same time? How could there be so much good economic news and so much troubling economic news? How could there be good news on the social front and troubling news on the social front? It is, I am convinced, endemic to the nature of this moment in our history, which I believe is most like what happened to us more or less a hundred years ago when we went through the transformation from being a rural and agricultural society into a more urbanized, more industrial society. And now we're moving into an age dominated by information and technology and the markets of the global village.

The nature of work has changed, and that helps you in your enterprise because we now have—almost all work contains more mind and less body, more information and more technology, and is changing more rapidly so you not only need to know more, you need to be able to learn more. The nature of work is changing, and there is no sign that the rate of change and the direction of change will do anything but speed up.

The nature of work organizations are also changing. You have more and more people who are self-employed, more and more people who can now work at home because there are computer hookups. The largest and most bureaucratic and most top-down organizations tend to be swimming down, pushing decisions down, and getting rid of a lot of people in the middle of the organizations that used to hand orders and information up and down the food chain of the enterprise. And again, that can be good, but it can be severely disruptive if you're 50 years old and you've got three kids to send to college and you've just been told that your Fortune 500 company doesn't need you anymore.

We see the change in the nature of work. The encouraging thing is that in the last 3 years, more jobs have been created by businesses owned by women alone than have been eliminated by the Fortune 500 companies. But they're different. They're smaller; they're more scattered about. They are less secure in a traditional sense. So work is changing and work organizations are changing.

And finally, the nature of our markets are changing. The markets for financing and the markets for goods and services are increasingly global, increasingly rapid, and on occasion, ruthless because of their ability to seek the area of greatest opportunity in a split second. And all of these things have opened up vast new opportunities but impose great new challenges on our ability to maintain old-fashioned values and to maintain a sense of national community as all these changes proliferate and put pressures on all of our institutions to pull apart and break down and leave people feeling more isolated.

You see, for example, in the United States right now in the last 3 years, we have enjoyed the lowest unemployment and inflation rates combined in 27 years. We have about 8 million new jobs. Homeownership is at a 15-year high. Exports are at an all-time high. As the Congress debates the farm bill today, we see soybeans at a 17-year high, wheat at a 15-year high, and corn is about $3.60—and I don't know how long it's been since it's been that high but a while—partly because of technology in agriculture and the sophistication of the markets by which agriculture is traded and moved around the world. We have in each of the last 3 years had the largest number of new businesses formed in our history, each year breaking a record, and the largest number of new self-made millionaires in our history, not people who inherited their wealth but people who lived the American dream, who went out by their own efforts and put something together in the private sector and made themselves a million dollars doing it. And that is all very encouraging. And, of course, you have enjoyed it because knowledge is at a greater premium than ever before, and it's exciting for you.

Now, the other side of that is, more than half the people in the workplace are working

in real terms for the same or lower wages they were making more than a decade ago. The average working family is spending more hours on the job today than they were in 1969. That's very important. And as more and more people work for smaller and smaller units in more and more shifting patterns, and there's more and more downsizing, over and over and over again, more people feel insecurity about not only their job but their health care, their retirement, and their ability to educate their own children.

I went to the typical little red brick schoolhouse when I was in grade school in my hometown in Arkansas with a man who grew up in very humble circumstances, who was the first person in his family to go to college, who was an engineer with a Fortune 500 company. And when he was 49 the company came to him and two other 49-year-old white male engineers and said, "We don't need you anymore," right when all their kids were ready to go to college, and the company was making more profits. And for 9 months he worked to try to find another position.

This story has a happy ending. He got another one; he's doing all right. And he had a lot of high-tech help. He had a sophisticated computer program where he had identified 250 contacts all across America of any possible employers who could hire someone like him, making about what he had made, doing about what he had done. And he churned that network with all of its high-tech glory for 8 or 9 hours a day, but it still took him 9 months to find a job. That is the other side of this.

The other day I had coffee with a friend of mine from out West who is an immensely successful man who by pure, blind irony was also in that little red brick schoolhouse with me 40 years ago in Arkansas, along with his brother. His brother was also immensely successful, but he happened to work for two companies in a row that were bought out in one of these leveraged buyouts, and in the downsizing he lost his job. He didn't do anything wrong; he was perfectly productive. But he just was in the wrong place at the wrong time, not once but twice.

So our big question here is how can we keep the dynamism of this new economy, how can we keep it going and growing and offering these opportunities but make the opportunities available to all Americans and give us a chance to preserve a sense of community in this country, that anybody who works hard and plays by the rules should have a chance to be rewarded for it?

You see the same thing on the social front where the American people really are beginning to get their act together, not only in terms of their values but in terms of adopting strategies that work. You see the crime rate down, the welfare rolls, the food stamp rolls down, the poverty rolls down, the teen pregnancy rate down for the last 2 years. That's the good news. The bad news is I could tell you the crime rate was down, and I could show you the statistics, and there is still a zillion streets in this country you wouldn't feel comfortable walking in after dark.

So all those problems are still far too great for a great country like ours to tolerate. And we are wasting too many of our children's lives and too much of our fortune dealing with the fallout of our inability to organize ourselves in constructive ways so that we raise our children properly and we all behave right. And we are paying a terrible price for it.

We're not putting all of our players on the field. We still have whole chunks of areas of our cities and isolated rural areas which have been completely untouched by this economic recovery, but they have plenty of the dark side of our social fallout.

So the challenge, I will say again, is how can we make the American dream available to all Americans and how can we pull this country together when there are so many forces working to divide it? I believe the first thing we have to do is to get beyond the partisan bickering here and pass the 7-year balanced budget plan that protects education and the environment and Medicare and Medicaid. We have identified now, in common, common to both the Republican and Democratic approaches, $700 billion in savings. That is more than enough to pass a balanced budget plan in 7 years that meets the criteria I've laid out. There is no excuse for not doing it. We ought to just do it and put it behind us and stop having the newspapers filled with it every day. We ought to give the American people a balanced budget.

Then, as I said in the State of the Union—so then what? The question is, how are we going to meet these challenges? How are we going to help people to make the most of their own lives? How are we going to help families and communities to solve their problems at the

grassroots level? I am convinced that we have to do it together. And I am convinced there are seven major things we have to do, and I will just repeat them briefly and then focus on education.

First and foremost, we have to enable ourselves, our friends, and our neighbors to do a better job raising our children and strengthening our families. Sometimes the time young people are old enough to go to college, it's already too late for too many of them.

And let me just mention one example. Today a comprehensive scientific study is being released on the impact of television violence on young people. And it concludes what we all know in our instinctive selves, that television violence is pervasive, numbing, and can have a lasting and corrosive effect on young people if they're exposed to too much of it for too long. It distorts their perspective and later changes their attitudes and, for some of them, their behavior.

In my State of the Union Address, I called upon Congress to pass the telecommunications legislation, but to pass it with the V-chip requirement in it so that all the new cable television sets would give parents the right to select out programs with excessive violence or other objectionable content they didn't want their children to see. I am proud to say that tomorrow, at the Library of Congress, I will sign the telecommunications bill into law with the V-chip requirement in it. And I think it will make a difference.

It's an example of what we ought to do, though. The telecommunications part of this legislation, because of the changes there, would enable our country to generate tens of thousands of more high-wage, high-tech, exciting jobs, to offer consumers vast new opportunities in telecommunications. But we can do it in a way that still reinforces instead of undermines our basic values, that doesn't say anything goes, whatever looks like a market opportunity in this millisecond should govern and overcome whatever your enduring sense of values is. But that's what I like about it. And that's the sort of thing I think we need to be looking for in other areas of our lives.

Our second challenge, obviously, is to try to provide an educational opportunity for every American for a lifetime.

Third: to provide a new sense of economic security in a dynamic economy by giving people access to education for a lifetime, access to health care, and access to a pension you can take with you when you move from job to job.

Our fourth challenge is to continue the fight against crime and gangs and drugs until we meet what we all know instinctively is the real test. The real test is when all of us feel that crime is the exception, rather than the rule, we'll be back to where we ought to be in America again, and we can't stop fighting until that is how we all feel.

Fifth, we have a serious challenge still, as we see from all the weather we've endured just in the last few years, to deal with the fundamental and pervasive impacts of environmental degradation and to change the whole mindset in America away from the idea that you have to accept a certain amount of environmental despoilation to grow the economy to the idea that you can actually reinforce economic growth if you have the right kind of environmental protection policies. And unless we make a commitment as a Nation to do that, we and the rest of the world are going to pay a terrible, terrible price.

I told the Prime Minister of China—I mean, the President of China, when we were in our last meeting that the biggest threat to our security from China had nothing to do with what everybody reads in the paper all the time; it had to do with the fact that they might get as rich as we are, and they'd have the same percentage of their people as we do driving automobiles, and we haven't figured out how to deal with the greenhouse gases and the global warning, in which case they would present a real threat to our security because we wouldn't be able to breathe, since they have 1 billion, 200 million people and we only have 260 million. This is a very serious thing. And it needs to be a bipartisan or nonpartisan issue.

The sixth great challenge is to maintain our leadership for peace and freedom. This is a time when a lot of Americans think we can afford to be isolationist because we have so many challenges at home. We paid a terrible price to win the cold war, and who is at our borders now? That's a very simple, but wrong, attitude. If we want people to buy our goods and services, we have to be willing to cooperate with them to advance peace and freedom. If we want countries to cooperate with us in stopping drugs from coming into our country, we have to work with them to get that done. And you'd only

have to think about a few examples, the World Trade Center and the sarin gas breaking open in Japan, killing all those people in the subway, to know that high-tech terrorism is a global phenomenon that can only be engaged if you are involved with other countries.

Finally, we have to change the way our Government works so it inspires more confidence, does more good, and can still meet the demands of the modern era.

Now, having said that, if you ask me which one of these things is most likely to meet my objective, which is to help people make the most of their own lives and to give people the tools to solve their problems together, you would have to say that creating a system of excellent education with access to everybody for a lifetime is the most likely thing to do that, because the more educated people you have, the more they're likely to see these connections that I'm talking about and to make the right decisions community by community, State by State, and in our Nation as a whole. And unless we do that, we're going to be in real trouble.

But if we do it, then the age of possibility will be for everyone, and the 21st century will probably be known as the American century too. That's why higher education is so important. That's why I have worked so hard to protect these student aid programs, and indeed, to advance a lot of what we are doing.

You know these statistics, but I think a couple of them are worth repeating. In 1979 a worker with a college education earned about 40 percent more than a worker with a high school degree. Today the gap is about 75 percent and rising.

When I studied the 1990 census figures, I noticed that the only group of younger people that had incomes that were rising were those that had at least 2 years of post-high school education, as a group. Those with under 2 years or less had declining incomes from the beginning of their experience in the work force. They had committed themselves to a treadmill from the beginning which would get harder and harder and harder to stay on.

So I say, you know that. Now, if we all know that, why in the world would we ever do anything to make it harder to go on to college or to stay in college or to discourage people from taking out college loans? This is not rocket science. I may be talking to a lot of college presidents, but this is simple. This is a, b, c. This is first grade, second grade, third grade. Why would we do anything ever to make it harder to go on to college and to stay there?

On this issue we must all stand firm, and I know I can depend upon you to do it. This is not a question of what the Government does. The Federal student loan guarantee program, the Pell grant scholarships, all these things are—these are not big Government programs. These are programs designed to help individuals make the most of their own lives and to help you succeed in operating your institutions. That is the role of the National Government.

And this is not soft-headed. We have—I'm proud of the fact that since we've been here Secretary Riley and I have overseen almost a 50 percent reduction in the student loan default rate. I'm proud of that, and I know a lot of you support that.

It would seem to me that that would be evidence that we know also what we're doing when we say we ought to make more loan options available to more people. I like the direct loan program because it's less hassle for you and less hassle for the students. But I really like it because as long as you even have the option to do it, it'll be more pressure on all the competition to cut the costs and increase the quality of service. And I've seen that happen as well.

We've increased the Pell grants, and we should do that some more. We still haven't gotten back to where they used to be; we ought to do it some more.

This year 25,000 young people will earn some money to go to college by their AmeriCorps service in communities all across the country, and we ought to maintain that program. I feel strongly about it.

And I'm sure you remember that in the State of the Union I proposed three further steps. First of all, that we should award a $1,000 scholarship to every student in the top 5 percent of every graduating class in America; that's 128,000 graduating seniors we could give a little more money to go to college on. I think we ought to do it.

Second, one thing that I think that we have not done as good a job as we should have in the last 3 years—and we're trying to catch up in a big way—the Secretary of Education and I want to expand the work-study program so that by the year 2000, one million American students will be working their way through college with work-study.

And thirdly, and most important of all, we believe that families with incomes of under $100,000 should be able to deduct as much as $10,000 in post-secondary education costs from their taxes, including tuition and fees at any eligible institution, university, or college, private or public, or vocational school. That would benefit 16½ million Americans, the best kind of tax cut we could have.

We give tax relief for businesses that invest in new plants and equipment. If we know we're running on brainpower, why shouldn't we give tax relief to families that invest in education? We ought to do that.

I know that all of you agree with all this. I also know that all of you are trying to come to grips with your part of this equation, which is to do whatever you can to hold down college costs. I was reviewing in my own mind. Being the father of a high school junior, I have to learn to think about this now. One of you will have a chance to make me much poorer before long, perhaps. [*Laughter*]

But I got to thinking about it. When I went to college, I had a job and a scholarship. And then I went to law school. I had a scholarship, a loan, and, in 3 years, six different jobs. And I enjoyed it all. I not only didn't mind working, I was grateful to have a chance to have the jobs, and I enjoyed being able to support myself, and I was proud when I was able to pay off the last of my loans.

But we know that from that time, when I was in school—nearly 30 years ago now when I finished—to this time, the cost of college as a percentage of a family's income has increased dramatically, that more and more people need more college aid. And I sometimes wonder whether colleges don't get more and more behind by raising tuition costs because you have to keep recycling it in scholarships and loans. They're about double what they were 10 years ago, and of course, as I said, the most significant thing is that the college costs have gone up so much more than middle class incomes have and much, much more than lower middle class incomes have, which—and that's evidenced in the fact that in the last 5 years you see a decline in enrollments among a lot of people in the bottom 20 percent of the income group in America, the very group that used to live the American dream with the greatest pride, so that you've got increasing enrollments as you go up the income scale, which is good, but decreasing enrollment as you go down the income scale, which is bad. We will do what we can to keep up with the scholarships and loans, but anything that can be done to ratchet down the burdens on deserving students is a good thing to do.

I noticed that Muskingum College in Oklahoma—I mean in Ohio—actually lowered its tuition by $4,000. And these notes I have say that North Carolina Wesleyan cut its tuition by 23 percent. I don't know whether they did it by containing costs or praying to God or both. [*Laughter*] But I think it is a good thing to do wherever possible.

Again, I say to you, we cannot do what we ought to do for America if we increase college enrollment overall, but children who would be disproportionately minority children, but not all, in the bottom 20 percent—or the bottom 30 percent of our income families, are seeing their enrollments decline. Drake University in Des Moines is holding its increase to the rate of inflation. I know that others are giving discounts to certain people. The University of Rio Grande is giving free tuition to high school valedictorians and salutatorians. This kind of innovation and leadership is something I think ought to be encouraged. But I would ask you all to think especially about those kids that are coming out of homes from the bottom 20 percent who are afraid that they can't make it.

The main reason I wanted the direct loan program has nothing to do with all the stuff that I just talked about about it. I wanted it because I thought that every person ought to have the option to borrow money for college and pay it back as a percentage of their income so that if they came from a poor family or if they decided to do jobs that were public service jobs, for example, if they decided to be police officers or schoolteachers or do something else where they would never get rich, they would know that there would never be a single, solitary year when they would be in need because of the payment schedule of their college loans. And I think that's important.

But I say to you again, anything you can do to try to bring down the college burden, especially on that group of our young people, so that all income groups increase their enrollment again is something that we could do together that would make a real difference for America.

The last point I want to make is this: A lot of you have AmeriCorps projects on your campuses. A lot of you who don't have that have

some sort of community service project. I think it is very important that the young people of this country have the opportunity to serve while they're in college in some meaningful community service. I think it is very important that when they leave their colleges and universities, they have the idea that they have an obligation to give something back to their country and they understand that the only way we ever get anything done in America is to bridge our differences and work together and to learn by doing in that way.

So I would urge you all to do everything you can to increase the involvement of your students in community service projects. We can change the character of America by changing the attitudes, the approach, the intuitive responses of this young generation, this brilliant, aggressive, intelligent, and energetic group of people toward the idea of community.

I see all these surveys that talk about how pessimistic or cynical people are, but the truth is, cynicism is an excuse for inaction and an awful poor one. It's a poor rationalization for believing that nothing you do makes any difference. And so I ask you all to remember that. You have these people—even though the age of college students is getting increasingly higher, none of us are too old to give a little something back and to be given an opportunity to give something to our community. And you can do that in a unique way that opens up the way people think about America and its future.

I believe—I will say again—I believe that the younger generation today will live in a time of greatest possibility America has ever known. But in order to make it really work, those possibilities have to be available to all Americans who are willing to work for them. And they have to be available in a country that is coming together across its divisions, not drifting apart.

The changing nature of work, the changing nature of work organizations, the changing nature of markets are all putting pressures to divide, to split up, to splinter off an American community that still needs very much to move closer together, to open opportunity to everybody, to tackle our social problems, and to make this country what it ought to be.

There are no people in America better positioned to lead this country in the right direction than you are. Thank you for your fight for higher education, thank you for your fight for student aid. Please, please, take on these other challenges, and let's give this country the kind of future it deserves.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:28 p.m. in the Ticonderoga Room at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Anne Die, vice chair, and Michael Adams, chair, board of directors, and David Warren, president, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities; and President Jiang Zemin of China.

Remarks in a Telephone Conversation With President Rene Preval of Haiti

February 7, 1996

President Preval. Good evening, Mr. President.

President Clinton. Hello?

President Preval. Good evening, Mr. President.

President Clinton. Good evening. I wanted to call you and offer you my congratulations on your inauguration. As you know better than I, this is the first democratically elected transfer of power in Haiti in the history of your nation, and it's a real advance for democracy in our hemisphere and a great opportunity for your country, and I'm proud that the United States has been supporting you.

Interpreter. You can go on, Mr. President. He understands English.

President Clinton. Well, I just wanted to say those things and also to assure you that we are aware that you still have a lot to do, a big agenda ahead of you, but so much has been accomplished. You've had these peaceful elections. You have restored democratic institutions, including the Presidency and the Parliament. You have dismantled the repressive FAd'H. You have shown some economic growth last year.

You have 5,000 people in the national police force, and there has been a dramatic decline in deaths due to political violence.

So for all those things, even as we look to the challenges ahead, I know you are proud, and you should be proud. And I'm very glad that Ambassador Albright and Deputy Secretary Talbott and others from the United States delegation were able to be there. General Sheehan was at your inauguration, and he's already back here visiting with me, and he brought me a new baseball made in Haiti with "Operation Uphold Democracy" on it, so it's my souvenir from your inauguration, Mr. President. And it's a great day for you and a great day for all of us who believe in freedom and who support you.

President Preval. Mr. President, on behalf of the Haitian people, I thank you very much for this call. I know that you are so much busy that I appreciate very much this gesture.

[*At this point, President Preval spoke in French, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter as follows.*]

I'm going to be more comfortable if I continue in French, Mr. President.

President Clinton. Please do.

President Preval. As you yourself said, you played a very great role amid the U.N. effort to help restore democracy in Haiti, and we thank you for that. We have been independent for 193 years, and this is the very first time that one President transfers power to another democratically elected President.

But as you very well know, the challenges before me are enormous, because democracy cannot take place without economic development. And on the economic front, we are going to make every effort that we possibly can to give satisfaction to the Haitian people. And in particular, we would like to invite American investors to come to Haiti to invest. Our police is yet weak, and we certainly want to strengthen it to consolidate it still further in order to safeguard security in Haiti.

Mr. President, I know how terribly busy you are, and as disappointed as the Haitian people were that you weren't able to be here, when they hear that you have called, they will, I am sure, be truly delighted.

Merci beaucoup.

President Clinton. Merci, Mr. President. You tell them that I'm still supporting them and their freedom, and the United States is still supporting them, and we will do what we can to encourage investment, to get the economic development going and, as you know, we want to continue to provide some support through civil engineering and infrastructure projects and some other things that we can do consistent with the ongoing partnership that we want to have with our two countries. So we will be there with you, and we're excited for this day and ready for the work ahead.

President Preval. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

President Clinton. Have a wonderful evening. It's a great day for you.

President Preval. And I hope that we'll have the pleasure to meet very soon.

President Clinton. Yes, I do, too. I'm looking forward to that.

President Preval. Thank you very much.

President Clinton. Thank you, and goodbye. Thank you.

President Preval. Thank you to your family.

President Clinton. Thank you.

NOTE: The conversation began at 4:16 p.m. The President spoke from the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. John J. Sheehan, USMC, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Command. He also referred to the Forces Armees d'Haiti (FAd'H), the Armed Forces of Haiti.

Remarks on Signing the Telecommunications Act of 1996

February 8, 1996

Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, and ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to begin by thanking the Library of Congress for hosting us here. It's my understanding this may be the only time in American history a piece of legislation has

been signed here and perhaps the first time in three decades when one has been signed on Capitol Hill. If that is so, then this is certainly a worthy occasion.

I thank Lily Tomlin for reminding us that the Internet can be fun—[*laughter*]—and the students at Calvin Coolidge for reminding us that the Internet can do a world of good. I thank the Vice President, who fought for this bill for so long on behalf of the American people. And I thank the Members of Congress in both parties, starting with the leadership, who believed in the promise and the possibility of telecommunications reform. I thank the vast array of interest groups who had sometimes conflicting concerns about this bill who were able to work together and work through them so that we could move this together.

This law is truly revolutionary legislation that will bring the future to our doorstep. In the State of the Union just a few days ago, I asked the Congress to pass this law, and they did with remarkable speed and dispatch. Even the years that were spent working on it were a relatively short time given the tradition of congressional decisionmaking over major matters.

This historic legislation in my way of thinking really embodies what we ought to be about as a country and what we ought to be about in this city. It clearly enables the age of possibility in America to expand to include more Americans. It will create many, many high-wage jobs. It will provide for more information and more entertainment to virtually every American home. It embodies our best values by supporting the kind of market reforms that the Vice President mentioned, as well as the V-chip. And it brings us together, and it was passed by people coming together. This bill is an indication of what can be done when Republicans and Democrats work together in a spirit of genuine cooperation to advance the public interest and bring us to a brighter future.

It is fitting that we mark this moment here in the Library of Congress. It is Thomas Jefferson's building. Most of you know President Jefferson deeded his books to our young Nation after our first library was burned to the ground in the War of 1812. The volumes that line these walls grew out of Jefferson's legacy. He understood that democracy depends upon the free flow of information. He said, "He who receives an idea from me receives instruction himself without lessening mine. And he who lights his paper at mine receives light without darkening me."

Today, the information revolution is spreading light, the light Jefferson spoke about, all across our land and all across the world. It will allow every American child to bring the ideas stored in this reading room into his or her own living room or schoolroom.

Americans have always had a genius for communications. The power of our Founding Fathers' words reverberated across the world from the moment they were said down to the present day. From the Pony Express to the miracle of a human voice over the phone line, American innovation and communications have broken the barriers of time and space to make it easier for us to stay in touch, to learn from each other, to reach for our highest aspirations.

Today our world is being remade yet again by an information revolution, changing the way we work, the way we live, the way we relate to each other. Already the revolution is so profound that it is changing the dominant economic model of the age. And already, thanks to the scientific and entrepreneurial genius of American workers in this country, it has created vast, vast opportunities for us to grow and learn and enrich ourselves in body and in spirit.

But this revolution has been held back by outdated laws designed for a time when there was one phone company, three TV networks, no such thing as a personal computer. Today, with the stroke of a pen, our laws will catch up with our future. We will help to create an open marketplace where competition and innovation can move as quick as light. An industry that is already one-sixth of our entire economy will thrive. It will create opportunity, many more high-wage jobs, and better lives for all Americans. Soon, working parents will be able to check up on their children in class via computer. Families heading off on vacation trips will be able to program the fastest route in their car computers, thanks to the work the Department of Transportation is now doing. On a rainy Saturday night, you'll be able to order up every movie ever produced or every symphony ever created in a minute's time. For those of us who like to watch too many movies and listen to too much music in a single sitting, that may be a mixed blessing.

This law also recognizes that with freedom comes responsibility. Any truly competitive market requires rules. This bill protects consumers

against monopolies. It guarantees the diversity of voices our democracy depends upon. Perhaps most of all, it enhances the common good. Under this law, our schools, our libraries, our hospitals will receive telecommunication services at reduced cost. This simple act will move us one giant step closer to realizing a challenge I put forward in the State of the Union to connect all our classrooms and libraries to the information superhighway by the year 2000, not through a big Government program but through a creative, ever-unfolding partnership led by scientists and entrepreneurs, supported by business and government and communities working together.

We know the information age will bring blessings for our people and our country. But like most human blessings, we know the blessings will be mixed. We also know that the programming beamed into our homes can undercut our values and make it more difficult for parents to raise their children.

Children sometimes are exposed to images parents don't want them to see because they shouldn't. A comprehensive study released just yesterday confirms what every parent knows: Televised violence is pervasive and numbing, and if exposed constantly to it, young people can develop a numbing, lasting, corrosive reaction to it. Televised violence in too much volume and intensity over too long a period of time may teach our children that such violence has no consequences and is an unavoidable part of modern life. Neither is true.

In my State of the Union Address, when I asked Congress to pass the telecommunications law, I mentioned in particular the V-chip designed to strengthen families and their ability to protect their children from television violence and other inappropriate programs as they determine. I am very proud that this new legislation includes the V-chip. It's not such a big requirement, as you can see—here is one—but it can make a big difference in the lives of families all over America.

I thank the Congress and the Members of both parties for giving parents who want to take more responsibility for their children's upbringing an important tool to do so. I thank the Congress for reducing the chances that the hours spent in church or synagogue or in discussion around the dinner table about right and wrong and what can and cannot happen in the world will not be undone by unthinking hours in front of a television set.

Of course, parents now have to do their end of the job and decide what they do or don't want their young children to see. But if every parent uses this chip wisely, it can become a powerful voice against teen violence, teen pregnancy, teen drug use, and for both learning and entertainment. The responsibility of parents to do this is something they deserve and something they plainly need. Now that they have it, they must use it.

I want to acknowledge in this audience the activists, the parents who pushed for the V-chip and thank you very much for making it possible.

To make the V-chip as effective as it can be, I have challenged the broadcast industries to do what the movies have done, to rate programming in a way that will help the parents to make these decisions. I invited the entertainment industry leaders to come to the White House to work with me to improve what our children see on television, and I'm pleased to announce that exactly 3 weeks from today, on February 29th, we will convene our meeting and get to work. I thank the leaders of the entertainment industry for coming, and I will look forward to working with them.

In 1957, President Eisenhower signed another important bill into law, another bill that was like this. It seized the opportunities of the moment. It made them more broadly available to all Americans. It met the challenge of change. It reinforced our fundamental values and aspirations. And it was done in a harmonious, bipartisan spirit. The interstate highway act literally brought Americans closer together. We were connected city to city, town to town, family to family, as we had never been before. That law did more to bring Americans together than any other law this century, and that same spirit of connection and communication is the driving force behind the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

When President Eisenhower signed the highway bill, he gave one of his pens to the father of that legislation, Senator Albert Gore, Sr., of Tennessee. His son, the Vice President, in many ways is the father of this legislation because he's worked on it for more than 20 years, since he first began to promote what he called, in the phrase he coined, the information superhighway.

You heard him say today that he always dreamed that a child from his little hometown of Carthage could come home from school and be able to connect to the Library of Congress. I'm proud that the Vice President is able to be here today and to play the role he deserves to play in this. And I thank all the others who have done this. But 2 days ago, I asked him if he would give me the pen that his father got from President Eisenhower to begin the signing of this legislation. And so, that is the very nice pen you see.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what we can do about this in a bipartisan manner, but I'm afraid that people would say that in the fifties, that's the time when people in Washington were real leaders and pens were real pens. [*Laughter*]

At any rate, I'm going to begin, in honor of Senator Gore, Sr., and Vice President Gore, the signing with that pen that President Eisenhower used to sign the interstate highway act, and then go on with the signing. And again, let me say to all of you, I wish every person here who has played a role in this could have one of these pens. I am very, very grateful to you.

And then after I sign the actual bill, we're going to sign a copy of the bill over here and send it into cyberspace. I believe that this is the first bill that ever made that journey, and that will make me whatever it was Ernestine said, a cybernaut, or whatever she said. [*Laughter*]

Again, let me thank you from the bottom of my heart, every one of you, for making this great day for America possible.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:34 a.m. in the Thomas Jefferson Building of the Library of Congress. In his remarks, he referred to comedian Lily Tomlin, who portrayed her character Ernestine the telephone operator in a dialog with the Vice President. S. 652, approved February 8, was assigned Public Law No. 104–104.

Statement on Signing the Telecommunications Act of 1996

February 8, 1996

Today I have signed into law S. 652, the "Telecommunications Act of 1996." This landmark legislation fulfills my Administration's promise to reform our telecommunications laws in a manner that leads to competition and private investment, promotes universal service and open access to information networks, and provides for flexible government regulation. The Act opens up competition between local telephone companies, long distance providers and cable companies; expands the reach of advanced telecommunications services to schools, libraries, and hospitals; and requires the use of new V-chip technology to enable families to exercise greater control over the television programming that comes into their homes.

For nearly two decades, Vice President Gore has worked to spur the creation of a national information superhighway. This Act lays the foundation for the robust investment and development that will create such a superhighway to serve both the private sector and the public interest.

Over the past 3 years, my Administration has worked vigorously to produce legislation that would provide consumers greater choices and better quality in their telephone, cable, and information services. This legislation puts us squarely on the road to a brighter, more productive future.

In the world of the mass media, this Act seeks to remove unnecessary regulation and open the way for freer markets. I support that philosophy. At the same time, however, my Administration has opposed measures that would allow undue concentration in the mass media. I am very pleased that this Act retains reasonable limits on the ability of one company or individual to own television, radio, and newspaper properties in local markets and retains national ownership limits on television stations. My Administration will continue its efforts to ensure that the American public has access to many different sources of news and information in their communities.

The Act increases from 25 to 35 percent the cap on the amount of the national audience that television stations owned by one person or entity can reach. This cap will prevent a single broadcast group owner from dominating the national media market.

While the Act removes the statutory ban on ownership of a cable system and a broadcast station in the same local market, it does not eliminate the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) regulatory ban on such cross-ownership. This ownership restriction continues to be very important in maintaining competition in local markets and should be maintained by the FCC. In addition, while certain regulatory cross-ownership bans are no longer necessary and have been eliminated, others that are critical to maintaining the diversity of local news and information sources have been retained. For example, the Act maintains the regulatory ban on common ownership of a newspaper and a broadcast television or radio station.

With regard to the ban on ownership of more than one television station in a local market, the Act directs the FCC to conduct a rulemaking to review its regulation and its waiver policy. Currently, the FCC allows ownership of more than one television station only in narrow and compelling circumstances, such as when a station would otherwise go dark, and where local diversity would not be reduced. Any changes in this policy should allow ownership of two stations only when doing so would clearly not reduce the diversity of independent outlets of news and information in a community. My Administration will continue to support a fair balance between economic viability and diversity.

Rates for cable programming services and equipment used solely to receive such services will, in general, be deregulated in about 3 years. Cable rates will be deregulated more quickly in communities where a phone company offers programming to a comparable number of households, providing effective competition to the cable operator. In such circumstances, consumers will be protected from price hikes because the cable system faces real competition.

This legislation also places a strong emphasis on competition in both local and long distance telephone markets, making it possible for the regional Bell companies to offer long distance service, provided that, in the judgment of the FCC, they have opened up their local networks to competitors such as long distance companies, cable operators and others.

To protect the public, the FCC must evaluate any application for entry into the long distance business in light of its public interest test, which gives the FCC discretion to consider a broad range of issues, such as the adequacy of interconnection arrangements to permit vigorous competition. Moreover, in deciding whether to grant the application of a regional Bell company to offer long distance service, the FCC must accord "substantial weight" to the views of the Attorney General. This special legal standard, which I consider essential, ensures that the FCC and the courts will accord full weight to the special competition expertise of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division—especially its expertise in making predictive judgments about the effect that entry by a Bell company into long distance may have on competition in local and long distance markets. This Act also allows the Attorney General to use any available evidence, including evidence acquired under the Modified Final Judgment, and make a recommendation under any legal standard the Attorney General considers appropriate.

Further, when a regional Bell company establishes a long distance or manufacturing affiliate, the Act bars it from discriminating in favor of its own affiliates and against the interests of competing long distance providers or manufacturers, when such outside companies seek to do business with the regional Bell's local network.

The Act's emphasis on competition is also reflected in its antitrust savings clause. This clause ensures that even for activities allowed under or required by the legislation, or activities resulting from FCC rulemakings or orders, the antitrust laws continue to apply fully.

I am also pleased that the Act requires interstate telecommunications carriers to contribute to a fund to preserve and advance universal service. The fund would be spent to provide and upgrade facilities and services, as prescribed by the FCC. And carriers would receive credit toward their contribution by providing discount service to schools, libraries, and health care providers in rural areas. In addition, equipment manufacturers and service providers would be required to address the needs of individuals with disabilities if readily achievable.

I am especially pleased that the Act requires new televisions to be outfitted with the V-chip,

which will empower families to choose the kind of programming suitable for their children. The V-chip provision relies on the broadcast networks to produce a rating system and to implement the system in a manner compatible with V-chip technology. By relying on the television industry to establish and implement the ratings, the Act serves the interest of families without infringing on the First Amendment rights of the television programmers and producers.

I do object to the provision in the Act concerning the transmittal of abortion-related speech and information. Current law, 18 U.S.C. 1462, prohibits transmittal of this information by certain means, and the Act would extend that law to cover transmittal by interactive computer services. The Department of Justice has advised me of its long-standing policy that this and related abortion provisions in current law are unconstitutional and will not be enforced because they violate the First Amendment. The Department has reviewed this provision of S. 652 and advises me that it provides no basis for altering that policy. Therefore, the Department will continue to decline to enforce that provision of current law, amended by this legislation, as applied to abortion-related speech.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 will strengthen our economy, our society, our families, and our democracy. It promotes competition as the key to opening new markets and new opportunities. It will help connect every classroom in America to the information superhighway by the end of the decade. It will protect consumers by regulating the remaining monopolies for a time and by providing a roadmap for deregulation in the future. I am pleased to have signed this historic legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 8, 1996.

NOTE: S. 652, approved February 8, was assigned Public Law No. 104–104.

Statement on Signing Temporary Debt Extension Legislation

February 8, 1996

A nation's financial integrity is a sacred trust. To preserve our creditworthiness, we must honor all obligations of the United States. Through the Civil War, two World Wars, and the Depression, America has paid its bill and kept its word.

Last week, congressional leaders acknowledged the importance of protecting our Nation's creditworthiness. They made a commitment in a letter to pass a mutually acceptable debt limit increase by February 29th to ensure that the United States does not default on our obligations.

Congress also took a constructive step by passing H.R. 2924 which I am signing today. This law provides temporary debt relief that allows us to meet all of our obligations and to pay Social Security and other benefits, military active duty pay, and other commitments at the beginning of March. Congress has promised to secure a mutually acceptable debt limit increase. Today, I call on Congress to pass a straightforward, long-term debt limit increase immediately so that we can get on with our shared goal of balancing the budget without the threat of default hanging over our Nation.

NOTE: H.R. 2924, approved February 8, was assigned Public Law No. 104–103.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on the V-Chip With Families in Alexandria, Virginia

February 9, 1996

The President. First of all, I'd like to thank our hosts for welcoming us in and to all the members of the press and our guests here.

As you know, yesterday I signed into law the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which was the first major overhaul of our telecommunications laws in six decades. That bill will do an enormous amount of good for our country. It will, for consumers, open up vast new opportunities for entertainment, vast new opportunities for information, vast new opportunities for different kinds of communication. It will create many, many thousands of high-wage jobs. But it will also bring a lot more images and messages into every home in America.

One of the things that the Vice President, Mrs. Gore, and I like so much about this bill is that in addition to getting the benefits of the telecommunications revolution, it gives more power to the parents to control what their young children see on television by requiring all new television sets to have a V-chip in them.

And so we wanted to come here today to discuss with these folks how they feel about it and to give them and to give you a chance to see how this will work. So, I'd like to turn it over to the Vice President and give him a chance to make a demonstration and some comments.

[*The Vice President said that the V-chip legislation would give parents the ability to make categorical choices about what their children could watch. He then demonstrated the V-chip concept by programming the host family's satellite television system to block movies exceeding a designated rating limit.*]

The President. Let me explain. This technology—you get this if you hook into a satellite where you may have access to large numbers of channels and a large number of movies. The difference in this and the Telecommunications Act is that it requires this V-chip which I want to show you. This is a V-chip. And it will be required to be put into all new television sets so that as every family in America buys a new set, they will have this. The V-chip basically is a power to the parent, a technology marvel. It enables everybody to have all the benefits of television. It will enable everyone to have the benefits of the new developments coming out of the telecommunications revolution, but it will give parents more control over the content of the programming to which their young children are exposed.

Let me say I think it's quite important. Just this week we have seen another major study chronicling the destructive impact on young children of hours and hours and hours of mindless violence and the so numbing impact it has on our young children.

So that's what the V-chip is designed to do. It will add about a dollar to the cost of every television set—a little less, actually. And we replace our TV sets at the rate of about 25 million a year, so as you can see, it will rapidly come to be a very important part of American family's arsenal of tools for raising children.

And there's another benefit that this will bring as well. I have challenged the leaders of the entertainment industry to come and meet with me about this, to talk about how we can develop a rating system for television programs like we have a rating system for movies. And we believe as more and more families get this and exercise their options under it and as more and more information is available to parents, that it will change the programming so that even parents who can't afford to buy a new television this year or next year as the V-chip comes out will begin to benefit from it.

So that's what the V-chip is. I guess I want to bring you back to Al, and he wants to say a few words before we turn it over to——

[*The Vice President introduced Tipper Gore, who expressed her long-standing concern about children's exposure to graphic and violent television programming and thanked the President for enabling families to protect their children in their own homes. She then invited the participants to comment. The first participant said she was excited about the opportunity to decide what would come into her home through the airwaves. An elementary school principal and father said that television had more power to influence children than schools did in terms of*

time and that the V-chip represented a giant step in saving the children. He also raised the issue of candy produced in the form of syringes.]

The President. What you said about the candy, that makes a point about what I think is important about the television violence study. It seems to me—and what you said about the hours—it's not so much—and I know a lot of people in the media who produce these programs get very defensive. They think they're being unfairly attacked. They talk about there's always good content, often a good moral to the story of some of these things. But it's the cumulative impact of it. I don't think they see it from the parents—perspective of the parents. It's not that our kids couldn't handle this program, that program, or the other program. It is a total impact of hour after hour after hour, day after day.

And the candy thing you mentioned made the point to me that—what it means is that people began to think of things as normal that we should never accept as normal, so we began to accept a level of violence in our society, that it's normal. It's not true. And that's the thing that bothers me. We have to go back. Now, one of the things that we've really worked hard on in our administration is trying to help communities reduce the crime rate. And I think we ought to—we need to keep at it until we go back to a time when people think that violence is abnormal, not normal; when crime is the exception, not the rule.

And I think that it's much harder if kids—like 5 hours a day, 6 days a week, for 15 years, they're dominated by this notion that it's a violent, brutal world, people do whatever they can get away with doing.

[*The Vice President mentioned the estimate that a child would witness 20,000 simulated murders on television by high school graduation, and then asked if anyone had ever had to comfort a child whose sleep was affected by what they saw on television. Several participants answered that they had, and one complained that even if the programming was acceptable, the commercials could be a problem.*]

The President. I must say, since I don't watch as much television as I used to, I was sort of unaware of that. But it's so interesting you said that, because my best friend from childhood called me yesterday, a guy I went to grade school with, and he has three wonderful children. They're various ages, like your children. His oldest child is my daughter's age, and he has two younger ones. He said the same thing. He was talking about a show he was watching with his youngest child, a little girl, and he made the same point you did, that—no one had ever said this before, the disconnection between the programming content and the ads.

[*The participant said that she felt she had to be there the entire time her child was watching. The Vice President said that broadcasters should correct that problem and cited ratings for theater movie previews. Two participants agreed that television ads posed a daily problem. Another participant said that the V-chip ratings system would have a direct impact as a guide even for people without V-chip televisions.*]

The President. That's correct.

[*The participant asked about the prospect for a low-cost installable V-chip.*]

The President. That's a big problem. We're concerned about that. Do you want to talk about that?

[*The Vice President said that there would be devices to make an older TV compatible with the V-chip system. He added that with the introduction of the V-chip, the dynamics in the marketplace would change in favor of programming that would not be blocked by the V-chip.*]

The President. Keep in mind, though, the ratings, as we all know—all of us who've ever purchased advertising know—advertising rates are tied to rating rates. Income is all related to rating rates. If there are—let's say there are 300 million television sets in the United States, which is, I think, about right. That means within 4 years, at a 25-million-a-year replacement rate, a third of the television sets will have these. If, among the third, just a significant percentage—not even a majority, just a significant percentage of the parents with young children begin to use this along with the rating system, it will affect the overall ratings, and it will have a backup impact that will benefit the parents that don't own it.

Also, I think, to be fair, a lot of our children are still at a position in their life that if we knew enough to know what things to ask them not to watch, they wouldn't do it. I don't think we should minimize the fact that a lot of these problems are caused by blind ignorance.

[*A participant said that she avoided unwanted programming at home by not watching television. The Vice President then asked the children for their comments. One child responded that he had nightmares after watching scary movies with a friend. Another child said that many parents were overprotective concerning television shows.*]

The President. I agree with that. I think kids are a lot more—good kids that have good, loving parents and a good, loving home, they can handle a lot more sometimes than their parents think. I agree with that, but the only thing I would say in defense of the parents is, remember what I said in the beginning, it's not so much that one program. If it was just one program, you know, it wouldn't be—it is the total impact of this on families where there are no restrictions for hours and hours a day, every day of the week, for a whole childhood. It changes your outlook toward the world, and what is and is not acceptable, and what you think about human nature, and whether you're optimistic or pessimistic, in ways that you don't—you can't know while it's happening to you. That's what I would say in defense of stricter parents.

It's not that kids can't handle one thing, nearly any one thing. You know, you read a lot of examples of children that see horrible incidents on the street, and they grow up to be perfectly fine, wonderful people. It's the total impact. And that's why parents need to have this.

[*One young man said he thought it was an excellent idea for younger children, especially when both parents were working. A parent added that blocking certain shows made a statement to children about individual and family values. The Vice President agreed that drawing a line was a significant part of parenting. Another participant expressed dismay that violence was presented as entertainment. The school principal noted that violence had become too commonplace and stated the need to teach nonviolence. He also praised the V-chip as a means to cope with unexpected violent or sexual content in movies shown on cable television.*]

The President. Let me just say one final thing about this. Maybe we ought to change the name from V-chip to parent power chip.

One of the things that we talk about all the time, to go beyond this, is that all these technological changes that are going on in the world are so wonderful in so many ways, in making opportunities for people to do things they never could do before. But if we're not careful, they also make the majority of the people feel that they're losing control of their lives in many ways, not just this way, in many ways. And I think anything we can do to harness the power of new technology to give people more control back over their lives, their family lives, the workplace, the community, that's a good thing. We don't want people to feel powerless.

One of the things that frustrates people in this country is they feel like there are all these forces out there running around working on their lives, and they have no control over them. And this is maybe just one small step, but it's a way of saying to people that new technologies can put you back in the driver's seat in your life, not take you further and further out of it.

[*A participant thanked the President and the Vice President for support of the V-chip legislation to empower parents.*]

The President. It's still the most important work in this society. It's everybody's most important job.

Participants. Thank you.

The President. Thank you very much. Thanks again for having me here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:05 a.m. at the residence of Ric and Jean Voigt.

Remarks at the Louisiana Economic Development Brunch
February 9, 1996

The President. Thank you so much. Senator Johnston, I appreciate that, especially since you don't have to run for reelection, that you said such a nice thing. [*Laughter*] Senator Johnston,

Senator Breaux, Congressman Hayes, Chairman Livingston—that's a nice tie for you. You're going to change your whole image up here. [*Laughter*] Thank you. Lieutenant Governor Blanco, ladies and gentlemen.

John Breaux told me I should come to this event. He said, "This is the largest number of people in my State that you will ever see at one time when they're all in a good humor." [*Laughter*]

I'm really going to miss Bennett Johnston in the Senate. I always find it so helpful to have him there in getting my budgets passed. All I had to do was give 40 percent of all the discretionary money to Louisiana and—[*laughter*]—things went right through. It was easy.

The person in this audience that I really envy today is Buddy Leach. I'm a President; he's a king. [*Laughter*] I have to run for office; he doesn't have to get elected anymore. [*Laughter*] I have to persuade; everybody has to agree with him. [*Laughter*] Do you want to switch jobs? [*Laughter*]

Let me say to all of you—I want to, first of all, just kind of take my hat off to the State of Louisiana for coming up here and doing this event every year and for the level of cooperation that you have throughout your State in trying to develop your economy. I know we've got people here from all over the State, from all the communities, and I really think it's a good thing to do.

I guess if I had to say the thing that surprised me most about becoming President when I was elected, as compared with being Governor of your neighbor to the north, it is that the atmosphere is much more partisan than I expected it to be and that the way we were presented to the rest of the country was even more partisan than we are, the way that the story sort of spins out across the country. And I went home after I'd been President about 4 months, and we were sitting around with a bunch of my friends, and I said, "Shoot, if all I knew about me was what I saw on the evening news, I wouldn't be for me either." [*Laughter*]

And we have tried to sort of move away from that. Mr. Livingston and I tried. We played golf one day, and the course was so hard it took us 6 hours to finish the round. But by the end of it, I completely lost any sense of partisan difference.

I want to say to you that yesterday we did something here that, to me, is the embodiment of what we ought to be doing as we look toward the future. I signed the telecommunications bill into law yesterday, a bill that was passed almost unanimously with overwhelming bipartisan support, the first significant reform of our communications laws in over six decades.

Everyone concedes that it will create tens of thousands of high-wage jobs, perhaps hundreds of thousands of high-wage jobs for America; that it will give vast new opportunities to ordinary citizens for communications, for information, for learning, and for entertainment. It also embodies some of our most sacred values. The Congress required that all new television sets, after a couple of years, carry with it a V-chip so that parents will have more control over the content of the programs that their children watch, so you can get more information, but you can also filter it out for a change. And we're using technology not just to rush society ahead but to give basic fundamental control back to citizens and families.

And it was all done not only in a bipartisan fashion, but taking all these incredibly powerful and diverse interests—and they are powerful and very diverse—that have a stake in how this thing is going to unfold and somehow reconciling them.

And I just—I want to applaud the Congress for what they did and the way they did it and the way they worked with me, and it is the way we ought to conduct our business, especially now—especially now, because when times are changing profoundly—and make no mistake about it, my fellow Americans, times are changing now as profoundly as they have in this country in a hundred years. The time through which we are living is most nearly parallel, in my belief, to the time in our history a hundred years ago when we moved from being a rural, agricultural country to an urban, industrial country.

Now we're moving into an economy dominated by information and technology and dominated by global markets and a global village in which urbanization will still be important because people will want to live next to each other and work together but where people, no matter where they live, will be able to do almost any kind of work within a fairly short time, face to face with others, through the communications revolution. And whenever you have a change of time like that, there is a great uprooting, so that a whole lot of people do terrifically well and other people are dislocated. And if you're

not careful, the society, its values, its institutions, get dislocated. It's very important to see everything we do up here in that context.

What are the fundamental changes we're going through? First of all, the nature of work itself is changing; there is more mind and less muscle in work. You go in any new factory in Louisiana, it wouldn't be surprising to see a woman on the factory floor working a computer, doing work that 10 years ago was done by 10 big, burly people. Even in manufacturing you see more and more work being done by fewer and fewer people—more mind, less muscle.

What else is going on? The work organizations are changing. They're flatter, they're less bureaucratic, you don't need as many people in middle management passing information up and orders down. That's very good, unless you're one of the middle managers that isn't needed anymore. I want to say more about that in a minute. So that in every year—for 15 years now, in every year the Fortune 500 has reduced its total employment in America—every year.

For the last 3 years, in every year we have set a new record in the number of new small businesses being formed. In the last year jobs created by businesses owned by women only created more jobs than the Fortune 500 laid off. So there is a change in the nature of work organizations.

And finally, there is a change in the nature of our markets, both our financial markets where money can move across the globe in a split second, and we sell goods and services in the global market, which you in Louisiana know very well because of the large size of your port at New Orleans and because of the nature of your economic base there. And all that means that there are a lot of good things happening but a lot of dislocation. And that's how we need to see what our work is up here.

Our job up here now is to create opportunities for all Americans to benefit in this economy, to give people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives and to work together to pull this country together instead of seeing it split apart, which means that the truth is that the nature of the challenges facing America today call on us to reach a new consensus, but the easy thing is, since we're all divided anyway because all this stuff is up in the air, the easy thing is to do the wrong thing, which is to find new ways to divide the American people for short-term political advantage. It may be good politics, but it's bad for the country, especially now.

And I want to say a word—I want to thank, again, Senator Johnston; he's leaving, and I'm going to miss him. But I also want to thank my good friend Senator Breaux for trying to fashion this kind of consensus in the Congress as we deal with this budget issue.

This country needs to balance the budget. We need a balanced budget plan. It would be good for the country for two reasons: It would give us a sense of discipline up here. You would have a sense that we're getting our house in order. We're moving away from the 1980's, which is the first time in our history we ever ran a large, persistent, permanent structural deficit. We've cut the deficit in half in 3 years. We need to finish the job. We also need to do it because it will keep the economic recovery going. It will inspire consumer confidence. It will lower interest rates. It will increase investment. We need to do this.

The good news is, we have identified in common to the President's plan, the Republican majority's congressional plan, and all of the various Democratic options that have been offered—we have now in common over $700 billion in budget savings over the next 7 years, more than enough to balance the budget and continue our commitments to our parents, to our children, to those with disabilities, to our environment, to our investments in education. And we should do it. I believe we will do it. I believe we will do it.

When Mr. Livingston was good enough to go to Bosnia with me a few weeks ago, we were talking about it, and I believe there will be—this is not the conventional wisdom at the moment, but I predict to you that there will be a coming together in the Congress and in the White House, and that we will do this. It is the right thing to do for America, and I hope you will support it.

And I think you have to ask yourself, well, then what? You still have to come up here every year; you still have to keep working to develop Louisiana's economy. How are we going to open the opportunities of this new age to all of our people? How are we going to bring the American people together around our basic values? How are we going to continue to lead the world as a source of peace and freedom?

Let me just mention—if you look at where we are, to try to illustrate the general points

I made, this country in the last 3 years has produced almost 8 million new jobs, a record number of new small businesses. You know, there's been a huge increase in the stock market, more than a third; it's way over 5,000 now. We've got a 15-year high in homeownership, a 27-year low in the combined rates of unemployment and inflation, as Mickey Kantor told you earlier, an all-time high in American trade. For those of us from farming States, we've got $7 soybeans, wheat is over $5, and corn is through the roof, and we think that's pretty good. And a lot of it is bad weather, but an awful lot of it is we're selling it all over the world. This is a good thing.

Now, if I had told you 3 years ago these things could happen and more than half the American people still wouldn't get a raise, you'd have a hard time believing that. But that's true; that's the other side of this change. With low inflation, high productivity, intense competition, and a lot of people not well-positioned for a world where the changing nature of work and the changing nature of work organizations is creating winners and losers, we've got to worry about those folks.

Then you've got a lot of people who are my age—I got a letter just the other day from a guy I grew up with who finally got another job after 9 months of looking—50-year-old white male, engineer, fixing to send three kids to college, and he lost a job with a Fortune 500 company because all of a sudden he wasn't needed anymore. Their stock price went up, but his life stock went down. So we have to worry about that.

And if you look at our social problems, the news is good. The crime rate is going down. The welfare, the food stamps, the poverty rate, the teen pregnancy rate, even the divorce rate, they've all gone down for the last 2 years. American people are getting their act together. That's the good news. The bad news is, they're still way too high.

And they will be—if you just take crime for an example, they will be too high until—the test for you—there will never be a time when there's no crime and violence. The test for you should be, the crime rate will be low enough when crime is the exception rather than the rule in your community again. When people are surprised when something bad happens, then the crime rate is about as low as it can get. And that ought to be your test. And until it is the exception and not the rule again, we should keep working on it.

So if you look at it in that context, I believe there are seven things that we ought to be working on, not the Federal Government, we together. One is the most important job in this country is still to raise good children and support families. That's what we did with the Family and Medical Leave Act. That's what I hope we will do with any tax relief we give coming out of this budget battle. That's what I thought we were doing when we required the V-chip in the telecommunications bill, so parents can choose for themselves what their children are exposed to. We should be supporting good childhoods and stronger families.

The second thing we should be doing is recognizing that in a world where work is more mind and less muscle, you have got to have more education, and it's got to be better. And we all have to work on it. That's why I am doing my part to see that the Federal Government is a partner in making sure that by the end of this decade every classroom and every library in America is hooked up to the Internet with good computer equipment and good software, skilled teachers, the kind of things we need to really make this work.

The third thing we have to do is to deal with this economic insecurity. If we're going to have work organizations changing, if people aren't going to be able to rely on the company the way they used to be able to, what do people need to be secure without wrecking the dynamism of this economy, whether it's in Louisiana or Seattle, Washington, or New York City? What do they need? How can we give families security without wrecking the dynamism?

Well, people have to have access to lifetime education and training. They have to have at least access to affordable health care. If the decision has been made that we will continue to be the only country in the world with a rich economy that can't figure out how to give every family under 65 health insurance, at least we ought to be smart enough to figure out how to give every family access to affordable health insurance that they don't lose.

And there is a bill in the United States Senate right now with 45 cosponsors that's been passed out of its committee unanimously, sponsored by Senator Kassebaum of Kansas and Senator Kennedy, which would basically say you won't lose your job—you won't lose your health insurance

if you change jobs or if somebody in your family gets sick. Now, that may seem elemental, but millions of people lose their health insurance arising out of those two conditions. And I hope very much that the Senate will pass it and send it on to the House. It is a good thing. The national chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers have endorsed it. It has broad bipartisan and broad-based economic support.

The third thing we've got to do is to figure out what to do about people who don't have pensions anymore. One of the most important things that all sides have agreed to in this budget debate is a minor provision which would make it much easier for small-business people and self-employed people to take out pension plans for themselves and their employees. It doesn't cost a lot of money. It was one of the top three priorities of the White House Conference on Small Business, and we ought to do that. So we have to find a way to give people more economic security. We'll do our part, but you have to do yours. We've got to keep the economy growing in order for these other things to make sense.

The next thing we have to do, as I said, is to continue the fight against crime and violence, drugs and gangs. I am proud of the fact that the crime rate has gone down. In my hometown of Little Rock, we had the biggest drop in years and years last year. New York had the lowest crime they've had in years and the biggest drop they've had in 25 years in crime. New Orleans had a 20 percent drop in the murder rate last year, in the first 6 months of '95. I haven't seen the last 6 months' statistics yet. But you see this going everywhere. We know what works. We know that if you put more community police and they work with their neighbors and you put them on the street and they're walking the blocks and they know the school kids, we know you can do something about that.

Last weekend I was in Manchester, New Hampshire, where the chief of police and a beat policeman stood there with community leaders and said, "We have taken our neighborhoods back. The crime rate is down. The drugs are gone. The gangs are gone. People can safely walk the streets at night. The police know the names of the children in the schoolyard. This is our town again." That is the song I want to hear every American singing. And they said they were able to do it because the United States Government and the crime bill of 1994 gave them more police officers and the resources they need to do that. We didn't tell them how to do it, but we said, "Here is a national problem, and we're going to help you." That's the sort of thing we need to do.

And in Louisiana and Arkansas, let me say, the next big challenge we have is we have got to continue to fight these environmental battles in a way that grows the economy. There is this idea still abroad in the land that we have to accept some environmental degradation in order to grow the economy. That cannot be the case. If you look—one of the major news magazines had a big cover story a couple of weeks ago saying that this horrible winter we've just gone through, which has paralyzed one-third of our economy for nearly 2 weeks, was the direct result of global warming. Last year was the hottest year on record ever. This is not some conspiracy. Guys won the Nobel Prize for proving how it is working.

I met with the—in the interest of Senator Johnston, I met—he cares a lot about our relationship with China—I met with the President of China in New York a few months ago, and we were talking about our differences. And I said, "You think that I'm really worried about your politics?" I said, "You know what the biggest threat to our security is that you present?" I said, "You got 1.2 billion people, and you all want your folks to be as rich as Americans, and so do I. But if you get rich in the same way we do and every one of you drives a car, you're going to burn up the atmosphere. You won't be able to breathe, and that's a threat to our common security." And he laughed, and he said, "You might be right." That's why we're working with Detroit to get a clean car, because I think it's important.

So I say to all of you, we can find ways to nurture the chemical industry, nurture the energy industry, nurture these industries in a way that creates more economic opportunity by figuring out how to use energy in a way that is good for the environment.

Let me say two other things very briefly, and some of you will agree with this, at least on the trade message, but one of my biggest challenges as President is convincing the American people that all these changes we're going through require us to be more involved with the rest of the world, not less. And now that

I've been here awhile, and we've been able to do some things in foreign policy, and people see that there are no Russian missiles pointed at our children for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, and we've got continued progress on that front and others, I get the feeling sometimes when I make a decision like Bosnia, the American people say something like, "Well, okay, that's your job. We hired you to make it. I wish you wouldn't fool with it, but if you're going to do it, we'll let you do it. But we're not very interested in that." Let me just say to all of you, if you could see this from my perspective, you would see that all the things we hope to gain from trade, for example, would be impossible if we were to withdraw from the world in other ways.

Let me just give you a few examples. We know that our safest big market for the future is everything south of New Orleans, is in Latin America. There will be a billion people there soon. It's the second fastest growing area of the world, next to Asia. Every nation but one is governed by an elected—democratically elected leader. Now, if we want them to buy our products and we want to have good relationships with them and we want them to try to help us stop the drug problem, we have to be a good neighbor.

You know that we have arrested in the last 2 years seven of the eight top leaders of the Cali drug cartel in Colombia. That's something we can be proud of, but I didn't have to put my life on the line to do it. The people in Colombia that helped us, they risked their lives to do it. You can't tell them to do that and don't put drugs in the veins of America's kids and not be a good partner. You can't do it.

We can't ask Pakistan and other countries to go arrest suspected terrorists when people come into this country and blow up buildings and kill innocent Americans—and I want to put them in jail—if we're not willing to be good partners with them in other ways and be engaged with them and help them to realize their dreams.

A lot of people thought that this Haiti thing was something we shouldn't be involved in. I heard a lot of people say that. Well, 2 days ago they had the first democratic transfer of power in the 193-year history of Haiti, and there are no illegal immigrants, full of boats, besieging the shores of the United States, because we were involved.

So I say to you, this matters. If you want the Europeans, which will soon be the biggest economy in the world collectively, if they all unify, to open their doors to our products more instead of become more protectionist, which is a big deal for farmers and a big deal for high-tech telecommunications people, then we must be prepared to be their partners in places like Bosnia.

So I ask you to go home and talk to your friends and neighbors about this. If we're going to have all-time high trade figures, if you want 4 or 5 more years where exports grow faster than imports, the United States cannot walk away from the fact that we are the only superpower in the world and people look to us to be leaders for peace and freedom.

The last thing I want to say is, we have big decisions to make about what kind of Government we're going to have in Washington. What are we supposed to do? What are you supposed to do in Louisiana? What should be done in the private sector? And I just want you to know that from my perspective, that the old debates are no good anymore. This is not about big Government and small Government. This Government here in Washington—you're sitting in the Commerce Department at a time when your Federal Government is the smallest it's been since 1965. Next year, it will be—by the end of this year, it will be the smallest it's been since 1962, and it's going to get smaller still. Two hundred and five fewer thousand—205,000 fewer people work here than they did the day I showed up. The big Government issue is not there.

It's not a question about Government versus the marketplace. We needed a Government action, the Telecommunications Act of 1996, to unleash the power of the marketplace. The issue is whether we're going to do this together.

Now we're trying to give you better Government here, not just smaller but better. The SBA has doubled its loans and cut its budget. Last year—I'm really proud of this—in Forbes or Fortune, one of those business magazines—depending on the outcome of these primaries, I'll have to figure out which one—[*laughter*]—but anyway, one of those business magazines gives awards every year to the best performance by a business organization in a lot of categories, and one of them is telephone service to consumers. And this year, the nominees were Federal Express, Southwest Airlines, L.L. Bean, pretty

distinguished group. Do you know who won? The Social Security Administration—not by a Government determination, by a business magazine. I'm proud of that.

So we're trying to give you that. But let me just say, you have to decide, because you will determine the tenor of this election and more importantly, you will determine where we're going in the future, whether you believe what works to bring you here when you all get together and work together is what should work in the country. This is not big Government versus small Government anymore. It is not the Government versus the private sector anymore. This is about whether we are going to work together to solve our problems or whether we are going to continue to treat politics like a sport which makes the people more and more cynical and more and more divided. Those are luxuries we cannot afford.

The best days of this country are still ahead of us if we are willing to meet our challenges and if we're willing to meet them together. We are going through a period of great change which will give us the greatest age of possibility the American children have ever known. But we have to do it. And if we do our job up here in the way that you are doing your job where you live by working together, this country is going to be in great shape for the future.

Thank you very much.

Senator J. Bennett Johnston. We want to make the President an honorary Louisianian so he can properly celebrate Mardi Gras, so I'm going to give him my beads which I wear every day. [*Laughter*]

The President. When I am no longer President—and I have been making this little list of all of all the things I wanted to do in my life I never got around to doing, and if God leaves me healthy and I can do it—when I'm taking time off of paying my legal bills—[*laughter*]—I've got this list of things I want to do. And one of the things I want to do is go to the Mardi Gras and play my saxophone with a group like that. If I live long enough, I'll wear these beads.

Thank you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:10 p.m. in the auditorium at the Department of Commerce. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gov. Kathleen Blanco of Louisiana and Claude (Buddy) Leach, king of Washington Mardi Gras.

Statement on the Terrorist Attack in London, United Kingdom

February 9, 1996

All Americans join Hillary and me in our outrage at the bomb explosion today in London. I condemn in the strongest possible terms this cowardly action and hope those responsible are brought swiftly to justice. Our hearts and prayers go out to those injured in this terrible blast and to their families.

I am deeply concerned by reports that the Irish Republican Army has announced an end to the cease-fire. For a year and a half, the people of the United Kingdom and Ireland have enjoyed living in peace, free to go about their daily lives without the threat of the bomb and the bullet. As was clear during my visit to Northern Ireland last year, the people want peace. No one and no organization has the right to deny them that wish.

The terrorists who perpetrated today's attack cannot be allowed to derail the effort to bring peace to the people of Northern Ireland—a peace they overwhelmingly support.

The United States stands ready to assist the two Governments in continuing their search for negotiations and peace. Today's action underscores the urgent need for all sides to join in the fight against terrorism and to press forward in that search.

Statement on the Floods in Oregon and Washington
February 9, 1996

Our hearts and prayers go out to the thousands of people in Oregon and Washington who have been inundated by the devastating floods and those who are waging a brave fight to keep the water from pouring over the river banks.

In an effort to provide quick action in their urgent time of need, today I have signed Federal disaster declarations for Oregon and Washington. These declarations will give help to individuals, including temporary housing, family grants, and low-interest loans. We are also providing funds to help rebuild the State and local infrastructure.

I have asked FEMA Director James Lee Witt to go to both Oregon and Washington, survey the damage, and lead the Federal response and recovery efforts.

The people of Oregon and Washington have demonstrated a remarkable amount of courage and resilience in this difficult time. I know they cannot recover alone. We are with them for as long as it takes.

Finally, let me take a moment to express my deepest sympathies to the families and friends of those who have lost their lives during this natural disaster. Our thoughts and prayers are with them.

Memorandum on Benefits for Military Personnel Subject to Involuntary Separation as a Result of HIV
February 9, 1996

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs

Subject: Benefits for Military Personnel Involuntarily Separated from the Armed Services as a Result of HIV

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (S. 1124) contains a provision I strongly oppose, which requires the discharge of all military personnel living with the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), regardless of whether there is any medical necessity for such discharge. This provision is clearly discriminatory and wholly unwarranted. It is also highly punitive. Service members discharged pursuant to this provision would not receive the benefits to which they would otherwise be entitled had they continued to serve until it became medically necessary for them to retire.

Consequently, I will give my full support to legislative efforts to repeal this provision.

In the meantime, I am committed to ensuring full benefits to these service members and their families to ameliorate the unfair burden this legislation will place on them. I am therefore directing you, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget and such other agencies as may be appropriate, to take all necessary steps, consistent with applicable law, to ensure that these service members and their families receive the full benefits they are entitled to, including, among other things, disability retirement pay, health care coverage for their families, and transition benefits such as vocational education.

This memorandum is for the internal management of the executive branch and does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any person.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Message to the Congress Reporting on Terrorists Who Threaten To Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process

February 9, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments concerning the national emergency with respect to organizations that threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order No. 12947 of January 23, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On January 23, 1995, I signed Executive Order 12947, "Prohibiting Transactions with Terrorists Who Threaten to Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process" (the "order") (60 *Fed. Reg.* 5079, January 25, 1995). The order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of 12 terrorist organizations that threaten the Middle East peace process as identified in an Annex to the order. The order also blocks the property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons designated by the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, who are found (1) to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process, or (2) to assist in, sponsor or provide financial, material, or technological support for, or services in support of, such acts of violence. In addition, the order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, any other person designated pursuant to the order (collectively "Specially Designated Terrorists" or "SDTs").

The order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDTs, including the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or services to or for the benefit of such persons. This prohibition includes donations that are intended to relieve human suffering.

Designations of persons blocked pursuant to the order are effective upon the date of determination by the Secretary of State or his delegate, or the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the *Federal Register*, or upon prior actual notice.

2. On January 25, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice listing persons blocked pursuant to Executive Order No. 12947 who have been designated by the President as terrorist organizations threatening the Middle East peace process or who have been found to be owned or controlled by, or to be acting for or on behalf of, these terrorist organizations (60 *Fed. Reg.* 5084, January 25, 1995). The notice identified 31 entities that act for or on behalf of the 12 Middle East terrorist organizations listed in the Annex to Executive Order No. 12947, as well as 18 individuals who are leaders or representatives of these groups. In addition the notice provides 9 name variations or pseudonyms used by the 18 individuals identified. The list identifies blocked persons who have been found to have committed, or to pose a risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose of disrupting the Middle East peace process or to have assisted in, sponsored, or provided financial, material or technological support for, or service in support of, such acts of violence, or are owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of other blocked persons. The Department of the Treasury issued three additional notices adding the names of three individuals, as well as their pseudonyms, to the List of SDTs (60 *Fed. Reg.* 41152–53, August 11, 1995; 60 *Fed. Reg.* 44932–33, August 29, 1995; and 60 *Fed. Reg.* 58435–36, November 27, 1995). Copies of the notices are attached to this report. The FAC, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, is continuing to expand the list of Specially Designated Terrorists, including both organizations

and individuals, as additional information is developed.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from July 23, 1995, through January 22, 1996, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to organizations that disrupt the Middle East peace process are estimated at approximately $2.6 million. (The expenses for the previous period, incorrectly stated in the report of July 27, 1995, to be approximately $55,000, were about $2.5 million.) Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Justice.

4. Executive Order No. 12947 provides this Administration with a new tool for combating fundraising in this country on behalf of organizations that use terror to undermine the Middle East peace process. The order makes it harder for such groups to finance these criminal activities by cutting off their access to sources of support in the United States and to U.S. financial facilities. It is also intended to reach charitable contributions to designated organizations and individuals to preclude diversion of such donations to terrorist activities.

In addition, the Congress has pending before it comprehensive counterterrorism legislation proposed by the Administration that would strengthen our ability to prevent terrorist acts, identify those who carry them out, and bring them to justice. The combination of Executive Order No. 12947 and the proposed legislation demonstrate the U.S. determination to confront and combat those who would seek to destroy the Middle East peace process, and our commitment to the global fight against terrorism.

I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against extremists seeking to destroy the hopes of peaceful coexistence between Arabs and Israelis as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 9, 1996.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Iraq

February 9, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of August 1, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 of August 2, 1990. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Executive Order No. 12722 ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Iraq (including the Central Bank of Iraq) then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a U.S. person. That order also prohibited the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iraqi origin, as well as the exportation of goods, services, and technology from the United States to Iraq. The order prohibited travel-related transactions to or from Iraq and the performance of any contract in support of any industrial, commercial, or governmental project in Iraq. U.S. persons were also prohibited from granting or extending credit or loans to the Government of Iraq.

The foregoing prohibitions (as well as the blocking of Government of Iraq property) were continued and augmented on August 9, 1990, by Executive Order No. 12724, which was issued in order to align the sanctions imposed by the United States with United Nations Security Council Resolution 661 of August 6, 1990.

Executive Order No. 12817 was issued on October 21, 1992, to implement in the United States measures adopted in United Nations Se-

curity Council Resolution 778 of October 2, 1992. Resolution 778 requires U.N. Member States to transfer to a U.N. escrow account any funds (up to $200 million apiece) representing Iraqi oil sale proceeds paid by purchasers after the imposition of U.N. sanctions on Iraq, to finance Iraq's obligations for U.N. activities with respect to Iraq, such as expenses to verify Iraqi weapons destruction, and to provide humanitarian assistance in Iraq on a nonpartisan basis. A portion of the escrowed funds also funds the activities of the U.N. Compensation Commission in Geneva, which handles claims from victims of the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait. Member States also may make voluntary contributions to the account. The funds placed in the escrow account are to be returned, with interest, to the Member States that transferred them to the United Nations, as funds are received from future sales of Iraqi oil authorized by the U.N. Security Council. No Member State is required to fund more than half of the total transfers or contributions to the escrow account.

This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 and matters relating to Executive Orders No. 12724 and 12817 (the "Executive orders"). The report covers events from August 2, 1995, through February 1, 1996.

1. During the reporting period, there were no amendments to the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations.

2. The Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) continues its involvement in lawsuits seeking to prevent the unauthorized transfer of blocked Iraqi assets. In *Consarc Corporation v. Iraqi Ministry of Industry and Minerals,* No. 94–5390 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 15, 1995), the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit issued its second opinion in this case, finding in FAC's favor on all issues presented to the court. The court ordered the district court judge to direct Consarc Corporation to restore the status quo by returning $6.4 million plus interest to the blocked Iraqi government account from which it was withdrawn after the district court erroneously held that these funds were not blocked Iraqi government property. The court also found that the unsold furnace manufactured for the Iraqi government and sales proceeds of a second furnace were blocked property. Finally, the court reversed the district court's ruling that Consarc held a specific claim against a blocked Iraqi government account for $6.4 million, holding that any claim Consarc had against the Government of Iraq was as a general creditor only.

Investigations of possible violations of the Iraqi sanctions continue to be pursued and appropriate enforcement actions taken. Several cases from prior reporting periods are continuing and recent additional allegations have been referred by FAC to the U.S. Customs Service for investigation. Additional FAC civil penalty notices were prepared during the reporting period for violations of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and Iraqi Sanctions Regulations with respect to transactions involving Iraq. One *de minimis* penalty has been collected from an organization for unlicensed exports in violation of the prohibitions against transactions involving Iraq. Several other penalty proceedings are pending completion.

3. Investigation also continues into the roles played by various individuals and firms outside Iraq in the Iraqi government procurement network. These investigations may lead to additions to FAC's listing of individuals and organizations determined to be Specially Designated Nationals (SDNs) of the Government of Iraq.

4. Pursuant to Executive Order No. 21817 implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution 778, on October 26, 1992, FAC directed the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to establish a blocked account for receipt of certain post-August 6, 1990, Iraqi oil sales proceeds, and to hold, invest, and transfer these funds as required by the order. On September 5, 1995, following payments by the Governments of Australia ($216,360.00), Denmark ($168,985.00), Japan ($4,075,000.00), The Netherlands ($4,168,745.47), New Zealand ($67,050.00), Switzerland ($265,108.20), and by the European Union ($647,463.31), respectively, to the special United Nations-controlled account, entitled "United Nations Security Council Resolution 778 Escrow Account," the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of $9,606,711.98 from the blocked account it holds to the United Nations-controlled account. Similarly, on October 30, 1995, following the payment of $1,504,000.00 by the European Community, and payments by the Governments of Germany ($355,871.89), The Netherlands ($2,698,348.13), Norway ($199,983.00), and the United Kingdom ($2,188,992.67), the Federal

Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of $6,947,195.69 to the United Nations-controlled account. Finally, on December 21, 1995, following the payment of $3,062,197.28 by the European Union, and payments by the Governments of the Netherlands ($1,922,719.00), Sweden ($4,223,178.20) and the United Kingdom ($208,600.44), the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer the amount of $8,313,066.13 to the United Nations-controlled account. Cumulative transfers from the blocked Federal Reserve Bank of New York account since issuance of Executive Order No. 12817 now have amounted to $200 million, fully satisfying the U.S. commitment to match the payments of other Member States from blocked Iraqi oil payments, and its obligation pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 778.

5. The Office of Foreign Assets Control has issued a total of 618 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to Iraq or Iraqi assets since August 1990. Licenses have been issued for transactions such as the filing of legal actions against Iraqi governmental entities, legal representation of Iraq, and the exportation to Iraq of donated medicine, medical supplies, food intended for humanitarian relief purposes, the execution of powers of attorney relating to the administration of personal assets and decedents' estates in Iraq and the protection of preexistent intellectual property rights in Iraq. Since my last report, 28 specific licenses have been issued.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from August 2, 1995, through February 1, 1996, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Iraq are reported to be about $1.6 million, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, and the Office of the Legal Adviser), and the Department of Transportation (particularly the U.S. Coast Guard).

7. The United States imposed economic sanctions on Iraq in response to Iraq's illegal invasion and occupation of Kuwait, a clear act of brutal aggression. The United States, together with the international community, is maintaining economic sanctions against Iraq because the Iraqi regime has failed to comply fully with United Nations Security Council resolutions. Security Council resolutions on Iraq call for the elimination of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, Iraqi recognition of Kuwait, and the inviolability of the Iraq-Kuwait boundary, the release of Kuwaiti and other third-country nationals, compensation for victims of Iraqi aggression, long-term monitoring of weapons of mass destruction capabilities, the return of Kuwaiti assets stolen during Iraq's illegal occupation of Kuwait, renunciation of terrorism, an end to internal Iraqi repression of its own civilian population, and the facilitation of access of international relief organizations to all those in need in all parts of Iraq. More than 5 years after the invasion, a pattern of defiance persists: a refusal to account for missing Kuwaiti detainees; failure to return Kuwaiti property worth millions of dollars, including military equipment that was used by Iraq in its movement of troops to the Kuwaiti border in October 1994; sponsorship of assassinations in Lebanon and in northern Iraq; incomplete declarations to weapons inspectors; and ongoing widespread human rights violations. As a result, the U.N. sanctions remain in place; the United States will continue to enforce those sanctions under domestic authority.

The Baghdad government continues to violate basic human rights of its own citizens through systematic repression of minorities and denial of humanitarian assistance. The Government of Iraq has repeatedly said it will not be bound by United Nations Security Council Resolution 688. For more than 4 years, Baghdad has maintained a blockade of food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies against northern Iraq. The Iraqi military routinely harasses residents of the north, and has attempted to "Arabize" the Kurdish, Turcomen, and Assyrian areas in the north. Iraq has not relented in its artillery attacks against civilian population centers in the south, or in its burning and draining operations in the southern marshes, which have forced thousands to flee to neighboring States.

In April 1995, the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 986 authorizing Iraq to export limited quantities of oil (up to $1 billion per quarter) under U.N. supervision in order to finance the purchase of food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies. The resolution includes arrangements to ensure equitable distribution of such assistance to all the people of Iraq. The resolution also provides for the payment of compensation to victims of Iraqi aggression and for the funding of other U.N. activities with respect to Iraq. Resolution 986 was carefully crafted to address the issues raised by Iraq to justify its refusal to implement similar humanitarian resolutions adopted in 1991 (Resolutions 706 and 712), such as oil export routes and questions of national sovereignty. Nevertheless, Iraq refused to implement this humanitarian measure. This only reinforces our view that Saddam Hussein is unconcerned about the hardships suffered by the Iraqi people.

The policies and actions of the Saddam Hussein regime continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, as well as to regional peace and security. The U.N. resolutions affirm that the Security Council be assured of Iraq's peaceful intentions in judging its compliance with sanctions. Because of Iraq's failure to comply fully with these resolutions, the United States will continue to apply economic sanctions to deter it from threatening peace and stability in the region.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 9, 1996.

Message to the Congress on Japanese Whaling Activities
February 9, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

On December 11, 1995, Secretary of Commerce Ronald Brown certified under section 8 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (the "Pelly Amendment") (22 U.S.C. 1978), that Japan has conducted research whaling activities that diminish the effectiveness of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) conservation program. This message constitutes my report to the Congress pursuant to subsection (b) of the Pelly Amendment.

The certification of the Secretary of Commerce was based on Japanese research whaling activities in both the North Pacific and the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary. In 1994, Japan expanded its research whaling activities into the North Pacific by permitting the taking of 100 minke whales, 21 of which were taken. The IWC found that this North Pacific whaling failed to satisfy applicable criteria for lethal research and was therefore inconsistent with the IWC's conservation program. Nevertheless, Japan continued its whaling activities in the North Pacific, taking 100 minke whales in 1995. In addition, during 1995, Japan increased the number of minke whales to be harvested in the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary by 33 percent, despite a 1994 finding by the IWC that this lethal research program did not meet all applicable criteria.

In his letter to me of December 11, 1995, Secretary Brown conveyed his concerns not only over the whales that have been killed in this program to date but also over any further expansion of lethal research. While noting that the Japanese have informed us they have no plans for a further expansion of lethal research in the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary, he expressed particular concern over whaling activity in that area. I share these concerns.

At this stage, I do not believe that the use of trade sanctions is the most constructive approach to resolving our differences over research whaling activities with the Government of Japan. However, I have instructed the Department of State to convey my very strong concerns to the Government of Japan. We will also vigorously pursue high-level efforts to persuade Japan to reduce the number of whales killed in its research program and act consistently with the IWC conservation program. We hope to achieve significant progress on these issues by the beginning of the next Antarctic whaling season and will keep these issues under review. I have in-

structed the Department of Commerce to continue to monitor closely Japan's research whaling and to report promptly on any further inconsistencies between Japanese whaling activities and the guidelines of the IWC conservation program.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 9, 1996.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Poland-United States Fisheries Agreement Extension
February 9, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Poland Extending the Agreement of August 1, 1985, as amended, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States ("the 1985 Agreement"). The Agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Warsaw on December 15 and 20, 1995, extends the 1985 Agreement to December 31, 1997.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Poland, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this Agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 9, 1996.

Remarks on the Terrorist Attack in London, United Kingdom
February 10, 1996

The President. Good morning. I have a few words to say about yesterday's terrorist bombing in London. As all of us know, it injured scores of people. Let me begin by saying that I know I speak for all Americans who join Hillary and me in praying for those who were hurt and for their speedy recovery. We also hope that those responsible for this terrible and cowardly act are quickly brought to justice.

There can be no doubt about the purpose of this attack. This attack was aimed at the growing prospects for peace, a just and lasting peace, in Northern Ireland. I am deeply concerned by reports that the Irish Republican Army has announced an end to the cease-fire. The cease-fire and the good will and hard work of the parties to the Irish conflict have given the people of Northern Ireland the greatest gift of all, the simple blessings of a normal life. Since the cease-fire went into effect a year and a half ago, people of all faiths have been able to go about their daily lives without the disruption of searches and roadblocks, and especially without fear of the bullet and the bomb. We must not turn away from that path now.

I know that the overwhelming majority of the people of Northern Ireland, Catholic and Protestant alike, want to stay on the path of peace. During my visit there last year I could see for myself that the demand for peace was lasting. No one and no organization has the right to deny the people of Northern Ireland a peaceful future, and I am determined to do all that I can to see that the enemies of peace do not succeed.

Last night I spoke to the British Prime Minister, John Major, to express our shock and sadness over this event. I also spoke to the Irish Prime Minister, John Bruton. I assured both of them that America would continue to be committed to work for a negotiated, secure peace.

Let me say again that this terrible incident reminds me of a lesson I have learned in working for peace throughout the world in the last 3 years. The real differences in our world are not between Catholics and Protestants, Arabs and Jews, Muslims, Croats, and Serbs; they are between those who embrace peace and those who reject it, those who look to the future and those who are blinded by the hatreds of the past, those who open their arms and those who are determined to keep clenching their fists.

We all have to choose. The people of Northern Ireland have chosen peace. They do not deserve to have a small group choose bloodshed and violence and wreck the peaceful life they long for. And the people of Great Britain do not deserve to have this violence wreaked upon them. We will not stop in our efforts until peace has been secured.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:47 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to his departure for Iowa City, IA.

The President's Radio Address
February 10, 1996

Good morning. Today I want to talk with you about our families and our future—a future of great possibilities and strong challenges, challenges we cannot meet with Government alone, but we can't meet them by letting people fend for themselves, either. We have to go forward together.

In my State of the Union Address, I outlined our seven biggest challenges for the future, challenges we must meet if we are going to make the American dream available to all our people and unite our country around our shared values.

Those seven are: strengthening our families and giving our children better childhoods; providing better education for all Americans; enhancing the security of working families through access to health care, lifetime education and training, and secure pensions; fighting crime and gangs and drugs until crime is the exception, not the rule, in America again; protecting our environment; maintaining our world leadership for peace and freedom; and continuing to reform and reinvent our Government so that it does a better job at less cost in helping our people to make the most of their own lives and solve our problems together.

Our first and in many ways our most important challenge is to strengthen our families and improve childhood for all of our children. Our children are shaped by many forces, first and foremost by their parents, but also by other relatives, schools, places of worship, their peers, their communities, and the larger economic and social forces of our time.

If the first years of a child's life go right, with engaged, caring parents to love and encourage them, to teach them right from wrong, it can mean the difference between a lifetime of fulfillment and a lifetime of frustration and disappointment. It can also mean the difference between an America prepared to meet the challenges of the 21st century and an America that is not.

These days, most parents are working harder just to make ends meet; so it's an even greater challenge to spend the time, the energy, the concentration necessary to get children off to a good start. And it's a tougher job because our children are subject to so many outside forces that can undermine their growing up.

Sadly, too many of our children are growing up without parents; others are abused or neglected by their parents; others have parents who simply don't know how to be strong positive forces, the kind of forces every child needs in his or her life. Too often, these parents become shadows on the outskirts of their children's lives.

We know that when parents are absent or abusive the results can be tragic. Recently in Chicago a 5-year-old boy was held 14 stories above the pavement by a 10-year-old and an 11-year-old, and dropped to his death. The boys who did the killing were essentially parentless, with both fathers in prison. In New York, a

6-year-old girl was beaten and tortured to death by her own mother.

We know neglect can be bad, too, and not just in physical ways. Just this week, another national study confirmed the destructive impact on children of being permitted to watch excessive violence on television for hours and hours a day, year after year after year. Beyond that, we all know of the threats to our children outside the family. We must do a better job of dealing with these challenges.

The sad fact is that while the overall crime rate is going down, crime among juveniles is still going up. While the overall drug use rate is going down, drug use among our children is still going up. When we lose these children, we suffer terrible individual losses and more; we lose a piece of our shared future.

I know today's parents face tough challenges. This information and technology revolution in the new global economy we're experiencing is transforming the world to a degree seldom seen in history. Many of these changes are good, but let's face it, many of them put extra tremendous stress on America's parents, financial and otherwise.

That's why we've worked hard to help parents in building strong families and bright futures for their children with things like the Family and Medical Leave Act so parents won't have to sacrifice their jobs when there's a baby born or family emergencies; with investments in Head Start and immunization so our children get off to a healthy start; with the earned-income tax credit, which this year will cut taxes for working families with incomes of less than $27,000 so that no families with full-time workers and children will be in poverty; with record amounts of child support collected; and with successful new efforts to make our streets and schools safer—100,000 more police, things like the Brady law, which has now kept 40,000 criminals from getting handguns.

Just this week I signed the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which gives the parents the V-chip so they can take greater responsibility for their children's lives and help them to kick the degrading influence of excessive television violence and other inappropriate programming out of their house.

Now we're working hard to pass bipartisan legislation to prevent insurance companies from dropping people when they switch jobs or when their family members or they have preexisting health conditions. A sick child is enough weight on your shoulders without threatening the family's insurance. We're trying to pass welfare reform which supports both work and childrearing. And we ought to raise the minimum wage. No parent can raise a child on $4.25 a hour, though millions are trying to do just that.

Government will continue to do its part. But governments don't raise children; parents do, and no program can ever replace parents teaching their children right from wrong and helping them to grow into strong, self-confident citizens. We can give you the V-chip, but you have to use it. We can make dads send checks to support their children, but a check is no substitute for a parent's love and guidance. We can continue to improve our schools, but what happens in the classroom depends in part on what happens at home, before and after school. We can pass laws to help families, but families must help themselves with parents respecting each other, keeping violence out of the home, challenging each other to work harder to stay together. Divorce may be easier than staying together for parents, but usually it's tougher for the kids.

So to every parent I say: Turn off the TV more. Get to know your child's teacher. Spend time together. Read and learn together. Above all, teach your child right from wrong. If parents do their job and the rest of us, including Government, do our part, America's future will be assured because we work together.

The Bible asks: "If your child asks for bread, would you give him a stone? If he asks for fish, would you give him a serpent? If he asks for an egg, would you give him a scorpion?" Our children are what we give them, what we teach them. We dare not forget that basic truth. Their lives and our common future depend upon it.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at approximately 8:15 a.m. in the Oval Office for broadcast at 10:06 a.m.

Remarks to the Community in Iowa City, Iowa
February 10, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you, Erin. Thank you to the University of Iowa Band. You were great. I thank the basketball team for ending their practice early so we could come and gather, and I hope they have practiced enough to do very well. I think they have.

I congratulate the University of Iowa on all of its successes, athletic and academic, and I think we should, in addition to football and women's and men's basketball, mention the long success of the wrestling team here, which has always impressed me.

I want to thank Allison Miller, who spoke here before, for her work on the Clinton-Gore campaign. And I thank Bob Rush for running for Congress and trying to change the direction of the House of Representatives. I want to thank the Iowans who have contributed to the success of our administration, and in particular two: your former attorney general, Bonnie Campbell, who directs our Office of Violence Against Women; and the President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, who directs jobs for America by getting investments abroad, Ruth Harkin. I thank her for the wonderful job she has done.

You know, I'm glad to be back in Iowa, and I was glad to hear Senator Harkin giving you all those reasons you should vote in the caucus in just a couple of days. He didn't give you the best reason of all, from my purely selfish point of view. You see, I've always admired the Iowa caucuses, and the last time I ran, for some reason I could get almost no votes here. [*Laughter*] And so I would like, just one time before I have to retire from politics, to get a great vote in the Iowa caucus. So I ask you to please go out and do that.

I have been privileged to serve you now for 3 years. And before we talk about the next 4, just let me thank you for the last 3: for the support I received in Iowa in 1992; for the incredible experience that Hillary and I and Al and Tipper had when our bus drove through here, and the times I came back, and the people I met, the stories I heard, the things I learned; for the opportunity to come here when you were reeling from the floods, with our Federal Emergency Management Agency and the other agencies, to try to help Iowa put itself back together and get back on a good foot to the future; for the rural summit we had here, where people came from all over America to Iowa to talk about our plans for rebuilding rural America as well as urban and suburban America. I thank you for all that.

And let me also say there was a sense in which, while I only came to Iowa on these occasions, Iowa was always there with me because of the heroic, courageous, never-failing, energetic, determined stands that Tom Harkin has taken in the United States Senate every day he has served.

My fellow Americans, I know that because Iowa has this incredible responsibility of beginning the process of nominating the President, and because so much time and money is spent here, ever more on television ads, it seems, this year, there is always a lot of discussion about what the Iowa caucus means and what the election is about. And very often it's in terms of, is this going to be an election where grassroots campaigns will be less significant than television ads? Is this going to be an election where some kind of message works better than another? Is this going to be an election where economics or social issues and fundamental values dominate? In other words, there's all this sort of handicapping that goes on, and I guess you get used to it. But let me tell you: This election fundamentally is about you, and don't you ever forget it. It's about your responsibilities. It's about your opportunities. It's about your country. It's about your future. It is about you. And you must make sure that is exactly what it is about all year long until November.

As I said in my State of the Union Address and have said all across America, we are now living in a time of profound change, more profound than any period of our history since we moved from being fundamentally a rural, agricultural society to being a more urban, industrial society 100 years ago. This change we are now going through is as profound as that.

Senator Harkin mentioned Bill Gates, the great founder of Microsoft. You know, he's written a book about the future, the information superhighway, and he says that the revolution

in communications brought on by digital chips will be more profound than anything that has happened since the printing press was invented in Europe by Gutenberg 500 years ago. That is the dimension of the period of change in which you live.

How does this affect you? We're changing the way we work, where mind counts more than muscle. We're changing the way we communicate because of the information explosion. We're changing the workplace itself. Workplaces tend to be less bureaucratic, less hierarchical, and smaller. And it's great if you're on the upside of it, but not so good if you're like a lot of my classmates from grade school and high school and college, who are being laid off from some of these companies as they downsize.

If you change the way you work, if you change the way you communicate, if you change the way the workplace works, if the marketplace changes so that financial markets and markets for goods and services are all global, the way markets for farm products have been for years, inevitably we'll have to change the way we live and the way we related to each other and the rest of the world. And that means the roles of our Government must change, too.

But our Government must be the servant of the people. And so, to decide what we should do for the next 4 years and into the future, we have to first ask ourselves, what kind of country do we want to be? What is our vision for the future? How are we doing now? That will answer the question of which policies we should pursue.

My vision for the future is one in which this incredible age of possibility—there are literally more possibilities available for personal fulfillment today and tomorrow than at any time in our history—I want those possibilities available to every American without regard to race or gender or income or region. Every American who is willing to work for them ought to have them.

I want America to be strong enough and good enough to still be the world's strongest force for peace and freedom, as long as we are needed to try to heal the divisions in this troubled world and as long as we need to be a leading force to protect our own security and advance the quality of our own lives. And more than anything else, I want this country to grow and work and live together. I am sick and tired of seeing us divided by short-term political strategies that are bad for our country.

Now if you share that vision, you have to ask yourself, how are we doing? And if you ask yourself, how are we doing, you have to answer, we're doing better than we were, but not nearly good enough. That is the short answer.

Look at the economy. Nearly 8 million new jobs, a big drop in the unemployment rate, an explosion in the growth of manufacturing jobs here in Iowa, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years, a 15-year high in homeownership for 3 years in a row, record numbers of new small businesses. Interestingly enough, businesses owned by women alone in the last 3 years have created more new jobs than the Fortune 500 have laid off. That is good.

In each of the last 3 years, a record number of new self-made millionaires—not people who inherited it—people who had the talent God gave them, developed it, had a good idea, and went out and made it on their own. That is good for America, and we should be proud of that. We have all-time-high exports of our products. Our exports are growing faster than our imports for a change. You can see it in what's happened to corn prices and soybean prices in Iowa. You can see it in what's happened to high-tech telecommunications exports all across the country.

That is the good news. But what is the whole truth? Half the American people still haven't gotten a raise in terms of what their incomes will buy in the last 10 or 15 years. Some Americans who worked hard and played by the rules are just being left behind in all these changes.

I had lunch with a good friend of mine from out West who is a terrifically successful businessman. By blind accident of fate, 40 years ago he and I went to the same little red brick schoolhouse in our hometown in Arkansas. And so did his brother, a man with a college education, a good man, he worked hard, almost 50 years old. His kids are ready to go to college. Twice in the last 5 years his brother has lost his job because his company has been bought out by another one, and they went through one of these downsizes.

So we have a lot of good news and a lot to be happy about. But the American dream and all the possibilities of this age have not been open to everyone. That's what the Rural

Development Conference was all about. There are pockets in our cities and in our rural areas that this has not reached.

Look at our leadership in the world. I am grateful that we've made progress for peace, from Northern Ireland to southern Africa to the Middle East to Bosnia to Haiti. I'm grateful for that. I am grateful that there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the United States anymore.

But we know the work of peace and freedom, of security is far from over. We saw it yesterday in an act of venality and cowardice when the peace was broken in Britain and that building was blown up and innocent people were thrown in to the hospital, in total violation of the wishes and dreams of both the Catholic and the Protestant people in the street in Northern Ireland who came out to cheer the First Lady and me because they want the United States to keep the peace and to move to a resolution. We know these are problems.

We saw it when the Prime Minister of Israel, my dear friend, was shot down at the moment of his greatest triumph, pushing for peace. We see it when, in Japan, they can break open a little vial of poison gas in the subway and kill hundreds of people like that. We see it when terrorists come in to our country from other countries and blow up the World Trade Center. We see it when terrorists can exchange information over the Internet about how to make simple bombs like the one that killed our beloved fellow citizens in Oklahoma City.

So I say to you: This is a much more peaceful, secure world than it was. But we have a lot of work to do to free the world of the dangers of weapons of mass destruction, to free the world of the dangers of terrorism and drug trafficking and organized crime. We have to work on this. And we cannot withdraw from the world. If we want a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty this year, if we want a global effort to preserve the environment, we can't say America cannot be bothered with you. We have to lead the world for peace and freedom.

How are we doing? Perhaps most important in how we are doing is that there is some evidence that we are getting our act together again as a country, that we are coming back together around our basic values. In the last 3 years nationwide, the crime rate is down, the welfare rolls are down, the food stamp rolls are down, the poverty rolls are down; the teen pregnancy rates are down now for 2 years in a row. That is good news for America, and we should rejoice in that.

But the crime rate is still too high. There are still too many people trapped on welfare who want to be independent. There are still too many children having children. And there is still too much that doesn't make sense in this country. We all know that. We can't stop now.

So what is this election about? I think it's about our challenges for the future and how we're going to meet them together. You have to do that before you can answer this great question about what the role of our Government is and what the President should be doing.

This is not that tired old debate about big Government versus small Government. The Democrats and this President and our administration, we cut the deficit in half and reduced the Government to its smallest size in 30 long years. But we cut 18,000 pages of Federal regulation that were useless. We closed thousands of offices we didn't need anymore. That's all well and good. But we also—while this is not about big Government—there is no more big Government—it's also not about having Government walk away and leave the American people to fend for themselves in the global marketplace where they won't amount to a hill of beans unless they work together and stand together and make the most of their potential.

You know, it's amazing to me when I hear these debates and people act as if what we really ought to do is just give everybody and each other a good letting-alone. Well, we just had the Super Bowl, and whenever we have a Super Bowl, the stars get all the television time. That's all right; that's probably the way it ought to be. All I know is that the team that won the Super Bowl last time won in large measure because the guys whose names you may not know who were playing from tackle to tackle on offense and defense made them a team. And a lot of us could look good playing on a team like that.

Iowa went to a bowl game this year not because of the stars, just because of the team. Your basketball teams are doing well not just because of the stars, because it's a team. We've got to put everybody on the field in America, and we have to work together as a team. That's how we're going to do it.

And that means you need a Government that's less bureaucratic and does fewer stupid

things but is still strong. I didn't hear anybody in Iowa begging for a weak FEMA when the floods came down. I don't hear any farmers in Iowa begging for a weak trade ambassador when we've got a good deal so we can sell our farm products around the world. I don't hear anybody here in this campus, where you've got the direct loan program and you know it costs less, you have better repayment terms—no one in America will ever have an excuse not to go to college again if you can pay the loans back as a percentage of your income, so you can never be broken down by the burden of college debt. Who wants a weak student loan program? I don't believe we want that.

With families all over America driven into welfare partly because absent parents don't pay their child support, we have record child support collections this year. I don't think you want an America with a weak child support collection system. You want an America with a strong child support collection system.

We know we have to create most of our jobs from small businesses and that that's where most of the new jobs are coming from. I don't think we want a weak Small Business Administration. The one you have has cut the loan form from one inch to two pages, has cut down the delay time a lot, is 40 percent smaller in terms of budget, but we have doubled the loan volume of the SBA. And we'd better keep doing that if we're going to create more jobs through small businesses in America. We need a strong, strong SBA.

So what we really need is a Government that is a partner that helps people to make the most of their own lives, that helps families and communities to seize their opportunities and meet their challenges, that puts all the players on the field and helps us work together. That is why, in the State of the Union, I said our country—not our Government but our country—has seven great challenges for the future.

First, to strengthen our families and give your childhoods back to all America's children. Too many have been robbed of their childhoods for too long. That's what we were trying to do with our tough stand against illegal teenage smoking. That's what we were trying to do yesterday or the day before when I signed the telecommunications bill to open up vast new opportunities in information and entertainment and create tens of thousands of jobs, but also give parents in their homes that V-chip to protect their small children, because just last week we saw another study saying that hour after hour after hour, week after week, year after year of exposure to mindless violence numbs our young people to the impact, the consequences, and the moral dimensions of violent behavior. We must stand against it. It is wrong.

We need every young—our second challenge is to make sure everybody in America can do what those of you who are students here are doing, getting a world-class education adequate to the 21st century. Every school, every library in this country should be hooked up to the Internet by the year 2000, and every child ought to be able to access it. Every State ought to have as low a dropout rate and as high a student performance rate as the State of Iowa does. We ought to have high national standards for performance.

And we need to open the doors of college wider, not close them shut. We should keep the direct loan program. We should keep the national service program. We should expand the Pell grants. We ought to have a million people in work-study programs who are—young people who are willing to work themselves through college. And if we're going to have a tax cut, we ought to have a tax cut for the cost of college tuition all across America.

Our third great challenge is to do something to give every family that's willing to work access to the economic security that is coming to the most successful families in America. At a minimum, since people are changing jobs, that means that every family ought to have access to affordable health care that they can't lose just because somebody in their family gets sick.

Let me just call a timeout here. Here's something you don't have to wait for the election to do. There is a bipartisan bill with 45 cosponsors that was voted out of the Senate committee unanimously. It is on the floor of the Senate just waiting for the leadership to let it come up, sponsored by Senator Kassebaum of Kansas, a Republican Senator, and Democratic Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts. And this bill is a simple bill. It just says that you can't be deprived of your health insurance when you change jobs, and you can't lose your health insurance if you or somebody in your family gets sick. It is a simple bill. All the consumer groups have endorsed it; the chamber of commerce has endorsed it; the National Association of Manufacturers is for it. Everybody's for it except the

health insurance lobby. It was voted out unanimously, and we cannot get it to a vote in the Senate. Tell the United States Senators that are here campaigning to go back and vote that bill out, send it to the House, send it to my desk. Give the American people the protection they need.

Let me just give you two other examples I feel very strongly about. I think if American families lose their jobs, they ought to be able to immediately—immediately, not a month later—get into an education and training program. If they're grossly underemployed, they ought to be able to do it. I have given the Congress a proposal to take all these scores of training programs the Federal Government has developed over the years, collapse them into a funding stream and give every unemployed person in America a voucher they can take to their local community college, to their nearest education and training institution to immediately begin to acquire the skills that go back into the workplace. It's a simple, direct, good idea for America.

The third thing we ought to do is to recognize that most people who are working for small businesses, they still need retirement. And we have a proposal to make it easier for people who work for small businesses and their employers to take out pension plans. We also ought to protect the pension plans that exist. Just a year or so ago, I had to sign a bill to protect 8½ million Americans whose pensions were in danger and to secure the pensions of 40 million others. You remember it wasn't so many years ago that all these people were losing their life savings, their pensions because they had been allowed to be abused by the employers. I say to you, we should not allow people to go back and raid these pension funds and put the pensions of America's workers at risk again. That is not the right thing to do, and we should stand against it.

Let me just say one last thing about economic security. I hear a lot of talk in Washington about family values. And a lot of the people who talk about it act like the worst thing that ever happened to America was the minimum wage. If we don't raise the minimum wage this year, it will fall to a 40-year low in terms of what it will buy. You cannot raise children on $4.25 an hour. But millions of Americans, millions of your fellow countrymen and women, are not on welfare, they are not abusing the system. They are the real heroes in this country. They will get up Monday morning and Tuesday morning and sometimes 6 days a week and sometimes more, and they will go to work to try to support their family for $4.25 an hour because Washington has turned a deaf ear to them. No one should do that. If we are pro-work and pro-family, we ought to raise the minimum wage. It is wrong.

Our fourth challenge is to continue the struggle to take our streets back, to make them safe again, to make our schools and our neighborhoods safe again. I am proud of the fact that this administration has led an effort to put 100,000 more police officers on our streets and that community police are preventing crime, not just catching criminals. I am proud of the fact that the Brady law has kept over 40,000 people with criminal records from getting guns. I am proud of that.

But I tell you, we cannot stop until a certain test is met. We know that every society has crime. We know there will always be violence. We know things will happen among people that make them do things they shouldn't do. You know what the test is for when crime doesn't have to be at the top of our agenda? When every one of you believes when you see a story on the news or you read about it in the paper involving a crime, you see it as the exception, not the rule; you stop being deadened to it; you stop saying, "Oh, the news is coming on. We'll have 5 minutes of crime, and then we'll see what else is going to happen."

Now, what I want to say to you is, I have seen in city after city after city in this country, the crime rate plummeting. I am telling you we can take our streets back. But I also want you to know that the biggest problem we have is the abysmal condition of childhood. For while the crime rate is going down in America, random violence among juveniles under 18 is going up. While drug use is going down in America, random drug use among juveniles is going up. We cannot jail our way out of this problem. We can be tough, but we have to be smart. We have to reach out to our children and give them a future they deserve.

I will be brief about this one because I imagine I'm preaching to the choir, but we must drop the crazy idea that in order to grow our economy we have to absolutely destroy our environment. We have to preserve and enhance the

quality of the environment if we expect this country to go forward.

You know, I had a very interesting conversation with the President of China a few months ago. And we have some differences with China, and he said, "Sometimes I think the United States looks at us as a future threat, and you want to contain us." And I said, "No, Mr. President, I don't." But I said, "There is one threat you present to our future, but it's our fault as much as yours." And he looked at me with a sort of quizzical look in his eye, and he said, "Whatever do you mean?" I said, "Well, your economy is growing like crazy. You're buying a lot of our farm products now. We're buying a lot of your products. Everybody in China wants to get rich, like everybody in America, and I don't blame you. But you have over 1.2 billion people, and if every one of your people gets an automobile, like every one of our people has, we're not going to be able to breathe the air together. We will be choking together, in common."

That's why I've worked for the clean car. That's why I supported ethanol. That's why I've done all these things to try to find a way to grow the economy and preserve the environment. That's why we shouldn't cut environmental protection. We shouldn't weaken environmental regulations. We shouldn't walk back on safe food and safe drugs and clean air and clean water. We should stay the course of protecting the environment.

I've already had my say about this, but the most unpopular one of these challenges or the one that elicits a giant yawn from most people when I say we've got to maintain our leadership in the world for peace and freedom. And a lot of people say well—I mean, I get the feeling that a lot of Americans, when I said that at the State of the Union, were sitting in their homes and they said, "Well, go on, Mr. President, I trust you. You've done pretty well on that. But I wish you wouldn't even bother me with it. I've got too many problems to think about at home. The cold war is over. The Russians aren't going to bomb us anymore. Let's forget about that."

But remember what I told you: Our second biggest market in terms of growth is Latin America. If you want them to cooperate with us in the economy, if you want them to stop sending drugs to our shores to pollute our kids, just remember, we have to cooperate with them. We have arrested, in the last 2 years, seven of the eight leaders of the Cali drug cartel, the biggest one in the world, because we cooperated. And they put their lives on the line; we didn't have to do that. You can't say, "Well, we'll be with you when it's good for us, and meanwhile don't call."

You know what Bosnia is about, in part? It's about stopping that war from spreading to other countries and dragging the Americans in, where we'd have soldiers in battle and getting shot and killed. It's about saying to the Europeans, "We don't want you to close up. We want you to be open. We want you to be open in trade. We want you to be open in ideas. We want you to be our allies, our friends, our partners in the future. And if we have to stand with you now because we are still the strongest country in the world after the cold war, we will do it to stop that kind of slaughter, because we're partners in the future."

If we want to go to Pakistan, for example, and say, "We think there's a suspected terrorist there. Will you arrest this person, even if it costs you something politically, and make it possible for us to bring someone back here to justice?" We can't say that we have no concern about India, we have no concern about Pakistan, we don't care what's going on on the Indian subcontinent, it's a long way away. We'd better care. We had better care.

If you want a safe world, if you want these countries to say, "We'll never develop nuclear missiles," if you want them to say, as I am pleading with them to say this year, "No more nuclear testing; it is over," we have to cooperate in the world.

The last challenge is, together you and I have got to make this democracy work, and we've got to make people think more of it. Every survey talks about how cynical people are, how skeptical they are. Even people who say, "My circumstances are better," say, "I'm worried about my country, don't have any faith in my Government." It's your Government.

I've worked hard for political reform. We passed lobby reform. We passed a law that says Congress has to live under the laws they impose on the private sector. We passed a law limiting the ability of Congress to require State and local governments to spend money if they won't help them do it. They ought to pass two more things: the line item veto they have been promising me for 3 years, and they ought to pass a cam-

paign finance reform law that gives power back to the American people.

But make no mistake about it, my fellow Americans, no matter what we do there, unless people like you all across America do things like show up at these caucuses and tell people you believe in your country and talk about the problems, but also brag on what's going right, we can't turn this country around. Cynicism is a cheap, phony excuse for inaction. It is a poor shield against having to assume your own responsibility.

This is a great country. Whenever I go overseas people say to me, if they follow trends here, "How could the American people be cynical? You have a stronger economy than any other advanced country. You have a smaller deficit as a percentage of your income already than any other advanced country. You have a lower tax burden as a percentage of your income than any other advanced country. You've spent half your money for the last 30 years on defense, on Social Security, and on Medicare. You won the cold war. You cut the elderly poverty rate in half and senior citizens in America have the highest expectancy of any group—life expectancy of any senior group in the entire world. America should be proud of itself."

That's what I say to you. We know we can solve problems. What we need to do is to stop whining about it and carping about it and get on with doing it, and doing it together—together.

Let me end where I began. This election is not about me, it's not about all those folks running television ads about each other and me—[*laughter*]. It's not about some spin about what this does or doesn't mean this time, or whether it's more TV ads and less grassroots. It's about you. And an election ratifies and makes explicit the truth of any democracy that ultimately you are the boss. You have the power. You must have vision. You must know what you want this country to look like for your children and your grandchildren. You must know what kind of life you want to live. You must understand that there will be more out there for you if you're willing to work for it than any previous generation of Americans. And you must understand that in order to really enjoy it you've got to make it available to all Americans who don't have the capacity to reach it now.

The central lesson I have learned in 3 years as your President is that we desperately, desperately, desperately have to face the fact that we must go forward together. If we do, there is no stopping us. The best is yet to come, and your future will be the glory of all American history.

Thank you. God bless you, and come out Monday night.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Carver Hawkeye Arena at the University of Iowa. In his remarks, he referred to University of Iowa students Erin Barber and Allison Miller, Clinton/Gore campus coordinator; and Bob Rush, Clinton/Gore chair, Johnson County.

Remarks to the Community in Mason City, Iowa
February 10, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you for that wonderful, wonderful welcome. I do feel that I have a home in the heartland, and if I hadn't felt it before I got here tonight, I sure do now. I thank you for your warmth and your enthusiasm.

Thank you, Dr. Buettner. Thank you, Deo Koenigs. Thank you, Ruth Harkin, for doing such a wonderful job in helping to create opportunities for our businesses and for our working people through the Overseas Private Investment Corperation. And thank you, Senator Tom Harkin, for continuing to have a heart and continuing to have the stomach and the will to stand up and fight for the interests of ordinary Americans when so many others have backed away.

I have had a wonderful time here already. I landed the airplane just in time to catch the snow and the wind coming back. [*Laughter*] Impeccable timing. And then I went over to Clear Lake to the farm co-op. And we had a wonderful—anybody here? [*Applause*] And I had a

great time there with all the folks who worked there. We brought in a truckload of corn, and I said to myself, if corn stays above $3, I ought to do all right in Iowa.

And believe it or not, there were even rail cars there to take it away. I saw that. [*Laughter*]

Audience member. [*Inaudible*] [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, we're working on it. [*Laughter*] And then, of course, I came here. And I've been hearing all about the advertising in Iowa, all these ads, you know. You know. [*Laughter*] So I want you to know I listen to the ads, and I want to show you how in touch I am with where I am tonight based on advertising. Of all the places I could have been tonight, I chose NIACC first. [*Applause*] Thank you. Thank you.

Let me say that it is true I always feel at home in Iowa. I'm always glad to be back here. We have had the opportunity, Hillary and I and our administration officials, to be here many times. I do think it's fitting that I'm here tonight, just as it was fitting that a major portion of our first bus tour went through Iowa. I still have vivid memories of the people I met along the way. I still have rich recollections of the conversations I had with elected officials, like your agriculture secretary, and conversations I had with people I just stopped the bus alongside of the road and got off the bus and spoke with. And I've always tried, in the last 3 years, to get up every day and go to work and try to work for you and people like you all over this country.

So before I say anything else, I want to just thank you for the opportunity that I have had to serve as your President for the last 3 years. I also want to say that being here at this North Iowa Area Community College is a fitting place for this event tonight because, as you will see as I get into my remarks, the community college in some ways is a symbol for what I think we ought to be doing in America. It is community-based, nonbureaucratic, sensitive to the needs of its customers, the students. It's a place where everybody can come. It's changing all the time as the economy changes and as the needs of the community and the students change. And it doesn't run on hot air and rhetoric; it runs on partnership, cooperation, people reaching across the lines that divide them in a society to come together, to build a community institution that will take not only the student but the community into the future.

That is what we need to do as a country. That is the central message I bring to you tonight. We have got to go forward together. We've got to put behind us the petty divisions and the easy cheap shots and the wedge issues that tear the heart out of American civic life, and get back together to face the challenges we have and to make the future what it ought to be for all the American people.

All of you know that Iowa has an extra responsibility in the political process. In an age where national politics tends to be dominated more and more by glib sound bites, people are expected to come to Iowa to look at their constituents face to face, to listen to their concerns and listen to their babies cry. [*Laughter*] We're not expected to have these set, pat, controlled events and just communicate with folks through paid ads. And I like it.

And I hope every one of you will take the time to show up on caucus night and make your voices heard. Even if I don't have a named opponent, I hope you'll show up for me. For another reason—thanks to the wonderful man who introduced me, it was impossible for me to get any votes in Iowa 4 years ago in the caucus. And I would hate to retire from politics never having done well in the Iowa caucuses. [*Laughter*] So, for purely selfish reasons, I hope you will go on Monday night.

I want to talk to you tonight about the challenges facing our country from the perspective of rural communities. I'm fairly sure that I am the last American President who will ever be elected who once lived in a home in the country without indoor plumbing. I know how far this country has come in the last 50 years. I'm not ashamed of it, and I survived it, and it makes a good story now, especially when I tell wide-eyed kids about the snakes that used to get in the outhouse. [*Laughter*] But—oh, there was somebody getting the chills over there. [*Laughter*]

I have seen what this country can do in rural America when we pull together and work together. Just before I came here—keep in mind, I lived when I was a young man for a year or so, maybe nearly 2, in a home in the country that didn't have indoor plumbing. I just came from a demonstration at this community college of a computer program using satellite information that tells farmers the difference in their soil composition, their average yield, and gives them all kinds of information that they can ac-

cess that they never could have gotten before. That is how far we have come in 50 years.

And what I want to say to you tonight is that our real obligation to work together is to find a way to take these phenomenal changes that are going on now, the biggest in 100 years—in the way we work, in the way our workplace is organized and the way we communicate with one another, in the markets to which we sell, and in the way, therefore, we relate to each other—the biggest changes in 100 years. The challenge for our country is to harness those things in a way that opens opportunity for all Americans and does it consistent with the values of rural America, with family and work and community. I believe we can do it.

We live in an age of incredible possibility. It is literally true that the young people here in this room tonight will have available to them more options for living out their dreams than any generation of people who have ever lived on the face of the Earth. It is literally true, as all of you know, that technology and information, the digital chip is transforming everything, including agriculture, as I just said. It is also true that this opportunity also carries with it, as every change does, a lot of challenge.

If you go back in history to the last period that was more or less like this, you have to go back 100 years to the time when most Americans stopped living in the country and started living in towns and cities, and farmers got productive enough and factories became available enough that most people stopped working on the farm and began to work in factories or in activities that supported them. You have to go back that far to see a change this great. And in many ways, this will be greater. But if you study the history of that era you will see the same thing happen then that's happening now: enormous opportunities opening up for people; vast fortunes being made by people who had nothing; but a great uprooting that put new pressures on families, on communities, and called into question whether the American dream could really be available to everybody who was willing to work for it.

And if you fast-forward that to today, you see what this election should really be all about. It shouldn't be about all the process and political things people talk about. It ought to be about you, your families, your work, your community, and your future. That's what it ought to be about.

Now, let's just look at for a moment where we are and what's good and what's still to be done. In a sentence I would tell you that we're better off as a nation than we were 3 years ago, but we've still got some strong challenges we have to face. Begin with the economy. Now we have the lowest unemployment and inflation rates combined we've had in 27 years. We have almost 8 million new jobs. Here in Iowa, unemployment has dropped to 3.2 percent. Across our country, homeownership is at a 15-year high. Exports of our products and services are at an all-time high. Agricultural exports hit record levels in 1995, over $54 billion, $10 billion more than when I took office. We still need to do better for the livestock industry, as the people in my home State always remind me. But in agriculture you know we have a huge positive trade balance. And that's one of the reasons for the corn and the wheat and the soybean prices that our farmers are enjoying today.

Now, that's the good news. But we also know that in this remarkable economy that for 3 years in a row has produced a record number of new small businesses starting up and a record number of self-made millionaires—not people that had it given to them, people that went out and by their wits and hard work and made it themselves—most Americans have not gotten a raise. Most Americans, when you look at the purchasing power of their income, are working for about what they were 10, 15, 18 years ago. And many Americans have been victims, if you will, of this changing economy because they worked for big companies that downsized or that were bought out or whatever. Many Americans have been on the receiving end of a great company announcing they're going to lay 10,000 people off. Their stock price goes up, but the price of dignity and the price of supporting one's children, if you happen to be one of those 10,000, goes down.

So we have to think about how can we take all of this dynamism, this wonderful, churning age of possibility, and make it available again to every American who's willing to work for it? That's our first challenge.

If you look at our role in the world, we see America, a positive force for peace and freedom from Haiti to Northern Ireland, to the Middle East, to Bosnia, all over the world. We also know, from the terrible bombing in London yesterday to the assassination of the Israeli Prime

Minister, to the terrorist acts from blowing up the World Trade Center to opening up that poison gas in Tokyo, this is still a dangerous world. And so we still have challenges we have to face. And much as we liked to say, "Well, the cold war is over, and the Soviet Union is not threatening us anymore; we'd like to fold up our tent, come home, and just worry about what's in front of us," we can't do that either.

And people in farming communities ought to know that better than anybody else. If you want to sell to the rest of the world, you have to be a good neighbor and a solid partner, and you've got to stand up for peace and freedom and try to remove the threats to decent people living good lives in every part of the world, because that affects us as well.

If you look at the most important thing to me, how are we doing in dealing with all this change in preserving and reinforcing our basic values, advancing the cause of family and work, of opportunity and responsibility, of people working together, I think you'd have to say the news is encouraging. In the country as a whole for 3 years, the crime rate is down; the welfare rolls are down; the poverty rolls are down; the teen pregnancy rate is down. That is good news.

But if you flip it over, you'd have to say, "Are you satisfied with any of those conditions?" And to be honest, the answer is no. So it's good that we're coming together again around our basic values. It's good that we're kind of getting our act together as a country. But we have work to do. And I'll just give you one example.

We all know there will always be crime in any society. You can't transform human nature. There will always be some level of violence. So people often ask me, "Mr. President, how would you declare success in the war on crime?" And I have a simple, one-sentence answer: When people like you hear about a crime and you're surprised again, when crime is the exception rather than the rule again. And it can be in America, and we ought to keep working at it until that's exactly what happens.

Obviously, if the nature of work changes, the nature of the workplace changes, the nature of communications changes, and the nature of markets that we sell our goods and services change, it's going to change your life, and it's got to change Government. So how should you change, and what should you do, and what should you expect your President to do for the next 4 years?

You have to begin by asking, what kind of country do you want to live in? What is your vision of what America should be? My vision is of a country where every person, without regard to their station in life or where they live, has a chance to have the American dream if they are willing to work for it and do what it takes to achieve it. Every person has a chance. My vision is of a country where people work together in communities, as they do in community colleges, to help each other make the most of their own lives and seize their opportunities and face their challenges; where we are not constantly looking for ways to look down on our neighbors and be divided from them, but we define objectives we can reach in common and, in a spirit of honorable compromise that has kept this country going for nearly 220 years, we get after working together to make America a better place, community by community. That is my vision.

If you say to me, "Well, what does that mean about the Government, Mr. President?" it would be the following: Government's got to be like all these other organizations. We don't need a big, centralized, top-down bureaucracy anymore. The technology revolution has rendered that irrelevant. If people are working in smaller and smaller work units, if you don't need a lot of folks in the middle to pass information down and orders up or the reverse, we can do better with a smaller, less bureaucratic Government, one that costs less and does better.

But if our mission is to help people make the most of their own lives and to help people work together to make the most of their situation, then we do not need a weak Government. When Iowa was flooded out with that 500-year flood, you did not want a weak FEMA. You liked it that you had a strong one.

If you want corn over $3 and soybeans at $7, you don't need a weak trade ambassador. You need somebody who's strong and who can guarantee a fair deal for America's products in the global market. You need someone who's strong.

If you believe as I do that every single high school graduate needs at least 2 years of post-high-school education and the ability to come back to school for a lifetime, you don't need a weak college loan program and a weak Pell grant program. You need a strong, strong emphasis on education.

If you want to reinforce family values, and it makes you sick to know that there are thousands upon thousands of mothers and their children on welfare solely because the absent fathers don't pay their child support, and your heart jumps for joy when I tell you that in the last 3 years, each year we have broken records for collecting more and more and more child support across State lines, you don't want a weak program. You want a strong program that can do the job for America's families.

If more and more of our businesses are being created in smaller units and more and more new jobs are coming through small business, we don't need a weak Small Business Administration. We've got an SBA that's cut its budget by 40 percent and doubled its loan volume, that's cut its regulation in half and cut its application to two pages, but they're out there making loans. And the consequence of that? Let me just give you one. In the last 3 years, businesses owned by women alone—just by women—have created more new jobs than the Fortune 500 have laid off. That's what we need to be a strong, effective partnership.

So we need a Government that is leaner, that is more creative, that is less bureaucratic, that does fewer dumb things. But we don't need somebody that's in the Government and we don't need a Government that is so weak it can't help fulfill the mission, to help people make the most of their own lives and help people work together at the grassroots level to advance our country's cause and to keep our country the world's strongest force for peace and freedom.

Now, it's in that framework that I would like to ask you all to look at this great debate that's been going on in the last year about balancing the budget. First of all, we ought to balance the budget. This country never had—never had—a commitment to running permanent big deficits year-in and year-out until 1981—never. It's very important that you understand that.

In the whole history of America from the time we started until 1981, we had a trillion-dollar debt, which was a very small percentage of our overall income, our earning capacity. And we borrowed money when we were in wartime, when we had to mobilize the country in a hurry, when we were in a depression and we had to put people to work in a hurry, or when we were in a recession and we wanted the Government to spend some money to help people who were genuinely in distress and to keep the economy from going downhill further. We never had a permanent deficit until the 12 years before I showed up in Washington.

Now, in that time we quadrupled the national debt because people kept insisting we could spend more money year-in and year-out than we were taking in and somehow it would all add up. It violated arithmetic, and we're paying the price for it today. And a lot of progressives like Senator Harkin and me are agreeing to cut some things we wish we wouldn't have to cut out of that budget so we can end this. We have cut this deficit in half in 3 years, and we need to finish the job. We need to finish the job.

But remember what our mission is: to provide opportunity, to help people make the most of their own lives, to help people solve their problems together. That means we have to balance the budget in a way that is consistent with our mission and our values.

You know, you hear these words roll around, Medicare and Medicaid and all that. Let me just tell you a few facts. The budget I have proposed—the budget I have proposed would hold Medicare spending below the projected rate of private health care increases. But it protects people on Medicare with the quality of their program and the cost they can afford to pay.

If you'd go to Washington you would swear that everybody on Medicare was a millionaire making out like a bandit. Well, I've got news for you. Seventy percent of the people on Medicare are living on less than $25,000, and people on Medicare are paying the same percentage of their income out-of-pocket for health care they were paying 30 years ago, before there was a Medicare.

So I say we ought to save some money. We have to have some savings to get the Medicare Trust Fund back in order. We should encourage people to save money by going into managed care plans. But we have no business doing something that will undermine the economic stability or the health care of senior citizens in the United States of America.

I feel the same way about the Medicaid program. It's not so famous because it's more complex. It's a program where the States and the Federal Government contribute to help elderly people in nursing homes, most of them from middle class families who could never afford

the over $30,000 a year it costs, on average, for people who have to go to nursing homes. It helps pregnant women and little children who are either at or just barely above the poverty line. And it helps families, including a lot of middle class families, who have people with disabilities in their family.

Now, we all know that Senator Harkin is the father of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and we're proud of that. But he would be the first to tell you that if we really want people with disabilities and their families to have a decent, dignified life and have the opportunity to live up to the fullest of their potential, we have got to keep Medicaid there to keep middle class families doing the best they can to take care of their children and their siblings and their parents from going broke. It is a very important thing.

There's a man with a red ribbon back there; let's talk about that. There's all kinds of people in this country that are HIV-positive that are able to work, pay taxes, contribute because they have access to Medicaid. If you take Medicaid away from them, they will get sicker sooner and cost you more money.

People, you know—again, you hear people talk about it, you'd think this Medicaid program was some colossal ripoff. Now, let me tell you, in the last 2 years the inflation rate in Medicaid has been way below the average inflation rate in the private insurance premiums that most of you pay. And we know we can hold it down.

We know we ought to have more poor people in managed care programs. But don't be fooled: Two-thirds and more of the Medicaid budget goes to benefit working families who have parents in nursing homes, have people with disabilities in their families; and the other third goes to pregnant women and their little children. And they're our little children, too, and we better give them decent health care and give them a chance to get off to a good start in life.

I feel the same way about investments in education and the environment. If you know that these are critical to your future, why in the world would you cut them, especially if you don't have to?

So let me say this: In spite of all the back and forth you've heard, I have spent 50 hours working in good faith with the Republican leaders and the Democratic leaders of the Congress. And in our private meetings we have discussed things openly, honestly, and in good faith. We have identified over $700 billion—where I come from that's still money—[*laughter*]—over $700 billion of savings that are common to both plans that we could put in, have a balanced budget plan, protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and environment, protect our fundamental obligations to our rural communities and our other fundamental obligations, and even have some left over for a modest tax cut, and still balance a budget in 7 years according to the way Congress scores the budget. They get to keep the books. We can do that. So why shouldn't we do that instead of continuing endlessly to fight over issues that divide us that will undermine our security?

Let me say this: I think there's a good chance there will be a budget agreement. But even if there isn't, this deficit will keep going down because the American people, without regard to party, have figured out we can't keep doing this. We can't keep spending ourselves in a hole every year when we don't borrow the money to invest it in something that will grow the economy—just spending, deficit year after year after year. It is going to go down. We are going to make that yesterday's legacy.

I want to ask you just for a few minutes before I close to think about what tomorrow's legacy is going to be. That's what I talked about in the State of the Union, the seven great challenges I think that are facing us all. And I just want to mention them quickly and ask you to think about what you expect me to do and what you should be doing about each of these.

The first of these challenges, clearly, is to do more to strengthen our families and to give childhood back to all American children. Too many of them have been robbed of it. You know as well as I do that if every child in this country had the benefit of a stable home full of love and discipline, where they were encouraged to live up to the fullest of their capacities and protected from life's cruelest developments, that we'd have about half the problems we've got on the social front. We all know that.

The question is, what are we going to do about it? I've told you we've done what we could to make sure we collect more child support than we ever have. I have taken on this issue of teen smoking. No one ever wanted to take the tobacco companies on, but there's something wrong with every State in the country saying that smoking's illegal and smoking's going up among children. And we know 3,000 kids

a day start smoking, and 1,000 of them will die sooner because of it. I can't stand it anymore. I want to do something about it, and I want you to help. I want you to help.

We know—just last week there was yet another survey, a national study saying that if you permit young children to grow up and spend hour after hour after hour for year after year after year watching gratuitous, mindless, senseless violence on television that they will become desensitized to violence. They will come to see it as normal, as the rule rather than the exception. And it will mess up the way they look at the world, and the chances are greater that it will mess up the way they behave. Now, I say the time has come to do something about that.

One of the things that I was really proud of the last week, one of the best things that's happened since I've been President is that I was able to sign into law the Telecommunications Act of 1996. A lot of you may not know about it; I hope you have seen that. Let me tell you what it will do. It also, like this community college, is a symbol of what we ought to be doing. It will create tens of thousands of high-wage jobs. It will give people in rural areas more access to information, more access to learning, and more access to entertainment. But it will protect the right of little telephone companies providing long distance service, for example, and smaller cable television companies and little guys who own radio stations to at least have a chance to compete in this brave new world and not be wiped out from the get-go. And it will, among other things, require that we provide telecommunications services at a discount rate to every hospital and library and classroom in this country, so rural America doesn't get left out.

And it passed almost unanimously, with all the Republicans and Democrats finally giving up and voting for it because we worked out all the problems in the American way. But the pro-family issue I want you to be aware of is it also will require all new television sets to contain a V-chip which will permit parents to decide if they don't want their young children to watch programs on televisions that are too violent or have other inappropriate conduct. And it's a good thing.

Our second challenge is to renew our schools and to provide educational opportunity for every American. That means, among other things, in our schools we have to connect every classroom—every classroom in the smallest rural hamlet in rural Arkansas or rural Iowa, rural Maine, northern California—everyone to the Internet by the year 2000, so that all of our children, wherever they live, will have a world, literally a world of information at their fingertips. And we have to make sure the kids have the ability to access that.

Our public schools should be the province of folks at the grassroots local level. That's why yours work as well as they do. But we ought to have national standards and national means of measuring achievement so that every child has a chance to be in the kind of system that have given Iowa such a low dropout rate and a high student achievement rate. There's no reason everybody in America can't achieve those same standards if we had a system to provide it. And I am committed to that.

And I will say again, we ought to open the doors of college wider, not have them shut. We need to maintain the direct loan program. We need to maintain the AmeriCorps program that allows young people to earn money by serving in their communities and then use it for college. We need to expand the Pell grant program. And I proposed in the State of the Union—I want to reiterate it here—that we give a $1,000 merit scholarship to every student in the top 5 percent of every high school graduating class in the United States of America. I believe—I want us to extend the work-study program so that a million young people can work their way through college on work-study. And if we're going to cut taxes, we ought to cut taxes in the best way we can, to grow the American economy and bring the American people together. We ought to make college tuition tax-deductible.

Our third challenge is to provide economic security for every American willing to work for it. I don't mean a guarantee; I mean a safety net, a sense of framework that will permit people to succeed. The first thing we have to do is to keep doing what we're doing right. We need to keep creating more jobs at high wages. That's what the Telecommunications Act does. We need to keep exporting American products.

But we also need to do some other things. Just before I came to Iowa today I signed the farm credit regulatory relief act, which provides better credit opportunities to farmers and ranchers. And again, it shows what we can do when

we cross party lines to work together. There's another important thing we could do for the farmers, with spring planting on us, we could pass a farm bill. It should have been passed a long time ago, and we ought to pass a good one.

Now, the Senate passed a bill this week that has some very good provisions in it, but I have some problems with it. Let me tell you what I like about it; then I'll tell you what I don't like about it. And then afterwards, maybe you can write and tell me what you like about it and don't like about it.

I like the fact that it gives farmers some more flexibility to plant to the market and not just to the programs. I like the fact that the Senate bill, unlike the House bill, included the conservation reserve and the wetlands preservation programs. I like the fact that it included the nutrition programs and protected them, which we have to do—the WIC programs and the other nutrition programs.

And I like the fact that the Senate bill took an amendment which embodied one of the central recommendations I got at the Rural Development Conference at Ames, that we held for all of rural America not very long ago here in Iowa at Ames; it creates a rural development fund to help diversify the economies of the rural parts of our country. I like those things about that bill, and that is good. The fund for rural America would invest $300 million to fund development and research programs to help us remain competitive. I like that. That's all good for America's farmers.

But what I have real questions about is the way the so-called freedom to farm law actually works in practice. They proposed to have a 7-year period when everybody gets a check every year in the same price, no matter what the crop price is. So this year you've got—I mean, today I think corn was $3.30 and Iowa soybeans were somewhere between $6.80 and $7.05, depending on where it was. That's about the range that it was today. And people are still going to get a check. Under this bill, if you don't plant anything you get a check. It used to be nearly everybody thought you ought to have to farm to get a farm payment. [*Laughter*]

So I'm worried about that. You know, farmers have never wanted to be—and I have fought this battle for years against urban journalists—farmers have never wanted to be seen as being on welfare. We had farm support programs for two reasons only: One is to help us compete with people who were subsidizing their farmers a lot more than we were; and second, to get family farmers through rough years because they couldn't finance their own bad years. That's why we had those programs.

So I'm worried about that. I'm also worried that in the bad years there won't be near enough money in this program to have a genuine safety net. I mean, it sounds great: "We're going to give you a check every year for 7 years whether you need it or not." That's a pretty good deal. Well, this year it sounds great because people don't need it; the prices are high. And maybe we can keep them high for a long time. There's a fair chance we can because of the growing wealth of Asia and the growing population there and because of the changes in their production capacity. There is a fair chance that we're in for a few years of high farm prices. But we may not be; we may have weather that will have high prices and no crop to sell. We've all been there before.

So I tell you, I will work to get a good farm bill. I will do it as quickly as I can. And I just wanted to come here tonight and tell you honestly how I feel. There's a lot of things in this Senate bill I like, and we do need to let farmers plant more for the market than the programs. But I think we have to really think about whether it is reasonable to say that we're going to have this flat payment and you get it whether you plant or not, you get it no matter how high the crops are. And then when the crops go to the bottom, you won't have enough to help you and keep you out of bankruptcy.

I think we have reached a point with the world markets when we could actually see young people coming back into farming, when we could actually see in America the number of family farmers growing again for the first time in forever just because of changes in the market. And I think we have to be very careful with this farm bill to meet our vision, which is to give everybody who can do it and is competitive a chance to be treated fairly and to succeed. That is my only goal.

I do believe there are two or three other things we ought to do to give people economic security. One of them would directly affect this institution. We built up over the years a whole lot of different training programs in the Government—70, 80, I don't know—a whole bunch of training programs. Every one of them was

passed with the best of intentions to try to solve some little problem in the economy as it came up. The truth is now the work force is just turning over a lot, and nearly everybody will have to go back for further education and training.

So I have suggested that we take 70 of these training programs and create what I call a "GI bill" for America's workers, put them in a big fund. And if somebody up here in this part of the country loses their job, we ought to just send them a voucher and let them bring it here to the community college to decide what they need for themselves in the form of education and training. I think it's one of the best things we could do to get adults back into education and training to increase their earnings and get them through the times when they lose their jobs.

One of the number one priorities, one of the top three, I think, priorities of the White House Conference on Small Business was to make it easier and cheaper for self-employed people, for small-business people and for farmers to take out pension plans for themselves and their employees. We have an item in this budget, this balanced budget plan, that would do that. And as far as I know, there's no opposition to it. We ought to do that. It should be easier. And then people ought to know that their pensions are going to be protected; we shouldn't go back to raiding pension plans like we did in the eighties. And we ought to find a way for people who have to change jobs to take their pension around with them so that we will all know that no matter what happens to us in life, as long as we're working we'll be able to have a decent retirement when the time comes.

And lastly, on this issue, middle class people, if we're going to continue to be the only advanced country in the world where people under 65 don't have a guarantee of health insurance, then at least we ought to have a guarantee that people have access to affordable health insurance that they don't lose when they change jobs or when someone in the family gets sick. That's simple enough, and we ought to do it.

I want every one of you to know this because I want you to ask everyone in your congressional delegation to support it. There is a bipartisan bill in the United States Senate sponsored by the Republican Senator from Kansas, Senator Kassebaum, and Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts, with 45 sponsors, which simply says you cannot lose your health insurance just because you changed jobs or just because you or somebody in your family gets sick. And if you're in a small work unit you ought to be able to get into a big pool at your option to buy health insurance more cheaply, the way Government employees or people working for big businesses do.

The national chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, all the consumer groups have endorsed this bill. It has been voted out of the committee unanimously, and we cannot get it scheduled for a vote because the health insurance companies are lobbying against it. It is wrong. We've got everybody for it; it ought to pass. It will help farmers. It will help small-business people. Ask people to vote for it in the Iowa congressional delegation. [*Applause*]

I thank you for standing up. I hope the message will go out across the country. This is what the election is about. It's about you. It's not about tactics and politicians and ads. It's about you and your future. And I'm going to try from now until November, whatever judgment you make on the election, to keep giving it back to you so you an use this opportunity to shape your future.

Let me just make a couple of brief remarks about the remaining challenges. If you want economic security, how can we justify a minimum wage that's at a 40-year low in purchasing power? That's where we are now. You know, in Washington, there's a lot of talk about family values. Well, I'll tell you one thing, it's pretty hard to raise a family on $4.25 an hour. But there are millions of people out there trying to do it, and they're heroes to me.

When I think of the people that get up every day, knowing they could take a powder and go on welfare and get health care for their kids, and they still show up for work and they do their 40 hours and sometimes they do a lot more, and they do it for the minimum wage because they believe in the dignity of work and they want to set a good example for their children, and I can't get anybody to schedule for a vote raising the minimum wage to take it from $4.25 just to $5.15 an hour and get out of a 40-year low in earning power, that's not my idea of the high-tech economy. I think the American people believe we can do better than that. And I believe if we're going to honor work

and family, we ought to do better than that. And I hope you will support it.

The fourth thing we've got to do is continue the crime fight. We talked about that earlier. I just ask you to remember, when you see the things that we're doing and they're debated, we shouldn't stop our program to put 100,000 more police on the street. We shouldn't weaken the program that your former attorney general Bonnie Campbell now heads to try to reduce domestic violence and violence against women. We shouldn't—we shouldn't back up from the clear truth.

We've now been through a bunch of hunting seasons. We've been through deer season and duck season, at least in my home, and just about everything else we hunt. Every hunter in my State now knows that the people who told them back in 1994 they were going to lose their guns did not tell them the truth. We killed a bunch of ducks with the same guns we were using 2 years ago in Arkansas this year. But I'll tell you one thing, over 40,000 criminals did not get to buy their handguns because of the Brady bill. We were right about that, and we should stay with it.

The fifth thing we have got to do is to rid ourselves of this notion that we can advance our economy at the expense of our environment. For the next 20 years, we will be growing jobs by protecting the environment. That's why I supported ethanol and why I still do. That's why I supported natural-gas-powered vehicles. That's why I supported electric-powered vehicles. That's why I supported the "Big Three" in Detroit with our clean car initiative. That's why I am against these attempts to weaken the enforcement powers of the EPA or to weaken our commitment to safe food, clear air, and clean water. We have to grow this economy while protecting the environment of the United States for our children.

As I said before, and I will say it again just briefly, we cannot do this if we divorce ourselves from the world. I intend to continue, and I ask you to support me, to try to keep this country on the forefront of the work for peace and freedom. We have a chance this year to get a comprehensive test ban treaty so that there will be no more nuclear testing. That will dramatically reduce the chance that any kind of nuclear weapon will ever be used against anybody in the entire world again. The United States will have to lead that fight if it's going to get done. That's one example.

And the last challenge we face is to make our Government inspire more trust and work better. We're going to continue this reinventing Government move that the Vice President has led so brilliantly. We are going to continue to downsize the Government. It's already the smallest it's been in 30 years. But we're going to try to keep it strong.

I read today something that my friend James Carville wrote in his new book, which will be coming out pretty soon. He said, "You know, people always say the Government can't do anything right." He said, "Well, for 30 years we spent half your money—half your money for 30 years—on just three things: defense, Social Security, and Medicare." You be the judge. We won the cold war. We cut the poverty rate among seniors in half. And if you get to be a senior citizen in America today because of Medicare, you have a higher life expectancy than any group of elderly people anywhere in the world. I think we got our money's worth, and I think we have to continue to give the American people their money's worth for what we do in public life.

We do have more to do. I hope the Congress will finally give me that line item veto they've been promising in their Contract. That's one thing in there I like. And I hope they will finally pass a genuine bipartisan campaign finance reform bill to give even more power back to the American people.

I want to leave you with this. I want you to think about it Monday, when you try to figure out whether you want to go to the trouble to go out or not. We can pass campaign finance reform. We can pass all kinds of reforms. But whether this country really works depends upon you, what's in your mind and what's in your heart.

There is no call for the cynicism which exists in America today. This country is doing some things that are very important better than any other country in the world. This country has problems; as long as people exist on the face of the Earth, there will be problems. Cynicism is a cheap and poor excuse for inaction and the evasion of personal responsibility. As long as you're cynical about somebody else, you don't have to pick up your own shovel and start digging. And it's wrong. It's wrong.

So I say to you, for the United States of America, the best is yet to come. For the children in this audience, the age of possibility will give them more chances to live out their dreams than any generation of Americans has ever had. But it won't work unless we make sure everybody has got a chance at that dream, unless we give our people the power to make the most of their own lives, and unless we remember that we cannot afford cynicism and we have to go forward together.

It's the most important lesson I have learned again and again and again in 3 years as your President. I will never knowingly do anything to see the American people divided again or to coddle the cynics again. We need to stand up, rear back, and seize our future.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:25 p.m. at the North Iowa Area Community College. In his remarks, he referred to David Buettner, president of the college, and Deo Koenigs, Iowa State representative. H.R. 2029, the Farm Credit System Reform Act of 1996, approved February 10, was assigned Public Law No. 104–105.

Statement on Signing the Farm Credit System Reform Act of 1996

February 10, 1996

Today I have approved H.R. 2029, the "Farm Credit System Reform Act of 1996," which will reform and expand the activities of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation (Farmer Mac), as well as provide regulatory relief to members of the Farm Credit System.

This bill should lower the cost of credit for farmers and ranchers by passing along the benefit of Farmer Mac's lower interest rates to local banks. Other changes also will make it more attractive for county and regional banks to participate in the Farmer Mac program, which will link these local banks to national and international credit markets.

This bill is an example of the kind of reinventing government that I have encouraged in all areas of government. Under this new law, banks and farmers will have less paperwork, and the auditing programs will be freer to target areas of major concern.

As Farmer Mac takes on new business responsibilities as a mortgage purchaser and an issuer of securities, it will be important for the Farm Credit Administration and the Treasury Department to monitor the use of these new authorities to ensure the continued safety and soundness of this government-sponsored enterprise. Similarly, the relevant congressional committees have requested the Farm Credit Administration, working with the Treasury, to conduct periodic evaluations of Farmer Mac.

I also note that H.R. 2029 maintains a common board of directors for the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration, which serves as a regulator of the system. As previously proposed by the Administration, the Congress should reconsider this structure in the future to provide more independence for the board.

I am pleased to sign this bill in order to expand opportunities and lower costs for the ranchers and farmers of America.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 10, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 2029, approved February 10, was assigned Public Law No. 104–105.

Statement on Signing the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996

February 10, 1996

Today I have signed into law S. 1124, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996." This Act authorizes appropriations for Department of Defense military activities, including military construction, and defense activities of the Department of Energy. It also provides, extends, or amends various authorities relating to national defense programs and activities.

I vetoed the original version of this legislation, H.R. 1530, on December 28, 1995. Since that time, the Congress has addressed my three central national security concerns about the earlier bill. First, the Congress deleted the provisions requiring deployment by 2003 of a costly missile defense system designed to defend against a long-range missile threat, which our intelligence community does not foresee in the next decade. Such a course of action would have prevented us from deploying the best possible technology if a real threat were to emerge at a later time. Moreover, implementation of the system called for in H.R. 1530 would probably have been inconsistent with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Second, the Congress deleted the requirement that the President submit a supplemental appropriations request within a defined time period after commencement of certain contingency and other operations, such as the ongoing military operations in Bosnia. The Act does, however, continue to contain unwarranted restrictions on the manner in which such operations may be funded.

Third, the Congress deleted the restriction on the President's authority to make and implement decisions relating to the operational or tactical control of elements of the U.S. armed forces, a restriction which clearly infringed on the President's constitutional authority as Commander in Chief.

The Act also includes a number of provisions of great importance to our national defense and to the men and women in our armed forces, authorizing critical defense programs to be continued and new ones to be initiated. The Act authorizes the full 2.4% increase in pay and allowances for our military personnel. It authorizes the Military Housing Privatization Initiative, which provides new authority to acquire and improve military housing and supporting facilities through the use of private expertise and capital. It authorizes necessary military construction and NATO infrastructure programs. It continues the Department of Energy's science-based Stockpile Stewardship program. It provides for the sale of the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve.

The Act also contains the Administration's proposal to allow the United States to extradite indicted war criminals and provide evidence directly to the International War Crimes Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda—a provision that should encourage others to cooperate fully with the War Crimes Tribunal.

And, this legislation makes important strides in the area of procurement reform, which will help produce a better-equipped military for less money. The legislation gives agencies enhanced authority and flexibility in their use of computers and telecommunications, while insisting on accountability. Consistent with the Administration's efforts under the National Performance Review to create a government that works better and costs less, the Act encourages agencies to adopt the best practices of successful companies in the private sector. And the Act includes measures to facilitate the purchase of commercially-available goods and services, to streamline and clarify procurement integrity laws, and to substantially improve the process for resolving bid protests for information technology.

All of these measures are important to the effective and efficient operation of our armed forces. I regret, however, that this legislation continues to contain a number of provisions, identified in my earlier veto message, that will adversely affect the Defense Department's ability to carry out its national defense mission.

First, I am strongly opposed, as is the Department of Defense, to the provision requiring the discharge of military personnel living with the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), where such discharge is not required by any medical, public health, or military purpose. This provision is blatantly discriminatory and highly punitive

to service members and their families. People living with HIV can and do lead full and productive lives, provide for their families, and contribute to the well-being of our Nation. The men and women affected by this provision are ready, willing and able to serve their country with honor and should be allowed to continue to do so.

Therefore, I strongly support the current efforts in the Congress to repeal this provision before a single service member is discharged from the armed forces.

Moreover, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have advised me that the arbitrary discharge of these men and women would be both unwarranted and unwise; that such discharge is unnecessary as a matter of sound military policy; and that discharging service members deemed fit for duty would waste the Government's investment in the training of these people and would be disruptive to the military programs in which they play an integral role.

I agree.

Consequently, I have concluded that this discriminatory provision is unconstitutional. Specifically, it violates equal protection by requiring the discharge of qualified service members living with HIV who are medically able to serve, without furthering any legitimate governmental purpose. As President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in 1943, explaining his decision to sign an important appropriations bill notwithstanding the fact that it contained a provision that infringed upon individual rights, "I cannot . . . yield without placing on record my view that this provision is not only unwise and discriminatory, but unconstitutional."

In accordance with my constitutional determination, the Attorney General will decline to defend this provision. Instead, the Attorney General will inform the House and Senate of this determination so that they may, if they wish, present to the courts their argument that the provision should be sustained.

Further, to mitigate any unfair burden that this legislation could place on these service members and their families pending any repeal or judicial invalidation, I have directed the Secretaries of Defense, Veterans Affairs, and Transportation, in carrying out the provisions of this Act, to take all steps necessary to ensure that these service members receive the full benefits to which they are entitled—including, among other things, disability retirement pay, health care coverage for their families and transition benefits such as vocational education.

I am troubled by another provision in this Act, which restricts the ability of service women and military dependents to obtain privately-funded abortions in military facilities overseas. I remain firmly opposed to this provision. In many countries, these U.S. facilities provide the only accessible safe source for these medical services. I will support congressional efforts to repeal this and a similar provision that became law in the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996."

Finally, I note that section 1404 of the Act expresses the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Defense should not take any steps toward dismantling or retiring specific strategic nuclear delivery systems until the START II Treaty enters into force, and it prohibits obligating or expending funds in fiscal year 1996 for such steps. Reading the provisions of section 1404 together, I interpret the section to prohibit obligations or expenditures only before the START II Treaty enters into force. The explanation of Section 1404 in the conference report supports this interpretation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

February 10, 1996.

NOTE: S. 1124, approved February 10, was assigned Public Law No. 104–106.

Exchange With Reporters in West Des Moines, Iowa
February 11, 1996

The President. Did you see that woman with the button out there that said, "President Clinton and national media, thanks for promoting Iowa tourism"? [*Laughter*]

1996 Election

Q. President Clinton, everyone keeps asking, why are you out here campaigning? You don't really have any opposition in the primary; why bother—I mean, in the caucuses here—why bother?

The President. Well, because we will hold caucuses, the Democrats will, and people will come. And I want them to know that I would appreciate their support. I want them to know what I am trying to do, what I intend to do in the future, and because I want to validate this process. I think this is—I want this to work the way it's supposed to. I want Americans to believe they make a difference if they go to town meetings, if they go to forums for candidates, if they ask questions, if they try to make some connections. And also because this is the beginning of a long process. I mean, all these—I've come to Iowa a lot in the last 5 years, and I expect I'll be here again before November.

Q. Yesterday Bob Dole said he's the candidate that can beat you; he ought to get the nomination. How would you feel about running against Bob Dole?

The President. I want the Republicans to select their nominee. That's their job, not mine now. One of the things that I have found about this is that no one knows who can beat someone else before the actual event occurs. No one knows. It's futile to speculate.

I think the Republicans will pick the person they believe is the best qualified to represent their party, and then we'll have an election.

Q. And there's nobody who you'd rather run against, sir? There's no candidate out here who you'd say, "Yeah, I can beat this one"? [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, if they wrote me a letter and asked me to nominate someone, I'd—[*laughter*]—I'd be happy to accommodate them. But——

Q. Who would you suggest?

The President. ——since they're not going to do that, I don't see that I should speculate.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:17 a.m. at A.K. O'Connor's Restaurant. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on the Work-Study Program in Des Moines, Iowa
February 11, 1996

[*Sally Hinders, assistant provost for career services, Drake University, welcomed the President and introduced the participants, one of whom said that he was from Winterset, IA, site of the movie "The Bridges of Madison County."*]

The President. They should have given you the role. [*Laughter*]

[*Ms. Hinders discussed some of the advantages of the work-study program at Drake University, indicating that student participants tended to become more involved in the Drake community and often used their experiences as stepping-stones to other opportunities. She then asked the President to talk about the program.*]

The President. Well, let me begin by thanking all of you for taking some time on a Sunday afternoon to do this. I'm delighted to be here, delighted to be at Drake.

Since I became President I've worked hard to try to increase access to colleges and universities for young people, because it's obvious that more need to be able to go and more need to be able to stay. And I never will forget, when I was Governor I had an encounter one night with a number of students in Fayetteville,

which is the hometown of the University of Arkansas. And I just stopped in a little place, drank a cup of coffee, and there were several students there, and I talked to two of them of the group there who had actually dropped out of school once already because they were afraid they couldn't afford the cost of staying in. They were worried about whether they could get the proper students loans, whether they could get any scholarships, whether they would ever be able to pay back their loans.

So I began to work on it when I was a Governor, things we could do at the State level. And when I ran for President I had a commitment to try to expand opportunities for college going. And essentially what we have done so far is to put the Pell grant program back on track—it was in serious trouble; passed a national service program, which this year has 25,000 young people in it earning money for college tuition while doing community service; and to expand loan options so that more young people could have the option to pay their loans back as a percentage of their income when they get out if they take a job that wouldn't permit them to make what would be the normal commercial repayment schedule. And that would mean no one would ever have to forgo borrowing money because they would always be able to handle the loan repayment.

And then in the State of the Union Address I recommended, as you pointed out, that we have a 50 percent increase in the work-study program to get up to a million students a year in work-study, because we haven't kept up over the years in work-study with the demand, with increasing enrollment. And I also believe that the cost of college tuition up to $10,000 a year ought to be deductible, which I believe would be—from my point of view, it's the best kind of tax cut you could have because you'd be giving a tax reduction to people who are investing either in themselves or their children and therefore making a big investment in our common future.

But the work-study program is of real interest to me because I worked myself through college; I worked myself through law school. I don't believe I would have made it if I hadn't had the jobs. And I also have observed just what you said, that a lot of young people actually do better when they have a work experience to go with their schooling. So I'm hoping to persuade the Congress to adopt this increase in work-study, even though in general we're reducing the budget. And we will offer to the Congress a way to do this consistent with our need to balance the budget in 7 years. So this won't bust the budget or anything, but it will help a lot more people to go and then to stay in college.

Let me just make one other point on that. I'm very encouraged that the college-going rate in our country is still going up, but I am not encouraged that it has started to fall again in the last 2 or 3 years among people whose incomes are in the lowest 20 percent of our economy. And if you think about it, the whole sort of premise, or promise, of America from our earliest immigrants is that hard-working parents would be able to open more opportunities to their children. So it's not a good thing that we have that happening.

So one of the things I hope will happen out of the whole combined impact of all these proposals is that young people who come from families with very modest incomes will start increasing their college-going again, just like the rest of our country.

[*Ms. Hinders introduced several work-study participants, one of whom said that the program was a stepping-stone to an internship and that throughout the experience her employers were supportive of her efforts. A parent indicated that her daughter would not be at a private university were it not for the work-study program and that, while her husband's job as a teamster was not always stable, they never had to worry about their daughter's education.*]

The President. Well, let me say I know that Drake has made a real effort to hold down the tuition, too, so that more people will be able to afford to go. And I just spoke to the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Washington a couple days ago, and I tried to cite the number of schools that were doing that. I think more and more schools are trying not to just get caught in a vicious cycle where they have to raise tuition and then they have to find more aid, then they have to do more work-study.

I'd just like to remind everybody—I know all of you around this table know this, but the American people who are watching us and citizens of Iowa who are watching us, this is not—this should not be viewed as a social program. This is an investment in our future. The tax-

payers make out big-time on this investment. We get a whole lot more back out of all of you because you're going to have college degrees, because you're going to be able to live out your own dreams, because you're going to be able to do what you wish to do—and not just financially. This is not entirely a money issue. There's also—our society is a better place when people find more personal fulfillment in the work that they do. So it is a financial issue, but it's also much more of a moral and social issue. It knits us together more strongly when more people have a chance to develop their God-given abilities.

I personally believe that we don't make any better investments than this. And almost 100 percent of people like you in your position will pay back to the Government far more in increased taxes than you ever took out in student loans or Pell grants or work-study funds or anything else. And I think that's an important thing for the American people to remember, that this is an investment with a big-time return.

[*Another participant said that the program reduced the burden on his family and gave him a greater appreciation for education and a career.*]

The President. Your son spoke very well.

[*The student's father said the work-study program had helped both his sons, teaching them to work harder toward their goals. Another participant said that a family member had faced medical problems that had diminished family financial resources, but that Drake had put together a financial aid package which allowed him to go to school and help pay for his education.*]

The President. How many hours a week on average do all of you work?

Participant. About 10, 11.

The President. About 10, 11? About the same for everybody? And do you all find that it doesn't undermine your studies?

[*A student said that the program made her work harder, set a schedule, and keep to it. Another indicated that it helped students mature. Work-study student Molly Adams explained how her work with Grace United Methodist Church increased her sense of responsibility and helped the community in Des Moines.*]

The President. Marilyn, what percentage of Molly's pay comes from the Government, and what percentage do you have to come up with?

[*Marilyn Henrich, deaconal minister at the church, said the church provided 25 percent of Ms. Adams' pay.*]

The President. So your church pays for 25 percent? So it's the same as with the college, then?

Participant. Correct.

The President. Because when you employ people it's 75–25, isn't it?

Participant. Correct.

The President. So do you have to allocate work-study slots off-campus, is that how it works?

Participant. Correct. We're supposed to spend 5 percent of our overall allocation on off-campus studies.

The President. Does the law limit you to 5 percent?

Participant. No.

The President. So it's Drake policy? Or is it Department of Education policy? If you wanted to have—if a college or university wanted to place 25 percent of the work-study people off-campus, could they do so?

Participant. As far as I know we could, if we could find the places and the students to work there.

The President. And what percentage of your students are on work-study?

Participant. About 75 percent of our students who receive financial aid go ahead and accept their work award and work.

Participant. And I can add to that, about 80 percent of our students receive some form of financial aid.

The President. So a majority do this, are on some sort of work-study.

Participant. Oh, yes.

The President. Now, if you had more positions, could you fill them?

[*Several employers indicated their willingness to take more work-study positions. Ms. Hinders discussed matching funds and said that the university contributed additional money because it really believed in the work-study program.*]

The President. Now, I saw in the notes I was given before I came in here that the students make between $4.65 an hour and $7.00, but mostly nearer $4.65 than $7.00. But what

would you say the average pay is? Between $4.65 and $5.00 an hour?

Participant. Right around $5.00, yes.

The President. What determines the pay, the ability of the match or the nature of the job, or what?

[*One participant said it was the nature of the job. Another said supply and demand played a part, but some positions required specialized skills and wages had to be competitive with the marketplace. Another participant noted that the university's contribution was closer to 50 percent than the required 25 percent.*]

The President. Really?

Participant. Lots of students coming in and out every day are involved with those positions. And they're quite varied as well.

The President. But you would—anyway, I take it that—you all agree, then, that there is a demand for more work-study positions and if we could go—one million a year is our goal, and that basically costs—it would be about a 50 percent increase from where we are now.

[*Ms. Hinders said that those were the kinds of opportunities that students and parents were really looking for. Employers and work-study students then described various programs, and a parent explained the benefits of his son's participation.*]

The President. Let me ask you something—you're a freshman?

Participant. Yes.

The President. That's one thing I wanted to ask. How do you deal with the demand—if the demand exceeds the supply, do you give any preference to older students or is it strictly by income, by need, without regard to class?

[*Ms. Hinders explained that the university began with need-based students but tried to make room for everyone. She then introduced the director of the university's financial aid program, who said that work-study was a cornerstone of the financial aid program and was a winning situation for all involved.*]

The President. I also think the value that the students give you—Erica mentioned it, just the work experience, working with older people in a good environment—it's amazing how quickly young people mature in—to take responsibility.

You know, it's a funny thing, when the Government was shut down—which wasn't too funny—[*laughter*]—but when it was shut down there were days when the whole White House was practically being run by the interns. [*Laughter*] It was amazing. There were probably four of us with gray hair—[*laughter*]—and the rest of it, the kids were sort of running the show. And they did a great job. I mean, they worked hard; they kept the basic functions open. They worked quite well the first time we were shut down and we didn't have everything covered by the budget.

It just reminded me again of how important it is to give young people that experience, too. It sort of binds the community and the society together in very important ways.

Ms. Hinders. Well, very much so. I know that we're running a little bit short on time.

The President. Tom, you want to say something?

[*Senator Tom Harkin thanked all the participants and mentioned that he was on both the authorizing committee for higher education and the appropriations committee for education and had been chairman of the appropriations subcommittee.*]

The President. I hope you will be again.

Senator Harkin. Well, I hope so. [*Laughter*] By the way, Rebecca, as I told you, is doing a great job for me. The youngest person I've ever had in that—the position of being the scheduler is a tough position.

The President. It's the worst job in an office.

[*Senator Harkin said that during his years on the education committee, the commitment to education had declined year after year, particularly regarding Pell grants and college work-study programs. He cited the President's support for the programs, saying he hoped that Congress would support them and retain low and deferred interest on student loans.*]

The President. I think that's quite important. I think it's been underestimated, the impact of not having that interest accumulate until people have been out a few months.

Participant. Definitely.

The President. Let me just also say, to follow up on what Senator Harkin was saying, and to try to put it in some larger political context—for the last 30 years anyway, by and large, education has not been a particularly partisan issue. We've had broad bipartisan support for these things until just recently.

And I hope we can get it back, because this is—this big philosophical debate going on in Washington, if you believe the Government is the problem and is the reason for all of our ailments as a society, then you think people are better off if you just get the deficit down, have a strong defense, and let people manage for themselves. If you believe that we're stronger as a country when we deal with our common problems in a common fashion, we will work together on them, then it's obvious that things that have a big-ticket cost, like a national work-study program, require some involvement with the National Government.

And as I said, these are really matters that historically have not been, at least in my lifetime, the last 30 years, have not been really matters of much partisan debate. But what has happened in the last, sort of, decade, there's been this sort of head of steam built up behind the notion that Government per se was bad. Not dumb regulations, or an ill-advised program, or a bad tax system, or whatever, but just the whole idea of Government was intrinsically—something wrong with it. And I basically don't agree with that.

I think what's happened is we need—all organizations have to become less bureaucratic, less rule oriented, more oriented toward empowering people to solve their own problems. And Government's like that, too, but we cannot meet our educational obligations unless there is a public, broad-based, national commitment to helping you do what you do here at the grassroots level.

And actually, one thing I like about the work-study program is it's my idea of what it ought to be—we say, okay, here's a national problem: We need more young people going to college, but it costs a lot to go and most people can't afford to go. Okay? Here's the national solution: We should give money to help that happen. But we don't tell you how to do it. In other words, that's the way the Federal Government ought to operate more. We say—we set a national goal. We provide some resources to meet that goal. We ask you to make a contribution as well. Then you get to decide how. We all agree on the what, nationally, and then you define the how at Drake. And at the University of Iowa, they might define it in an entirely different way. I mean, that's the way this country ought to work, where people work together in that fashion.

I just sat here and made a list of the seven people I worked for in college and law school. [*Laughter*] It's quite interesting. I was thinking, more than half of them I still hear from, I still have a relationship with, and I still feel enormously indebted to because they gave me a chance to get my education. I was sitting here thinking about it while you all were talking. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Hinders. Well, as we draw to a close, Senator Harkin, do you have any additional comments that you'd like to add?

Senator Harkin. Do you have any students in the Head Start program?

Participant. We do.

Senator Harkin. You do?

Participant. Yes.

Senator Harkin. Good for you.

Ms. Hinders. This has been a pleasure to have you here today, Mr. President. We have enjoyed coming together as a group to talk to you about an issue that we really have a passion for. And we can tell that you do, too. So, on behalf of Drake and our entire community, thank you.

The President. Thank you, and good luck to all of you.

NOTE: The roundtable began at 12:45 p.m. in the Knapp Center at Drake University.

Remarks to the Community in Des Moines
February 11, 1996

Thank you so much. First let me thank all of you for making me feel so welcome. It was a wonderful feeling just to come into this room today and see you full of energy and commitment and conviction, and apparently pretty happy. I liked it, and I thank you.

I want to thank President Ferrari, and your Young Democrats president, Sherry Desing, and

your student body president, Sandy Marshall, who met me outside, and all the people from Drake who have played any role in this. I want to thank the Knapp Center event staff. And I want to say a special word of thanks to the band, who played so well today and did such a good job. I thank Amber Schafer for her wonderful introduction and for embodying what a lot of this election is all about—your future and your hopes and your dreams.

I thank Mayor Davis for being here. We've known each other a long time. I was thrilled when he got elected mayor, and I think he's doing a fine job for you, and I'm glad he's here. I want to thank two other Iowans, one of whom is not here and one of whom is, who have been a big part of our administration. The one who is absent is your former attorney general Bonnie Campbell. She directs our Office of Violence Against Women, and we are doing a good job finally bringing America's attention to the problems of domestic violence and violence against women. And I want to thank the other public servant in the Harkin family, Ruth Harkin, the President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, for doing a magnificent job in promoting our economic interests around the world. And finally let me say, Tom Harkin and I have been together all weekend and that's the third time I've heard him tell those jokes, and they get funnier every time he tells them. [*Laughter*]

You know, if you do this as long as I have you have the privilege, sometimes the burden, of hearing a lot of people speak, watching a lot of people work. And I want every person in Iowa to know, whether you're a Democrat or a Republican or an independent, there is not a single, solitary soul in the Congress of the United States that every day works harder to do what he believes is right to the very core of his being than Tom Harkin of Iowa. And on some of the long, cold days and weeks of 1995, it was immensely reassuring to have him in the Senate speaking up for what we believe is right.

Let me say to all of you, I'm delighted to be here on the eve of the caucuses. I want you to go for all the reasons that Senator Harkin said. I have a selfish, entirely personal reason for wanting you to go. All my life, since I was a little boy, I've heard about the Iowa caucuses. I've waited for the returns to come in. In 1992, I couldn't seem to get many votes in the Iowa caucus. This is my last chance, and I would really like to do well. I would appreciate it if you would do that.

Let me thank not only Amber but the other young students and their parents and their employers who met with me just a few moments ago when we discussed the work-study program as you were coming in here, because they really represent what this election is all about.

You know, people descend on Iowa every 4 years and they try to discern what new development is going on in national politics, and that makes the election. That's what the election is all about. And this year I read all these columns and I see all this news coverage on whether the ads are more important than the grassroots campaigning, or the negative ads becoming more influential. Let me tell you something, folks: Every election is about you. Not us, not those of us who run, but those of you—this makes you the boss. This is about your responsibilities. This is about your opportunities. It's about your future. It's about your Nation. It's about what kind of country we're going to have. It is your election, and it's about you, and don't you ever forget it. It is your chance to chart your future.

This is an election that is full of perplexities, or a time full of perplexities. I've watched the signs. I saw a job sign up there and I've seen some very generous, nice signs about what we're trying to do. I like the "My President" one. Thank you very much, young man.

Let me give you some perplexing things to think about, sort of the good news of this moment. I said in the State of the Union Address that this is a time of great possibility, and it is. But it's also a time of great challenge. And sometimes you read about what is going on in the country and you think, well, that's inconsistent with my experience; why are all these things happening?

Let me just go through the areas that I ran for President to address. I said in 1992 that I was running because I wanted to restore the American dream for every citizen in this country willing to work for it, because I wanted our country to be the world's strongest force for peace and freedom, and because I wanted us to come together and not be divided. I am tired of people trying to divide the American people for their own interests instead of unite us for our common interests.

Now, that is still our mission. How are we doing? Look at the economy. In the last 3 years

we have nearly 8 million more jobs; we have a big drop in the unemployment rate in Iowa, as well as throughout the country; we have a 15-year high in homeownership; we have—the so-called misery index, which is the combined rate of unemployment and inflation, is the lowest it has been in 27 years. We have all-time high exports, which is one of the reasons that corn and soybeans and wheat are at high prices now, and the farmers are enjoying that. We have—listen to this—in the last 3 years alone, in each successive year there have been record numbers of new small businesses started and record numbers of new self-made millionaires, not people who inherited it, people who worked for it and made it. Now, that's one side of America's economy, and it is exhilarating. And it is the side of America's economy that most of you who are students here at Drake will move into.

But there is another side to America's economy: About half our people still haven't gotten a raise in terms of the real purchasing power of their incomes in 10 or 15 years. A lot of our people who have worked hard all their lives worked for these big companies that are doing all this downsizing. Hardly a week goes by that I don't hear from somebody I've known who is my age, nearly 50—I hate to say it—[*laughter*]—it's hard for me to look at you and think I'll be eligible for the AARP in 6 months—[*laughter*]—but there it is. But anyway, I get letters from people my age, people I've known. And they've been downsized, and they've got kids the age of the students that are here. And they say, "Well, this is great. My corporation's stock went up. They laid me off. How am I going to educate my kids?" So you ask yourself, well, if all these incredible good things are happening, how did that happen?

Or let's look at the march of the world toward peace after the cold war. There are no nuclear missiles pointed at the people of the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age. Your country is continuing to fight to reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction. We have thwarted terrorist attacks on our soil. We have worked for peace from Haiti to Northern Ireland, to South Africa, to the Middle East, to Bosnia. This is all a good thing. The world is plainly more secure than it was 3 years ago.

But it only takes a few people to decide that they don't want to bear the burdens of the daily work of peace, to do an act of cowardice and madness, like those people that blew up that building in London yesterday, or the cowards that killed the Prime Minister of Israel because he stood for peace, or the people that walked into the subway in Japan and broke open that little vial of poison gas and killed all those folks, or the people who are still terrorizing the citizens of their communities in Latin America because they insist on running drug cartels because there's just too much money in it and they don't care who they kill in the process. So this is a safer world, all right, but there are still a lot of things out there that we have to face.

Or look at the most important thing of all: How are we doing in being true to our basic values as a people? There's a lot of evidence that we are getting our act together, and it's good. In the last 3 years in the United States the crime rate is down; the welfare rolls are down; the poverty rolls are down; the teen pregnancy rate has dropped. That is good news, and America should be proud.

On the other hand, we all know they're still too high, don't we? When can we be satisfied about crime? I'll tell you when: when crime is the exception, not the rule again; when you flip on the evening news and you're surprised to see the lead story be a murder or a rape or arson or something else that a civilized people shouldn't have to look at every night on the news.

So, my fellow Americans, I tell you again, this is the age of possibility. More people will be able to have more opportunities to live out their dreams and to fulfill their God-given capacities than at any point in our history if we find a way to solve the challenges we have and to do it together.

Sometimes people come up to me and say—I mean just almost as if they're my neighbors—they say, "What's the most important thing you've learned in the last 3 years?" And I've learned a lot, so it's a pretty long list. [*Laughter*] But if you ask me what the most important thing is, it is that the debate this country should be having is not whether we're going to have big Government solve all the problems—no one believes that anymore—but it is certainly not whether we can just leave everyone to fend for themselves. It is whether we are finally going to get serious about working together on a daily basis the way we do when the town floods out, the way we do when the chips are down, the

way we did when Oklahoma City—tragedies happen. If we are going to do this together, or not—that is the most important lesson I have learned.

There is no more big Government. Our Government has been shrunk now; the National Government's the smallest it's been in 30 years. We did that. It's the smallest it's been in 30 years. But I saw those young people today and their parents and their employers right before I came in here—and your work-study program here at Drake, that's the kind of country we ought to have, where we say, nationwide, we want more young people to go to school; we think you ought to be able to go to school even if your family's hit on hard times and you don't have all the money. We think it's a good investment to pay people who are willing to work their way through school. We think that's a good thing. We're not going to tell you how to do it, who to hire, what to do, but we think it's a national responsibility to help people get this done. It is a good thing.

So let me ask you very briefly to consider where we are as a country in light of what I said. First, don't be discouraged. We are going through a period of change as profound as anything that's happened in 100 years. One hundred years ago, we moved as a country mostly from rural areas to where we mostly lived in cities and small towns. We moved from a time where most of us worked on the farm to a time when those who stayed on the farm were productive enough to feed ourselves and the world and most of us worked in the factory. It happened 100 years ago.

Now what's happening is we are moving from a time when our economy is dominated not by industry but by information and technology, and where we live in a global village of worldwide markets. The changes in work are staggering. There's more mind and less muscle. The changes in the workplace are staggering. There are more computers and fewer bureaucrats and people moving up and down the line, and more workplaces are smaller and more flexible. The changes in communications are breathtaking, and the changes in the markets are amazing. The money markets and the markets for goods and services are global.

Of course, there are going to be changes in our lives. And of course, there must be changes in what our Government does. Whenever you have a big uprooting like this, you can look at all of human history and you will see when things change this much, a lot of people do very well, but a lot of people are disoriented and suffer and are challenged.

So our challenge is to figure out a way for everybody to benefit, for all people to participate who are willing to work for it and to grow this country together instead of letting it continue to be divided. We should not use elections to divide; we should use elections to unite this country and move it forward.

Now I ask you all to see every issue debated this year in that context. When you hear a discussion about the national budget, you should say: We want you to balance the budget. This country has got no business running a deficit every year, even when times are good. We never should have gotten into that pattern of the 12 years before I became President when we were exploding the deficit. We shouldn't have done it. We have cut the deficit in half in 3 years, and we need to finish the job. But you should ask yourself when you hear a proposal: Will this help all people who are willing to work for it achieve the American dream? Will this bring us together instead of dividing us? Is this consistent with our values of work and family and community? Will this help us be a leading force for peace and freedom?

The budget that I favor enables us to balance the budget by the congressional score-keeping and still protects our obligations to our parents through Medicare and Medicaid, our obligations to our children through education and protection of the environment and investment in their health care. That's the kind of balanced budget we ought to have. It is consistent with our values.

Let me say this: As we go from now to November, I hope we will see that deficit as yesterday's legacy and ask ourselves, what are the great challenges facing all these young people in this audience, in this country, today or in the future? I believe they are seven, and let me reiterate them for you.

One, we have got to do more to strengthen family life and give all of our children their childhoods back. That's why I want to do something about crime. That's why I want more Head Start for children. That's why I want our children immunized. That's why, in the telecommunications bill, I fought to give parents the V-chip, because we had another study last week which showed that years and years of

hours a day of sustained, mindless violence have a deadening, numbing, destructive impact on young people, and parents ought to be able to limit it.

We have got to do more. We have got to do more to raise the level and the reach of education in America. Every one of our public schools should be able to have the low dropout rates and high achievement rates that you generally find in Iowa. There is no reason that should not be in every State in the country, in every school in the country.

By the year 2000, every classroom, every library in this country, and every schoolhouse in this country, no matter how poor, no matter how rural, no matter how inner-city, should be connected to the Internet so that every child, no matter how poor, should be able to reach the world with learning.

And we know that every young American should be able to go on to college. I am proud of the fact that this administration has improved the student loan options for students, has passed the national service program and put 25,000 young people out there serving their communities and earning money for college, has increased the Pell grant program. But it is not enough. I have proposed that we now give a $1,000 national merit scholarship to everyone who graduates in the top 5 percent of any high school in the United States of America every year. And I believe that we need to increase the work-study program by 50 percent, so that we can have one million students every year working their way through college, contributing to the workplace, growing America, and improving their chances for the future.

And finally, let me say, on the question of education, if we are going to have a tax cut, the best way to spend the money is to give families a deduction from their taxes of up to $10,000 a year for the cost of college tuition. We couldn't make a better investment.

Our third great challenge is to bring economic security to working families who never get a raise, lose their jobs, don't have health care, and are worried about their pensions. Because every family that's out there working and raising children deserves to have a measure of security. It used to be security came because you could guarantee someone a job for a lifetime at the same company. If you see all this downsizing now, how will we define security in the future? Here's how I think we have to define it.

Every working family should, number one, have access to immediate education and training whenever they lose a job. People ought to be able to look to the Federal Government for a "GI bill" for America's workers. If a person loses a job, they ought to get a voucher in the mail worth $2,600 a year to take to the nearest community college or other appropriate training institution to begin right away preparing for a new line of work.

Number two, all of you know that the First Lady and I and our administration tried hard to solve the health care problem so that every American family could have health insurance. Now we have apparently made a decision, with the help of hundreds of millions of dollars in lobbyist advertising, that we will remain the only country in the world with an advanced economy that cannot figure out how to give health insurance to everybody under 65. If you're over 65, we did it. Well, at least we ought to be able to guarantee that the people who don't have it have access to affordable health insurance that they can buy. At least we ought to be able to do that.

There is—it's not too late to ask everybody who wants to be President about this issue. There is before the United States Senate today a bill sponsored by 45 Republican and Democratic Senators, endorsed by not only the labor organizations and the consumer organizations but the national chamber of commerce and the association of manufacturers, which would say simply, you cannot lose your health insurance when you change jobs or when you or someone in your family gets sick. That's what health insurance is for. That bill would help millions of families to have a little peace of mind as they struggle with life's challenges.

That bill is on the floor of the Senate, but the insurance companies do not want it brought up to a vote. I want the people of Iowa to write their Members of Congress and say, "Bring it up to a vote and pass it, and send it to the President of the United States so I can have some more peace of mind." It is the right thing to do.

Finally, our working families need the security of knowing they can get and keep a pension. Whether you're a small-business person, a farmer, or somebody working in a big outfit, you ought to be able to get a pension and know it's going to be secure. I do not intend to let our pension funds be raided again as they once

were. I don't want our pensions endangered. And I want to make it easier for small-business people and farmers to take out pensions for themselves and their employees. That's a very important part of family security as well.

And while I'm at it, let me make one last point about family security. I learned that these young people working on work-study here are making between $4.65 and $7.00 an hour. Most of them make between $4.65 and $5.00 an hour. But do you know—and that's not a lot of money, but it will buy a pizza and take you to the movie every now and then, pay some of your costs and relieve the burdens on your families. But the minimum wage in America is still $4.25 an hour. If it is not raised this year, it will be at a 40-year low in terms of purchasing power. You cannot raise a family on $4.25 an hour, but millions of Americans are trying to do it. We have consigned—you think about that, I want you to think about that—I want the young people out in this audience who are on work-study making $4.65 an hour, knowing how you have to watch every penny if you just want to order a pizza once a week, to imagine what you would do if you were working for $4.25 an hour, trying to support children of your own. It cannot be done. There's a lot of talk in this country about family values every election time. Well, my family value says, we ought not to ask people to raise children on $4.25. We ought to raise the minimum wage.

Stronger families, better education, economic security. Fourth, we have to continue to fight for safe streets, to lower the crime rate. It is abysmal that young people today feel the fear they do from crime and violence. We are making progress. We are going to put 100,000 police on the street because we know with community policing you can prevent crime and drive the crime rate down.

We were right to pass the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. It has made this a safer country. I just want to point out—I imagine that Iowa is not all that different from Arkansas, where half the people have a hunting or fishing license or both. I just got back from New Hampshire where they had a big deer season, and I can tell you we had plenty of ducks in Arkansas, and they shot them with the same weapons they used before we passed the assault weapons ban. All those people who said those hunters were going to lose their guns didn't tell them the truth. They weren't right; they were wrong. But I'll tell you who did lose their guns: 41,000 felons could not buy handguns because of the Brady bill. It was the right thing to do.

And what we ought to do, we must have a renewed effort to finish the work of putting the police on the street and to move against gangs and drugs and guns. And we must continue to fight it abroad as well as at home.

The fifth thing we have to do is to leave the environment safer and cleaner for today and tomorrow. Until the last year or so, the work of cleaning the environment was by and large a bipartisan one. Until the last year or so, it would have been unthinkable for a majority in either party to say, "Let's cut the enforcement at the Environmental Protection Agency by 25 percent. Let's delay all regulations. Let's tie all new efforts to clean air and clean water up in knots in court for years and years and years. Let's walk away from our commitment to safe food and safe drinking water and the kinds of things that make this country a safe and good place to live. Let's delay regulations designed to address problems like the *E. coli* problem where people ate contaminated meat and some died, or the cryptosporidium problem that got into the water system in Milwaukee and 100 died."

We cannot afford to have a partisan division on this. We cannot afford to say we can't grow our economy unless we pollute our environment. We have to do everything we can to grow our economy by preserving our environment. That's why I supported ethanol and electric cars and natural gas cars. That's why I have supported these things, and I want you to support them, as well. This can never be a partisan political issue again.

The people of Iowa and the United States can put this away for decades as a partisan political issue if you will just stand up and say, "I want my environment preserved. I want my children to grow up in a healthy country, and I know the planet cannot be preserved unless we can grow the economy in a way that is good for the environment, not destructive of it." You can do that. You can give that to the future, and you ought to do it.

Finally, let me just briefly say there are two other things that we have to face. One is we have to continue to be the leader of the world for peace and freedom and security. It is so easy to say we should walk away from these

challenges now with the cold war over. But we can't. We have a chance this year to get a comprehensive nuclear test ban through, no more nuclear testing. We have a chance to do that. We ought to do that, but we have to lead to do it.

Everything we want other people to do for us in the rest of the world requires us to be willing to lead because we are strong and great and we are trusted. We want the Europeans to be fair and buy our agricultural products. We want Latin America to grow with us in trade. How can we walk away from them if they're willing to risk their lives to work with us to do what we did in the last year and a half, to arrest seven of the eight leaders of the Cali drug cartel? We can't; we've got to work with them.

So it isn't particularly popular. Every time I talk about foreign policy in a large group I get the feeling people are going to yawn or say, "Well, you're doing all right. I trust you, but don't make me think about it." This is a very small world. We've got corn over $3 today because of foreign policy; wheat is over $5; you've got $7 soybeans because we've got a growing world market. But you can't just have economics without a commitment to freedom and decency. And we have to be a part of all of that, and we must understand how it fits together.

The last thing that I want to say to you is that we have got to have a political system capable of generating support and trust from the American people. The Congress has to pass the line item veto they've been promising. The Congress has to pass campaign finance reform, like they've been promising.

But let me say this, this is a two-way street. That's why I like the caucuses; you actually have to make some effort to have your voice heard. You need to say, "I'm going to stop this uncritical bashing of Government and instead ask myself what do we have to do together to move this country forward."

When the streets were flooded here, you did not want a weak FEMA or a weak SBA. When we can collect, as we did last year, a record amount of child support payments to give back to families that have been abandoned, you don't want us to be weak; you want us to be strong. You want us to be strong. You don't want a weak student financial program, you want a strong student financial program. We can cut the default rate, but we ought to loan more money to people.

My friend James Carville has a line in his new book that I just commend to you. He said, "Everybody likes to bash the Government. But," he said, "in the 30 years, our Government has spent half of our tax money on just three things: national defense, Social Security, and Medicare." That's half your money. What happened? We won the cold war, cut the poverty rate among senior citizens in half, and Medicare means today, if you get to be 65 in America, we have the longest life expectancy for senior citizens of any country on the face of the Earth. We can do things together, folks, when we do it right, and we ought to say that.

Let me say especially to every young person in this audience, this country has got a lot of problems, and every politician in it makes mistakes, and Government sometimes does dumb things. But this is a very great country. And in this period of change, remember something President Kennedy said to my generation when the Berlin Wall was up and the Communist world was divided from the free world. He said, "Our democracy is far from perfect, but we never had to put up a wall to keep our people in." You remember that.

And remember, most of the problems we have in this country are broadly shared by other nations who are where we are in our development. And of all those wealthy nations, we have created the largest number of jobs; we have the highest rate of growth; nobody has a lower tax rate; nobody has a lower deficit as a percentage of their economy. We have problems, but we are moving on them.

Cynicism is a cheap excuse for inaction, for walking away from the responsibilities of citizenship—citizenship.

So I say to you, I will do everything I can as long as I am your President to meet those seven challenges for the future. I will do everything I can to complete my mission to see that every American who will work for it can achieve the American dream, to see that we remain the strongest force for peace and freedom, to see that we keep coming together instead of being torn apart. But in the end, what happens to this country still depends on what it has depended on for almost 220 years: you, the people; we, the people. You be there. You lift up your sights. You fight for your future. And we will see the best is yet to come.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:05 p.m. in the Knapp Center at Drake University. In his remarks, he referred to Michael R. Ferrari, president of the university, and Mayor A. Arthur Davis of Des Moines.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on Tobacco Use Prevention and an Exchange With Reporters

February 12, 1996

[*Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala thanked the President for his leadership on the issue of tobacco and children and described the participants in the discussion.*]

The President. I'm looking forward to it. First of all, let me welcome all of you here to the White House and to the Oval Office.

As I'm sure you know, this is an issue that has concerned me for some time, and there are real reasons for it. Three thousand young people start smoking every day, even though it's illegal for them to do so. A thousand will have their lives shortened because of it. Smoking tobacco is the largest single cause of preventable death in the United States every year. And while there are things the Government can do about it, we need your help.

When I gave my State of the Union Address I said that our country has seven great challenges for the future, but the first and most important is to strengthen our families and give all of our children back their childhood. In the case of teen smoking, the Food and Drug Administration is reviewing about 700,000 comments from citizens before deciding what to do to discourage the marketing, the advertising, the sales of cigarettes to children more. We just promulgated what it called the Synar regulation, named in honor of the late Congressman from Oklahoma, Mike Synar, which requires States to take stronger stands to discourage teen smoking and to set a goal of reducing teen smoking by about 80 percent over the next several years.

So we're working hard, but we know we've got to have your help. We know this has got to be a partnership. I think the most important thing I've learned as President is that while Government can't solve all of our problems, we have no business going back to a time when everybody's left to fend for themselves. These are things we have to do together. And I want to compliment the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and, of course, the National PTA—thank you so much—and the American Cancer Society and all of those who are going to create this National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids. This center is sort of a symbol of how I think America ought to work, because it will involve the best national experts but, more importantly, community groups, all kinds of grassroots groups of people working together to try to deal with this issue.

And I just want to thank you and say that I hope that your presence here today and your work and your concern, especially the young people, will be a symbol that will, through the help of all these fine people here covering us, go out across America so that others will do that.

I mean, the ultimate issue here is to protect our children more and to give more control of family life back to parents. I don't think many parents want their children to start smoking. And parents, not advertising, should control that. Children should have a chance to learn within the family unit, within the school, within the churches, within the community, without being bombarded by all kinds of destructive messages that will knock them off track. So ultimately, this is an effort that will give some dimension of real control and values back to the family, which is what we want to do.

Well, I'd like to spend the rest of the time listening to you. We could start—Donna, how should we do it?

[*Secretary Shalala introduced several teens who had done a survey in their neighborhood on tobacco sales to youth, and they described how easy it was for them to buy cigarettes.*]

The President. Out of the places you went, how many carded you and how many sold?

[*The young people said that about 60 percent of merchants sold them tobacco. One participant said she and a friend had surveyed 50 stores.*]

The President. Fifty?

Participant. Yes.

The President. Wow.

[*A participant said that they were able to purchase cigarettes from 11 vending machines but found one for which the merchant would sell a token only after seeing identification. Secretary Shalala then introduced the president of the Robinson High School PTA, who discussed their efforts to have vending machines removed.*]

The President. Let me say, all of you are from Virginia. Hasn't the Virginia—isn't there a new proposal before the Virginia Legislature to take much stronger positions? And I—all I know is what I've read about them, but it appeared to me that they were really moving in the right direction.

Participant. One is, as far as carding.

The President. What does it do?

Participant. You will have to have picture photo I.D. in order to purchase. That one will work. But for all intents and purposes, right now I'm afraid that the vending machine one is getting watered down.

The President. In Virginia when you get a driver's license, do they put your picture on it?

Participant. Yes, sir.

[*The participants added that they doubted that the Virginia law would do away with vending machines.*]

The President. Well, one of the proposals that we are considering, that's being considered here by the FDA, is the question of whether there should be no vending machines in any place that children have access to. If you're going to have vending machines, maybe they should just be where only adults can come in.

[*A participant said that advertising for tobacco seemed to be increasing, especially in African-American and Latin-American neighborhoods. He noted that there were two antitobacco initiatives before the District of Columbia City Council and asked for the President's help in getting them passed.*]

The President I didn't know that. Thank you for telling that. I'll see what we can do about it.

Participant. You're a resident.

The President. Let me just say one thing about the advertising. I have said this before, but I want to reiterate. If anyone doubts the impact of the advertising on the children, you have only to look at the evidence that children are much more likely to buy the three most heavily advertised brands than adults are. Adults are more likely to shop, buy generic brands, cut their costs, you know. Kids go right to the advertised brands. I think it's something like 85 percent of all cigarettes sold to young people are the three most heavily advertised brands.

[*A participant said that ads strong enough to overcome smokers' brand loyalty were too strong to be used around children, and that children did not connect the potential for physical harm with their own use of tobacco. Another participant said she thought that ads contributed to peer pressure to smoke.*]

The President. That's what her letter to me says: "I'm glad you're trying to stop teens and other people from smoking. There are already enough people dying from diseases, and I don't want any more people to die from diseases. I think these are the diseases you die from, like lung cancer, throat cancer, and other diseases caused by smoking. What I'm trying to say is, please stop young people and teenagers from smoking. We are tomorrow's future." Good for you. Good luck.

[*A participant described being caught smoking by a school security guard. Her mother described the parent-child Smokeless Saturdays program offered as an alternative to a 3-day suspension for children caught smoking.*]

The President. Let me ask you something. Do the young people in your school who smoke believe that it's dangerous?

[*A participant responded that they really didn't care.*]

The President. They just don't think about it one way or the other——

Participant. No.

The President. I wanted to ask another question, if I might, because I want to—this is relevant, I think, to the PTA concerns. Do the schools in your school district, do they have programs like, for grade schoolers, which show pictures of lungs in people who have smoked

for a long time and all that? Are those programs in the schools?

[*A participant described a Fairfax County community coalition meeting for children and parents at which graphic slides and videos were shown on drug abuse and driving while intoxicated.*]

The President. The thing that made the biggest impression on our daughter when she was in grade school was—and Hillary and I talked to her about this—the thing that made the biggest impression on her was a class she had where they just showed them pictures of lungs in progression. And you know, she saw all these black lungs, and it made this vivid impression. And my mother had smoked all her life, practically, since she was a teenager. She started as a teenager, as most people do. And my daughter kept telling her what her lungs looked like—this 8-year-old beating up on her grandmother. And for her 8th birthday, my mother stopped smoking. That was her gift to her granddaughter for her 8th birthday.

But that's why I asked you, because I thought it made a real impression on the children in the class. That's why I asked you that.

[*A participant said that with the high dropout rate in large cities many children might miss classroom training but would still need to be reached.*]

The President. That sort of thing, I think you've got to do that early.

[*Several participants described school health education programs and advocated starting them at an early age and emphasizing the short-term consequences of smoking.*]

The President. One of the biggest problems we have in our country—and one problem I have as President and one problem everybody who's in a position of any kind of responsibility has—is dealing with the tension every human being has between thinking about what's happening right this second and what's right to do over the long run. And in the world we live in, the wonderful thing about it is that we get some much information about so many things so fast, in ways we never did before, we have so many options we never had before. It's a very exciting time to be alive, but it's also true that people are just being constantly bombarded with all these things. And I think when you're a young person, it's just harder to believe that every little thing you do has a consequence over the long run.

And that's a problem for—it's been a problem throughout human history. It's part of human nature. But I think it's more difficult for young people today and particularly on this issue, which is why I think these groups are so important. All of your efforts really count. And I think that maybe the young people here, maybe that's the most important thing of all. I mean, I can't—does the peer pressure seem to work? Do you think you have any influence over your classmates?

Participant. It's worth a try.

Participant. Us?

The President. Yes. Do they think you're kind of loony, or do they think you're doing something good?

[*One participant said that while she had no friends who smoked, she was confident that she would be able to convince a friend to quit. Another participant said that it was not that easy.*]

The President. To convince people?

[*The participant said that since he discovered that most people started smoking at a young age, he began teaching elementary school-age children about the harmful effects of tobacco products.*]

The President. Let me ask a question. Why did you get into this? Why do you care so much about this?

[*The participant explained that his godmother died of a smoking-related illness.*]

The President. What about you?

[*A participant said that she got involved because she found smoking disgusting and was annoyed that smokers ignored the risk of dying.*]

The President. You were great, all of you. This is very encouraging. I'll do what I can to support you. We'll keep working on it. We'll do it together.

[*At this point, the discussion ended, and the President took questions from reporters.*]

1996 Election

Q. Mr. President, can we have your thoughts on the Iowa caucuses today? This is an historic day, obviously, for the American people. One specific thought: Did you think a year ago you

would be unopposed for the Democratic Presidential nomination?

The President. I don't know what I thought a year ago. I don't know if I thought about it. I hope I'll win tonight. [*Laughter*] That's my thought on the Iowa caucuses. I hope, as I told—you know, 4 years ago, there was effectively no campaign in Iowa because Senator Harkin ran and, as he well should have, he got almost all the votes there. And today, because there appears to be effectively no race in the Democratic caucus primary, I don't know how many people will go tonight. But I hope that the trip over the weekend made an impact, and I believe it did.

I was, frankly, astonished by the size and the enthusiasm of the crowds and by the response to just a serious discussion of the issues facing the country and my determination to not let this election divide the American people and also not to let the citizens of this country off the hook by saying, "Oh, I'm cynical. It doesn't make any difference."

Look at these kids. These children here—especially this young lady who was brave enough to come—[*inaudible*]—they are a stunning rebuke to the idea that it does not matter what ordinary citizens do in this country. It does matter what ordinary people do. These kids wrote a letter to the President; they get to come in here and talk about it. And it shows you what people can do if they work together. And so that's what I think people in Iowa responded to.

I was exuberant about the weekend; I thought it was very good. I don't know what's going to happen in the Republican caucus. I don't have any idea. As you all know, the nature of the rules and the size of the turnout has a lot to do with that. So I really don't have a clue what's going to happen.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned that the British are no longer going to deal with Mr. Adams of Sinn Fein?

The President. Well, let me say this, I think that all the parties are probably assessing and reassessing where they are and what is necessary to do now, but I intend to do whatever I can on behalf of the United States to try to restore the cease-fire and try to get the peace process going again.

I can tell you this: I believe if you let the Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland have a say in this, it wouldn't be close. They do not want to go back to violence. They want to go forward to peace, and they expect the people who are representing them to be disciplined and mature and to peacefully work this out. That's what they expect to be done. And I just hope and pray it can be done.

And I've been working—actually, I did some work last week before the cease-fire was broken, and I intend to do some more work this week on it. We will do everything we can to try to get the process back on track.

Q. Do you think Gerry Adams can still be trusted after what happened in the last few days?

The President. I said what I thought about what happened the last few days. We're going to look at all the evidence. We're going to see what we know and what we can do, and I'm going to do what I think is best to try to promote peace there. That's what I'm going to do. And that's all I can do.

Thank you.

1996 Election

Q. Are you curious about what Republican candidate is going to emerge?

The President. [*Laughter*] Well, I expect I'll know something by what happens in Iowa tonight, at least if the results are clear before bedtime. I'm just like you; I honestly don't know what's going to happen. And I have found it's not very fruitful to spend your time speculating on things over which you have no influence. And I have no intention of participating in the Republican primary. I'll let them decide who they want to run.

Q. Do you like watching them fight it out among themselves?

The President. Well, I don't know how to answer that. [*Laughter*]

Thank you.

NOTE: The discussion began at 1:27 p.m. in the Oval Office.

Remarks to the National Information Infrastructure Advisory Council and an Exchange With Reporters

February 13, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. I want to thank Ed and Del, and I want to thank all of you for serving. This was truly a distinguished council, a very diverse group. I bet you had some interesting meetings. [*Laughter*] I wish I had been privileged to hear all of them.

When Ed McCracken was talking about the reports and he compared it to President Kennedy, he said, you know, President Kennedy launched a move that sent Americans—men to the Moon—no, men into space, he said, men into space. I thought he was going to say this is going to send all of our children into cyberspace. [*Laughter*]

And what I was thinking about, watching Ed and thinking about the work his remarkable company has done—all of you have probably seen that picture of me when I was in high school, shaking hands with President Kennedy. After I saw "Forrest Gump" and thought about Ed, now every child in America will be able to shake hands with President Kennedy. [*Laughter*]

Let me assure you that we are going to take these recommendations seriously. The council's work may be done, but the Nation's work is just beginning. And I know I speak for the Vice President, who 20 years ago coined this term "information superhighway," and Secretary Brown and all the other members of our administration who are around this table, Deputy Secretary Kunin, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Barram, and others: We are very grateful for this work.

All of you know that we are entering an age of incredible possibility for the American people. I believe that the signing of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 last week will help to increase those possibilities, and I want to thank Reed Hundt and all others who worked on that legislation and all of you who supported it.

If you just think about what has happened since this council was formed in 1993, the growth of the Internet, the hit movie created by computer animation, the explosion of technology, we know that the potential to improve the lives of the American people, both economically and otherwise, is absolutely staggering. And we all know that we are just at the beginning of that process.

The thing that I liked so much about the Telecommunications Act is that that act was passed in a manner and requires a certain public interest in its implementation that I think represents the best of what we ought to be doing and how we ought to be doing it. You know, the act in the end passed almost unanimously. And it, to me, represents the model of the public and private cooperation we ought to have for the future in so many ways.

It obviously unleashes the forces of the market more than ever before. It will bring vast new opportunities for information, for learning, and for entertainment to the American people. It will do it in a way that is consistent with the best principles of fair competition and public interest. Among other things, it will help your recommendations in the KickStart Initiative to become law because of the guarantees in there for access of schools and libraries and hospitals. So all of these things are very hopeful.

If you think about the challenges facing our country, if you just take the ones that I mentioned in the State of the Union—the challenge to build strong families and to give all children a childhood, the challenge to give every American access to the education we need for the 21st century, the challenge to provide greater economic security for Americans in a time when their particular jobs may be less secure than they were in a former economy, the challenge to make our streets safe, to keep our environment clean, to restore integrity to our Government, to maintain out leadership in the world—all these things will be aided by the technological explosions symbolized by the information superhighway.

We know now, for example, that we can make families more secure by providing better health care because of technology. People in rural areas can contact a doctor in a city all the way across the country for help in dealing with a medical problem. We know we can make our criminal justice system work immensely better because of computers. We see that dangerous criminals can be arraigned by computer without having

to move them from police station to courthouse. We can expand our opportunities to identify problems because of technology. Today if someone steals a car and drives it halfway across the country and leaves it in a shopping mall parking lot, within literally a matter of a couple of seconds, as soon as the car is found, its owner can be identified and the facts surrounding its loss can be established.

We know that technology can enable our Government to work better, and it already has in so many ways. Millions of Americans will file their tax returns electronically this year because of the advances of technology, lifting a lot of burden and time off of them. We know Americans starting small businesses can get all their SBA information from a single place on-line now. And these are just the beginnings. The KickStart Initiative is particularly important to me because of the promise it holds to achieve one of my major goals, to connect all the schools, the libraries, and community centers in this country to the information superhighway by the year 2000.

And it can be done community by community. I was in Concord, New Hampshire, the other day, just 2 days after all the schools in that community were connected. And it was truly a community effort, the kind of thing that we have to have. I happened to be in a school in the neighborhood with the lowest per capita income in the community. And I saw what local community leaders had done to make equipment available to students that they could take home and share with their parents, even students who came from modest circumstances, with parents with no formal education or previous experience.

The community grassroots KickStart element of this whole endeavor, I think, is incredibly, incredibly important, and I applaud you for making it a separate report and making sure that we all do our part to help that succeed.

As you noted in your report, educational technology has actually helped to raise educational performance. You can see it in test scores at the Clearview Elementary School in Chula Vista, California, which you mentioned. You also know that it's allowing students around the country to do things they could never have done before, to examine gray whales, to study Hawaii's volcanoes, to explore the Galapagos, all without leaving the classroom. I remember I met a young man not very long ago in Albany, New York, an eighth grader who has done a research paper on volcanoes entirely based on resources in Australia, because of his access to the information superhighway.

We know, too, that technology can brighten educational prospects in all kinds of schools, even in areas where achievement had previously been very modest. The Christopher Columbus School in Union City, New Jersey, which you mention in your report, is a school I plan to visit later this week to try to highlight the importance of your recommendations and our goal, and to demonstrate to Americans all across this country that it really can make a difference.

As I said in my State of the Union Address, as we change the nature of work and we change the nature of the workplace, and more and more organizations become less bureaucratic, less hierarchical, and more flexible, the era of big Government is also passing from the scene as defined by big, centralized bureaucracies. This Government today is the smallest it's been since 1965. By the end of this year it will be the smallest it's been since 1963.

But just because we don't have a big Government, in a traditional sense, doesn't mean that we should have a weak one. It doesn't mean we can allow individuals and families and communities to go back to a time when they had to fend for themselves. In this new world we are facing, we can only take advantage of the opportunities and beat back the problems if we work together.

You have set an example. And this report shows the kind of framework of partnership that enables people to make the most of their own lives and communities to do the best they can in seizing their own opportunities that I believe should be followed by Americans in many, many other areas of our Nation's life.

Your support for the Benton Foundation, which I particularly want to applaud, will help countless schools and libraries and communities learn from each other and speed their progress much faster than what otherwise had been possible.

And thanks to the help of Bill Nye, the Science Guy, with the bow tie—that I can't tie—[*laughter*]—the video produced by Disney and AT&T will make it easier for everyone to understand the information superhighway. I want to thank Bill and Disney and AT&T, and I want to thank all the other companies that

have made their own contributions to this endeavour.

Finally, let me just emphasize what is to you obvious, but may not be obvious to all of our fellow Americans who have not been exposed to these developments. This is not about technology for technology's sake. It's about using technology to help people work together to realize a better future for themselves and for their families. You have helped to challenge America, and you have shown us the way, a way which offers the promise of the American dream to all of our citizens who are willing to work for us and offers us a way to continue to work together in a new era.

That is the most important lesson I have learned as President. We have to find new ways to work together so that people, as individuals and families in the communities, can realize their great promise. And you have done that for us in these two reports. Your country is indebted to you, and I thank you.

Thank you very much.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The Vice President. You did great.

The President. You led the way. Thank you very much.

Iowa Democratic Caucus

Q. [*Inaudible*]—think of the Iowa Democratic caucuses—the results?

The President. Well, obviously I was pleased. I think we got all the delegates and almost all the votes, 99.8 percent. [*Laughter*] The thing I'd like to point out, though, that I was astonished by, and I did not learn until about midnight last night, is that apparently, in an uncontested caucus, 50,000 people went. By contrast, there were only about, I think, 100,000 people in the Republican caucus with nine candidates, and they had anticipated 30,000 or 40,000 more.

And to me, the fact that 50,000 people went out on a cold winter night in Iowa to reaffirm their support for the positive direction in which we're taking the country, and the idea that we do have to work together, we do need a strong set of new ideas in which the Government is a partner in the fight for the future, that's the most rewarding thing of all. I was stunned. There never have been 50,000 people go to the Iowa caucus in an uncontested election—never had been anywhere close to 50,000 people.

And I want to thank the people of Iowa for the reception they gave to me. I want to thank the people who worked for our efforts. And most of all, I want to thank those 50,000 Americans who showed that our people are not cynical, they haven't given up on citizenship, and they are prepared to take control of their future.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:09 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to NIIAC cochairs Edward R. McCracken, chairman and chief executive officer, Silicon Graphics, Inc., and Delano E. Lewis, president and chief executive officer, National Public Radio; Assistant to the President for Science and Technology John H. Gibbons; Deputy Secretary of Commerce David J. Barram; Federal Communications Commission Chairman Reed Hundt; and Bill Nye, host of the PBS children's television program "The Science Guy."

Remarks to the 1996 Super Bowl Champion Dallas Cowboys

February 13, 1996

Please be seated. Mr. Hill, it's good to see you. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the White House. It's a great pleasure and honor for me to welcome Jerry Jones and his family and Coach Switzer and the entire Dallas Cowboys team, the coaches, the staff. Welcome back to the White House. This is beginning to be boring for them, I think. [*Laughter*]

But this is the only thing that happens at the White House as regularly as the State of the Union Address. In some ways, it's better. It's shorter—[*laughter*]—and there's no response. [*Laughter*]

I think everyone in America knows the remarkable record of the Dallas Cowboys, is well aware that they have won the Super Bowl 3 out of the last 4 years and that makes eight

trips to the Super Bowl and five victories. This year I thought was especially important for the team, and Jerry Jones said so after the victory over Pittsburgh, I might add, a hard-won victory and an excellent game. And the Steelers put up a great fight.

But Jerry must have been thinking about the injuries the team had overcome, the fact that there were two losses in December. And I have to say to my longtime friend and fellow Arkansan Barry Switzer—he was second-guessed so much, for a while I thought people had mistaken him for the President. [*Laughter*]

I want to congratulate everyone who played on this team: Emmitt Smith for his remarkable record-setting 25-touchdown year—be a long time before that's—[*applause*] I congratulate those who are here and those who are not here, Troy Aikman, all the receivers, the defensive backs.

But I would be remiss, as someone who understands what it's like to get the limelight all the time, when you're backed by a team that deserves the credit and they don't often get it—that's the way Presidents are. I'm always up giving the speeches, always getting the credit. But as somebody who has been a footfall fan ever since I was old enough to know what the football looked like, I don't believe I've ever seen a team play better, from tackle to tackle, on offense and defense, as the line did for the Dallas Cowboys in the closing games from the playoffs up to the Super Bowl. They were awesome, and they deserve a lot of the credit as well.

I want to say a special word, too, to Charles Haley, who came back from all of his injuries and played in the Super Bowl. It was wonderful to see him on the field. And if he wasn't out of pain, he sure hid it. And if you can play in pain, you can run for public office. [*Laughter*] It's something you might consider.

I also want to say a special word of appreciation—I think all Americans and people who are fans of the Cowboys and people who are fans of the Steelers were glad to see the performance that Larry Brown put into the Super Bowl that won him the MVP award, especially after he lost his young son. I think every parent in America identified with it and admired his courage as well as his performance.

So this was a good year for the Dallas Cowboys. But because of the way they won and the way they played and the obstacles they overcame, it was a good year for professional football and for reminding us all that talent is never enough. You also have to want to win. You have to have the courage to accept adversity and overcome it when you face it. And you have to keep going when the going gets tough. This year the Dallas Cowboys did just that. And every one of us in America can cheer them for that great accomplishment.

So, congratulations. We're glad to have you at the White House.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:05 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dallas Cowboys former player Calvin Hill, owner Jerry Jones, and quarterback Troy Aikman.

Statement on the Executive Order on Illegal Immigration

February 13, 1996

We are a nation of immigrants. But we are also a nation of laws. My administration has put in place a comprehensive strategy to address the problem of illegal immigration. Over the past 3 years, we have begun to reverse years of neglect at the border, with a 50 percent increase in border patrol agents and new technology to stop illegal crossings. We are deporting record numbers of criminals and other deportable aliens. But all this will not stem the tide of illegal immigration if we do not reduce the job magnet that draws illegal immigrants to this country.

It is against the law for businesses to hire workers who are illegal immigrants and are not authorized to work in the United States. For too long, however, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) has lacked the resources needed for vigorous enforcement. My administration has provided the INS with the resources

it needs to enforce the law. We have made it easier for employers who want to comply with the law. At the same time we have cracked down on employers who repeatedly violate the law. But we must do more.

Today I am signing the Executive order on immigration that I announced in my State of the Union Address. This Executive order keeps Federal contracts from going to businesses that knowingly hire illegal workers. It reinforces the principle that Government business—and tax dollars—should not be directed to employers who knowingly hire illegal workers. And for the first time, it will subject those companies to Governmentwide debarment. This will help the efficiency of our Government. And it will have the effect of increasing respect for our laws. The Executive order is simple and straightforward. It will neither burden employers with needless paperwork, nor place unreasonable demands on Government contracting agencies.

At the same time, I want to make clear that we will not tolerate employment discrimination. Federal laws prohibit employers from discriminating against employees or new hires on the basis of national origin or race. These antidiscrimination laws protect legal workers, and I am determined that our strengthened enforcement of illegal immigration laws will not weaken these protections.

American jobs belong to America's legal workers. This Executive order will make clear that when it comes to enforcing our Nation's immigration laws, we mean business. We are determined to restore the rule of law to our Nation's immigration system.

NOTE: The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks to the Community in Woodland, Washington
February 14, 1996

Good morning. Let me say first of all a word of thanks to Mayor Graham for giving me a good tour this morning. I'm here with your two Senators, Senator Murray and Senator Gorton, and of course Governor Lowry and Congresswoman Smith. And we have also Senator Ron Wyden from Oregon with us. And James Lee Witt, the Director of FEMA, and my Chief of Staff, Mr. Panetta, and I came in this morning to—and we flew over the flooded area, and we've been walking down the streets talking with some of the folks.

I was on the other side of the street where the houses were built higher, and they now have lakefront property, I see; that's what the Gleasons told me. And of course, I was with Doug and DeLois Jungnickel down there in their home, and I saw how much they've lost.

Let me say to all of you, I know there's nothing that anyone, including the President, can say that will make these losses go away. I can tell you that in my life, in my former life when I was a Governor, I have been in whole communities that were wiped out by floods. I've been in whole communities that were torn apart by tornadoes. And I have been very impressed with what the people here have done—the way you've rallied together, the way you've worked to help save as much as you could—the work the Corps of Engineers has done to try to get the water down as much as possible as quickly as possible. And I want to begin just by thanking all of you who worked hard to minimize the damage of this flood.

When I leave here, we're going to kind of a roundtable discussion, and we'll talk about what the Federal Government can do to try to help you rebuild. The only thing I can do to you is to pledge to you that I will do everything I can to see that we move as quickly as possible to do as much as we can, everything we're allowed to do within the law, to help you rebuild and to go on with your lives.

I can see just from talking to the mayor—he told me he had lived here all of his life—that this is a wonderful community with good, strong families and good, strong values, and I loved seeing the children at the school today. We will do what we can to help you put it back together and get going in the right direction just as quickly as we can. And meanwhile, I hope you will keep your spirits up. This will

pass, and it will get better, and we'll do everything we can to help.

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. in a residential neighborhood. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Jim Graham of Woodland and Gov. Mike Lowry of Washington.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on the Flooding in Woodland
February 14, 1996

The President. Is everybody here? Mark, do you want to start?

[*Mark Anderson, Woodland deputy fire chief, thanked the President and other roundtable participants, summarized the efforts to control the flooding, and asked the President to comment.*]

The President. Well, first of all, I want to thank you and the fire chief and the mayor and everybody in this community who worked so hard. You deserve to be a little emotional, and I bet you haven't had much sleep in the last several days.

[*Mr. Anderson reported that although he got little sleep during the first 4 days of flooding, the last few nights were more restful.*]

The President. When the mayor and I were coming in here—we went out and toured one of the neighborhoods, and we met with some people who had lost their homes, along with Governor Lowry and Senator Gorton, Senator Murray, and Congresswoman Smith and Secretary Pena and the FEMA Director, James Lee Witt, who is to my left there. It was interesting—he introduced me to one man who was standing on the side of the street. He said, "That man ran a jackhammer for 8 hours with a cracked rib." And I think that's sort of symbolic of what this community has done in the last few days.

And I just wanted to say the whole country has been touched by the pictures we've seen, moved by the losses that you've endured but also moved by the way that you have rallied in this crisis. And I thank you very much for what you have done.

I understand that you evacuated 1,000 people in 40 minutes. If that's true you could probably become police chief of Washington, DC, or fire chief of New York City—[*laughter*]—or Denver or some big place.

Mr. Anderson. I came here from a larger fire department, and I really like the size of Woodland. [*Laughter*]

The President. Let me say that—what I want to do today is mostly hear from all these folks that are here with us, but I would like to just—and both your elected officials and the citizens that are here. One of the things that we have really worked hard on since I've been President is trying to help make sure the Federal Government did its part whenever there's a natural disaster.

When I appointed James Lee Witt to head FEMA, he had headed the Emergency Management Agency of our home State of Arkansas for several years before that. And we had been inundated with floods; we had the highest per capita rate of tornadoes in America; we have picked up after every known disaster. And we really tried to work hard with people.

We know that the State and local community groups and people like the Salvation Army and all the folks that have worked here are terrific. We just want to do everything we legally can as quickly as we can to be helpful. And that's what I want to hear about today: Where are you now? How are you going to rebuild? What can we do?

Today we can announce that we will be able to provide over $26 million to the communities to help rebuild the community facilities, $10 million in emergency relief funds for Federal highway damage, and $2 million to meet other emergency needs. But there will be more that has to be done, a lot more.

We believe that—Mr. Panetta, my Chief and Staff, and I were coming out here, and we were just trying to assess what we know is the damage in Washington and Oregon and over in Idaho. We think we'll have to do a lot more, and we're prepared to do it. And I basically want to spend the rest of this time that we have here listening

to the citizens and the elected officials that are here, so that when we leave here we've got a very good idea of where we are and what we need to do.

[*Mr. Anderson introduced a Woodland resident who had worked for 4 days on a jackhammer without going home. He then invited roundtable participants to comment.*]

The President. Do you want to start?

Hans Johnston. I'm a terrible public speaker, as you soon will learn. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Anderson. Go ahead, Mr. Johnston.

The President. Just pretend you're not talking to the public; just pretend you're talking to us.

Mr. Johnston. No, we'll survive; with the proper help that you're talking about, we'll survive. And we'll go back and we'll move back in sometime this summer, I hope, if everything goes as planned—according to plan.

The President. Did you lose everything in your house?

[*Mr. Johnston said that he had lost 75 percent of his household effects, including photographs, furniture, and bedding.*]

The President. Mayor?

[*Woodland Mayor Jim Graham praised the community's response to the disaster. A participant then asked FEMA Director James Lee Witt how long it would take to assess damage to homes and provide financial assistance. Mr. Witt asked if the participant had called the 800 number and indicated that checks were being issued that day. He said that residents could get temporary housing assistance or emergency home repair assistance or an individual family grant and that they should hear in just a few days. Governor Mike Lowry then thanked the President for his presence and for the speed with which Federal funding was provided during the current and previous floods.*]

The President. That's a poor way to get Federal money, having these floods. [*Laughter*]

[*Governor Lowry said the flood would be the most expensive natural disaster in the history of the State of Washington, with estimates running to $300 million, including 2,600 residences and over 50 bridges lost.*]

The President. Thank you. Anyone else like to talk?

[*A participant thanked the President for his concern and then said that 1,000 families couldn't get from their homes to the cities because of damaged bridges and that the Tri Cities were running out of heating oil.*]

The President. Thank you. Let me say, first of all, on things like the heating oil issue—these big, specific issues come up—it's very important that we know about them if there's something we can do to help, and there may be.

Governor Lowry talked about the dimensions of the losses, and I think that that's probably a conservative estimate, depending on—you know, just based on what we've seen. We may have to come back to you, to Senator Gorton and Congresswoman Smith and to the Congress for some sort of supplemental appropriation on this, and if so, we want to do it as quickly as possible because I don't want all of these folks out here hanging by their fingernails, full of anxiety about whether we are or are not going to be there when they need us.

Ms. Howell, do you want to say anything? They tell me you're great. I expected you to be able to talk all over us. [*Laughter*] The guys with the best seat in the house up there were clapping for you. [*Laughter*]

[*Candice Howell, who covered the volunteer fire department telephones during the emergency, thanked the President for coming to the little town of Woodland to represent the support of the Government as a whole.*]

Mr. Anderson. With that kind of support, the community of Woodland can accomplish anything.

The President. Don't forget, folks, this country is made up of Woodlands. And most of us who live in bigger towns now once came from places like Woodland. So you should never—don't feel insignificant just because you're small. In some ways—I was just telling the mayor, I said, "It must be immensely rewarding to be the mayor of a place where you can know people, you see them, when they commit these acts of heroism and generosity you know who they are." There are a lot of places that are so big now, it would be impossible to know whether the guy that worked a jackhammer for 8 hours had a cracked rib, or not. In a place like this you know that. And that really counts for something.

Senator Gorton?

Senator Slade Gorton. Mr. President, it is said that a picture is worth a thousand words, and Lord knows, the people who follow you around certainly live by that.

The President. A thousand pictures is worth one word. [*Laughter*]

[*Senator Gorton said that for the people of the community, the President's presence was very important.*]

The President. Thank you.

Congresswoman Smith?

Representative Linda Smith. Thank you. We're honored you are here. I saw kids do what I did when I remember seeing President Kennedy—now you know how old I am, about the same age as you are. [*Laughter*]

The President. Looks better on you. [*Laughter*]

[*Representative Smith said that the President's visit gave people reassurance. She also asked for a direct assistance site, saying people were stunned by the destruction and would appreciate having someone to talk to directly for assistance. Mr. Witt then introduced Linda Burton-Ramsey, director, Washington Department of Emergency Management, and said her agency was willing to put a disaster coverage center in Woodland to put all the Federal and State agencies in the same building. He added that State and FEMA outreach teams had been going door-to-door in the community as well. Representative Smith then commended the FEMA effort in her district.*]

The President. May I say—she made a point here, the Congresswoman made a point that I think is, in some ways, for all of you, not just for us, one of the most important things that's been said here today. A lot of the people who have been hurt by this flood are, frankly, still in shock. They have not really come—they're still trying to come to grips with what's happened to them and grieving over the loss of family pictures and things that seem small until you lose them and then they become big.

And I know that it's true; whenever we go into a rural area or a set of small towns, people do feel awkward even asking for things from the Government; they don't quite know how to do it. And I appreciate the response James Lee gave to you.

But I just want to remind you that I met a couple on the street that told me they'd been married 64 years this year, and I could tell they were just trying to come to grips with this. I just ask you all to be sensitive to this. Sometimes when the flood waters go down and there's nothing for a neighbor to do that's real visible like stack the sandbags up, we forget that there's going to be a lot of scars inside. A lot of these folks are going to be hurt for a very long time, and they're going to have to try to come to grips with it. And all of us, from the Federal Government on down, need to be very sensitive to this. It's going to be—there's a lot of tough things that people are going to have to deal with. The churches will have to help; everybody will.

But I really appreciate you saying that, because sometimes I think we forget that in the moment. A lot of times it comes up a week or so later, sometimes 2 weeks later when it's really difficult.

I want to hear from our last panelists, but before I do I want to say again—I want to thank Secretary Pena for coming with us. And I want to recognize in the audience, as we're going back to Oregon as soon as we leave here, the presence of Senator Hatfield, Mark Hatfield, and Senator Ron Wyden, the new Senator from Oregon. Thank you both for being here with us.

[*On behalf of other local emergency managers, Trudy Winterfeld, emergency management supervisor for Cowlitz County, thanked the President, the Governor, and the FEMA Director for their response to the series of disasters in the area. Another participant praised Ms. Winterfeld's office.*]

The President. Thank you, Trudy.

Let me just say, you made a point which provoked another thought in my mind. We went down Gun Club Road today, and we saw the houses on the right side of the road that were wiped out. And the houses on the left side of the road had been built recently, consistent with the Federal flood standards. And as they all said, they all developed lakefront property overnight because behind all their houses is a big lake, but all those houses survived.

And I just think it's worth pointing out that we've had several places in America that within the last 5 or 6 years have had two floods that went into their 100-year flood plain. And no one quite knows—there's a lot of speculation—one of the major news magazines had a cover

story on the extreme winter weather, speculating that it was related to the phenomenon of global warning. No one really knows. But we do know that both in the winter and the summer now, we're having our weather in more extreme bursts, so that more of our precipitation is coming in more extreme bursts. And we're having also really long, hot spells that are quite extreme. Last year was the hottest year ever recorded.

So these are things that we have to be sensitive to, and I think that it's just worth remembering, as we all start the rebuilding effort, that there's something to be said for honoring the building standards in the flood plain; that it may be that these aren't 100-year flood plains anymore, they may be 10-year flood plains for all we know. There may be something rather fundamental going on, and there's nothing to be harmed by at least playing it safe.

Mark, anybody else want to speak?

Participant. Yes, sir. This will be the best, famous—whatever adjective you can think of, sir, for a Valentine's Day that we'll never forget. [*Laughter*]

The President. I received a note from a young lady from this community whose middle name is Valentine because she was born on Valentine's Day, and she asked me to come by and have a piece of cake at her house. [*Laughter*] The mayor said we were too busy; I'm going to blame it on him. [*Laughter*]

Mayor Graham. Thanks.

The President. I appreciate that.

Mayor Graham. Actually, we couldn't get the driver to turn the steering wheel in the right direction. [*Laughter*]

The President. Thank you.

Mayor Graham. Did we have some time for questions from the audience, Mr. President?

The President. Does anybody have any questions about the whole operation here? Yes, sir.

[*A participant asked if a project to deepen the Columbia River would go forward, given Government cutbacks.*]

The President. I don't know that I'm familiar enough with the project to answer. Does anyone want to comment on it? Slade or Patty or anybody?

[*A participant said that Senator Hatfield, Senator Wyden, and the two Senators from Washington were working on the issue and making progress, but that it was a long-term project. Another participant concurred and then related an elderly gentleman's comment that there was so much negative talk about the Government, but when something like this happened, people remembered why they had neighbors and Government.*]

The President. Thank you. But I think it's important to remember he said it right, too; it's neighbors and Government—if you had one without the other, it wouldn't work.

[*A participant expressed concern about the integrity of the dikes. Mr. Witt said that the President had signed legislation in 1993 making more money available for such mitigation projects to prevent disasters from recurring.*]

The President. Yes, I might say in the Middle West, there has already been another flood in one of those areas where hundreds of people were saved from losing their homes a second time, but there are other ways to mitigate; you don't have to—it's just that—that was the Mississippi and the other big rivers there, and they were way down in the flood plain, and there was no practical way for them to do something like the people did on the lefthand side of Gun Club Road when I was walking down there.

So they decided that they wanted to do that, and they saved it. There are other less drastic mitigation strategies that you can follow here, and you need to just decide whether—how you want to do with the dike or your flood wall or whatever you want to do here, and come up with a plan through the State, and you will be eligible for funds to try to implement it.

There was a question back there?

[*A participant asked if the Corps of Engineers could take some action with regard to 2 or 3 miles of identifiable problem dikes.*]

The President. Can they use any of their public infrastructure money to fix that?

Participant. The Corps of Engineers has——

The President. Oh, they're Corps dikes?

[*Mr. Witt indicated that the Corps of Engineers would make many such repairs. A participant pointed out the need for an early warning system on the river in addition to repairing the dikes.*]

The President. Sir, let me follow up on what you said. It is true that the Corps of Engineers can do that. It's also true they're probably out

of money because we've had a lot of floods this year, including back in—you probably saw the floods we had in Pennsylvania and West Virginia and Maryland back on the East Coast, so we will probably have to include some more money for the Corps of Engineers in whatever supplemental budget we do. But if we do it, they can immediately, if they have the personnel, go back and fix the dikes.

Yes, sir?

Participant. I live on Gun Club Road that you drove down. We can replace our stuff; you know, you can't replace lives. As long as nobody got hurt, that's what matters.

The President. Thank you.

Participant. We had no loss of life, and we had no injuries.

The President. Thank you for saying that.

Mr. Anderson. Do we have a question over here?

The President. These are, I think, the legislators from the local area. We thank them for coming out as well.

[*A State representative said that it was vitally important that people register with the 800 number as soon as possible and asked FEMA to do more to publicize it. Mr. Witt said that FEMA was trying to get information out to the public via the Recovery TV channel and the Recovery Times publication.*]

The President. Senator, you—well, let's do this gentleman, and then we'll come back to you.

[*A State senator asked for a reappraisal of height limitations for Corps of Engineers revetments on the Cowlitz River and also asked for work on flood warning systems for area rivers.*]

The President. Do you want to say anything about that, James Lee?

[*Mr. Witt said that local emergency management officials would soon be able to prioritize 5 percent of mitigation funds toward early warning systems.*]

The President. Mr. Panetta says—drawing on his experience as former chairman of the House Budget Committee, so he knows this stuff—[*laughter*]—he says if we get the money to the Corps, he believes they have some flexibility to build on the revetments as a part of the mitigation plan. So we need the—I would think that you all should work with the Governor and try to make that a part of the mitigation plan, because obviously that's what we're trying to do, to go back to his question. We're trying to minimize the chance of this occurring again. So I would urge you to make sure that you make that a priority, and then we'll try to make sure whatever we can do whatever is necessary to give the Corps the legal authority to do it.

Yes, sir. There's a gentleman in the back there. We're bringing you a microphone.

[*Participants praised the inmates of the Larch Mountain Corrections Facility and all the Hispanics in the farm communities for their sandbagging efforts.*]

The President. There's another question back there.

[*A participant said that the work done by high school students was impressive and then offered the President a tape of the high school jazz band.*]

The President. Send it up here.

The gentleman here in the blue jacket there.

[*Participants praised local restaurants for feeding the flood workers around the clock.*]

The President. Is there a question back here? There's someone with a hand up over here to the right. And then there's a lady over here. I'm running you guys crazy. [*Laughter*] This guy's a—he's with us, and he needs the exercise. [*Laughter*] This is part of my, you know, get-my-staff-fit campaign. [*Laughter*]

Participant. Happy Valentine's Day, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you, sir.

[*A participant described how the community responded within the hour to television requests for replacement workers on the sandbagging crews.*]

The President. Thank you. Now, there are two over there. Two people over here. There are two over there. You can stay now. [*Laughter*]

Participant. Thank you for coming to Woodland, Mr. President. I'm one of your supporters that writes you letters from Woodland, although you probably never see them.

The President. Keep them coming.

Participant. One of my concerns is the possibility that Congress could close down the Government in March; will that interfere with the help needed for this area?

The President. Well, first of all, I don't think that's going to happen. And I believe that the leaders have made it pretty clear that we don't think that's going to happen. And I believe that we will pass the legislation necessary to—the Congress can't act on it until we draw it up. We have to get up the supplemental appropriation necessary to provide the funds here. But as soon as we know it, what they are, we have—you know, it's going to take us a while because we can't keep—we want to do it all at once. But I believe that as soon as we know, the Congress will act appropriately. I wouldn't worry about that. I think they'll take care of it.

I thought there was somebody else. Nobody else? Okay.

Do you have a question, young lady? You want to ask a question? She had her hand up. Do you want to ask a question? Do you want to say something? I don't blame you, that's the right thing to do.

Participant. Mr. President, she wants to wish you a Happy Valentine's Day.

The President. See, I had to have valentines with my little girl last night. So I need a valentine today.

Thank you very much.

[*Mr. Anderson concluded the discussion by thanking all the participants.*]

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The roundtable began at 11:20 a.m. in the bay of the Woodland city hall/fire station.

Remarks to Workers and Volunteers at the Flood Wall in Portland, Oregon
February 14, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Jim McKune, for your fine words and, even more, for your fine work.

I want to say on behalf of all Americans, having had the opportunity now to fly over the areas of Oregon and Washington which were damaged by the flood and many of which are still under water, our country has been watching you and pulling for you and praying for you. We have a lot of admiration for the incredible work that has been done, and we're proud of the contributions made by all the groups and all the individuals who have worked so hard.

I want to thank especially, on behalf of the Federal Government, the Federal Emergency Management Agency and its Director, James Lee Witt, who is here with me today; the Corps of Engineers, who used their night scopes to make sure the dikes along the Columbia were holding strong; the Secretary of Transportation Federico Pena, who is also here today. I want to thank the National Guard, which has done about everything it could to help, and I understand they even air-dropped hay to cattle cut off by water on Sauvie Island.

I want to congratulate and thank Bill Long and Steve Barrett for the tour I just got of the wall and the work they did to build it and all those who did it so well. And let me say a special word of appreciation also to Governor Kitzhaber and my good friend Mayor Katz, Senator Hatfield and Senator Wyden, and Congressman DeFazio and Congressman Bunn. We're going to need them all in the next few weeks because we don't have enough money right now in the Treasury to meet all the demands for the problems that Oregon and Washington and your neighbors in Idaho have gone through, and we're going to have to go back to Congress and ask for a little help. But I'm sure it will be there. And I thank them for their support.

I want to say a special word of thanks, too, to the United States Marine Corps members who worked on this wall. I understand some of them worked all night long.

I won't keep you here long. I just wanted to come here and listen, and in a few moments we'll be going to kind of a roundtable where I'll be hearing about where you are now in the flood recovery efforts and getting some suggestions about what else needs to be done. But I do want to point out something. If you look at this wall behind us, it seems to me that it is a symbol of what our country does when everybody pulls together and works together and

forgets about their differences and focuses their attention and their hearts and their minds.

I understand it was exactly a week ago when Mayor Katz learned that the seawalls might be no match for the river, and that you would have to get an emergency wall up before the river was expected to crest on Thursday night. Crews worked overnight, but there were too few of them for such a big job, and without outside help, clearly the wall couldn't have been ready. So the mayor called on the people of Portland. I've had enough experience with the mayor to know that she's hard to turn down, but with the aid of the river coming down, I suppose that focused the attention of the citizens.

Within minutes, 1,000 men and women from all over the area cast aside what they were doing to come to build the wall, to hammer the boards, to wrap them with plastic, to pile the rock, to pass sandbags hand to hand. Restaurants donated food, carpenters lent equipment, AmeriCorps volunteers—young people learning construction skills—put their education to work, and as I said, there were even 60 marines who pitched in and finished the wall on time. When the river finally crested, it was about where you built the wall.

I have seen similar stories of courage and teamwork all around this State. We know that a lot of the places hit by this flood were in very small towns and rural areas, places that often get overlooked but places that are really the backbone of our Nation, places from Tillamook County, where dairy farmers sought to save their cows, to Sherman County, where wheat farmers saved the battle of their fields, to Marion County, where kids volunteered around the clock to help in shelters. There are individual heroes everywhere: a tugboat crew rescuing a man stranded on top of his house; a police officer jumping into a debris-filled river to save a life; rescue workers evacuating people from their flooded homes; neighbors helping neighbors move cattle to higher ground.

But I also think we know that all of these individuals together really is what made this such an extraordinary, remarkable experience. This wall will never obscure the triumph that the people who lost their homes and their lives in the Pacific Northwest—there were four lives lost, dozens of people injured, thousands more evacuated; a lot of farmland was ruined; a lot of livestock was destroyed. That is a tragedy. It can never be obscured. The roads, the homes, the businesses, the powerlines that were swept away in the mudslides, the avalanches, and the washouts, they are many.

And let me say to all of you, the people who experienced these losses, a lot of you have rallied to their side in the last couple of days, and I applaud you for that. But I can tell you, from years of experience long before I became President, as a Governor with whole communities flooded out and whole towns leveled by tornadoes, the going will get tough again for these people in a week or 2 weeks or 3 weeks. Many of them are almost in shock now, but they will have to come to grips with the dimensions of their losses.

And so I ask you all, everybody who put a shoulder to build this wall and everybody who has done anything else in the last few days, be on the lookout for your friends and neighbors for the next few weeks, because a lot of them will have to come to grips with enormous personal loss and anxiety and pain, and they will need you then as well.

I want to thank you for doing your part, for pulling together. You will have our help, I assure you of that, in the job of cleaning up and rebuilding. And we will help you until it is finished. Today I'm going to survey the damage, as I said, talk with Members of your congressional delegation, with your State and local officials, with the citizens who are dealing with this. We want to know what more we at the national level can do to help.

I want you to understand that I know that this is not just an emergency for a few days or a week. We have been committed. We are still working on the hurricanes that hit Florida years ago. We have continued to work on the terrible floods that hit the Middle West a couple of years ago. We are trying to finish the work of dealing with the aftermath of the earthquake and the fires that hit California. We know that we have to be your partners until the complete work of rebuilding the lives, the economy, and the communities that were damaged by this flood is over. And I look forward to that.

When I became President, one of the things I promised myself I would do is to at least see that the Federal Government did a good job when disaster struck. I had lived in a State which had the highest per capita incidence of tornadoes in America, and I know what it's like when you need help and it's not there.

I am proud of the fact that, where it used to take a month or more for families who were hurt in disasters to get checks, now you can call an 800 number and get it within days. Already more than 3,500 Oregonians have registered for help, and the first checks were mailed to them today.

The Small Business Administration will do everything in its power to get Oregon's small business communities up and running again. And I am pleased to announce today emergency grants from other Government agencies. The Department of Transportation is today committing $10 million to help repair highways damaged by the flood. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is speeding $10.3 million for community development and housing assistance. The Department of Labor is providing $2 million in emergency funds for dislocated workers.

And today we are opening two disaster recovery centers in Tillamook and Clackamas Counties. Residents can go to the center and meet with representatives of all the Federal and State agencies that are taking part in the recovery. So those who can't get everything they want or need over the 800 number will be able to go in and deal with someone face to face. I know that it takes time to get this done. But let me say again, we can do it.

I hope you will never forget this wall behind me, and goodness knows, I hope you never need it again. But I hope you will always remember for as long as you live what the people of Portland did in one remarkable day. And I hope that all of us will find in our minds and hearts the wisdom and strength to be a little more like the people of Portland were on that one day every day of the year. If we had that kind of cohesion, that kind of common commitment, we'd really be in pretty good shape.

When I was up in Washington a couple of hours ago, I went to the home of a man, 70 years old, hard of hearing, lost everything he had in his home including his hearing aid. And all he did the whole time I saw him—he and his wife were there, and their two daughters had come in, their granddaughter trying to help them deal with the aftermath of losing everything in a home they had lived in for decades—and all he did was crack jokes the whole time I was there—[*laughter*]—trying to keep everybody else in a good humor.

And he said, "You know, it's amazing how all these total strangers showed up to help me." He said, "People were going down into my basement, which I turned into an indoor swimming pool—[*laughter*]—and really risking getting hurt pretty seriously trying to help me save the few little things I've accumulated in my life." And he said, "I'm real grateful, but I just wish we could all be that way every day." And that's a pretty good pearl of wisdom from a man who, at the age of 70, is looking at a future without anything that he had just a couple of days ago.

Let me close by asking you to remember that today is your State's birthday. On February 14, 1857, the people of the Oregon Territory decided their bond to each other was strong enough to sustain a State. The spirit that brought statehood was alive and well again here last week. May that spirit heal the wounds of recent days, and may it continue to grow and flourish for another 139 years and beyond.

Thank you, happy birthday, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:30 p.m. in Waterfront Park. In his remarks, he referred to Jim McKune, volunteer carpenter; Bill Long, supervisor, bureau of maintenance; Steve Barrett, structural engineer; Gov. John A. Kitzhaber of Oregon; and Mayor Vera Katz of Portland.

Statement on the Interim Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses

February 14, 1996

I am pleased to accept the interim report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses. Dr. Joyce Lashof and the Committee members have made an impressive start on helping to ensure that we are doing all we can both to determine the causes of the

illnesses Gulf war veterans are suffering from, and to provide effective medical care to those in need.

I am pleased that the Committee's interim report recognizes the serious efforts underway in the administration to restore these men and women to good health. I know that the Departments of Defense, Health and Human Services, and Veterans Affairs will review the recommendations contained in this report and will continue the research, outreach, and medical programs needed to improve the lives of Gulf war veterans and their families.

I have asked Secretary William Perry, Secretary Donna Shalala, and Secretary Jesse Brown to develop an action plan for implementing the recommendations in the interim report. I am also asking the Departments to continue their record of full cooperation with the Advisory Committee as it prepares its final report over the next 10 months.

As I said last March when announcing my intention to establish the Advisory Committee, 5 years ago we relied on these Gulf war veterans to fight for our country; they must now be able to rely on us to try to determine why they are ill and to help restore them to full health. We are all indebted to the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses for its contribution to this critical task. I look forward to reviewing their final recommendations later this year.

Remarks on Departure from Boise, Idaho
February 14, 1996

[*The President's remarks are joined in progress.*]

On the ground, we are doing what needs to be done not only now, in the next few days, but for as long as it takes, until the people there are back on their feet and back to normal.

Let me also say that, as I'm sure all of you know, this has been a long day for me but it's been a very rewarding one, even though I've seen a lot of sad and heartbreaking things. And not only in my conversations here but in my trip to Oregon and to Washington, I've seen a lot of loss, but I've also seen what happens when the American people work together in a spirit of genuine community and when people exhibit individual acts of courage and kindness that seem to overwhelm the dimensions of even the worst tragedy. And I have seen that as well.

I think the lesson that I have learned more than any other in 3 years and a few days as President is that when this country works together, we never lose. And when we permit ourselves to be divided, we often wind up being less than we ought to be.

I thank again everybody here in the northwestern part of our country for what I have seen today, for the work that they have done. And I want to say again specifically to the people of Idaho, I will follow up on the suggestions that we have gotten. I look forward to working with you. And I hope, as the members of your congressional delegation suggested to me in there, Senator Kempthorne in particular, that maybe the model of cooperation that we've seen in dealing with this flood can become a model for other kinds of cooperation in the future, so that Americans everywhere feel that their Government is a partner in a common endeavor to help individuals and families and communities make the most of their God-given capacities.

Thank you. Good luck, and we'll be at work on this immediately. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 7:50 p.m. at the Idaho National Guard Ramp at Boise International Airport. These remarks were released by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 15. The press release did not include the President's complete opening remarks.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on Education Technology in Union City, New Jersey

February 15, 1996

The President. Thank you very much, Carol. Good morning, Secretary Riley. You look great long distance there—[*laughter*]—glad you're in the Cabinet. Good morning, Bob Fazio, and thank you again for what you said and for the remarkable work you have done here. I want to say hello to Senator Lautenberg and Congressman Menendez, who had so much to do with starting this technology effort in this school system; and to Jim Cullen at Bell Atlantic, and the others who are here from the private sector; and the teachers, the parents, and especially the students who are here; and the students from the 65 schools in Hudson, Bergen, and Morris Counties who are with us today, thanks to technology. I want to say hello to all of you.

I have been looking forward to this for some time. And the Vice President and I have had some very exciting conversations about what we would see here and what all of you have done here. And I want to just begin by thanking all of you for making this kind of partnership work and by proving what I said in the State of the Union, that we have an obligation if we want all Americans to have the opportunities that this new information and technology age offers, we have an obligation to make sure that all of our children have access to world-class education through the finest technology. And you are doing that. And I'm very, very proud of you, and I'm very excited to listen to all of you and what you have to say today.

But I would like to talk a little bit about what we are trying to do. What we trying to do from the White House is to work in partnership with everybody in America who is concerned about this to see that by the year 2000 every classroom and every library in the entire United States is hooked up to the information superhighway, that all our children have access to computers and the finest educational software and all of our teachers have the kind of training and support that obviously you have provided here, and that there is the kind of connection that we see here.

I am very excited about the prospects that young people like those here at this table in this room will be able to learn things that I could never have even dreamed of as a child. And while I want districts like yours to be able to stand out and be proud, I think all of you want every child to have the opportunities that your children have.

And that's why I wanted to come here to announce what our next steps are. As I said in the State of the Union, when I outlined the importance of meeting the challenge of providing all of our children an education for the 21st century, one of the primary goals I set was making sure every classroom was hooked up to the information superhighway by the year 2000. Today I am proposing and will include in my budget to the Congress a $2 billion technology literacy challenge that will put the future at the fingertips of every child in every classroom in the United States. Let me explain just briefly how it will work.

We'll basically do what you have done here in Union City on a national level. We will use the resources of State and local governments and school districts, of the private sector, the schools, the students, the parents, and the teachers. The proposal is part of the balanced budget plan, as I said, I sent to Congress, and we will use these funds basically as challenge grants to try to make sure that no school district, no matter how poor, no matter how urban or rural, will be denied the opportunity to do what your children have been able to do because of your vision and work.

I ask for all the people in this country who will support this effort to get active, to get involved. Companies like Bell Atlantic can do a great deal, but they can also use a lot more help. And obviously, none of this will happen unless the school and the parents support the endeavor.

So we're going to try to do our part. We want to support you. And we look forward to the day when we can have a conversation like this and every school child in America can be a part of it.

Now I'd like to turn this over to our high-tech Vice President who has educated me—between the Vice President and my daughter, I'm about to figure out this modern age. [*Laughter*]

And I want to thank them both and introduce the Vice President and thank him for all the work he has done in this important area.

[*The Vice President compared President John F. Kennedy's initiative in America's early space program with President Clinton's initiative to link schools to the information superhighway.*]

The President. Thank you.

Let me just say one other word and then we'll go back to the planned rotation. Bob Fazio said something that sparked a warm response in me and reminded me that technology is only as good as the people who are using it, and in the service of education, it's only as good as the educators who are committed to educating our children.

And he introduced himself as the instructional leader of this school. Having worked now for almost 20 years in the field of education reform and having had the opportunity as a Governor to travel all across America, to go into many of our country's finest schools, it wasn't so many years ago that there were almost no principals in America who would have introduced themselves as the instructional leaders of their schools. They thought of themselves as managers, people who kept order and made sure the books balanced and did all kinds of things that were unrelated almost to what was going on in the classroom. And the reason this technology initiative is working here is because, from the principal to the teachers, people understand what the mission is.

And I wanted to thank you. That was a statement that people that haven't spent a lot of time in classrooms might not have even paid any attention to, but to me it meant more than anything else you said. And I thank you for that because it's important for all us who are trying to put this equipment at the fingertips of our educators to remember that what happens then is the magic between the teachers, the children, and the parents. And I thank you for what you said.

Mr. Fazio. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Mr. Vice President, who is going to go next?

[*Mr. Fazio introduced a teacher who described how her school used technology and commented that she was nervous.*]

The President. You're doing great.

[*The teacher said that the President's initiative was important to Union City students because many could not afford home computers.*]

The President. Thank you.

[*The Vice President introduced a participant who commented that learning computer skills in grammar school would give students an advantage in high school and college.*]

The President. Let me ask you something. Why do you think that students here are doing better now, like on test scores and things like that, than they would have done if there had been no technology here? What do you think the most important thing is about technology?

[*The participant said that computers gave students immediate access to current information and more time to study, without regard to economic class.*]

The President. That's right. Do you think that having access to the computer makes all children believe that they're equal, that they can have equal aspirations because it's an equalizer across income, isn't it?

Participant. Yes, it is.

The President. Is it also more fun?

Participant. Yes.

The President. Do you think that has something to do with why people learn more, because it's more fun? [*Laughter*]

Participant. Yes, I do.

The President. That's not bad, that's okay. You can say that. [*Laughter*] It doesn't have to be hard; it can be fun.

[*The Vice President introduced a participant from Bergen Academy who described how partnerships were created between businesses, schools, and professionals to bring technology into the schools and community. He said that technology made teaching more exciting and he woke up every morning not knowing what was going to happen.*]

The President. It is like our job. [*Laughter*]

[*The participant said that rather than being a teacher, he now was a facilitator, a teammate in solving problems. He then introduced two students who described their computer projects, including an effort to put a biovisualization and 3–D gallery on the Internet.*]

The President. Tell us what biovisualization is. For all of us mere mortals, we'd like to know what that means. [*Laughter*]

[*A participant described the project of electronically reproducing specimens from the Smithsonian Institution. Other students then described and demonstrated their projects.*]

The President. That's great.

[*Parent Luciano Calles explained that the program motivated children and exposed families to the education process.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

[*The Vice President introduced parent Louis Clements, who described parental cooperation with faculty and school administrators to expand the program.*]

The President. Thank you very much, Lou, and thank you, Mr. Calles. I want to just comment very briefly. I think if every school in America had 75 to 80 percent parental participation, we wouldn't have half the problems we've got, and we'd have a lot more computers in the schools a lot faster. I thank you for that.

And I wanted to say to you, Mr. Calles, one of the things that you said that meant a great deal to me personally was that you thought it had helped at home, too—the atmosphere of education at home. I mean, I gather you feel that you have a higher level of security about your child's education, and you feel more involved in it because of this technology project.

[*Mr. Calles said that his children taught their parents to use the home computer and that school administrators communicated with parents at home using E-mail.*]

The President. Do you have a lot of parents who communicate through E-mail now?

[*Mr. Fazio affirmed that it provided an opportunity to reach parents who could not come to the school.*]

The President. I'd like to call on Jim Cullen, the vice chairman of Bell Atlantic. Bell Atlantic has been an indispensable part in this project here at Christopher Columbus in Union City. I want to thank you, but I'd like for you to talk about your role, why you did it, and what you think the future holds.

[*Mr. Cullen described the process of electronically linking schools with outside resources. He noted that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 encouraged the establishment of electronic links to educational institutions and libraries. The Vice President said that the President was responsible for that part of the legislation.*]

The President. Explain to everybody what is in it, though, so that——

[*The Vice President summarized the legislation, emphasizing the challenge grants to create public-private partnerships. Mr. Cullen then said he expected that corporations would be eager to participate.*]

The President. Jim, I want to hear from Congressman Menendez and Senator Lautenberg and the mayor and Secretary Riley about their perspectives on this and their involvement with it, because they all have been involved. But just before I do, I'd like to ask you to just touch once more on something that has come up several times today that comes up in other places where I've been—I was in Concord, New Hampshire, several days ago, 2 days after they connected all the schools in their community—and that is the challenge of making sure that children have access and their parents have access to computers and to being hooked in when they're at home. How important do you think that is? Could you say again, very briefly, what steps you took to do that, just to emphasize that for the people that are listening here, because this is one thing that's going to require an extra amount of effort in several places in the United States to get this done. And so if you could just—and maybe, Bob, you might want to comment a little bit—but if you could just talk briefly about it, and then we'll go to our public officials.

[*Mr. Cullen summarized the vision of the information superhighway, concluding that it had the potential to be available around the clock in schools, small businesses, and homes.*]

The President. But it's important to hammer that home. I mean, the ultimate vision of this is that the reach of the information superhighway will equal the reach of telephones and television here. It will be in every house.

[*A participant reported that Mayor Bruce Walter's vision was to open the public library to on-line users as a way of providing a safe haven for children.*]

The President. Congressman and Senator and mayor?

[*Representative Robert Menendez said New Jersey was willing to work with the President to move the rest of the Nation onto the information superhighway.*]

The President. Great.

Senator?

[*Senator Frank Lautenberg emphasized that technological advances had sharpened students' learning abilities and concluded by thanking the President and the Vice President.*]

The President. Mayor, I'd like to let you speak last, so let me interject here and call on Secretary Riley out there in cyberspace to ask if he has any comments.

[*Secretary of Education Richard Riley discussed the role of Government as a leader and supporter of technology initiatives.*]

The President. Thank you very much. And thank you for your leadership to make sure that's exactly what we did.

Mr. Mayor?

[*Mayor Bruce Walter discussed the role of local government and concluded by thanking the President and the Vice President.*]

The President. Thank you.

Mr. Vice President?

[*The Vice President reviewed the concept of universal service as it would apply to computer communications and thanked the participants for demonstrating the future. A participant then invited the President and the Vice President to continue the discussion at another location.*]

The President. We will do that. But before we get up from this table I want to leave you with one final thought to muse about, and I hope not only all of you but all the people who will read or see about this—as President, I have said repeatedly, I believe—when it comes to the American people I have two great objectives, and that is to do everything that we can do to make the American dream available to every person who is willing to work for it, and secondly, to do it in a way that brings the American people together instead of divide them.

Technology has been a big part of this debate. Technology clearly here is uniting us and moving us forward. Erika said it: It doesn't matter where you come from, doesn't matter who your family is. And Luciano said it: You can be an immigrant family; you can bring a computer there; you can have access to the information. People—all people can have high expectations for themselves, no matter what their income background, no matter what their roots are, they can do that. This is bringing us together and moving us forward.

If you look beyond the schooling years, there are lots of people who are afraid that technology is doing the reverse. In our economy, where we have global information and global markets and breathtaking changes in productivity, you read every day—and I have talked about it in my State of the Union Address—we have almost 8 million new jobs, but half the country hasn't gotten a raise and a lot of people are wondering what will happen to them if their big company becomes a smaller company because of information productivity.

What I want the American people to see about this is that when we complete the work of bringing the information superhighway to all education and to all of our people, it will empower everybody, and it will close the circle, and it will enable us to use these great new forces of the modern world to bring all of America together and to move all of America forward.

You know, you can't turn around and go back. This will carry us forward. And I think it's a very, very great thing for our country. And some day, when Erika is about our age thinking about her children and her grandchildren, we will look upon what you are doing as the beginning of a great renewal of American society that goes even far beyond education and proves that we can make this technology our friend and reinforce the American dream and give everybody a chance to live up to their own dreams.

And you are real pioneers, and I'm very grateful to you. Thank you, everybody.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in a classroom at Christopher Columbus Junior High School. In his remarks, he referred to Carol Lisa, principal, Bergen Academy for the Advancement of Science and Technology, and Bob Fazio, principal, Christopher Columbus Junior High School. A portion of this discussion could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks on the Education Technology Initiative in Union City
February 15, 1996

Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President, thank you for that introduction and for your leadership to advance the technological revolution in America and especially to bring its benefits to all of our children. Thank you, Mr. Mayor; Superintendent Highton; Senator Lautenberg; Congressman Menendez; Secretary of Education Klagholz; Bob Fazio, the principal of this fine high school; I'm glad he's not running for President this year. [*Laughter*]

Jim Cullen, the vice chairman of Bell Atlantic, thank you so much for everything you have done to make this school district a success, and the work you have done throughout this State and throughout your area of service. To the folks at Bergen Academy and Secretary Riley and to others joining us on the information superhighway, including students from 65 schools in 3 counties—and I believe Congressman Torricelli is out there in cyberspace somewhere—it's nice to have all of you with us. And let me say a special word of thanks to the parents, the teachers, and the students of this school and the Bergen Academy who joined us today to talk about what all this means to our children and our future. And let me ask us all to give a special word of recognition to the two students who just spoke, who must have been somewhat nervous but did not betray it, Marlon Grenados and Tonya Nagahwatte; they did a great job.

I'm very glad to be back in New Jersey and in Union City. All of you know that the Vice President and I came here today because this school system is undergoing a remarkable transformation. I want the rest of the country to know about it, and I want everybody in the country to be able to emulate it. Let me begin by acknowledging the contributions of Congressman Bob Menendez, who was formerly mayor here, a true native son of Union City, a sponsor of the New Jersey Telecommunications Act in 1991 that set the stage for the remarkable events we are celebrating today.

The rebirth of Union City and your schools reminds us that we do live in an age of great possibility if people are willing to work together to make the most of it. More Americans from all walks of life will have more chances to live up to their dreams than at any time in our Nation's history. New technologies are opening prospects for vast new areas of human activity that will bring prosperity. A growing global marketplace is putting a premium on the kind of ingenuity and skills Americans can contribute to the present and the future.

But let's face it, we also know that this new era is a time of great new challenges, putting new pressures on families that are not particularly well equipped to deal with it. More and more of our citizens are living better, but more and more of our families are working harder and harder just to keep up. They justifiably wonder if they and their children will be winners in this new age, or if they will be left behind in some downsizing or in some job in which they never get a raise.

After what I have seen today, I believe more strongly than ever before the answer to the problems of those who are not yet benefiting from the information age is not to try to put walls up or turn around and go back, it is to keep going forward until every child and every family in every home, in every workplace can see what we are seeing here today.

You know, in the State of the Union Address I talked about the importance of the budget discussions we have been having in Washington for the last year, the need to finish the work of balancing the budget but to do it in a way that recognizes our obligations to our future through investments in education and environmental protection, and that recognizes our obligations to our families and to our larger American family, including those who through no fault of their own need help from all of us, and that's why we ought to preserve the Medicare and Medicaid programs. But I also said there, and I would like to reiterate here, I believe there is a broad bipartisan consensus in this country to continue the work until we have eliminated this permanent deficit, until we are living within our means, until we are committed, all of us, in living on a balanced budget.

So what we have to do now is look to the future. In that address, I outlined what I believe are the seven great challenges facing America if we want all Americans to have a chance at

the American dream and if we want to grow together, not be driven apart. We must build stronger families and better childhoods. We must have better education; we must make sure all of our children—every single one of them—has access to the educational opportunities of the present and the future. We must build economic security for every single working family genuinely willing to work for it to hook into that future so that they will not be left behind. We must continue the fight to make our streets safer until crime in America is once again the exception, not the rule. We must work to clean up our environment while we grow our economy and forever dispose of the myth that you cannot have a strong economy unless you are destroying your environment; we cannot afford any more of the luxury of pretending that that is true. We must continue to work to lead the world toward a direction that is more peaceful and free. And finally, our Government must be one that serves and works and earns your trust, instead of your distrust.

I think it is fair to say that none of those goals can be achieved unless we are successful in improving the quality of education for all Americans. We will do this through a partnership, not through big Government. The high-tech information age means that all large bureaucracies will be restructured, that more decisions will be pushed down to the grassroots, that people will be able to make more decisions for themselves.

But we dare not go back to an era when all of our people were left to fend for themselves. We have to go forward together with teamwork, just the way Union City has gone forward together with teamwork to have this remarkable educational achievement we celebrate today. I thank Congressman Menendez for what he said in echoing the title of the First Lady's book, which I'm pretty proud of. He is right, it does take a whole village to raise and educate our children. And it takes all of us to meet all these common challenges.

That's what Union City is an example of. That's why we wanted to come here today. I loved looking into the eyes of young people in the meeting which we just came from and hearing one of them say, you know, the thing about this technology is we can all achieve. It doesn't matter whether we're the richest family in the State or not. It doesn't matter what our background is. It doesn't matter if our parents came here just a few years ago. This is the great equalizer. We can have high standards and high expectations and we can all make it if we work together. That is the message America needs to heed today.

For 3 years, working with our distinguished Education Secretary, Dick Riley—who may not be a cheerleader in his next life—[*laughter*]—but has been a terrific cheerleader for America's children for the last 3 years and, indeed, even before—we have worked on a simple strategy for education. We believe in high standards. We believe in high expectations. We believe in high levels of opportunity. We believe in high technology. And we believe the doors of college should be open to every single American citizen.

We have worked hard to expand Head Start; to implement the Goals 2000 program, which gives to States and school districts the ability to advance toward high national standards through grassroots reforms, like public school choice or even letting teachers start their own public schools or doing things like you have done here that can't be done everywhere in the beginning. We have worked to create a network of school-to-work programs to help young people who don't go on to college immediately to at least find good jobs and to continue their education when they leave high school. We have set challenges to schools to recognize that they must impart the basic values that keep our society together, through character education and teaching good values and good citizenship.

All these things we have done. We have expanded Pell grants and created a new direct lending program that makes it easier for young people to borrow money for college and easier for them to repay it. Our AmeriCorps program is now giving 25,000 young Americans a chance to work in their communities to solve problems at the grassroots and earn money for college.

But we have to do more. In the State of the Union I proposed giving a $1,000 merit scholarship to the top 5 percent of every high school graduating class, to expand work-study to include a million students so more people can work their way through college. And if we are going to cut taxes, what better way to do it than to give a tax deduction of up to $10,000 to every American family for the cost of college tuition? That would be a good way to cut taxes.

But we know that none of these things will work until we bring the information and technology revolution into every school, and through

the schools, into the homes of every school student in the United States of America. You heard the Vice President say he was in Philadelphia yesterday to celebrate the birthday of ENIAC, the first computer. He was too delicate to say it's 50 years old this year, and it was born in the same year I was. [*Laughter*] The computer and I this year will become eligible to join the American Association of Retired Persons. I don't know about the computer, but I hope I don't quite qualify this year. [*Laughter*]

Let me just say, when I was the age of the students here—let me just give you some examples of what has happened in this 50 years. When I was the age of the students that we met with today, the big technological breakthroughs were Technicolor movies and stereo music. I can remember when 3–D movies came out and you got to wear little glasses to look at the movies. And we really thought that was hot stuff, that we had to put glasses on to see movies that looked like real people. I remember when color televisions and cellular telephones and computers that could fit on somebody's desk were science fiction; nobody could even imagine it.

For our young people today, that all seems like ancient history, not science fiction. They interact with computers at the supermarket, at the checkout counter, in video arcades, in their homes. You know, to them it's all second nature. I'd venture to say that at least half the adults in this room have learned more about computers from their kids than from any other source.

But it's a real misfortune that not every schoolroom in America has the computers we celebrate today here and at the Bergen Academy. That is wrong. And that's why I have issued this challenge to our Nation to form a national partnership to make sure every young American has access to the future through the information superhighway.

When I was young, I thought the future was there for every American who would work for it. It turned out to be true for my generation. It will be true for this generation, too, and it will be a bigger, brighter, broader future, but only if we bring the benefits of the information revolution to every single one of them.

Bob Menendez talked about the achievements of this school district. But think about it: Not so long ago this school system was on the brink of a State takeover under New Jersey's law, that actually has a lot to recommend it, saying that if students aren't learning, the State should have a right to move in. But you rescued it. And you did it the way we have to meet our challenges, everybody working together, everyone doing their part: the board of education voting to modernize, Bell Atlantic making all the contributions it made linking up the schools, the State of New Jersey helping with its resources, teachers and experts writing a new curriculum, parents actually coming here for weekend training taught by a teacher and her students, parents who now can work with their children at home on the computer.

And the students have taken this opportunity and this responsibility. They feel empowered, and they know it makes learning more fun. You know that with the computers in the classroom and at home, linked together, homework is being done in a new way; classrooms, lessons take on a new life; parents and teachers can keep in touch by E-mail. Test scores have gone up, and truancy and dropout rates have gone down. In the words of the Vice President that he coined 4 years ago, everything that should be up is up and everything that should be down is down. And that's the way it ought to be all over America.

We're not just talking about an option that it would be nice for schools to have. Over 130 recent academic studies have shown clearly that the use of technology in support of instruction has led to higher achievement in language, in art, in math, in social studies, and of course, in science. We have dramatic proof of the power of technology to expand opportunity for our young people. We have to harness that power and spread it throughout this country.

In the State of the Union, I called on Americans to join in this national mission to make every child technologically literate, to connect every classroom and library in our country by the dawn of the 21st century, which is just a few years away, to connect them with quality computers, trained teachers, creative software. We must do everywhere what you have done here.

We are making real progress. We are bringing companies and volunteers together in California to wire 20 percent of those schools this year alone. And the Vice President and I are going out there in a few days to celebrate that. And in the telecommunications bill which I signed last week, there is a requirement for companies to provide a discount for connecting all of our

classrooms and libraries to the information superhighway. And I thank the people in Congress who unanimously—almost unanimously—passed that bill, and the industries that supported it. We must all continue to do our part.

But our National Government must do its part, too. Consistent with the recommendations of the National Information Infrastructure Advisory Committee, which I appointed and which recently issued its last reports—full of communications executives and others expert in communication around our country—I am today announcing a major initiative to energize our people to work to fulfill that mission even more quickly. I am proposing in my present budget, paid for in the balanced budget, a $2 billion technology literacy challenge that will put the future at the fingertips of every child in every classroom in America.

The two Members of Congress here present are in a unique position to support this endeavor: Senator Lautenberg, because before he became a Senator he was in the information business, and he saw the possibilities of computers, and he knows it should be used to do more than make successful businesses, it should make successful students; and Congressman Menendez, because of what he has done with you here.

Together, working with like-minded Democrats and Republicans, we can make this America's cause. We can do this. We can have computers in every classroom. We can have all students eager to learn. We can have the face of every single child light up, and we can know that down deep inside every child can believe again that he or she—no matter what their background, no matter what their economic challenges—can fulfill the mission that they have the capacity to fulfill. We can do this. We can do it together, and I believe we will.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. in the gymnasium at St. Michael's Academy. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Bruce D. Walter of Union City; Tom Highton, superintendent, Union City School District; and Leo Klagholz, New Jersey secretary of education.

Statement on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Report on Tobacco and Youth

February 15, 1996

This week at the White House, I heard directly from a group of children about the easy access and allure of cigarettes.

This report is further evidence that parents need all the help they can get in their daily struggle to keep our kids tobacco-free.

Every day, more than 3,000 young people become regular smokers. Nearly a thousand of them will have their lives shortened because of tobacco-related illnesses. Smoking is the leading cause of preventable death in this country, contributing to more than 30 percent of all cancer deaths.

Let me be clear: This administration will continue to lead the fight to help parents protect children from the hazards of tobacco addiction.

NOTE: The Department of Health and Human Services' Centers for Disease Control and Prevention released the report entitled "Accessibility of Tobacco Products to Youths Aged 12–17 Years—United States, 1989 and 1993" on February 16.

Memorandum on the Interim Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses
February 15, 1996

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs

Subject: Interim Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses

On May 26, 1995, I established the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses to review and provide recommendations on the full range of government activities relating to Gulf War veterans' illnesses. The Committee has now released its interim report, which you have reviewed and forwarded for my attention.

I am pleased that the Committee's interim report recognizes the serious efforts underway in the Administration to respond to the health concerns of Desert Storm veterans, and I thank you for your close cooperation with the Committee as it fulfills its charge. I trust that you will continue to work closely with the Committee as it prepares its final report.

I also request that you carefully review the recommendations and report back to me promptly with your plans for implementing the recommendations. As I said last March when announcing my intention to establish the Advisory Committee, we will leave no stone unturned in our efforts to determine the causes of the illnesses experienced by Gulf War veterans and to provide the best possible medical care to those who are ill.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Remarks at a Democratic Dinner in New York City
February 15, 1996

Thank you so very much. I told the Vice President when we were outside and James Earl Jones was speaking that we ought to go out here and smile and quit while we're ahead. [*Laughter*] And I did tell him, I confess, that I thought it was kind of a bad deal that he got to be introduced by James Earl Jones and he introduces me all the time. But James Earl Jones fails the first test of Presidential introductions that the Vice President passes with flying colors, which is, whenever possible, always, always be introduced by someone you have appointed to high office. [*Laughter*]

Don't you think it's wonderful what a sense of humor the Vice President has developed? I think—I actually resent it myself. [*Laughter*] I used to have a sense of humor, but they told me it wasn't Presidential. So, like everything else that's really enjoyable, in this administration the Vice President gets to do it. [*Laughter*]

Let me say to all of you who are here, to the people who cochaired this dinner and all those who sold tickets and all of you who have come out on this third-time's-the charm—[*laughter*]—to the leaders of the Democratic Party who are here; to James Earl Jones, who I admire so very much, I thank you for being here and for your wonderful words and for your support. To Lesley Gore and to the orchestra, all the musicians, I thought they were terrific. And I think it's okay if Lesley Gore tells people she's kin to Al. After I became President, I found out I had all kinds of relatives I didn't know that I had. And it makes for interesting reading. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Mayor Dinkins and the members of the New York City government, the Members of Congress who are here, the borough presidents who are here, and all of you who have come to be a part of this evening.

You know, I guess that because this is in all probability my last campaign, unless someday I run for the school board—[*laughter*]—I'm a little bit nostalgic. And I was in this hotel at a fundraiser almost 4 years ago to this week. Some of you were here that night. And I'm

thinking tonight—and I ask all of you to give your prayers to our wonderful friend Paul Carey, who is battling an illness but is doing better. And he can't be here, but I want to think about him because he was here with me in that campaign. And so I'm kind of counting my blessings tonight and remembering that.

The Vice President has graciously bragged on me because it's unseemly to do it for yourself, even in an election year. What I would like to talk about tonight is the—kind of the time in which we're living and why the things that we have done commend us for reelection, but why we don't deserve to be reelected just based on our record because there is so much more to be done.

What are the fundamental facts of this time? A democratic system can only work if it preserves the freedom and liberty of all citizens and is flexible enough to adjust to the challenges of every time. It is no accident that we're the longest lasting democracy in human history. It isn't easy to keep meeting the challenges. It's no accident that Haiti, which the Vice President mentioned, after being a nation, an independent nation for almost 200 years, just had its very first transfer of power from one democratically elected President to another.

This is a wonderful system of government, but it's not always easy to get a majority of the people, first, to zealously guard their own freedoms and those of their neighbors and to respect those who are different from them, and secondly, to make the decisions necessary or to let their leaders make the decisions necessary to keep meeting the challenges of each moment.

I believe, as I have said on many occasions, that we are living through the period of greatest change in the way we work and live and relate to each other in a hundred years; that this moment represents the most fundamental change since we moved from being primarily a rural people to being primarily a people who lived in towns and cities, since we moved from being primarily an agricultural economy to an economy primarily based on industry.

This information age represents dramatic changes in the nature of work. There's more muscle—excuse me—more mind and less muscle in work. And as people in New York read every week, it represents dramatic changes in the nature of work organizations. There are more small businesses, and big businesses keep getting smaller. There are fewer levels between the people at the top and the people actually implementing decisions. There has been an enormous growth in small business, as the Vice President said, but an enormous downsizing of bigger companies.

This era represents an enormous, dramatic change in the way information is communicated. Bill Gates in his recent book said that the information age, based on the digital chip, represents the most profound revolution in communications since Guttenberg printed the first Bible 500 years ago. And, obviously, when you're dealing with changes this profound, which also include the change in markets—money markets, markets in goods, and markets in services—to global markets, it is clear that there must be changes in Government. It is also clear that there will be changes in the patterns of people's lives.

And whenever in our history and, I believe, whenever in any society in human history there has been a great uprooting, you always see enormous opportunity for the gifted, the clever, the understanding, the lucky, and the well-prepared. But you also see a lot of people feeling insecure and disoriented because they feel that they're working hard and playing by the rules and their future seems to be drifting away. And that represents the remarkable paradox of the present moment.

Overwhelmingly, this is an age of possibility. The Vice President recited the economic statistics; I need not repeat them. But what we know is that this is an unusual time because in these 3 years we've seen our economy produce 8 million jobs, a record number of new small businesses, a record number of self-made millionaires—a remarkable and very good thing, not people who inherited their wealth but people who went out and made it with the opportunities that this country provided. And yet, still, about half our people have not gotten a raise in terms of real purchasing power in a decade or more.

We know that these entrepreneurs are exploding. We know, for example, that businesses owned by women alone, just businesses owned by women, have created more new jobs than the Fortune 500 have laid off in the last 3 years. But that's not very helpful if you're one of the people my age who is, you know, 49 or 50 years old and your kids are ready to go to college and you're one of the ones that got laid off, and all you've ever been is a middle manager in a very big company, and you can't

imagine how you can ever find another job making what you made doing roughly what you used to do. What are you to do now? So that is the paradox we're trying to come to grips with.

If you look at the other great challenge I think we face, which is to live up to our values and to come together as a country instead of being driven apart by this change, you see the same sort of thing. We should be ecstatic. The crime rate is down; the welfare rolls are down; the food stamp rolls are down; the poverty rolls are down; the teen pregnancy rate is down. This country is coming together. The commissioner of police of the city of New York was on the front page, the cover of one of our major news magazines with a serious question implying we may have turned the corner in our efforts to whip violent crime. That is something to be celebrating about. And yet, we all know that all those things that are going down are still too high. So our work is not yet done.

If you look at the role America has played in the world, we should be rejoicing for the reasons the Vice President has said and for others. There are no more nuclear missiles pointed at any children in the United States. I'm proud of that. If the Russians follow the lead of the United States Senate and adopt a START II treaty, we will reduce by two-thirds the nuclear arsenals of both countries. We have gotten almost 180 countries to agree to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty and promise never, never to develop nuclear missiles. This year I believe we will get a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty for the whole world. This is a remarkable thing.

And I am profoundly grateful for what this Nation has been able to do, to work with other countries, to fight terrorism, and to fight organized crime, and to fight drugs. I am profoundly grateful for the role we played in the liberation of South Africa, and the role we played in Haiti, in the Middle East, in Northern Ireland, and Bosnia. But you know as well as I do that this work is ongoing; that even though the nuclear cloud is not hanging over us as it once did, we still face serious, serious obstacles to doing everything we need to do.

There's a lot out there to do when one fanatic can break open a vial of sarin gas in a subway station in Tokyo and kill hundreds of people; when one fanatic in the United States can get on the Internet and find through high-tech means the very low-tech way of making a bomb, like the bomb that destroyed the Federal Building in Oklahoma City. When our open borders can lead terrorists into our country and allow them to come here, and they do their mischief and then leave and go to countries from which we cannot have them returned, we still have security challenges.

Now, I would say to you, on balance, you should be pleased with where this country is and where we're going. The economic direction is right. The social direction is right. The national security direction is right. We are opening the American dream to more people. We are coming together around our basic values. We are still the world's leading force for peace and freedom, but we have a very challenging agenda for the future. And it is that agenda on which I hope this election campaign will be waged, not the cheap, silly, divisive, distractive issues that will undermine our ability to unleash the potential of every American and do right by this great country.

In my State of the Union I said there were seven great challenges facing this country. I don't want to talk about all of them tonight; I want to emphasize one or two. But I want to talk about one or two and remind you of all of them. We must—we must continue to fight for stronger families and better childhoods for all of our children. We must open up the opportunities of the 21st century to every American by giving everybody a world-class educational opportunity, based on high standards and high expectations and high technology and high opportunity. We must find a way to capture and maintain and even accelerate the dynamism of this wonderful new economy and at the same time provide a higher measure of economic security for every American family willing to work for it.

We must continue the fight against crime until we meet the real test of any civilized society, which is not a zero crime rate—there will never be a time when we won't have crime and violence—but there is a test that you can apply in your own home, to your own personal experience. We will have done what we should do in crime when you feel in your bones that it is the exception, not the rule; when you turn on the evening news and you read about the latest murder, the latest rape, the latest madness, you think it is the exception and you're surprised, not numb to it. And until we reach

that point, we have to keep working on it as one of our highest national priorities.

We must continue the fight to preserve, maintain, and even enhance our natural environment. We must reject once and for all the totally destructive notion that we can only grow this economy if we continue to destroy the environment. That is a terrible idea. It won't work. It will undermine our economy. It will destroy our quality of life. And it's nice to have the Vice President at work every day reminding me of that ultimate truth.

We must maintain our leadership for peace and freedom. In New York, we have a lot of people who deal with the rest of the world. You have a lot of wonderful Jewish-Americans and Americans of Arabic descent who want me to continue to fight for peace in the Middle East. You have a lot of people involved in world trade who want me to continue to reach out to Latin America and to Asia. But many of our fellow Americans are so burdened by the moment that I get the feeling when they see me on television talking about Ireland or Bosnia or whatever, they look and they say, "Well, you're doing all right and as long as you don't mess up I'll let you do that, but I really kind of wish we didn't have to fool with that." But let me remind you, we do have to fool with that.

If you want those countries in Latin America to cooperate with us in breaking the drug gangs—and remember, in the last 3 years, 7 of the 8 leaders of the Cali drug cartel have been put behind bars, thanks to that kind of cooperation—if you want that to happen, we have to be good neighbors with the Latin Americans. They, after all, are risking their lives. At least we have to have good trade partnerships and other partnerships.

If you want Europe to grow as an open community instead of a closed community, if you want Americans to have a fair shake at selling our goods, our services, and growing our economy in partnership with the Europeans, we have to be partners in the common security of democracy and freedom there. And that's part of what Bosnia is all about, apart from the fact that it is the right thing to do. So I ask you all to support that, to support your country when we stand up for peace and freedom.

And finally, our last challenge is we have got to give the American people again a Government that does more, costs less, and most important, is worthy of their trust. But we also have to have a group of Americans who understand what their responsibilities are at this time. People can't be looking down their nose at the Government if they don't do their part to raise their kids, if they don't do their part to educate their kids, if they're not willing to do their part to work with their local police officers or their part to demand grassroots environmental reform or their part to show up and vote. So we have to have this kind of balance.

In this new era, we will change the way the Government works. You heard the Vice President say it. I heard our friends in the other party for years lambast and rail against big Government. All I know is, it was still pretty big when we showed up, and now it's the smallest it's been since 1965. I heard them rail against Government regulation. All I know is, when we showed up there were 86,000 pages of Government regulations, and we're getting rid of 16,000 pages of them. I heard these things, but I never saw anything done. We are trying to give the American people a Government that's not so big, that's not antiquated, that's not some dinosaur of the age we used to live in instead of the one we're moving toward. But that does not mean we need a weak Government. It does not mean we can go back to the time when people were left to fend for themselves.

If you were to ask me, "What is the one lesson you have learned in the last 3 years, Mr. President?" I would say to you, I have learned that when this country is together, America never loses. And we have to solve our problems together. That means the Government has a role. That means citizens, that means families, that means community institutions, that means the private sector, that means the churches and synagogues, that means all of us have to do something together. And we all have a role to play. And to pretend otherwise is ridiculous.

And let me just give you a couple of examples of what I think we ought to be doing and one example that affects New York that shows you what is still wrong with things in Washington. And I believe there are laws we ought to change. I still—I can't understand why Congress won't pass a campaign finance reform bill. They all say they're for it, but they won't do it. [*Applause*] And actually, most of you in this room should be clapping louder. It would save you a lot of money if we passed it. [*Laughter*]

I can't understand why they won't pass the line item veto. They said they thought it was the greatest thing since sliced bread until they took over the Congress. I'd like to have it. I'll use it, and it will help to bring the deficit down.

But the way we operate is fundamentally important, and let me just give you one example. This telecommunications bill reflects the way our country ought to work. It will create tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of high-wage jobs. It will dramatically increase Americans' access to information, to education, to entertainment. And it will be done in a way that brings us together because it protects the ability of all the players in telecommunications to have their fair chance to compete, the small as well as the large. It protects the ability of people to know that there will be a diversity of opinions still available to them. And it gives a preference to our schools and to our libraries and to our hospitals, so they can be on the information superhighway no matter where they are and all our children have a chance to go into the 21st century.

Let me say this: We did an event in Union City, New Jersey, today which the Vice President talked about, which is the antithesis of what everybody worries about in the economy. All this anxiety in the economy really is rooted in the fact that people are afraid that there's something about this technological revolution that mandates inequality in wages and stagnant wages and people being permanently dislocated. But if you saw these kids today—kids that came from immigrant families, kids that were poor, kids that never would have been able to dream of this before—all of them fluent in the use of their computers, all of them being able to go home and have access to computers at home, all of them having taught their parents how to use computers so that their parents are E-mailing the principal and finding out back and forth how the kids are doing, you would see that the answer is not to go back or put up walls around this country, the answer is to see this technological revolution through until it benefits every single American and gives us the future that we need.

And that is an example of how we ought to do it. We fought very hard for those public interest provisions of the telecommunications bill. But in the end, the bill passed almost unanimously. And it is a good thing for America, and it hooks us into the future. Now, that's an example of what should be done.

An example of what should not be done, that most people in this room are familiar with, was the outrageous political treatment of my intention to nominate Felix Rohatyn to be the Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve. And he is here tonight. I think we all ought to give him a hand. Felix, where are you? Stand up there. Let's give him a hand. [*Applause*]

If you believe that we should give everybody a raise when the economy does better and you don't want to engage in class warfare; if you believe all these people that are inevitably downsized when big corporations become smaller should have the opportunity to go on with their lives and you don't want to engage in class warfare; if you are perplexed by how we can generate 8 million new jobs and record numbers of new businesses and still have half the Americans not get a raise, one clear area where we ought to debate is whether the conventional wisdom about how fast this economy can grow is right. That ought to be debated. It ought to be debated within the commitment to deficit reduction and a balanced budget. I think we've established our commitment to that. It ought to be debated within a commitment not to let inflation get out of hand.

But the truth is, nobody but nobody knows for sure that this economy can't grow any faster in the information age than it did between 1970 and 1995. The truth is, if you want to get jobs into Brooklyn, into the Bronx, into the Mississippi Delta, into the rural areas of America; if you want to see people who work hard and work harder today than they did 25 years ago, on the average, get the rewards, one of the most obvious things you have to do is to see whether or not this economy can grow a little faster. I'm telling you, if this economy grew at an average of 2.7 percent instead of 2.5 percent, all the arguments we are now having in Washington over balancing the budget would be gone like that—two-tenths of a percent—over, history, out.

I believed, based on repeated conversations I have had with business leaders, both Republicans and Democrats, in this country over the last 3 years, talking about the very rapid growth and productivity in our manufacturing sector, the increasing growth in productivity in our service sector, and the fact that we have such an open economy, that competition is an incredible

pressure against inflation, far more than ever before—and I'll just give you one example. When we put out our deficit reduction plan in '93 and the interest rates dropped, there was a housing boom. And what always happens when there's a housing boom happened; lumber prices went up because they got tight. Except lumber prices this time did not lead to a new inflation. Why? Because we got flooded with lumber from other countries because we have an open economy. So we had our housing boom and no inflation.

Now, it seems to me a good thing for the President to do to say, wouldn't it be nice to have a debate within a controlled framework, with serious people with a lifetime of achievement, to see if we can't give Americans a raise who are working hard; to see if we can't minimize inequality as we move to this new economy; and to see if we can't do it the old-fashioned American way, with opportunity and not class warfare?

That's what I wanted to see done. And that's why I wanted to put Felix Rohatyn on the Federal Reserve. But the politics of Washington said, no, we insist on the conventional wisdom; we insist on holding people down; we don't even think it's worth debating. Over and out. That is wrong, and we must end that kind of thinking if we want this country to grow and prosper and become what it ought to be.

The last thing I want to say is this: The most important thing about this election is that you and everybody like you in this whole country remembers that it's not about me or whoever the Republicans decide to nominate when they get through with their business. This election is about you and people like you. It's about all those people that served your food tonight. It's about everybody in between. And this country is still here after all this time, still doing well, still the envy of the world because most of the time most of us do the right thing.

And one of the things that I have a hard time dealing with is this alleged cynicism and skepticism among our people. Now, skepticism is a healthy thing at one level. But you tell me why the American people should be cynical when we have the lowest unemployment rate, the highest growth rate, the lowest deficit, and the brightest prospects of any advanced country in the world?

People from other countries ask me all the time. They would give anything to have our problems. Of course we've got problems; problems are endemic to the human condition. But we see them as challenges and opportunities. And cynicism is a cheap, bogus, inadequate excuse for the inaction of our fellow citizens. And we've got to get rid of it.

The other thing we have got to stop doing as a people—and I want you to pledge to me that as our supporters you will carry through this whole year doing this—we have got to stop using these elections to divide the American people in ways that benefit some politician at election time but cripple the ability of the United States to come together as one country. We have got to stop doing that.

Tonight I looked up at my table and when the gentleman came to ask if we wanted any wine, and I saw a man serving me that I met in this kitchen 4 years ago last week. And some of you may remember the circumstances I faced 4 years ago last week. We were dropping like a rock in New Hampshire. My obituary had been written by every elated editorial writer in the country who always wanted one hide in every election. Everybody said we were going to single digits in New Hampshire and the whole thing was over. And Alan and Susan Patricof and I were laughing around the table. We had 700 people here; I thought we'd be lucky to have 70 people here after what I had been through the last few days.

And I walked through the kitchen coming here, and I was feeling pretty sorry for myself, I'm ashamed to say. I was feeling pretty sorry for myself. And the man that came to my table tonight to serve us stopped me. And some of you heard this story, but I want to tell you—he's still here, he's still working for his family and for this hotel. And he said, "Governor, my 10-year-old son is studying the Presidential elections. He has studied all the candidates, and he says I should vote for you." Well, that made me feel better. I didn't know there was a 10-year-old in all the State of New York who knew who I was. [*Laughter*]

He said, "But let me tell you something." He said, "I'm an immigrant, and where I came from, we were very poor. And we're much better off here economically. But where we lived before, we were free." He said, "Here we have a park across the street from our apartment, but my boy can't play in that park unless I go with him. We have a school down the street from our apartment; my boy can't walk to school

unless I go with him. So if I do what my boy wants me to do and I vote for you, will you make my boy free?" And I thought to myself, "What have you been thinking about? This election is not about you. It's about him and people like him."

And let me tell you something: When we passed that crime bill and we put another 100,000 police on the street, and I see the crime rate going down in city after city after city in this country because we did that; when we passed the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban, and the Democrats lost the House of Representatives probably because so many of them sat up and voted for that one bill—but I could go to New Hampshire and say, we just had a great deer season in New Hampshire, and the air was full of ducks in Arkansas and every hunter I know shot them with the same gun they had last year, so the people who told you we were going to take your gun away were not telling you the truth. But I'll tell you something, there's over 40,000 crooks that couldn't get a gun because we passed the Brady bill.

And I saw him tonight, I saw Dimitrios standing there, and I said, "Your son is about 14 now?" "Yes." "How's he doing?" "Fine." And I said, "You got a message for me?" He said, "Yes. Keep fighting for the working people; it's still pretty tough out here."

This election is about you. It's about him. It's about our country. And yes, we have some challenges. But I'm telling you, these are high-class problems because this country is moving in the right direction. And don't let anybody tell you that your Government is inherently bad.

James Carville's new book, which I commend to all of you, points out in the last 30 years we spent half of your tax money on three things: defense, Social Security, and Medicare. What did you get for it? We won the cold war. We cut the poverty rate among elderly citizens in half. And if you get to be old enough to be on Medicare, seniors in the United States have the highest life expectancy of any group of elderly people in the world.

This is a very great country. If you do your part and we do ours, we're going to be just fine. Let's do that in 1996.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:45 p.m. at the Sheraton New York Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to actor James Earl Jones; entertainer Lesley Gore; David Dinkins, former New York City mayor; Alan Patricof, former Chair, White House Conference on Small Business Commission, and his wife, Susan; and waiter Dimitrios Theofanis.

Message on the Observance of the Chinese New Year

February 8, 1996

Warm greetings to everyone observing the Chinese New Year as you welcome 4694, the Year of the Rat.

This ancient annual festival unites people of Chinese heritage across America and around the globe in a joyous celebration of hope and new beginnings. Family and friends gather to renew the bonds of love and to rejoice in the rich cultural traditions of the Chinese people. The sorrows and mistakes of the past year dissolve in a flurry of fireworks, dancing, feasting, and the exchange of gifts.

The Chinese New Year is a fitting occasion for us to reflect on the many contributions that Chinese Americans have brought to our national life—among them a respect for family, a reverence for knowledge, and an unwavering determination to make tomorrow better than today. Let us rejoice together in this season of renewal and resolve to work for a future of harmony and prosperity for us all.

Best wishes for a new year of happiness, health, freedom, and peace.

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 16.

Message on the Observance of the Vietnamese Lunar New Year
February 8, 1996

Warm greetings to everyone observing the Vietnamese Lunar New Year as you welcome the Year of the Rat.

This ancient annual festival unites people of Vietnamese heritage across America and around the globe in an exuberant celebration of hope and new beginnings. Family and friends gather to renew the bonds of love and to rejoice in the rich cultural traditions of Vietnam. The joys of the coming year are anticipated with a flurry of fireworks, flowers, decorations, and feasting.

Tet is a fitting occasion for us to reflect on the many gifts that Vietnamese Americans have brought to our national life—among them a reverence for family, an unquenchable optimism, and an unwavering determination to make tomorrow better than today. Let us rejoice together in this season of renewal and resolve to work for a future of harmony and prosperity for us all.

Best wishes for a new year of happiness, health, freedom, and peace.

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 16.

Exchange With Reporters During a Tour of Flood Damage in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania
February 16, 1996

Republican Debate

Q. Mr. President, did you have a change to see the Republican debate last night?

The President. No.

Q. Have you heard about it?

The President. No—I mean, no more than I saw in the press this morning.

Federal Reserve Board

Q. Do you think you were a little too tough on the Fed last night?

The President. No. Well, let me clarify something about that. I think the Fed and Mr. Greenspan, particularly, have done a very good job in responding first of all to the actions that were taken by the Congress in adopting an economic program in '93. They brought the interest rates way down; we got the economic growth going. We have had now—this expansionary period has gone on for a long time. But under the conditions of the present economy, with the competition we have in the global economy and with all this new improvement coming from technology, the growth levels are enough to create a lot of jobs and get unemployment down but not enough to get incomes up and to bring jobs into a lot of the isolated areas in the country.

The point I was making last night is that there is now a debate, a serious debate in the country about whether there is a maximum growth rate we can have over any period of years without inflation. The conventional wisdom is that it was about 2.5 percent—that's from 1970 to 1995; that's what we averaged.

There are a lot of people, including a lot of Republican executives in the manufacturing sector, who believe that global competition will keep down inflation and that higher productivity, driven by technology and Americans working more effectively, will permit higher growth rates in the next 10 years than in the last 25.

What I was trying to do with trying to have Mr. Greenspan and Mr. Rohatyn on the Fed was to have that discussion in a nonpolitical context, that is, away from the Congress and the President and national politics so that we could honestly examine whether we could sustain, let's say, an average growth rate of 2.7 percent, 2.8 percent since we're all committed to bringing the deficit down and balancing the budget.

If that could happen, our budget fight in Washington would go away, and we would be able to create more jobs in the inner cities and isolated rural areas, and we would be able to get incomes up; all these people that have been working for 10 years without a raise would be able to do that in a way that doesn't have anything to do with class warfare, nothing to do with redistributing the wealth. That's the point I was trying to make. And I think it is a mistake not to allow a distinguished person like that to be on the Fed and have that kind of debate.

I do believe the Fed's done an excellent job of giving a sustained period of growth without inflation. This is just in the debate. No one knows the answer to this. It's a new era; no one knows the answer. I would like to see this debate carried out in the Federal Reserve and in the Congress and in the country so that we can find the right answer.

Global Climate Change and Flooding

Q. On the flooding, Mr. President, you've twice this week said that there's some suggestion that global warming has something—do you think the flooding this year is because of global warming?

The President. I do not know. But I know this. I know there is a block of ice the size of the State of Rhode Island that broke off from Antarctica. I know that we have problems with fishing in the Pacific Northwest. I know that there is a pattern of more intense rainfall and snowfall in greater volume in shorter spurts than in past years. And I know that a lot of experts believe that this is tied to global warming, that even perversely, that the intensity this winter may have something to do with the upsetting of the normal patterns of the global climate.

What I believe we need to do is, in the United States, is to continue making our contribution to the investigation of this, and we need to do everything we can to slow the phenomenon down. We need to do everything we can to support new technologies and new businesses, new endeavors that are designed to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and to develop a clean car. We're working with the big three automakers on that, and we'll do whatever can be done to reduce the phenomenon.

But I'm not an expert; I don't know that. But a lot of people—one of the major news magazines had a cover story on it, speculating that that was the case, and I think we need to keep looking at it.

In the meanwhile, we need to do what we can to help protect the communities like this one from the adverse effects of unexpected high water marks. All the congressional delegation here and the mayor and the Governor pointed out that they have had on line a project in the Corps of Engineers for many, many years that we're now going to try to get funded and executed that would provide protection for this area in these sort of excessive rains. I heard the same thing out West in Oregon and Washington.

So I think one of the things that we need to do back in Washington is take a hard look at the work schedule of the Corps of Engineers. You know, in the seventies and the eighties a lot of their work was slowed because—including in my State. I had reservations about some of the environmentally controversial projects that were being pushed.

We are now dealing with repairing and strengthening existing networks of protection against floods in areas that Senator Specter pointed out have already been appropriated, and we need to really go back and make sure we've got the Corps on a clear schedule, and all of the people of the United States, like these people that are vulnerable, can get done what they need it to do.

Q. Mr. President, does Rohatyn's fate affect your thinking on Greenspan's reappointment?

[*At this point, the President continued his tour. Later, he spoke again with journalists.*]

The President. You know, when it rains and floods out, when the water runs down the street, I can't tell whether a Democrat or a Republican lives in these houses. And I think we all feel that way. This is some support. I believe we will have to have—I told Senator Specter and Senator Santorum and Congressman Kanjorski today—I believe we will have to have some sort of supplemental appropriation in the Congress to deal with the damage here in Pennsylvania, in West Virginia and Maryland, and in the substantial losses in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

When I get back to the White House this afternoon, we're going to sit down with the latest total damage estimates we have from the areas and then try to come up with how much

we need and then go forward in the Congress with it.

Q. Is there enough money to go around?

The President. I believe there will be. I think, for example, every Member of Congress in California will vote for this because the Congress was good to them when they endured their earthquakes and their fires. And I believe every Member of Congress in the Middle West will vote for this because they had a 500-year flood on the Mississippi and its tributaries and these folks helped them. So I think it will be there.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 10:30 a.m. on Parker Street. In his remarks, the President referred to Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan and financial analyst Felix Rohatyn. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks Prior to a Roundtable Discussion on the Flooding in Wilkes-Barre

February 16, 1996

Thank you very much. Well, Jim, I was looking at the pictures behind me while you were talking, trying to visualize what you all have been through. And I want to just begin by thanking you and everyone who worked with you for the way you handled this, and also the people of this area for the way they handled it.

Governor, Congressman, Mayor, we're all honored to be here with you. I'm here, obviously, along with the James Lee Witt and a number of people from the Federal Government who were privileged to work with you. We have Dave Sharma from the Department of Transportation, a number of people here from SBA, General Genega from the Corps of Engineers, and Martin Lancaster, the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works. And I'll have more to say about them in a moment.

I think all of you know that the Governor and your two United States Senators, who had to go back to work, and Congressman Kanjorski and Congressman Holden and I, along with our FEMA Director, James Lee Witt, just toured Parkin Street with the mayor. And I must say I was very moved by the spirit of the people there. They told me some of the stories and I went over to the place where the water came out and I saw the damage there to the canal.

I have—I followed this problem with great interest, and of course, even though I was a long way away and not in public life then, I have very vivid memories of that 1972 flood. Everyone in America saw it unfolding and saw the suffering that all of you went through. And I want to say that I know there were other places which really suffered in the Wyoming Valley. We have people here, I think, from Plains, Avoca, and Shickshinny and Lycoming County. There was, I think, the Governor told me—I think you had 12 people lost their lives in this flood. So I just want to say to all the people of Pennsylvania how much I appreciate what you went through.

I also—in these natural disasters I never cease to be amazed by the courage and ingenuity and stamina people show. I just met a—when I was out West, I met a man who was a retired employee of the public utility in this little town where I visited. He was a Norwegian immigrant well up into his sixties, and to help the town deal with the aftermath of the flood, he worked for 8 hours on a jackhammer with a cracked rib. And that's the sort of thing that you see all over America.

I want to compliment Eric Malone here who is, as I understand it, only 19, and he used his jet ski to pull 5 people from the Juniata River. I couldn't even stay on a jet ski. [*Laughter*] And I'm impressed that he got himself and others on. I thank Jean Wilde for coordinating the evacuation of Mercy Hospital and the work that you are continuing to do. And I thank you, sir. I can't believe that you evacuated 100,000 people. For those of us who were not here when this flood occurred, we saw the pictures, but I don't think that the dimensions of it hit home in the rest of America until it was announced that you were actually evacuating 100,000 people. We saw the pictures of all of

these people leaving their homes. It made a profound impact on everyone.

We want to continue to do our part at the national level through all of the Federal agencies. FEMA has already invested $35 million in response and recovery effort here, and that number will continue to climb. The Small Business Administration, I believe, has already approved about $11½ million in home and business loans. The Corps of Engineers is here, and the fact that Martin Lancaster and Bill Coleman are both here is very encouraging to me.

To date, the Department of Transportation has allocated $11 million to help repair roads that were damaged by the floods, and today I am pleased to announce—I talked to Secretary Pena just before coming here—that we will provide another $10 million for that purpose. That will give you $21 million to deal with the roads. And FEMA is going to give this city another $400,000 to repair the damage along Parkin Street to the canal.

But that, I think, is just the beginning. I think the Federal housing assistance to the State, Governor, will run somewhere in the neighborhood of $10 million for the people who have had their homes damaged. And I'm sure there will be more.

One of the things that you mentioned that I wanted to emphasize is that in 1993, after we dealt with the impacts of the terrible flooding in the Middle West, and the Governor was still in Congress then—you remember, we changed the law to permit, I think, up to 15 percent of the total losses in any given State to be used for the State to develop a mitigation plan to avert such things happening again. And we estimate that you will probably have somewhere in the neighborhood of $15 million that you can put into mitigation.

And so I would urge you to make maximum use of that, to come up with whatever plans you can to avert this from happening again. And of course, that would be over and above the work that the Corps of Engineers has now agreed to do. And I think Congressman Kanjorski announced this last night. But I want to emphasize that the Corps has now agreed to move forward with a contract that can be done now that this preliminary agreement has been made, and we can start work on that this year to make sure that the Wyoming Valley will never be subject to a flood like that which came in 1972. And I think that's very important.

And I believe they're prepared to provide some extra protection as well. I know—the Governor and I were talking about the other communities in this area and in the State that were damaged by the flood. I think FEMA has already made available about $2½ million to local governments and, as you need it, there is more available there to help the local governments try to deal with the problems that they sustained in the flood.

So the main point I want to make to you is, I am grateful to all of you for what you have done, and we will do our part. And the thing that I am determined to do is to see that we stay with you until all the work is done, until you've returned to normal, until you've got everything back the way it ought to be. And we'll stay all the way through.

I've already said more than I meant to. I'd like to spend some time now hearing from the rest of the people around the table if you want to tell me how you think we should do that.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the chapel at King's College. In his remarks, he referred to Jim Siracuse, emergency management director, Luzerne County; Gov. Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania; Mayor Thomas McGroarty of Wilkes-Barre; and William Coleman, Deputy Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget.

Remarks to the Community in Wilkes-Barre

February 16, 1996

The President. Thank you very much.

Audience member. We love you!

The President. Thank you.

Audience member. Hillary, too!

The President. Thank you very much.

I want to begin by saying that Patrick Murphy did not have the easiest job in the world today and that all of his fellow students who stood up and cheered him may have made it a little harder even. [*Laughter*] But he hung in there, and he did it very well. And he spoke powerfully about this community and his people. I think we ought to give him another hand. [*Applause*]

Father Lackenmier, I want to congratulate you on the 50th anniversary of King's College. You know the Vice President was in Pennsylvania just a couple of days ago to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the first computer, ENIAC, over in Philadelphia. So Pennsylvania now has three 50-year-olds: ENIAC, King's College, and me. When your president said that King's College was 50 and so was I going to be 50 this year, I looked out at all the students, and I thought, it looks a lot better on you than it does on me. [*Laughter*]

I was delighted to be here today to review the flood damage and hear a progress report with your two United States Senators, with Governor Ridge, with Congressman Holden, who is also here and does a very fine job for his district and Congress, and with Congressman Kanjorski who spoke today so well. I can tell you there aren't very many people in the Congress that are as effective, as persistent, downright nagging—[*laughter*]—in advancing the interests of the people of their district as Paul Kanjorski. You are very well served. He is always nice, he is always dignified, but he is utterly relentless in your behalf, no matter what the issue is.

And I want to congratulate your young mayor, Mayor McGroarty. It's been a long time since I met a public official with so much energy and enthusiasm. I don't know if he ever sleeps. And if we could bottle whatever it is he has and reproduce it, we wouldn't have to build any power plants in America for 10 years. [*Laughter*] I think he's got a great future.

I also want to thank all the Federal officials who are here with me and, in particular, the gentleman who is behind me, James Lee Witt, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, who's been spending more time with you and more time in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho than he has in Washington, DC, in the last several weeks. He is the kind of person, I think, that reflects the very best in our National Government: the true spirit of public service.

And all of the Federal officials here, including the local representatives of all of these agencies, I want to thank them as well. They have enjoyed having the opportunity to work with you in this difficult time.

I'd like to say one more word about Patrick Murphy, because it makes the point I want to make. I'm not going to make fun of him anymore. When this disaster was imminent, he and his brother, J.J., led fellow students to help fill and pile sandbags. A lot of other young people did that as well. Some of the young AmeriCorps volunteers who were introduced, our national service volunteers, also worked on that program. As a lot of you know, the AmeriCorps program is now headed in Washington by your former Senator, Harris Wofford, who also helped to create the Peace Corps. I want to say that we need to find ways to multiply the spirit shown by Patrick Murphy, by the AmeriCorps volunteers, by the students of King's College, if we're going to meet our country's challenges.

A couple of days ago, I was out in Washington State and Oregon viewing the floods there—you may have seen the films—and I went into the home of a 70-year-old man. He and his wife had literally just lost everything they had. He was hard of hearing, and he even lost his hearing aid in the flood; the water washed it away. And I thought to myself, how do you start over when you're 70? I was walking down the street toward this man, and I thought, how will he feel when I come there? And he said to me, "I'm so glad to see you. And I've never met a President before, but maybe it wasn't time. This is the first time I've ever been able to invite a President into a home with an indoor swimming pool." [*Laughter*]

You know, this is a pretty great country. And the man went on and introduced me to his wife and his two daughters and his granddaughter. And he was raving about how all of his friends and neighbors came to his aid. And they were talking about a man I later met who was a retired utility company employee, a naturalized immigrant from Norway, who had worked 8 hours with a jackhammer—well up in his sixties—with a cracked rib. I don't know if any of you have ever tried to hold a jackhammer in the proper place before, but it isn't easy if you're young, strapping, strong, and you can breathe well.

But I was looking at all these people—we were having this talk, and when I left this man's

home, I said, "I'm really impressed with your sense of humor and the way you and your wife are handling this." He said, "As awful as it is," he said, "it's wonderful. Look at how we're all behaving." He said, "Don't you wish we could be this way all the time?"

So I say to the people of the Wyoming Valley, to all the communities that were hurt so badly, to the people in the rest of Pennsylvania who suffered so greatly, all of the members of the families of people who lost their lives and those who have suffered heartbreaking losses: Our country has been very moved by your spirit and by what you have done. Our country has been very moved by individual examples of courage.

Just a few moments ago, I was meeting in a roundtable with some people who worked in this flood and some of your local officials. I met young Eric Malone, who is behind me, a 19-year-old world champion jet skier who lives just outside Altoona who found out you could run a jet ski in a raging flood and saved a lot of lives as a result and risked his own life. And I thank him for doing that. I asked him if he would give me a ride on his jet ski, but only on a calm lake. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Dr. Christopher Breiseth, the president of Wilkes College, who is with us today—[*applause*]—some of his students are there, I guess—for the difficult work he had to do in evacuating his school. I want to thank Jean Wilde from Mercy Hospital, who evacuated people there. And you know, you always think of a hospital taking people in. Can you imagine the psychological pressure of evacuating a hospital, the one place every community looks to be a pillar of strength and security and hope? I want to thank Jim Siracuse, the Luzerne County Emergency Management Director, who coordinated the evacuation of 100,000 people.

I'll tell you, folks, when something like this happens, because news is instantaneous, I've become just almost like another American. I get most of my information off of breaking television news. And all of America was watching you and pulling for you, and we never knew, I don't think, how serious this was even with all the gushing water we kept seeing until we learned that you had to evacuate 100,000 people. That got America's attention.

There are so many others I would mention if I knew them or if we had the time. I just want to say that I applaud all of you who looked beyond your own needs to help others and to help people get through this crisis. You have really shown us, as that elderly gentleman in Washington said, that America can rise to its challenges and show its best self. And I thank you for that.

I do want to say something to all the people in Pennsylvania who tried to be good friends and good neighbors to those who suffered losses. Mr. Witt and I worked together for years in Arkansas, where I was the Governor. We saw whole little communities buried in floods. We've rescued people off the roofs of their house. We have a State with the highest per capita incidents of tornadoes in the country. I have seen whole communities decked by tornadoes. I have seen wind blowing so hard that literally thin sheets of paper were going so strong they pierced the bark of trees. I've seen trucks in the tops of trees and houses moved half a block off their foundations with the foundations apparently untouched. And of course, I have seen a lot of people who lost everything. And I would just say this: For all the wonderful things you have done, it's important to remember that the people who really sustained great losses were more or less in shock for the first several days after it occurred. And a lot of the most difficult times will come now and maybe even a week or two or a month from now.

So I ask you to remember that, because this is something the Federal Government can't do, that one-on-one personal commitment it takes to get people all the way through a tragedy. I will say this: I know that the work of rebuilding and repairing this State is not over when the flood waters go down or when the emergencies have passed. And I do want to assure you that we will do everything we can to continue to do our part until this State and all its communities are completely rebuilt. I know that about 32,000 people registered for help through FEMA at the 800 number or one of our disaster centers, that we've had over 19,000 home inspections already, that more than $23 million in payments have been applied for and dispensed through the disaster housing program.

I want to compliment Denise Ginger, who is also up on the stage with me. She was at our roundtable, and she got her check within 2 days of her home inspection. And there it was, and she wasn't sure what it was for, because there it was 2 days later. And she was such an honorable person she would not cash that Government check until she made abso-

lutely sure what it was for. I told her if we had a million more Americans like her, we wouldn't have any problems in this country. And I thank her. Stand up there. Thank you. [*Applause*]

We have approved more than 600 small business loans worth about $10½ million to help small businesses and individual homeowners and renters and nonprofit organizations and some not-so-small businesses as well. The Department of Transportation has now committed over $20 million. I told the mayor today that we were going to give him $400,000 to fix that canal along Parkin Street where I was to make sure that it doesn't break again and that it is still protection against the floods.

We are going to keep working with you until this job is finished. That's what we did in working with Florida and California and the States along the Mississippi River. And we want to do what Congressman Kanjorski says; we want to prevent these problems from coming again.

In 1993, in the wake of those horrible floods, those 500-year floods in the Middle West, the Congress passed legislation that I strongly supported to enable us to take up to 15 percent of the value of the disaster payments to the State when something like this happens, to be spent on mitigation to try to protect people against it recurring. I said today I was very encouraged by my conversations with the Governor. When we get a Pennsylvania State plan, we will look forward to putting that money in here, and we want to see people protected from having to go through this again. So far as we can, we will work with you until that job is done as well.

I'd like to close with a few words that refer to some of the things the president of this college talked about in his opening remarks. If you look at what happens in this flood, you know that when our country works together, we never lose. If you ask me what is the lesson that you have learned most clearly in the last 3 years and a few weeks as President, I would have to tell you that that is the lesson I have learned. The era of big Government is fading. We now have the smallest Federal Government we've had in 30 years.

All big organizations are going through changes. We see that everywhere. It's part of the information and technology revolution that's going on. We don't need large, big, centralized bureaucracies to solve grassroots problems or to perform big, national functions; we know that. But that does not mean that we can go back to a time in America where people were simply left to fend for themselves.

One of the great and enduring contributions of the Catholic Church to this country are the Catholic charities and the mission you see in every Catholic college and university in this country of service, of understanding that we are all stronger when we help each other to live up to our God-given capacities. And that is something every American must remember as we move into this new age.

We are working to balance the budget in Washington. We should do that. We never ran a permanent deficit in this country just all the time until about the early eighties. We've cut the deficit in half in the last 3 years, and we ought to finish the job. But we ought to do it consistent with our values, which include our responsibilities to each other, to our parents, to our children, to families who have disabled children. That's what we ought to do.

If you look at the challenges that I tried to set before our Nation for the future in the State of the Union Address, in every single instance, there is something for everyone to do, including your Government; it should be smaller, but it should not be weak. When the floods come, you don't want FEMA and the Small Business Administration and the Department of Transportation to be weak. When we argue to open markets so our people can get a fair deal in selling their goods and services abroad, you don't want a trade program that is weak.

And when people tell you that Government is inherently no good, just remember this: In the last 30 years, we have spent one-half of your money, one-half of the taxes that you've paid to the Federal Government on three things: national defense, Social Security, and Medicare. What did you get for that? We won the cold war; the poverty rate among elderly people was cut in half; and if you live to be 65 and you start drawing Medicare in America, elderly people have the longest life expectancy of any group of elderly people in the entire world. I think we got our money's worth.

Part of my college education was paid for by a national defense education loan. I was proud to pay it back on time with interest, but I was proud to get it, too. I think America was better off because people in my generation were able to get help to go to college. And

these young people today live in a time when the percentage of a family's income, a middle-class family's income, required to finance a college education is far greater than it was when my generation went to college.

So I say to you, we should invest in scholarships for children who need it. We should invest in the college loan program. We should do that. I have sent a budget to the Congress consistent with the balanced budget plan that will let a million young people engage in work-study programs so they can help to work themselves through college and that would give our families a tax deduction for the cost of college tuition up to $10,000 a year. I think that's the kind of thing we ought to have.

So I ask you to think about these challenges that we face. How are we going to build stronger families and give every child a childhood? How are we going to guarantee quality education to all Americans? How are we going to declare or develop a system for economic security for working families?

You know, this is an amazing economy we have. We have more new businesses started every year than ever before. The last 3 years, every year broke a record. We have more new self-made millionaires than ever before; not people who gave them anything, people who used the opportunities of this age. But we also have more than half of our wage earners working harder without ever getting a raise. And we have in a lot of big companies people who got downsized in these corporations who now don't know what they're supposed to do, and we have to find things for them to do.

So what we have to do is to find a way consistent with our values to keep the economy going, to keep creating more jobs, but to do it in a way that enables every American working family to benefit from that, consistent with our values. And we know if we grow together that we'll all be better off.

If everybody has a chance, we're all better off. That's the kind of thing I want you to think about. Every single challenge, you have to ask yourself: What should I be doing about that; what should my community be doing about that; can my church, can my synagogue do something about that; should my State do something about that; should my Nation do something about that, whether it's a challenge for more jobs or safer streets or a cleaner environment or working to keep the world more peaceful and secure for our children and their future? We have to do everything we can to work together. And I'm doing what I can to see that this Government continues on its course of reform and does more every day to earn your trust and respect.

But I just want to say this: Did you ever notice how there are no cynics in a flood, there are no cynics in a tornado, there are never any cynics in a natural disaster? Why? Cynicism is a luxury you cannot afford when you have work to do. One of the things I want to say to you is that these young people and their enthusiasm today, and those four young people doing their service through AmeriCorps, that's what makes this country great, the spirit of people like this young man. He could have said, "I'm 19 years old. I've got 60, 70 years to live. I like riding my jet ski and winning prizes. Why should I risk my neck putting that jet ski in a raging river?" He could have stayed home, and no one would have ever known the difference—no one.

That is the way we ought to live every day. It really bothers me when I hear people say, well, they don't believe in our country, and we can't make progress, and everything's not going to get better, and none of these people we put in office are any good. That's a bunch of bull. And it's a lousy excuse for inaction. It's a lousy excuse for inaction.

Just remember something. I have one opportunity that none of you can ever have unless you get to be President, and it has nothing to do with me. Whenever I leave the borders of the United States of America and I go to other countries and I see people cheering, they are not cheering for Bill Clinton, they are not even cheering for the President, they are cheering for America.

I cannot possibly convey—I don't have the words to tell you what it feels like to represent all of you and to be the country in the eyes of people from other lands. But I can tell you this: They know we're a pretty great place. John Kennedy said once, in the middle of the cold war, that freedom has many difficulties and our country was far from perfect, but we never had to put up a wall to keep our people in. And I want all of you to remember that.

I believe that the young people at this college are facing the greatest future, the greatest age of possibility our country has ever known. But every one of us knows that we have enormous challenges. There are a lot of people fulfilling their dreams, but we have to make the Amer-

ican dream available to everybody willing to work for it. There are a lot of people who are doing well, but there are still things that are dividing our people when we ought to be pulling together and being united.

And when you are tempted to give up on your country or to give up on yourself or to give up on your community or to give up on some problem you're facing in your family, remember this flood. And remember how people just showed up and did what they were supposed to do. Remember how courage seemed ordinary and how cynicism was a luxury nobody could afford. And if you can recapture that, then your community, your State, and your Nation will have a future that is better than anything that has happened so far.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:30 p.m. in the gymnasium at King's College. In his remarks, he referred to Patrick Murphy, student government president, and Rev. James Lackenmier, president, King's College.

The President's Radio Address
February 17, 1996

Good morning. Today I want to talk about what we need to do in Washington to make our democracy work better for all Americans so that we can meet our challenges together and take advantage of the enormous possibilities of our future.

In my State of the Union Address, I outlined seven challenges we face as we move into the future, challenges we must meet if we are to keep the American dream alive for all our people and unite our country around our shared values.

The first six challenges are challenges we all face together: strengthening our families and giving all children a good childhood; providing better educational opportunities for all Americans; enhancing the economic security of all our working families through greater access to health care, secure pensions, lifetime education, and more good jobs; fighting crime and gangs and drugs so that all Americans can feel safe again, so that crime is the exception, not the rule; protecting our environment; maintaining our world leadership for peace and freedom. These challenges we must meet together as partners. The seventh challenge is really America's challenge to all of us in public service. It is a challenge to continue to reinvent our Government so that it works better and costs less, and to make our democracy work better for the American people by limiting the influence of special interests and expanding the influence of our people.

Today I'm in New Hampshire, where citizens will exercise their responsibility as voters in the first primary of the year on Tuesday. It's no secret that even here in New Hampshire, with its proud tradition of town meetings and studied debate over the issues, people want all of us in politics to clean up our act. The fact is, organized interests have too much power in the halls of Government. These influence groups too often promote their own interest at the expense of the public interest. Too often they operate in secret. Too often they have special privileges ordinary Americans don't even know exist. And elections, where ordinary voters should have the loudest voice, have become so expensive that big money can sometimes drown those voices out.

Yet we have made progress in the last 3 years. Shortly after I took office, I implemented the toughest ethics code on executive officials in our history. Senior appointees are barred from lobbying their own agencies for 5 years after they leave, and they can never lobby for foreign governments. In 1993 we repealed the tax loophole that lets lobbyists deduct the cost of their activities. And early last year, Congress finally passed a law that applies to Congress the laws they impose on the private sector.

Last June I met with Speaker Gingrich in Claremont, New Hampshire, for a town meeting. The very first question we took was from Frank McConnell, a retired steelworker, who wanted us to launch a bipartisan effort to clean up politics and curb the power of special inter-

ests through passing campaign finance reform. I'm meeting Mr. McConnell later today to thank him and to bring him up to date. Last year Congress answered my call to stop taking gifts, meals, and trips from lobbyists. In December I signed a bipartisan bill to bring lobbyists out from the darkrooms and into the bright light of public scrutiny. That's half of what Mr. McConnell asked us to do.

When this law's first deadline approached earlier this week, lobbyists were pouring into registration offices for the very first time to let the public know who they are, what they do, who pays them, and how much. This is a tough law. It's good for the American people. I'm proud to have signed it. And I congratulate the Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, who voted for it. Now we have a chance to finish the job, to make the way we finance campaigns work better, too.

Two distinguished United States Senators have sponsored a sensible campaign finance reform bill that can serve as a foundation for real reform. John McCain is a Republican Senator from Arizona. Russ Feingold is a Democratic Senator from Wisconsin. On many issues it's fair to say that Senator McCain and Senator Feingold don't see eye-to-eye. But they do know this: The health of our democracy goes way beyond partisan politics, and it's high time to reduce the influence money has on elections.

The McCain-Feingold bill includes limits on spending, curbs on the influence of PACs and lobbyists, and an end to the soft money system. The bill will discourage the attack ads that have become all too common by requiring candidates to take responsibility for putting them on the air. Perhaps most important of all, this bill provides free TV time for candidates so that they can talk directly to citizens about real issues and real ideas.

All these campaign finance reform ideas are ideas I embraced back in 1992 when I was running in New Hampshire. Now, as we work to reform campaign finance, we must do everything we can to ensure that we open, not limit, the political process. Our goal is to take the reins of our democracy away from big special interests, from big money, and to put them back into the hands of ordinary Americans, where they belong.

Our bottom-line test should be: Will our efforts make our Government more representative, not less representative? Will reform make our elected representatives more likely to promote the public interest, even when it conflicts with powerful special interests?

We have an historic opportunity to renew our democracy and strengthen our country. If we truly believe in a Government that puts ordinary Americans ahead of the powerful and privileged, then we must act and act now. I call on Members of Congress from both parties to follow through on what Frank McConnell asked of the Speaker and me: Let's put politics aside, work together, and get this done. If you take pride in our democracy, as I know all of you do, then let's pass a bipartisan campaign finance reform bill now and give the American people something all of us can be proud of.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:19 p.m. on February 16 in the Map Room in the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on February 17.

Telephone Remarks to the Community of Rochester, New Hampshire
February 17, 1996

I'm sorry I'm not there, but I'm on the way. We spent 2 hours on the runway in Washington today, waiting for a weather clearance. If you'll wait for me, I'll be there. I'm looking forward to it.

I know between Jeanne Shaheen and everybody else that's there you can find plenty of people to speak until I get there. Just tell old stories and reminisce, and I'll be there as quick as I can.

Thank you. Goodbye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. aboard Air Force One en route to Pease International Trade Port. In his remarks, he referred to Jeanne Shaheen, New Hampshire State senator.

Remarks to the Community in Rochester
February 17, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you for waiting. Thank you. I can see that someone was up to a lot of mischief before I got here. [*Laughter*]

Let me say that I was all dressed up and ready to go at 7 sharp this morning, and they said I couldn't leave the White House until 8 because of the weather. And when I got to the airport, we sat there for another 2 hours. But I knew that I would wait for you if you would wait for me, and I thank you for being here. I'm glad to see you.

I want to thank the Rochester Middle School Rock and Jazz Band for playing and for playing "Hail to the Chief." Give them a hand there. [*Applause*] I want to thank the Spaulding High Red Raiders, the boys and the girls basketball teams, who gave up their practice yesterday to prepare this. Thank you very much. I thank my friend Jeanne Shaheen for her leadership here in New Hampshire and for that wonderful introduction and what she embodies. I want to thank George Stephanopoulos and my old friend David Matthews for warming the crowd up before I came. I want to say thank you to the mayor; your deputy mayor; your county attorney; my old friend George Maglaris, who was here earlier and I think said a few words; all the others who spoke before. I'd also like to acknowledge two friends of mine from 4 years ago who aren't here today, Mayor Roland Roberge and his wife, Lorraine. I miss them, and I know you remember them well here in Rochester.

I know someone before I came here mentioned it, but 4 years ago, I made 75 scheduled appearances and countless more unscheduled appearances in New Hampshire in just the last 6 weeks of the campaign, from New Year's Day forward. And not very far from here, at the Dover Elks Club, I gave what became a rather famous speech, because I said that I was trying to give the election for President back to the American people and back to the people of New Hampshire and that if you would give it to me, I would be there for you 'til the last dog dies.

I have come here today to give you an accounting of that pledge and to ask you to look to the future and to ask you to bring all this incredible enthusiasm with you into this election year as citizens and to ask you, yes, to go out and vote in the primary on Tuesday for Bill Clinton for President of the United States.

I brought a straightforward vision to this job. I wanted to see the American dream available for all Americans, not just a few. I wanted to see our country continue to be the world's greatest force for peace and freedom. And I wanted to see our country coming together, not being divided for cheap, short-term political reasons. I said that I thought the only way we could achieve that is if all of us worked for more opportunity, all of us showed more personal responsibility, and all of us made a real commitment to build an American community.

Well, in the last 3 years, here's where we are—the good and the not so good. Look at the economy. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years; almost 8 million new jobs; homeownership at a 15-year high. We're moving in the right direction.

The unemployment rate in New Hampshire is less than half of what it was on election day in 1992. And the commitments that I made to you helped that to occur. I said we would cut the deficit in half, and we did in 3 years. I said we would have 8 million more jobs, and in only 3 years we had 7.7 million more jobs. We're going to make that record and beat it by a good long ways this year. I said that we would expand trade in a fair way, and now, for the first time in years, our exports to other countries are growing faster than imports into America and creating good jobs for the United States of America.

I said that we would invest in new technologies, that we would expand educational opportunity, and that we would find a way to protect the environment and grow the economy. That's the only way you can do it in the long run, and that's exactly what we have done.

I asked you to give me a chance to try to give America a more secure future and a more peaceful, more democratic world. And the fact that there are no nuclear missiles pointed at any American children for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age is evidence of that commitment kept.

And I am proud of what the United States has done to stand up against terrorism, to limit the spread of dangerous weapons, to work for a ban on all nuclear testing, to stand up for peace in the Middle East and in Haiti and in Northern Ireland and in Bosnia today, where our brave soldiers are fighting for peace. I am proud of them.

And we are coming together around our basic values. In this country as a whole, the crime rate is down, the welfare rolls are down, the food stamp rolls are down, the poverty rate is down, the teen pregnancy rate is down. And I am proud of the work that we have done with our crime bill, with promoting welfare reform, with being tougher on child support enforcement, the kinds of things that we have done to support good family values, to bring people together, and to help our country work again. I am proud of that. And you should be proud that those things are going in the right direction.

But any full accounting, my fellow Americans, would require us to look at the full picture. Isn't it perplexing that we could have almost 8 million new jobs, that your unemployment rate could be cut by more than half, and that people could still feel economic insecurity? Why is that? Who would have believed we could have this many more jobs and more than half the American people would still be working harder without a raise? Who would believe we could generate this many more jobs and still the great companies of America would be downsizing—their stock price goes up, but their middle-aged middle managers trying to send their kids to school go off, and what happens to them?

Who would believe that we could bring the crime rate down, but that violence among juveniles would go up? Who would believe that drug use could go down, but that casual drug use and rampant illegal cigarette smoking among juveniles would go up? What explains this? How could things be so good on the one hand and still have these troubling elements?

Look at the rest of the world. Everybody ought to know that peace is better than war, that economic competition is better than terrorism. But here we are on the brink of a new peace in the Middle East and my friend, the Prime Minister, is murdered. Here we are on the brink of a new peace in Ireland and, foolishly, the peace is broken by a bomb. Here we are on the brink of making our people safer than ever before, but we know that none of us are free from terrorism generated at home and abroad.

So we are moving in the right direction, but there are challenges we have to face. How did this happen? It is happening because I see now more clearly even than I did when I came here 4 years ago that we are going through a period of change more profound than anything the American people have experienced in 100 years. About 100 years ago, we moved from mostly being a people who lived in rural areas to mostly living in towns and cities. We moved from being people who mostly made their living on farms to being people who mostly made a living from factories and the economic opportunities that factories generated.

Today we are moving from people who mostly make a living based on information and technology. We are moving into a period where, no matter where people live, they operate all over the world because of technology and computers. We are moving in a period where we sell things, our goods, our services, and our money throughout the world.

And this great uprooting has created an enormous age of possibility for the American people. The young people in this audience will have an opportunity to do more things to live out their dreams than any generation of Americans ever has. But whenever things change this much, there is bound to be dislocation, uncertainty, people who worry about whether they will be a part of that future. And whenever that happens, it is our common responsibility as Americans to make sure, as I said 4 years ago, that everybody who will work for it has access to the American dream, that we do it together, and that we continue to be the great beacon of hope and freedom and peace that this country was meant to be. That is our mission, and we still have to fulfill it.

And in the State of the Union Address, I said that the most important lesson I have learned in 3 years as President is something I knew when I took office but something I now feel in my bones and the very fiber of my being, and that is, when we are together, we are never defeated, and when we are divided, we defeat ourselves. We have to go forward together. We have to work these issues through together. We have to seize these opportunities together. We have to face these challenges together.

That is what the balanced budget debate is all about. I hate these big deficits. We cut the deficit in half in 3 years. We do have to finish the job, but we have to do it together, which means we have to honor our responsibilities to our parents and to our children through Medicare and Medicaid, to the future through investments in education and the environment. We have to remember that all among us deserve a chance at the present and all among us deserve to have our children have the kind of future they deserve. That is how we must balance the budget.

And let me just say that I told you here in this county 4 years ago that I did not believe that Government had the answer to all the problems, that I was not a Democrat who favored big Government bureaucracies. Look at the record. The United States Government is 205,000 employees smaller today than it was the day I took the oath of office. It's the smallest it's been in 30 years. At the end of this year, it will be the smallest it's been since John Kennedy was the President of the United States of America.

We are getting rid of unneeded regulations and unneeded programs and unneeded bureaucracies. But just because we don't need a big Government doesn't mean we need a weak one. Just because we don't need a big Government to solve all of our problems doesn't mean we can go back to the time when Americans were left to fend for themselves, when people were told, "You're on your own." We have to do this together.

And if you look at the challenges we faced in moving to the 21st century and meeting our mission of guaranteeing the American dream for all and maintaining our leadership and bringing the American people together, you can see it. What are those challenges?

One, we have to strengthen our families and give all children a childhood. Yes, it begins with parents. But it also includes things like having the American National Government help as we did last week when the telecommunications bill gave parents the V-chip so they can decide whether their children should see this mindless violence on television.

We have to make sure we educate everyone for the 21st century. Yes, it begins with parents and teachers and local schools. But we need a national effort to see that all of our classrooms and all of our libraries are hooked up to the information superhighway by the year 2000. And we need—it is in the Nation's interest to see that every child who wants to go on to college can do it with a scholarship, with a loan, and, I believe, with a tax deduction for college tuition for the parents.

We have to see—we cannot ask parents to wait for their children to achieve economic security. If people are out there working hard, they deserve to be able to raise their children and have a stable, secure life. And yes, it begins with people's willingness to work and to learn and to acquire new skills, but it is legitimate for the Government to say, "We're going to give all working families access to health care." And there is a bill that would prevent—[*applause*]—there is a bill before the Congress today, before the Senate, that would say insurance companies can't cut you off when you change jobs, insurance companies can't cut you off if someone in your family gets sick. That's what insurance is for.

It is a simple bill. It has 45 Democratic and Republican cosponsors. It's been voted out of the committee unanimously. But because the insurance lobby is holding it up, we cannot bring it to a floor vote. It is out of the committee. It will pass. It should pass the Senate. It should pass the House. It is an American bill. It's in America's interest. We ought to do it for the people of the United States.

Yes, people have to take care of themselves, but we ought not to let our Government once again go back to the time when companies could raid their workers' pension funds. Instead, it should be easier for small businesses to take out pensions for their employees and for themselves.

Yes, people ought to have to get retraining if they need it, but we ought to make it easier. I have asked the Congress to get rid of dozens and dozens of these training programs and create a pool—to create a "GI bill" for America's workers, just give a simple training voucher to anybody who loses their job and let them decide where to spend it and how to spend it at the nearest and best educational institution.

We have to continue the fight against crime. Even though the crime rate is going down, you know it's too high. It is still too high. When will we know we have won that fight? When you turn on the television news and you see a report of a crime and you're surprised. That's when we know. When you're surprised. When

once again it is the exception rather than the rule. When people do not feel afraid on their streets or for their children in their schoolyards. We have to continue that.

That means we cannot—we cannot—reverse our commitment to put 100,000 more police officers on the street. It means we should not walk back on any of our anticrime initiatives. But let me say this in New Hampshire. I know it wasn't popular here when I signed the Brady bill and when I signed the assault weapons ban. And I know what the hunters were told. But let me say this, let me say this, in my home State we just had a great duck season. And in New Hampshire you just had a great deer season. And I'll bet you anything every hunter that wanted to shot deer in New Hampshire and ducks in Arkansas with the same gun they had last year. They did not tell you the truth. I'll tell you who doesn't have guns: 41,000 criminals who couldn't get them because we passed the Brady bill.

Let me say this. For a very long time in America our commitment to the environment was a common bipartisan commitment. It has only recently become partisan. My fellow Americans, we must make it bipartisan again by the vote and the voice of the American people in this election. We cannot afford the illusion of believing that the only way we can grow this economy is to destroy our natural resources and undermine our future. All the evidence we have indicates that that is a fool's choice that we will pay for dearly. And we have evidence that is overwhelming that we can create good new jobs by having the right kind of environmental protection. I will not weaken our commitment to preserve and protect the environment of this country.

Nor will I walk away from the responsibilities of this country in the world of today and tomorrow to lead for peace and freedom. No one else can do this. We have to do the right thing, and the right thing makes us more secure. We can be hit by terrorists from anywhere. It is the right thing to stand up against terrorism everywhere. We have to stand for the things we believe in.

And finally, let me say this. We have got to make democracy work. And all these other challenges—you say it starts with the citizens and ends with the Government. In this case it starts with the Government and ends with the citizen. I have worked hard. We have passed tough new lobbying laws, as I pledged we would in '92. We have eliminated the tax deduction for lobbying in Washington, as I promised we would in 1992. We have applied to Congress the laws they impose on the private sector, as I said I would try to do in 1992.

There are two more things we have to do. The Congress should give me the line item veto they have been promising. And we should join hands, as the Speaker and I did when we shook hands in Claremont not very long ago, and finally pass a bipartisan campaign finance reform bill to give elections back to the people of New Hampshire and the people of the United States of America.

But it ends with you. It ends with you. There is no call—they say a politician is never supposed to disagree with the majority at election time, but I'm going to tell you something: There is no call for the cynicism, for the negativism, for the apathy that so many express today.

Yes, it is true that we have not solved all the problems in the last 3 years, but what I said was—in Dover 4 years ago—that the Presidency is the most important hiring decision the American people ever make. If you vote for me, I won't solve all the problems, I won't give you a miracle, but I will give you movement. You won't have to worry about whether I'm working every day, caring about you every day, or making progress.

My fellow Americans, by any standard, we have made progress. But most important is what will we do tomorrow, what is your vision of the future, and are you willing to do something about it? Cynicism is a very cheap excuse for inaction, and it is ultimately frustrating and unrewarding. It guarantees the failure of democracy.

So I ask you again to participate in democracy. They say, "Well, there is no opponent in the primary." Oh, yes, there is. Cynicism is our opponent. Apathy is our opponent. Division is our opponent. The siren song of simple answers that are wrong is our opponent. And you should know that, whatever anybody says, this is still the greatest country in human history. Most people would give anything to be in your shoes around the world today. And this system will work if you will make it work. This system will work if you will make it work.

All my life I have been driven by the conviction that it is simply wrong, it is wrong when any person is deprived of the opportunity to

live up to the fullest of their God-given potential. I now know more strongly than I ever had that it is also wrong to believe for a moment that we can ever become all we ought to be unless we do it together.

And so I say to you, I have tried to be there for you. I have loved the opportunity to be your President. I am grateful beyond words for the chance you gave me in New Hampshire when everybody who was an expert said it was over. I am grateful. But I do not want you to reelect me based on what we have done, or even based on your personal feelings. I want you to do it because the only way you and your children and your community and your State and your country are going to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow is if we do it together, together 'til the last dog dies.

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. in the gymnasium at Rochester Community Center. In his remarks, he referred to Harvey E. Bernier, Jr., mayor, and Sandra Keanes, deputy mayor; Lincoln Soldati, county attorney, and George Maglaris, county commissioner, Strafford County.

Remarks to the Community in Keene, New Hampshire
February 17, 1996

Thank you. Thank you for waiting in the cold. I waited on the runway for 2 hours this morning in Washington for the weather to clear so that I could come, and I was hoping you would wait for me.

Mayor Russell, thank you for those wonderful remarks about your beloved city. Senator Blaisedell, thank you for your support and your statement and your service. And Jennifer Durling, thank you for reminding us all what this election is all about: you and people like you, your future, and your country's future. Thank you for doing such a good job. Let's give her another hand. [*Applause*]

I am delighted to be back in Keene. I thank the high school band and the choir for doing so well today. I was in the band in high school; I can tell you they are freezing to death over there. [*Laughter*] It's not easy to play the national anthem on a warm day, and they did it on a cold day. Let's give them another hand; they were great. [*Applause*]

You know, I know the movie "Jumanji" was filmed here. And I know one of the biggest scenes was an elephant stampede right up this street. And I decided I'd better get up here before it's too late and we had another elephant stampede. [*Laughter*]

I have such wonderful memories of this community. I was last here in 1994 at the Markem Company, but all of you know I came many times in 1992. And the first time I had an inkling that we might actually go on to victory was the night I had one of my town meetings in Keene, before they were the thing to do. And we rented a hall, or got one, anyway, that was supposed to be big enough for 150 people, and everybody was hoping we'd make the room look almost full. And over 400 people showed up that night. Some of you were there, and I thank you. You gave me heart then to go on, and I thank you for being here now.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to the people of Keene for being so good to Hillary when she was here recently at her rally. On my desk at the White House I've got one of those buttons that says "I'm Keene on Hillary." And since I am, it's only appropriate for me to have it there.

My fellow Americans, you all know that New Hampshire gave me the chance to become President of the United States. And even more important, in all the many visits I had here in 1992—and I just counted before I came up—there were 75 separate scheduled events in New Hampshire between January 1st and election day in 1992. You taught me a lot about America, about America's dreams and challenges, America's hopes, and America's concerns. And because you did in this town square, in those rooms, and the town meetings, you helped me to do my job better. So before I say anything else, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for the opportunity I've had these last 3 years to work for you. I thank you.

In 1992, I came here with a straightforward vision for our country. I wanted us to go into the 21st century with every American who was willing to work, having a chance to live the American dream. I wanted us to go into the 21st century together, not divided, and the leader of the world for peace and freedom.

I believed then and I believe now there is a simple strategy. We have to create opportunity. We have to insist on responsibility. And we have to believe in our common destiny. We have to go forward together. I am tired of seeing this country divided for short-term political gain. We are strong when we are together. We are never defeated when we are together.

When I came here to New Hampshire, I said I had an economic strategy for America. If you would vote for me, we would cut the deficit in half, institute an investment plan that would create 8 million new jobs, open the doors of trade to American goods and services. In the last 3 years, we have cut the deficit in half. I have another year, but we have almost 8 million jobs already. The unemployment rate today in New Hampshire is less than half what it was in 1992. And for the first time in a long time, our exports to other countries are growing faster than their imports here. America is on the move.

I said if you will elect me I will try my best to reassert the values that made this country great: to strengthen our families, to be tougher on crime, to reform welfare to value family and work, and to try to bring us together. And in the last 3 years, the crime rate is down, the welfare rolls are down, the food stamp rolls are down, the poverty rate is down, the teen pregnancy rate is down. America is on the move.

And I am so grateful that our country has been able to be a force for peace and freedom around the world. More than anything else, I am grateful that now there is not a single nuclear weapon pointed at any American citizen. I am grateful for the role we have played for peace, from the Middle East to Northern Ireland to Haiti, and yes, I am grateful for the brave Americans who are defending peace in Bosnia today. And I know you're all proud of them as well.

But what I have to say today is you're entitled to a complete report, because you know in your bones this is an unusual time. How could we have 8 million new jobs, how could we have in New Hampshire an unemployment rate below 4 percent and people still feel uncertain about their present and their future? Because half or more of our people are still working harder without a raise. Because a lot of companies are downsizing and laying people off. Their stock prices go down, but their people go out. What happens to them?

We all know that there are still profound social problems in our country that must be addressed. And we know this is still a dangerous world, as we have been visited in the last 3 years with terrorism in our own country, and we've seen it in Japan and in other countries as well. We've seen that there are enemies to peace everywhere when the great Israeli Prime Minister is murdered and madness returned when the building was blown up in England, trying to shatter the peace in Northern Ireland. Everywhere in the world we are safer than we were, but we are not free of difficulty.

Why is this? I want you to understand that very clearly. I believe that we are having these changes and these perplexing times with all the good things happening but challenges remaining, because this is the time of the most profound change our country has experienced in 100 years. Not since we moved from being primarily a rural people to people who live mostly in towns and cities, when we moved from being primarily a people who made our living on farms to being a people who made a living mostly on factories and the activity that created, have we been through such change.

We are now going into an economy dominated by information and technology, where work is ever more mind and less muscle. We are going into a world where global markets for goods and services and money forced us all to compete in ways we never had to compete before. And wherever there is a great uprooting, there are lots of opportunities that we can celebrate. Just for example, in the last 3 years, there have been more new jobs created by businesses owned by women alone than have been laid off by the Fortune 500.

But there are those who do well and those who are not doing so well, who are not positioned yet to win in this new age of possibility. I believe with all my heart that the young people in this audience today will have an era of greater possibility to live out their own dreams than any generation of Americans has ever enjoyed if we meet the challenges of the present and if we do it in the right way.

And so I've come here today to ask for your support, not because of the warm personal feelings I feel, not because of the many friends I have in this audience, not even because of the achievements of this administration, but because of the challenges that lie ahead and because we dare not face those challenges unless we are willing to face them with vision and to face them together. That is why I seek your support.

Look at the discussion in Washington over balancing the budget. I'm for balancing the budget. When I showed up in Washington, the debt of this country had been quadrupled in 12 years. We cut it in half in 3 years, just like I told you we would in 1992. And we have to finish the job, but we have to do it in a way that is consistent with our values and consistent with our interests. That means we must do it in a way that honors our obligations to our parents, to our children, to our environment, and to our future.

We do not need to eliminate the AmeriCorps program to balance the budget, and it would be wrong to do so. We do not need to cut environmental protection by 30 percent, and it would be wrong to do so. We do not need to deprive good, hardworking families who have children with disabilities of the support that Medicaid gives them, and it would be wrong to do so. And we do not need to change the Medicare program that has given us senior citizens with the highest life expectancy of any senior citizens in the entire world and break that down. It is not necessary to balance the budget, and we should not do so.

Now, let me tell you what I think we will do. I believe we will keep that deficit coming down. I believe there's a national consensus for balancing the budget. And I want you to look ahead as I asked in the State of Union Address at the challenges of the future and to ask what you should do and what I should do. That is what this election is all about. Don't let anybody kid you about anything else. Elections for President are still about you. They're about you and your family and your dreams and your challenges and your future. And don't you ever let anybody take an election away from you. Make it about your future.

Our first challenge is to strengthen our families and to help all children recover their childhood. That's what the Family and Medical Leave Act was all about. That's what providing more opportunities for Head Start is all about. Yes, most of it has to be done by people in their individual families. But the rest of us have a responsibility, too. I am proud of the fact that the Vice President and I insisted on the inclusion of the V-chip in the telecommunications law to give parents the right to decide whether their children watch hours and hours and hours of mindless, destructive violence on television for years and years and years.

We have got to provide all Americans the opportunities that Jennifer spoke about. We live in an age where education matters more than ever before. Just last week there was a new study saying that the difference 15 years ago between the earnings of high school graduates and college graduates was about 20 percent, and now it's 80 percent. I believe that we have an obligation to open the doors of college education to every person in America who wants to go.

We should increase the Pell grant program, not reduce it. We should maintain a direct college loan program that gives young people the chance to borrow the money they need to go college and pay it back as a percentage of their income so they will never be discouraged from borrowing that money and going on to college. And if we are to have a tax cut, the best tax cut we could give America is a deduction for the cost of college tuition for every family.

We have to meet a challenge today that won't wait for tomorrow to help every American family willing to work for it achieve a greater measure of economic security. If we're going to see people changing jobs more and more, if we want to keep the dynamism of this economy and still support families who work and want to raise their children, there are a few things we have to do.

Number one, we ought to make it possible—if we can't have health insurance for everybody, at least everybody ought to have access to it. You shouldn't lose your insurance when you change jobs. You shouldn't lose your insurance because somebody in your family gets sick. There is a bill before the Senate today that has almost 50 Republican and Democratic cosponsors. It has been voted out of committee unanimously, but the vested interests do not want it voted on on the floor. We should say to the United States Senate: Pass that bill; send it to the House. Pass it, and send it to the President. America deserves it.

We should guarantee the integrity of the pension systems in America. We dare not go back to the time when companies were allowed to raid their workers' pensions for other short-term gains. And we ought to make it easier for small-business people, like the people who work up and down this street, to take out a pension for themselves and their employees. Less costly, more secure; we have got to do that.

And finally, when people lose their jobs, instead of having to go through this array of programs to find out whether they qualify for training, I propose a "GI bill" for America's workers. Collapse all the programs, put the money in the bank, and give every unemployed worker a voucher. Let the worker decide where to get the training. Cut the bureaucracy, increase the training, put people back to work at higher wages, that's what we need to do here.

And let me say one other thing. To me, among the greatest heroes in this country are the people who work 40 hours a week and do their best to raise their kids and only make the minimum wage. If we do not raise the minimum wage, this year it will drop to a 40-year low in terms of what it will buy. There is always a lot of talk in Washington about family values. It's hard to raise a family on $4.25 an hour. Let's raise the minimum wage.

We have got to take our streets back from crime. I am glad the crime rate has gone down, but we all know it's too high. You know when we'll know this problem is whipped? When you turn on the television news and you see the report of a crime and you are surprised. We have got to make crime the exception, not the rule in America again. We must not repeal the crime bill's requirement to put 100,000 police on our streets. And we dare not go back on the other provisions of the crime bill.

I know here in New Hampshire where, like my native State of Arkansas, there are a lot of people who love to hunt. When we passed the ban on assault weapons, when we passed the Brady bill, there were hunters who were frightened into opposing our policies, who were told that their guns were going to be taken away. Well, we just had a great duck season in Arkansas and a great deer season in New Hampshire, and not a single hunter lost their guns. They were not told the truth. But I'll tell you who did lose their guns. Over 40,000 criminals could not buy guns because of the Brady bill. We are not going to repeal it.

We must meet the challenge of keeping our environment clean and safe and even better for the next generation. We must discard this crazy notion that the only way we can grow the economy is to destroy the environment. It is not true. We can grow the economy by preserving the environment. That used to be a bipartisan commitment in America, and if you vote for Bill Clinton and Al Gore, the environmental Vice President, you will send a message that will make the environment a bipartisan commitment of America again.

Even in this time when it is tempting to say we have no challenges beyond our borders, I ask you to remember that this great country of ours is looked to all across the world to stand up for decency and peace and freedom. I ask you to understand that we have certain responsibilities because no other nation in the world can do the things we are called upon to do.

I have not sought to make America the world's policeman, but I have not permitted America to withdraw from the world. Where we can make a difference and where it is consistent with our values and our interests, we cannot be policemen, we cannot withdraw, but we can be the world's greatest peacemaker. And that is exactly what we are trying to do today.

These are all challenges that begin with you but involve your Government in a partnership. But there is another challenge we must meet that begins with us and involves you in a partnership. Here in this square of Keene, let me say our seventh great challenge is to make our democracy work again, to give you a Government that costs less and works better, and demands and deserves your trust and your confidence and your participation at election time.

Let me say that just a few months ago I was in Claremont with Speaker Gingrich, and we shook hands on a commitment to try to reform the political system when we were asked by a man who came down to be with me here today, named Frank McConnell. Frank, where are you? Where's Frank? There he is. He is the guy that asked Newt Gingrich and Bill Clinton to join together to clean up the political system, to pass lobby reform and campaign finance reform. Let's give him a hand. [*Applause*]

Well, we did half of it. We passed a very good lobby reform bill, and believe me, the lobbyists are flooding the registration offices. They are getting this information for the first time

on the people they are working for, how much money they're spending, and what they're trying to get done. It's a good law, and I'm proud we did it. And I compliment the Republicans and the Democrats for doing it. But we need to finish the job.

Two distinguished United States Senators—a Republican from Arizona, John McCain, and a Democrat from Wisconsin, Russ Feingold—who disagree on a lot of things but understand that the health of our democracy must be put ahead of partisan politics, have sponsored a campaign finance reform bill. And we ought to pass it, and pass it now, because of Frank and because of you.

This bill includes the things I talked to you about in 1992. It limits spending. It curbs the influence of PAC's and lobbyists. It ends the soft money system. Most important of all, it would recreate the kind of town meetings that New Hampshire made famous, because it would give the candidates free air time. No more negative ads dominating politics but open air time and honest discussions of the issues. We need campaign finance reform, and we need it now.

But let me tell you something else we need; we need you. We need you. I want you to go out Tuesday night. You say, well—or Tuesday in the daytime—and vote. You say, "You don't have an opponent, Mr. President." Oh, yes I do. Oh, yes I do, and so do you. Our opponent is cynicism. It is negativism. It is apathy. It is division. It is short-term gain instead of the long-term interest of the country. Those are our opponents.

Remember, when we're united we never lose; when we're divided we defeat ourselves. Cynicism is a cheap cover and a poor excuse for inaction by the American citizens. Don't tell me your vote doesn't make a difference. It does. It does. If you voted for Bill Clinton and Al Gore 4 years ago, you got the family and medical leave law, you got national service, you got a better college loan program, you got more kids in Head Start, you got a halving of the deficit, you got policies that contributed to the growth of jobs in America. You did make a difference, and it will make a difference.

You dare not permit the American people, your friends and neighbors, who would never think of coming out here on a cold day and standing here like you are, fall victim to this kind of skepticism and cynicism. It has no place in America.

Let me tell you, I know people say the Government would mess up a one-car parade and nothing good ever happens, but I just gave you a list of things good that happened. And let me tell you something else. In his new book, my friend James Carville points out something that every American should know. In the last 30 years, we have spent one-half of your tax money on just three things: defense, Social Security, and Medicare.

Now, what did you get for it? We won the cold war. There are no missiles pointed at America's children. The elderly poverty rate has been cut in half, and if you live to be 65, senior citizens in America have the highest life expectancy of any group of seniors in the world. I think we got our money's worth. We can make a difference when we work together and when we determine to do things. If we meet the challenges of the future the way we met those three challenges, this country's best days are ahead of us.

You can do it. Go Tuesday. Stand up for your country. Fight for your future, and determine that we are going to do this together.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:55 p.m. in the Keene central square. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Pat Russell; Clesson Blaisedell, State senator; and Jennifer Durling, student body president, Keene High School; and Yitzhak Rabin, former Prime Minister of Israel.

Remarks to the Community in Manchester, New Hampshire
February 17, 1996

The President. Thank you so much. Didn't Jason Sabatino do a great job? And thank you, Donna Soucy. And to New Hampshire College Board Chair Bob Morine, and all the people

here from New Hampshire College, I'm glad to be here with the Penmen. I congratulate you on the success of your basketball and your soccer teams. And I now know that enthusiasm is one key to that success. It's wonderful to be here with you.

Let me also ask you to join with me in giving a warm round of applause to the Salem High School band. We thank them for playing. This is the second time they played for me in 2 weeks; I feel like we're on a road tour together. [*Laughter*]

I want to tell you how wonderful it is to be here. I have been in Rochester and Keene today. I have been in Concord and Nashua and Bedford and Salem on the last trip I was here. And this is my second trip to Manchester just in the last couple of weeks. It has been a wonderful experience for me. I can also tell you that when the First Lady was here a couple of weeks ago, she had a wonderful time. And I thank all of you who have been so supportive of her. And I thank all those who have come out to see the Vice President and who supported his efforts and our administration to protect the environment and promote technology.

This is a remarkable experience, the New Hampshire primary season. You might ask, well, what are you doing here? [*Laughter*] I'm here for two reasons. One is, when I was elected President, I told the people of New Hampshire that I would not forget, that I would not stop coming back, that I would be here again and again, and I have been. And I wanted to be here to say, secondly, I do have an opponent Tuesday in the election. It's cynicism and apathy. It's the division of our people that comes up too often at election time. And those are the real opponents that you have. So I came here to ask you for the last time to go to the polls Tuesday and vote for Bill Clinton for President of the United States in the primary.

Now, let me say—you were cheering so loud, let me finish—I want to say—I said, for the last time in a primary. [*Laughter*]

I want to talk to you tonight—this is a rally. We're all going to have a good time. I want you to cheer and enjoy yourselves, but I want to be just a little serious tonight as well, because the people of New Hampshire have a unique opportunity every year that a lot of our—every 4 years—that some of our citizens never have. The country is vast and heavily populated. And when people are running for President in most places they have to go from tarmac to tarmac. They don't have the opportunity to visit the towns, to have the meetings, to see people face to face in the way that all people seeking public office ought to.

I also want to thank the people of New Hampshire, not only for the incredible boost they gave me at a difficult time 4 years ago but for the educational opportunity I received, being able to go to those communities, being able to run a grassroots campaign, having town meeting after town meeting after town meeting, just listening to people tell me their life stories, tell me their hopes, tell me their dreams, tell me their concerns. I have learned a lot.

Audience member. [*Inaudible*]—for '92. We're still waiting for—[*inaudible*].

The President. I might say to you—I believe in free speech. That's right. Wouldn't you like——

Audience member. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Let me point out something, if I may. Let me point out something. Let me point out something.

Audience member. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Thank you.

Abridging my right of free speech is not the best way to get a positive response from me or anyone else. What is the truth? What is the truth? What is the truth? What is the truth?

Audience member. [*Inaudible*]—doctors—AIDS——

The President. Let me ask you this. Would you consider at a time of declining public spending a 30 percent increase in research action? Would you consider, at a time when hundreds of programs are going by the boards and I'm fighting my heart out to save student aid programs and other opportunity programs that affect all Americans, would you consider a huge increase in treatment funds for people with AIDS, action, not words? Would you consider the most serious effort in 40 years to give health care coverage to all Americans, including people with AIDS, action, not words?

Let's look at the facts. Would you consider a yearlong effort to save the Medicaid program, which allows people who are HIV-positive to work, to be constructive citizens, against what the Congress has tried to do, action, not words? Would you consider the appointment of the first AIDS director ever and having the first AIDS conference ever, action, not words? I think you would.

So you might ask, why is this demonstration going on at our rally instead of their rally? Now, this is New Hampshire. You heard them; you heard me. Now, let's go back to the agenda of the evening.

You know, when I came here 4 years ago, and I looked into the faces of all the people who were here, the unemployment rate was over seven points——

Audience member. Poll that now—[*inaudible*].

The President. I've got an idea. Why don't you pretend he's not here and listen to me, and then you'll defeat him.

I told you then that our country had to have an agenda for the future, if all of you were going to be able to participate in the American dream, if we were going to come together and not be divided, if we were going to maintain the leadership of this country. I said if you voted for me I would not promise you miracles, but I would promise you progress, that we would move.

In the last 4 years, the unemployment rate in this State has been cut by more than half. This country has almost 8 million new jobs. The deficit is half what it was. Trade is at an all-time high. We are selling more of our products overseas than people are selling to us again. Americans are competing in this world.

We are coming together. The crime rate is down. The poverty rate is down. The welfare rolls are down. The teen pregnancy rate is down. We are coming together as a country, and we are the strongest force for peace and freedom in the world, from the Middle East to Bosnia to Haiti.

But this is also a perplexing time. No time is free of difficulty. Do you ever ask yourself, those of you who are in college particularly, how could it be that New Hampshire has an unemployment rate under 4 percent, the country has almost 8 million new jobs, and yet, millions of people still feel uncertain in their lives. They're worried about being laid off in one of these big corporate downsizings, or they're worried about continuing to work harder and harder and never getting a raise. They're worried whether they can afford a college education for their children or if they'll lose their health insurance if someone in their family gets sick.

How can this happen? It is very important that you understand why. It is happening because your country is undergoing the biggest period of change in 100 years. Not since we moved from the rural areas to living primarily in cities and towns, not since we stopped making our living largely on the farm and mostly in the factory have the American people seen such change in the way they work and live. Now we are moving into an economy dominated by technology and information, and the longer we go into the future, the less it will matter where you live because you'll be able to access everybody else through the information superhighway.

We are living in a world dominated by world markets for goods, for services, and for money. And what that means is that there are incredible new opportunities in this world for Americans, more than at any time in the history of the country, for those who are prepared to take advantage of them. But if those who aren't prepared to take advantage of them, or those who have the misfortune of being downsized, it is not a rosy picture.

What we have to do today is not to reverse the policies of the last 3 years; we are moving in the right direction. What we have to do is to bear down until every American has the opportunity to succeed. And we have to do it together.

If you ask me what one lesson I have learned as President in the last 3 years, it is this: Whenever we are together as a people, we never lose. And when we permit ourselves to be divided, we defeat ourselves. We must solve these problems and meet these challenges together.

Now, it is in that context that I want you to see your responsibilities as citizens. In the State of the Union Address, I said, again, I want to balance the budget, but we have to do it together in a way that is consistent with our values and consistent with our interests. That means that I want to balance the budget. After all, the debt was quadrupled in the 12 years before I moved to Washington. We have cut it in half in 3 years.

But I want us to do it together. That means that, yes, we can balance the budget, but we don't want to do it in a way that violates our obligations to our parents or to our children or to the future. What does that mean? Don't wreck the Medicare program. Don't weaken the Medicaid program. The people that are here to demonstrate tonight, the people they represent, they need Medicaid. They deserve it. They deserve the right to work and to be here as long as possible.

And balance the budget, yes. But what is the purpose of balancing the budget? To give our young people a stronger future. Therefore, don't balance the budget by cutting back on the student aid program or by cutting Head Start or by abolishing the national service program. That is not the way to balance the budget.

What is the purpose of balancing the budget? To make us more secure in the future. Therefore, do not balance the budget by cutting environmental protection by 30 percent and undermining the future of this country.

We can do this. We have identified more than enough savings to balance the budget and to provide a modest tax cut. We must not sacrifice our values or our future to do it. We must not.

But I want to say this to you. When you think of your decision in this election, of course, I want your support. But I don't want you to support me just because of my affection for New Hampshire, even though it's enormous. I don't want you to support me just because of the record we have established, although clearly we are moving this country in the right direction. I want you to be with me because I will be with you as we go together into the future to meet our challenges.

You know, we have seven great challenges. We have to strengthen our families. We have to educate all Americans. We have to provide economic security to every family in this country willing to work for it. We have got to preserve the environment and grow the economy. We have got to abolish forever from our thinking this destructive idea that we can only expand economically if we undermine our environment. The truth is, we can only grow over the long run economically if we find ways to preserve our environment and put people to work doing it.

We have got to continue the fight against crime and violence. Even though the crime rate is down, it is too high. Everybody knows it. If you saw what we did in Manchester when I was here a few days ago, with the local police, in a neighborhood that is now a freer neighborhood where people can walk the streets at night and children can play safely in the schoolyard—that's what we have to do everywhere. We should not turn our backs on it until we have finished the job.

And I ask for your continued support in meeting the challenge of leading the world toward peace and freedom. I know Americans wonder sometimes whether it is really necessary for the United States to do some of the things that we have done when I have been in office. And I know some of them have not been popular. But the people of Haiti just had the first peaceful transfer of power in almost 200 years of history. The people of the Middle East have undergone the awful agony of having the Prime Minister of Israel assassinated. But they are moving determinedly toward peace and freedom and partnership with us.

We see it all across the world. And tonight, while we are here in this wonderful, warm gym, our men and women in uniform in Bosnia are in the cold Bosnian winter standing up for humanity around the world.

Finally, we have to meet the challenge of making our democracy work. You have to have a Government that works better and costs less. You have to have a Government that earns your trust, and you have to be worthy of your legacy as citizens. We need the line item veto. We need campaign finance reform, and we need it now.

But of all these challenges, I want to say here at this college, with its rich heritage, we must, we must, open the doors of learning to every American for a lifetime. And let me just say, I come to you with a record and an agenda. We have had a clear strategy, high standards, high expectations, high technology, and high levels of opportunity and grassroots reform. That has been the strategy of this administration. We have expanded Head Start. We have given schools money and flexibility they never had before to try to meet high national standards. We have dramatically expanded college loans and scholarships, and we must do more. But it is not enough.

And if you continue this administration, here is what I want to do. I want, first, to make sure that every school, every classroom, every library in this entire country is hooked up to the Internet, to the international—information superhighway by the year 2000.

Second, I want to open the doors of college education to every single person in this country who wants to go. I want to maintain the loan programs. I want to expand the Pell grants. I want to keep national service. And I want to expand work study to a million students in this country working their way through college. And if we are going to have a tax cut, let's have

the best tax cut of all, a tax deduction for the cost of college tuition.

Finally, let me say, at New Hampshire College, called the Penmen, something you know. You understand the economy. You know that more and more jobs are being created by small businesses. But you know more and more people my age are being laid off by big ones, being asked to start over again when they're trying to send their own children to college. You know more and more people are struggling in jobs where they never get a raise and they would have to have new training to get that raise.

So I say to you that college cannot just be for the young and training cannot just be for the young. One of the things that I have proposed to do is to take all these Government training programs and collapse them into a big pool of money and give every unemployed and underemployed person in this country a simple voucher they can take to the nearest college to get whatever training and education they want.

We built the opportunities we enjoy today through the GI bill after World War II for the returning soldiers. Today we need a "GI bill" for all those American workers who are working harder and harder just to hang on. They need to be lifted up. They need to be able to go forward. We need to support them as well.

Let me say the most important thing I have to say to you tonight is: Whatever we do, we have to do it together. The era of big Government is over. I told you that 4 years ago, that I was not a Democrat who believed in preserving the status quo and every bureaucratic program that ever existed. And I can report to you tonight that under our administration we now have the smallest Federal Government in 30 years. To find more money for the programs that need our investment—the health care programs, the medical research programs, the education programs, the technology programs—we have eliminated hundreds of other programs. We have closed thousands of offices. There is no big Government.

But just because we don't have a big Government anymore doesn't mean we need a weak Government and that we can go back to the time when people were told to fend for themselves. That is wrong. It will not work.

When business people in New Hampshire 4 years ago asked me to make more credit available to them so they could borrow money again to keep their businesses going and create jobs, and we did it, we didn't do it with a weak Government. When I went just a few days ago out to Washington and Oregon and Idaho to deal with the terrible floods that are gripping those people, they don't want a weak emergency management agency. You don't want a weak Government. You don't want a weak student loan program. You don't want a weak Pell grant program. You don't want a weak national service program.

We don't have to have bureaucratic inefficiency to have strength and partnership. That is what we have to have. But let me say to you, a partnership is a two-way street. Yes, your Government has let you down, and I've tried to change that. I've made it smaller and more efficient. I've done everything I could to do that. We have addressed the problems that were before us with everything from the family leave law to the Brady law to the college loan law, all the initiatives we have taken.

But we also know that we have to make you trust the Government more. So we passed a tough lobby reform law, a law to apply to Congress the laws they impose on the private sector, a law that stops lobbyists from having tax deductions for the cost of lobbying, for a change. We are moving in the right direction.

Yes, we need to do more. Yes, we need the line item veto. I hope Congress will give it to me soon. We need it. They promised it, and I want it. And yes, we need campaign finance reform, and we need it now to put you back in the driver's seat.

But if you think about all those other challenges—if we're going to strengthen our families and give childhood back to all children; if we're really going to have a world-class system of education that offers opportunity to everybody; if we're really going to provide economic security for every family willing to work for it; if we're really going to make our streets safer and our environment cleaner; and if we're going to continue to lead the world toward peace and freedom—in the end this is a democracy—you are the most important players. You have to do your part. That's why I'm asking you to vote on Tuesday, and even more of why I'm asking you to fight the cynicism and the negativism and the division and the turnoff that so many citizens express.

I'm going to tell you something. We had an interesting little exchange here, but I honor

these people that came here to demonstrate. At least they care about something. At least they show up. At least they make their opinion known. At least they're fighting for something. They're standing up just like you are. Just like you are.

And I want to tell you, make no mistake about it, there's one thing I can do that none of you can do. I can go abroad to represent all of us. And when I do, it is a feeling I can't even put into words for you, because I'm no longer Bill Clinton, and I'm not even really the President. You just become the United States. And you realize what a very great country this is, what we stand for and what we can do.

No one has been more willing to be critical of Government that doesn't work than I have. But for people to go around and say, "It doesn't matter what I do; it doesn't matter how I vote; it won't make any difference"—it does make a difference. It does make a difference. You got the family and medical leave law, the Brady bill, a doubling of tax breaks on low-income working people. You have a whole new economic strategy. You've got the deficit cut in half. You've got a telecommunications law now that provides for honest opportunity for everybody to compete in this brave new world in a way that advances the public interest, all because of the votes in the last election. It does make a difference.

But more importantly, it bothers me when I hear people say that our Government is intrinsically bad and every penny is wasted. My friend James Carville has written a book which I commend to you in which he says that in the last 30 years we have spent half of your tax money on just three things: national defense, Social Security, and Medicare. Now you decide if you got your money's worth. What happened? We won the cold war, and there are no missiles pointed at the United States or any of its people tonight. In spite of the fact that most people over 65 live on very modest incomes, we have cut the rate of poverty among our seniors in half because of Social Security. And most important for the present budget debate, if you live to be 65 in this country, our seniors have the highest life expectancy of any group of seniors in the entire world. So I think we got our money's worth. And it shows you what we can do when we go together and when we work together and when we stand together.

Now, don't let anybody fool you, folks. It's just like I said 4 years ago. This election is fundamentally about you and your families, your children, your future, your dreams, and your challenges. It belongs to you. And you have to seize it. The first thing you got to do is show up, be heard, and be counted. The second thing you have to do is to go to your friends and neighbors and get them to do the same thing.

And then what you have to remember is—I will say it again—no country like this has ever existed. Look around this room. Just look at each other. Look at all the differences that leap out at you, the differences in age, the differences in physical condition, the differences in racial and ethnic background. Look at it all. And it all works when we realize that we must go forward together.

I believe more strongly than anything else—you've got to decide—I am telling you there is no challenge out there we cannot meet. But we all got to show up. We have to put all our players on the field. And I want you to start Tuesday. Say to yourselves, your friends, your neighbors, we are going to go out there and take a stand for our future, and we are going to do it together.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:11 p.m. in the gymnasium at New Hampshire College. In his remarks, he referred to Jason Sabatino, student body president, and Donna Soucy, Manchester alderman.

Message on the Observance of Presidents' Day, 1996

February 17, 1996

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Presidents' Day, 1996. I am pleased and proud that so many of our citizens gather at this time each

year to celebrate our nation's rich history and to pay tribute to the office of the Presidency.

America has been blessed with many great and good leaders over the past two centuries. The Presidents we honor with special pride on this day—George Washington and Abraham Lincoln—accepted the burdens of their office at moments of great national challenge and set a shining example for those who were to follow.

As the first President of the United States, Washington played a vital part in defining the role of the Presidency in America's government and national life. With courage and vision, he ensured the steady course of American democracy and, in relinquishing his office at the appointed time, established the peaceful transition of power that has become the envy of other nations around the world.

Abraham Lincoln preserved the Union that Washington helped to create. He guided America through four years of painful and bloody conflict, and at the end of his Presidency, we were still one nation under God, and government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" had not perished from our land.

But Presidents alone cannot ensure America's success or preserve our freedom for future generations. It falls to each and every citizen to take part in the great experiment of American democracy. As we face the unknown challenges and exciting possibilities of a new century, let us renew our resolve to participate actively in the process of government, to stay informed and committed, and to educate our children about the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. In this way we will keep faith with the great men whose service and sacrifice we honor on this day.

BILL CLINTON

Statement on the Railroad Accident in Silver Spring, Maryland
February 17, 1996

Today all Americans extend our thoughts and prayers to the families of the people who died in the train crash last night. We are working hard to find out what caused this tragedy.

Several young men and women who died were Job Corps trainees, returning from a training center in West Virginia—taking a journey of personal responsibility. They were working hard to better themselves, and we salute their lives as we mourn their deaths.

Statement on the Death of Pat Brown
February 17, 1996

Hillary and I were saddened to learn of Gov. Pat Brown's death.

I am very grateful for the warm friendship and wise counsel he generously extended to me and for what he meant to America.

More than any other individual, he built modern California, with its great universities, highways, and vital water system.

He loved people, and he loved politics. Always positive and optimistic, he believed in the promise of America, and he brought out the best in people, because they knew he was committed to their future.

He was blessed with a wonderful wife and five children, who carried on his traditions of public service. Our thoughts and prayers are with Bernice, Jerry, Kathleen, Barbara, and Cynthia, and Pat Brown's grandchildren and great-grandchildren. May his great heart and good spirit be with them always.

Remarks at a Democratic Dinner in Nashua, New Hampshire
February 17, 1996

Thank you very much. Please relax. [*Laughter*] I have had a wonderful day today, the second wonderful day in just 2 weeks in New Hampshire. And to all of you who had anything to do with that day or the one before, to all of you who helped me in 1992 in the primary and then to win this State in the general election, which surprised everybody in the world, I want to thank you.

I thank chairman Joe Keefe and your vice chair, Mary Chambers, and my dear friend Anita Freedman, and Keith Regli and the other officers of the Democratic Party, and your DNC members, Terry Shumaker and Stephanie Powers and Ambassador Bruno— it has a nice ring to it, don't you think—[*laughter*]—for their service to our party. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Congressman Dick Swett and John Rauh for being willing to fight and struggle to guarantee that we win that United States Senate seat for the Democrats in November.

Somebody asked me this morning when I was coming up here, what in the world I was doing going to New Hampshire. They said, "You don't have an opponent." I said, "Well, for once I'd like to win the New Hampshire primary." [*Laughter*] "And it seems that this might be a good opportunity, so I thought I would go up and try."

When I was a young fellow, when I ran for Governor the first time, I had my—sort of unfortunate thing that happens to anyone in public life, where you plan something, and you think it's going to be so wonderful, and it doesn't make any news because something else happens on that day. And that happened to me. I had helped all these tomato farmers in my hometown—my home State—in a little town in south Arkansas, who were working—legal migrant workers—to improve their conditions, to give them decent places to live, and in the process, to be sure they could get a permit to get these people to help them. And it saved this little town that was going to otherwise dry up and blow away.

So they invited me to town one day when I was campaigning for Governor. And unbeknownst to me they had decided to have a parade in my honor. And they had a banner over the street. There are about 400 people in this town. It was hardly a metropolis. It was sort of your standard Arkansas or New Hampshire town. But I was blown away. I mean, you know, I was 32 years old. I thought it was pretty hot stuff to have a parade down the street. [*Laughter*]

And the whole—the high school band—the schools let out—the high school band led me down the street. Everybody was laughing and screaming and crying for joy. And the next day there was not a single word about it in the newspaper—[*laughter*]—because something else happened in the Governor's race. So I spent the next umpty-dump months until the election saying, "You should have seen the crowd in Hermitage." [*Laughter*] People made fun of me. They'd say every time, you know, "Just punch him, and he'll automatically say, 'You should have seen'—like one of those toy dolls—'You should have seen the' "—so for the rest of my life I'll be saying, "You should have seen the crowd in Keene today in New Hampshire."

At first when I arrived there, you know, because I waited so long this morning—I got up at a quarter to 6 and I was ready to go at 7 and they said we couldn't leave until 8. And then we got to the airport, and they said we couldn't leave. And we stayed there for 2 hours while the winds whipped across the runway, and they wouldn't let me take off. And we were very late to Rochester, but at least they were warm. And I call in and say, "I'm coming; please wait," and they did, and it was quite wonderful.

But when I got to Keene, they'd been standing out in the cold for an hour and a half. And at first I thought, they'll have to leave; they won't be able to take it. And then when I saw the crowd and I thought, my God, they're frozen there; they can't leave if they wanted to go—[*laughter*]—then I realized that, sure enough, they actually believed in what we were all doing and they were there to stand up for what they believed in and to fight for a better future. And it was very—[*applause*].

Let me say to all of you one thing I said 4 years ago that everyone needs reminding of now. These elections are not about the candidates; they're about the people. The Presi-

dential election is nothing more or less than the most important hiring decision the American people can make. And ultimately, the hiring decision must, therefore, turn on whether the employers show up to make the decision, first of all, and secondly, on what their vision is for where they want our common enterprise to go.

When I came here 4 years ago, I was concerned that our country was not changing as fast as we should change or moving in the right direction, given what I thought the future was going to present; that we were neither going to seize the opportunities or meet the challenges of the 21st century. And I had a very simple message, which I still share and think about every day. I believe it is wrong for any person to be deprived of the opportunity to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities. I believe everybody should have a chance to work for the American dream.

I believe it is wrong for this country to be divided in artificial ways, in ways that make us all less than we ought to be. And I believe it would be a tragedy if we were to walk away from the responsibilities that we have now, having won the cold war, to lead the world toward greater peace and prosperity and freedom. I believed then and I believe now that we have to pursue a simple strategy in which we work together to create more opportunity, in which we work together and demand more responsibility from ourselves and from each other, and in which we create in this country a genuine spirit of community.

I do not believe, as I told you 4 years ago, that the answers to all of our challenges can be found in Government, nor do I believe Government is at all points even the most important player in our great national drama. But neither do I believe we can go back to the time when the American people were told they should just fend for themselves. That would be a terrible mistake. And down deep inside, almost every American knows that would be a terrible mistake.

A couple of days ago I flew out to Washington and Oregon, and I'm sure you've seen on the television the absolutely horrible floods they have been enduring. And I went into one of the little towns in Washington State, just across the Oregon border, that had been badly flooded out. And I rode around town with the mayor, who had been the police chief for 20 years or something before he got elected mayor. There's 3,300 people in this town. And these folks were just, you know, like most folks here. And he took me to a block that had been wiped out. And we went into a home of a 70-year-old couple who had been married for, I don't know, nearly 50 years. They had lost every single thing they had except a few pictures and a couple of pieces of furniture. The man was hard of hearing, and he had even lost his hearing aid in the flood. The water just rushed it away.

But when I showed up to meet this fellow, he said "You know, I'm 70, and I've never met a President. It was nearly worth losing my home to do it." [*Laughter*] And he said, "Besides that, you know, it's fitting because now I can show you to my indoor swimming pool." [*Laughter*] It was unbelievable. How can this man laugh? He's lost everything.

I saw another man well up into his sixties, a retired employee of a utility company who was a Norwegian immigrant, naturalized citizen, who worked in that flood for 8 hours with a jackhammer with a cracked rib. Now I don't know if any of you have ever tried to hold a jackhammer where it was supposed to go, but it's not easy on a good day if you're big, strapping, strong, and know what you're doing. And I thought about that. And he did it without a second thought. It was just his duty.

And I saw all these stories that you always hear whenever there's a natural disaster. But the most important point I want to make to you is, on the way out, this 70-year-old man said to me, he said, "Boy, I'm glad you came, and I've enjoyed talking to you." But he said, "Don't you think it's too bad that we don't behave this way toward each other all the time?" And that's what I want to say to you.

This is a very great country. I know we get down, we get frustrated. But when I talk to other world leaders, they often ask me, they say, "Oh, we see these opinion polls about how Americans say the country is going in the wrong direction or they're pessimistic or they don't believe in their political system." And they say, "After all, you have the highest job growth rate, the highest rate of new business creation, the greatest amount of opportunity for individuals, the lowest deficit as a percentage of your income, and the strongest sense of security and defense of any country in the world. How could your people be down?"

I know this is a perplexing time. When I was here 4 years ago, if I had told you, for

example, that 3 years from now I'll come back and in only 3 years I will have kept my commitment to cut the deficit in half, and I'll be almost there on our commitment to provide 8 million new jobs—we're at 7.7 million—and credit will be more readily available than it used to be; and the Small Business Administration will cut its budget by 40 percent and double its loan volume; and we will start selling more products abroad than we are importing from abroad, so at least the growth rate in exports will be greater than growth rate in imports. We're closing the gap. And the unemployment rate in New Hampshire will be under 3½ percent; it will be less than half of what it was at election time last year, but there will still be uncertainty out there about our economy because of the downsizing of big companies and because there's still a lot of people who are working hard and never get a raise; and because there's still people who can't afford to have health insurance for their families, you would have found that hard to believe, I think.

It is happening because we're living in a very different world that is absolutely exploding with opportunities and still full of challenges. That's why I talked as I did in the State of the Union.

And you could say that the answer is to run away from the world: "We'll just pretend the modern world's not happening. We'll put a wall up around America, and we'll just run away from it." But that won't work. The answer is to run through the barriers until everybody can have the opportunity now that most people do but a lot of people don't. That's the answer.

Technology, for example, is a mixed blessing for people who can't access it, but it's an unmixed blessing for all of our students. When I was in Concord the other day, a couple of days after they'd connected all the classrooms in the city to the Internet, and I saw in, I think, the school with the lowest per capita income in the city, all these kids that were taking computer equipment home at night and working on it, I realized that technology for them was a great equalizer.

When I was in Union City, New Jersey, a couple of days ago, a school district that was almost closed down by the State, a district with low per capita income, a lot of immigrants, and I saw that a partnership between the government, the school district—Bell Atlantic had put a computer not only in every school and classroom but in every home so that immigrant parents were E-mailing the principal to find out how their kids were doing. All of a sudden, this desperately poor school had a higher attendance rate, a lower dropout rate, a higher graduation rate, and higher test scores than the State average in one of the wealthiest States in the United States of America. We can make this new world work for all Americans. And that's what I am trying to do.

There's no point in my reiterating here for all of you—because you keep up—what I said in the State of the Union. I outlined what I believe are the challenges for the future and how I want to balance the budget. I'm not against balancing the budget. We—our administration, the Democrats, the Democratic Party—cut the deficit in half alone. And don't you ever forget it—alone.

And we took a lot of other tough decisions. But we have to do this in a way that is consistent with our values, with our obligations to our parents and to our children, with our obligations to the environment and to our future. That's what we have to do.

And we have to face the challenges of the future. And we have to be willing to take tough decisions. But when we do, and we turn out to be right, we shouldn't be ashamed to go tell people we did the right thing, it was unpopular. I'll just give you one example, because one of your Congressmen paid a terrible price for it.

We got beat up pretty bad for the Brady bill and for the assault weapons ban. And a lot of good, rural people, who work hard and are honest citizens, were driven away from our party in the November 1994 elections because they were convinced that we were out to take away their right to have their weapons to go hunting. Well, as I have said all over New Hampshire, we had a great duck season in Arkansas, and you had a good deer season in New Hampshire, and everybody that wanted to went out and shot their ducks and their deer with the same gun they did last year. So the people that told those folks that we were messing with them were not telling them the truth. They did not lose any guns. But I'll tell you who did lose guns. There were over 40,000 criminals who could not get guns because the Brady bill is the law of the land.

So it makes a difference. It makes a difference that the family and medical leave law passed. It makes a difference that we doubled

the tax break for lower income working families so nobody works full time and is still in poverty if they have children in the home. These things make a difference. It makes a difference that we improved the student loan program, extended it to more people, made it easier to repay, and still cut the default rate in half.

It makes a difference that the welfare rolls are going down, and we're giving States a lot more permission to move people from welfare to work, but we're also collecting record amounts of child support payments for parents and their children. These things make a difference.

It makes a difference to your children's future that there are no nuclear weapons pointed at the children of the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age. And I thank Chairman Keefe for what he said about the efforts of the United States in the Middle East, to Haiti, to South Africa, to Northern Ireland. And now in this cold winter, the men and women of our Armed Forces are in Bosnia helping to stop a war of madness and to bring peace and decency and honor back to that war-torn land. And I'm proud of them.

What I want to say to you is that we know what we have to do, and we know what we believe in. And now the American people know that all the old cliches—"tax and spend," "soft on crime," "weak on welfare"—that it's all a bunch of bull. And that—[*applause*]—"weak on defense," "no concern about foreign policy," all that's a bunch of bull. But what is not a bunch of bull is that this country has enormous opportunities and enormous challenges. And we can only meet them together. And we need our Government not to be a big bureaucratic obstacle to progress. We need it to be an entrepreneurial, creative, vigorous, but strong supporter and partner of progress. That's what we need.

And you know, I've been telling this ever since I read it in James Carville's book, but—[*laughter*]—and it's not funny even. But I had never thought about it until I read it in the book, that people always bad-mouth Government. You know, we've been doing it since we started. I mean, it's as old as the Founders. After all, half our people came here to our shores to get away from oppressive government. And the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the whole thing is set up to keep Government from treading on us too much.

So if we're not careful, we just uncritically act like every governmental action is messing up a one-car parade. But the truth is, in the last 30 years, half of your tax money has been spent on just three things: Social Security, Medicare, and national defense. Did you get your money's worth? We won the cold war. The elderly poverty rate was cut in half. And if you live to be 65, our seniors have the longest life expectancy of any country in the world. I think we did what was required of us, and we got our money's worth.

Where would we be today without the Head Start program? I was just—where would we be today without the student loan program, without the college aid program? I was just at New Hampshire College, and the chairman of the board there told me that 90 percent of the students at that school are getting Federal aid to help them go to college. That's a good investment. We're going to get our money back. They're going to make us stronger.

And so I ask you to do what you can to get a surprising vote out on Tuesday, just to stand up for what is good and decent and positive and right about this country and for what is necessary to be done so that we can become all we ought to become. I ask you to go out there because we do have a big opponent. It is cynicism. It is the willingness to believe that public life is always the lowest common denominator, that nothing matters, really, in the end.

It is the vulnerabilities to those strategies that would divide us when we desperately need to be united. Those are our enemies. And frankly, that's not a Government problem. Cynicism in any form in human endeavor is a cheap, lousy excuse for inaction by the person who has the luxury of being cynical.

In Portland, Oregon, the other day, when they told them that the city of Portland was going to be flooded because the floodwall would not hold, in one day, 1,000 people showed up and built the floodwall another foot and a half higher. They had no luxury, no time, no effort, no opportunity to be cynical. And I go back to what that old man said, "It's just too bad we can't act like that all the time."

And that's what I want you to do Tuesday. That's what I want you to do between now and November. I want you to recover the spirit, the genius of the New Hampshire town hall meeting, of all those visits we had in 1992. I want you to make people believe again that they

can make a difference. Because if we're going to be partners, it all begins with the citizens.

Harry Truman said when he went home to Independence that he was going to now have the most exalted title you could have in the United States, the title of citizen. This is a State where citizenship has a reputation of being honed to a fine art. It's a State now where people are being given an opportunity to see that there are now alternative visions of change for the future, very different roadmaps to the future. If 1992 was about change versus no change, 1996 is about two very different visions of change.

I have done my best to be there for you, as my old saying goes, 'til the last dog dies. But now you have got to be there for your friends and for your neighbors. I am telling you, I know, I have seen the world as it is, and I believe I understand where it is going. We are on the verge of the era of greatest possibility our country has ever known, but we have very serious challenges that we have to meet to get there if everybody is going to have their shot at the American dream and if we're going to go there together.

I believe we will. I know I am an optimist, but when I look at you, when I looked at the faces that I saw today in those three stops I made before I got here, when I know what is really in the heart of the American people, and when I understand that we've been around for nearly 220 years because most of the time we do the right thing—if you will go out there and do what you can, yes, it will advance the cause of our party but far, far more important, it will advance the future of our country and these children that are here.

Do it. Do it for me. And one time, let me win the New Hampshire primary. [*Laughter*]

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:19 p.m. at the Sheraton Tara Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to George Charles Bruno, U.S. Ambassador to Belize.

Statement on the Terrorist Attack in London, United Kingdom

February 19, 1996

It is with great sadness that I once again express my condolences to the victims of an IRA bomb in London. These cowardly acts of terrorism are the work of individuals determined to thwart the will of the people of Northern Ireland. They want peace. I condemn these acts of violence in the strongest possible terms and hope those responsible are brought swiftly to justice.

Over the last 17 months, the people of Northern Ireland have tasted peace and grown accustomed to the blessings of a normal life. We must not let the men of the past ruin the future of the children in Northern Ireland. The Irish and British Governments are engaged in intensive efforts to move the peace process forward. I strongly believe that is the path to follow.

For our part, we will continue our dialog with the Irish and British Governments and the parties to support their efforts to restore the cease-fire and find a lasting and just peace. We look forward to the summit expected at the end of the month between the Irish and British Governments. I am hopeful they will find a way to peace.

Remarks on the Observance of Eid al-Fitr

February 20, 1996

On behalf of all Americans, I want to extend my personal greetings to the entire Muslim community here in the United States and around the world as it celebrates the Eid al-Fitr.

This week marks the end of the holy month of Ramadan. It is a time for rejoicing and celebration, but it is also a time for reflection and rededication. On this occasion, let us rekindle our commitment to the cause of peace among all the peoples of the Earth. If we are dedicated in our belief and constant in our labor, we can build a better future, one of cooperation, understanding, and compassion, for ourselves and for our children.

Let us also remember the values of family and community, as well as our responsibility for those who are less fortunate, ideals that lie at the heart of Ramadan. These principles of personal commitment to faith and to society truly are universal values.

So as the new Moon ushers in this holy celebration, let me say to all who follow the faith of Islam here in the United States and around the world the traditional greeting: *As-Salaamu Alaykum,* may peace be with you, and may God grant you health and prosperity now and in the years ahead.

NOTE: The President's remarks were recorded at 5:26 p.m. on February 16 in the Map Room at the White House for later broadcast. This item was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 20.

Remarks at the Swearing-In Ceremony for Kweisi Mfume as President of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

February 20, 1996

Thank you very much, Myrlie Evers-Williams, for your introduction, for your remarks, and most importantly, for your willingness to take on what appeared to be a thankless and could well have been a no-win situation in seizing the helm of the NAACP and helping to bring it to this moment of great celebration and unity. The entire Nation is in your debt, and we thank you.

To the distinguished Members of Congress, the mayors who are here, the clergy, members of the administration; to the young people who have performed and the family of Congressman Mfume. Kweisi told me today before we came out that this is a celebration of rebirth and renewal. And the Vice President and I were standing there amidst his—four of his five strapping young sons; the other is in school or he would be here, showing that he still has his priorities in order. [*Laughter*] He said, "This is going to be a celebration of rebirth and renewal. And so I have given this over to the young people and to Roger Wilkins." [*Laughter*] And I must say, as I heard Jaimie speak, and as I heard Jason speak for the Arkansas contingent here, and as I heard Ayinde speak—by the way, I memorized that poem, and I never spoke it half that well—and then I heard the Morgan State Choir sing, I thought this really is about rebirth and renewal and energy and youth. And I kept cutting my speech shorter and shorter. [*Laughter*]

I just want to make a couple of brief points. This country does still need the NAACP. Oh, we are here in the Justice Department today because of what the NAACP has meant to us. When I was the age of these young people here, I can remember what it was like, still, to have a church burned in your home State, to have people intimidated away from pursuing their legal rights. We are here because of what the NAACP has meant to America. To me and to Al Gore, growing up as white southerners in the South, we loved the NAACP. It made us believe that something good was going to come at the end of the civil rights struggle. It made us believe that we could all live together and grow together.

But we know today in this age of incredible possibility for our country, when we have the African-American unemployment rate in single digits for the first time in 20 years, 100,000 new African-American owned businesses—we know still that more than half our people are working harder just to keep up. We know still that, as we glory in these young people being in college, that the college-going rate is going up, but the college-going rate among young people who come from the poorest fifth of our families has leveled off and going down because

of the costs. And we know we must never go back to the days of the black church bombings, the other terrible acts of racial terrorism. And so I want to say, too, we need the NAACP today not only because there are still economic problems and elementary social divisions. We have to do everything we can to see that we determine, in this Justice Department, who created these recent crimes and all of us stand together against any kind of return to that.

Let me say as I look across this crowd and I see so many people—I don't want to call names, but I want to say just one thing about our public life. I see Reverend Jackson and Mrs. King and Dexter and Congressman and Secretary Kemp standing there, sitting there. One of the men who wanted to replace me in the Presidential election this year had to undergo the agony of having leaflets passed out against his Asian-American wife. That is wrong. We still need the NAACP, and no party can tolerate that sort of thing. And none of our people should. We're all the same in this country, and we still haven't learned that yet.

If you look at where we are and where we're going, we can never create opportunity for all Americans who are willing to assume the responsibility to seize it unless we determine to go into the future together. That's what the NAACP must remind us of. That is the great lesson of America, and unfortunately, not every American has learned it yet. And until we all learn it and live by it, we will need the NAACP.

Let me also say that when Kweisi called me to tell me that he was going to take this job, in the words of the old country song, I didn't know whether to kill myself or go bowling. [*Laughter*] I had become almost emotionally dependent upon him being in the Congress—[*laughter*]—supporting me when I needed it, reprimanding me when I needed it, whether I knew it or not. [*Laughter*] I never have much time for television, but whenever I channel-surfed and saw him doing his talk show on television, I always stopped and marveled at how well he related to all those different kinds of people. He is a uniquely gifted man, with a personal history that shimmers with the promise of America and the possibility of personal renewal and the virtue of never giving up on yourself or your family or your common possibility.

I can't help but say that in the continuing struggle we have to rescue our young people. When you see these young people, you know there is nothing that they cannot do. And when you see so many others we are losing, when the crime rate goes down in America, the juvenile violence rate goes up, when drug use goes down in America and drug use among juveniles goes up, you ask yourself, there's got to be something wrong here when not all of our children don't do this and don't have these opportunities and don't shimmer with their own energy and integrity and possibility. That's what Kweisi Mfume will help to bring to America through the NAACP.

Because he is a Congressman from Maryland and we have so many of his colleagues here, I think we must also say that a lot of our hearts were broken when those eight young Job Corps trainees from Maryland perished in the train crash just a few days ago. Like most of you, I sat there, a helpless citizen, watching it on television, thinking about all of the promise of those children. But let me remind you that they were given a chance, and we should remember them and honor them by determining to give every child who needs a chance the chance they were given. And that is why we need the NAACP and why we need Kweisi Mfume to lead it. We should honor that.

Let me finally say that his constituents have given him the greatest recommendation possible for this job in what is going on in the effort to succeed him. [*Laughter*] You can tell how good a person is by whether others want to do what he once did or she once did. We had a mayor in my hometown once spend his entire term offering to fix parking tickets in nongrammatical ways, and when he left office, it took us months to find anyone to run. [*Laughter*] When he announced he was leaving, 32 people showed up; it's almost impossible to sort out the election process. It's a great tribute to the standard of public service set by this Congressman. I am laughing about it; I am dead serious: 28 Democrats and 4 Republicans showed up because they know it means something to represent the American people in the United States Congress because of the way he represented the people of his district.

So I say to you, my fellow Americans, as someone who is in the personal debt of the NAACP, and as your President, we need the NAACP. I thank every person here who worked with Myrlie to bring it back together to this point, to shed the old baggage and to go forward with a clear mind and a free heart. And I thank

my good friend Congressman Mfume for his willingness to lay down his political career for even higher public service. It is a wise choice. It will give us a better future. And we are all here to celebrate as I ask the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals, Judge Harry Edwards, to come forward and administer the oath to the new president and CEO of the NAACP.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:38 p.m. in the Great Hall at the Department of Justice. In his remarks, he referred to Myrlie Evers-Williams, chair, board of directors, NAACP; Roger Wilkins, author and professor, George Mason University; Jaimie Smith, student, Baltimore School of the Arts; Jason Hines, student, Morgan State University; Ayinde Jean-Baptiste, student, Whitney Young Magnet High School; civil rights leader Rev. Jesse Jackson; Coretta Scott King, founder, and Dexter King, president and chief executive officer, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change, Inc.; and former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Jack Kemp.

Statement on the Balkan Peace Process

February 20, 1996

This afternoon I met with my senior national security team to review the situation in Bosnia. I received a report on this weekend's meeting in Rome with the Presidents of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia.

I am pleased that in Rome, the Balkan leaders recommitted themselves to keeping peace on track. The parties pledged to resume contacts with the NATO-led Implementation Force, to reunify Sarajevo on schedule, to release all remaining war prisoners, to remove any remaining foreign forces, to cooperate in the investigation and prosecution of war crimes, and to strengthen the Bosnian-Croat Federation and reunify Mostar.

I have instructed my foreign policy team to continue efforts to convince all the parties that their Rome commitments must be implemented faithfully and without delay. The road to peace is a hard road, but it is the right road. We are proud to be part of the NATO force, and I am pleased to be meeting with NATO Secretary General Solana today.

While serious problems remain, it is important to keep the situation in Bosnia in perspective. After nearly 4 years of war, peace will not take hold overnight. We should not lose sight of the remarkable progress that has been made since Dayton. The cease-fire is holding. The zones of separation are in place. And in Sarajevo, once a dying city haunted by snipers and shells, the markets are filled. People are back on the streets. Builders are repairing shops and small businesses in the center of town. Sarajevo has come back to life, with a future for all of its people.

These are the kinds of tangible benefits that will help give all the people of Bosnia a greater stake in peace than in war. Tomorrow, I am sending to Capitol Hill a supplemental appropriations request for $820 million to support IFOR and its mission. This includes $200 million to assist the essential process of civilian implementation—specifically, economic reconstruction and reform, deployment of international police monitors, and demining. I will work with Congress to secure these funds as quickly as possible. The sooner the Bosnian people recover the blessings of a normal life, the surer the chances for a peace that endures.

I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the enormous dedication of Assistant Secretary Holbrooke, who has spearheaded the peace effort for us since last August. As Ambassador Holbrooke steps down, I want to thank him for his service to our Nation. The people of Bosnia and American people owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude. My new Special Adviser for Implementation of the Dayton accords, Ambassador Robert Gallucci, one of our most experienced and successful diplomats, joined our meeting today and will continue our mission of moving the peace process forward.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the United Nations Agreement on Conservation and Management of Fisheries

February 20, 1996

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, with Annexes ("the Agreement"), which was adopted at United Nations Headquarters in New York by consensus of the United Nations Conference on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks on August 4, 1995, and signed by the United States on December 4, 1995. I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the Agreement.

The Agreement represents a considerable achievement for the United States in promoting better stewardship of living marine resources. It strikes a sound balance between the interests of coastal States in protecting offshore fishery resources and those of States whose fishing vessels operate on the high seas. If widely ratified and properly implemented, the Agreement should significantly improve the prospects for sustainable fisheries worldwide.

The Agreement builds directly upon, and strengthens, the fishery provisions contained in the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea ("the Convention"), which I transmitted to the Senate for advice and consent on October 6, 1994. As such, the Agreement further reflects the central role of the Convention in governing the maritime relations of the international community.

Perhaps more than any other nation, the United States stands to benefit from widespread adherence to this Agreement. The Agreement will help to ensure that the harvesting of fish by vessels of other nations in waters beyond our exclusive economic zone does not undermine our domestic management of fisheries within U.S. jurisdiction. In addition, by promoting sound conservation practices generally, the Agreement can restore and maintain productive ocean fisheries for the benefit of American consumers and for U.S. fishing vessels wherever they operate.

With regard to disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Agreement, I intend to choose a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII of the Convention, as recommended in the accompanying report of the Department of State.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 20, 1996.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the National Endowment for Democracy

February 20, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 504(h) of Public Law 98–164, as amended (22 U.S.C. 4413(i)), I transmit herewith the 12th Annual Report of the National Endowment for Democracy, which covers fiscal year 1995.

As the report demonstrates, the National Endowment for Democracy remains at the forefront of our efforts to expand and consolidate democratic gains around the globe. The strong bipartisan support the Endowment continues to

receive reflects our Nation's steadfast commitment to the promotion of democracy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

February 20, 1996.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine

February 21, 1996

1996 Election

Q. Pat Buchanan said today congressional Republicans shouldn't cut Medicare and veterans' benefits. Do you agree?

President Clinton. Good for him.

Q. What's your reaction to what happened last night? There seems to be a split in the Republican Party.

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I'm very gratified by what happened in the Democratic primary last night. I haven't seen the final numbers, but we may have made history there, even for an incumbent President without appreciable opposition, compared to anything that's happened in the last 50 years if the vote holds up. And we had a good turnout, too. And I think that's evidence that what the American people really want is someone who will take a positive approach to the future, bring us together, and come out with the continuing movement, continuing ideas that will bring us together and move us forward.

So I'm satisfied with the election, and I'm going to let the Republicans and the pundits deal with their business. You know, this country doesn't need another pundit, and I need to go on and be President.

Q. Are you surprised by the Republican outcome, Mr. President?

President Clinton. I had no—I didn't know what to expect. Since I didn't know what was going to happen, I couldn't be surprised.

Q. Do you regard Mr. Buchanan as too extreme to be a mainstream candidate?

President Clinton. I regard this whole process as one for the Republicans to work out. I'm going to be President and go out there and tell the people what I'm trying to do and what I would do if given a greater opportunity to do it. And I'm not going to get involved in their business or yours. That's your business and theirs.

Ukrainian Aircraft

Q. A question for Mr. Kuchma. Mr. Kuchma, are you commenting at all on the allegations that aircraft from state-owned factories in your country have gone to the Cali cartel for their use?

President Kuchma. First of all, it was owned not by the state but by a company. And I think that the aircraft not only of Ukraine but of all other countries are used on the same basis all over the world. They are used on the basis of leasing.

And I think that the Colombian side should take all the responsibility on that, and in fact, I have instructed so that to find all the reasons and all the deepest backgrounds of that issue, though I don't think there was any blame on our side.

I think that international mechanisms should be worked out so that we face less issues of this sort of misusage of aircraft and so on and so forth. So we are always asked this sort of question only after their usage, but we have to do everything possible to prevent this usage and so that to avoid this sort of asking. Though according to our information, our aircraft are not involved in this sort of affairs.

President Clinton. Thank you all. Have a nice day, you guys. You have a decent day outside. Why don't we have a national recess? [*Laughter*]

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

President Kuchma. I would like to add one thing to that question, that our Secret Service has addressed yours so that you consider this issue together.

President Kuchma's Visit

President Clinton. Let me say to our friends in the Ukrainian press, it's a great honor for me to have President Kuchma here. The United States is strongly committed to a sovereign, independent, prosperous Ukraine.

I admire the difficult and courageous steps that President Kuchma and Ukraine have taken toward democracy and economic reform. I know this has been a difficult time, and I want to see the world community, including the United States, do everything possible to support Ukraine in its efforts to maintain democracy and to restore real prosperity and opportunity to the people.

President Kuchma. It's a pleasure to listen to such nice words addressed to Ukraine and its people. And I'd like to confirm the only thing that from the very beginning the United States have always been a guarantor for economic and political transformations in Ukraine, the guarantor for building and shaping all the civilized, democratic society in Ukraine. This is our priority assignment, and we are happy to be together with the United States in this respect.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:20 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on the Unveiling of the Domestic Violence Hotline and an Exchange With Reporters

February 21, 1996

The President. Thank you, Candice. Thank you, Secretary Shalala. Thank you, Senator Kennedy, Senator Leahy, Representative Conyers. I want to thank Bonnie Campbell for doing such a great job as the Director of the Violence Against Women Office at the Justice Department. And I thank the Attorney General and Associate Attorney General John Schmidt and the others at Justice who have supported this endeavor for the first time. I want to thank you, Ellen Fisher, and your entire team for your hard work and your leadership. We are counting on you.

I want to thank all the brave women in this audience who have survived the horrors and the fears of domestic violence and who have gone on to work, like Candice, as advocates. And I want to thank the men and the women who are here today, some in law enforcement, some in other walks of life, who are here because they believe in this effort and they want to support it.

I was just sitting here thinking how many of you had the same reaction to Candice that I did. She sort of stepped up here and started talking; it sounded like another ordinary speech—I've done thousands of these now in the last 22 years—and it was almost hypnotic, just a calm, even-voice narrative that seemed almost unbelievable except for those of you who have lived through it so often.

When I gave the State of the Union Address and asked the American people to look beyond the present battle over the budget to the real challenges facing our country, not just our Government but our country, I pointed out that our first and foremost challenge now and perhaps forever will be to have good, strong families and to give childhood back to all the children in this country. Most of us have known the joys of—some of the joys of family life. And anybody who's been in a family knows that none of them are perfect. But there's a world of difference between a family with its joys and its problems and a family terrorized by violence and abuse.

For all the economic problems facing poor children in America, I would rather them be poor in homes with loving parents than have their childhoods robbed by violence in their homes. So I say again to all of you, this is not a women's issue; this is an issue for families and for children and for men as well. And it is an American challenge that we have to face.

This issue has been swept under the rug for too long. We have tried to take it out into the

daylight, to let people talk about it, to give people a chance to find courage in the efforts of others and to know where they can find help. That's what the Violence Against Women Act in the 1994 crime bill was all about. And again, I thank Bonnie Campbell and all those at Justice who have supported those endeavors.

It's also what our efforts in the crime bill to train people locally to be more sensitive to this are all about. We're making progress now. We're actually getting a core group of police officers and prosecutors and judges who really understand this problem and how it should be dealt with. This past September, Federal prosecutors used the Violence Against Women Act to help ensure that a man convicted of severe violence against his wife was actually sentenced to life in prison. So I think that we need to continue this effort.

The second thing we need to do is to make sure that women who are struggling to take control of their own lives know how to do it. And for all the reasons that Secretary Shalala said, this number—this hotline will make a difference to women everywhere, whether they're isolated in rural areas, whether they're in big cities without enough money for a quarter for a telephone call; everywhere that people can see this number they will be able to use it.

So I guess what I'd like to do now is to wrap up my remarks and say that we're really, all of us, here for people who aren't here. And my greatest hope about this press conference is that people out there across America will see it tonight or hear about it, and if they are victims of domestic abuse or if they suspect that someone they know and care about is a victim of domestic abuse, they will pick up the phone and call this number: 1–800–799–CARE.

Secretary Donna Shalala. SAFE.

The President. SAFE, I mean. [*Laughter*] I can't read. Maybe it will get overused and we'll have to have two. [*Laughter*]

If this hotline—if one person does this and it saves their lives, if one person winds up safe, it will have been worth the effort. But all of you in this room know that it's not one person, that there are thousands and thousands and thousands of people out there.

I'm going to be very interested to see what the report is after 1 month and 2 months and 3 months. And I'm going to ask to get a report: how many calls, how many people out there, feeling alone and lonely and bereft and abandoned will dial that; how many people will commit to memory 799–SAFE and dial it, because I believe that all of us, even those of you who are advocates, may well be surprised by the sheer numbers, the volume of calls.

So I ask you as you leave today to reaffirm our common commitment to an end to domestic violence; to reaffirm our common commitment to saying to people, you must not raise your hand in violence against members of your family in your home; and to reaffirm our commitment to get this number everywhere. I want schoolchildren to know that there is a 1–800–799–SAFE. I want every police officer to know there's a 1–800–799–SAFE. I want every mayor to know it. I want every church leader to know it. I want it to be emblazoned in the synagogues and all the houses of worship in America. I want people to know this number. This is a way that we can bring the marvels of modern technology to solve a very old problem in a profoundly human way.

So again, I say, I thank all of you for your efforts. As you know, it means a lot to me personally. But it will only count if everyone in America who needs to know this number, knows it; and if everybody who needs to know it, knows it and feels that they can use it; and then that the people on the other end of the line do their job. I'm convinced that people on the other end of the line will do their job. [*Laughter*] And I'm convinced those of you who are out there in the fields will continue to do your job.

So I ask you to celebrate today, but remember, there's a lot of doctors and teachers and police officers and others that we need to gather into this great American family committed to doing away with this problem. I think—I will say again, if we can do this, and then we can make some progress on the real issue, which is getting every man in America to make a personal pledge never to raise a hand in violence in the home, this is a problem that America has that can actually be solved. And I think all of you are going to hasten the day when we do it.

Thank you very much.

Q. Mr. President, Can we have a question on this topic, sir?

The President. Yes.

Q. Following up on what the speaker said, could you or your family or your mother have benefited from a service like this when you were

growing up, considering the problems that were in your household?

The President. The honest answer is, I don't know. I think that—I think, yes, because at that time in our country's history, most women were too embarrassed to talk about it. They didn't know that anybody else—they didn't know if anybody else had the problem, and if they did, they had no way of finding out who they were. And I think that the sense of shame, the ambivalence that "Maybe somehow this must be partly my fault," or "This is my burden to bear," that "This is not anything that I can get out of"—I think that's how it would have been most helpful.

I had a—my mother was one of the most remarkably resilient and self-reliant people I knew, but I think she came of age at a time when women in America simply didn't know that there was any way out of this. And I bet you there's still a lot of women out there who just don't know that there's any way out of this. So I would think that would have been the most important thing that would have helped us.

Thank you.

Audience member. May I ask you a question also?

The President. Sure.

Audience member. I wonder if you could just take a moment and speak to the fact that with the billions of women who are battered, those that are the least addressed are those that are deaf, and that there is also a TDD line——

The President. Oh, I'm sorry.

Audience member. ——and maybe a special thank-you to Senator Kennedy for seeing that that happened. [*Laughter*]

The President. Thank you. Would you like to say something about it?

That's the TDD line, and for the last couple of years we've done some things to point out what telephone technology is doing to bring communication to the deaf. And this TDD line is 1–800–787–3224.

I thank you for mentioning that.

Thank you. Thank you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:38 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Candice Slaughter, domestic violence victim, and Ellen Fisher, hotline director.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting Budget Rescissions
February 21, 1996

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

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report three rescission proposals of budgetary resources, totaling $820 million. These rescissions offset the emergency FY 1996 Defense supplemental appropriations, which support the Bosnia peace implementation force. The rescissions affect the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The report detailing the proposed rescissions was published in the *Federal Register* on March 5.

Remarks to the White House Conference on Empowerment Zones
February 22, 1996

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Hannah and Vinnie and the Congressmen, the mayors, county officials, and others here. Can you believe the Vice President asked me in front of all of you about this trade deal? [*Laughter*] I figured that the—you know, in this league there's only two teams. [*Laughter*] Nobody on their team I want to trade him for. [*Laughter*]

I'm a lot more worried about the other team treating him like a free agent, making him an offer he can't refuse. [*Laughter*]

I want to say to Vinnie Johnson, all of us saw him play on television with Detroit, but I was in my very first term as Governor of Arkansas when he was a star at Baylor. So I want to say here in front of all of you, I forgive him for all the points he scored against my team—[*laughter*]—when I was trying to succeed at everything, in every endeavor. I thank him, I thank Hannah for their stunning examples. I want to thank the Vice President and Secretary Cisneros and Assistant Secretary Cuomo and Secretary Glickman and all the people in our other departments who have worked to make this communityempowerment effort a success.

I had believed in this concept long before I became President, long before I ran for President. But to make it work in the way that it has worked required an incredible amount of planning and discipline and followup and effort. And I must say, I have been pleased beyond my wildest dreams not only with what you have done but with the role that our administration has played and the role that they have done. The idea and the passing of the law in Congress was only the first step, and had they not done such a superb job in the followup—all the people on Community Empowerment Board, but beginning with those I mentioned and starting first and foremost with the Vice President—this would not have happened. So I want to thank them for what they did.

I also want to say, just before I get into my remarks about you, the Congress is coming back next Monday, and in the weeks since they've been gone you can see that sometimes partisan activities lead to inattention to the public's business. Now we've got a real opportunity for action between now and Easter when the Congress goes out for its next recess, and I think it's time that we here got down to doing our work the way you are doing your work in your communities. It's time to deal with the unfinished business of this country: to continue to create opportunity, to continue to give people like you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own lives and to build our American community, to grow this economy in a way that will help you to succeed.

That means we should act now—not later but now—to pass a 7-year balanced budget plan that is consistent with our values and our interests, that protect Medicare and Medicaid, our investments in education and the environment, that gives a modest tax cut to those who really need it, and that grows our economy. It means we ought to act now to pass real welfare reform that elevates work and family and protects children and gives people a chance to make the most of their own lives. You want to know what kind of welfare reform I want? You just heard her speak up here; that's what this country needs.

We ought to pass the health care reform bill now before the Senate, unanimously voted out of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike for it. The labor unions are for it. The National Association of Manufacturers are for it. The chamber of commerce is for it. Why has it not been voted on? The health insurance lobby is against it. Everybody else is for it. It's a simple little bill. It says if we can't find a way to give everybody health insurance, at least everybody ought to be able to afford health insurance, and people shouldn't lose their insurance just because someone in their family gets sick or because they have to change jobs. That bill, the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, should be passed immediately to help the American people.

I heard Vinnie say he was going to give his employees a 401(k) plan. There are a lot of small businesses that simply cannot afford pension plans for their employees now because of the laws that exist. One of the things in our balanced budget plan—it's a top priority of the White House Conference on Small Business—would make it much easier for the small businesses in your community empowerment zones to take out retirement programs for themselves and their employees. We ought to pass that right away.

And I'll tell you something else we ought to do when they come back. We ought to raise the minimum wage. You know, I believe if we raise the minimum wage, you'd have people coming out of welfare looking for work even more intensely than they are now. If we don't raise the minimum wage, it will fall to a 40-year low this year in terms of what it will buy. You know, it's hard to raise a family with children on $4.25 an hour. And yet, that's what a lot of people are trying to do. Now if we want to value our families and value work, we ought to do it. We ought to do it now.

We ought to pass antiterrorism legislation that has been languishing for a year almost. And we ought to enact real campaign finance reform. There is a lot for Congress to do. And this can be an era of genuine bipartisan achievement for our country. It's the only way we can achieve anything since the Congress is in the hands of the Republicans, but we need Republicans and Democrats to vote for things, and the White House is in the hands of the other party. We can do that.

What we really need to do here is to behave the way you are back home. What we really need to do is to adopt a model that you have had to adopt back home, get all kinds of people together, different people, different walks of life, different parties, different attitudes, different outlooks, and bring everybody's strengths to the table and prove that we can create an era of possibility for everyone.

You know, sometimes people say to me when I give these speeches, "Well, what exactly is it that you believe? What is your philosophy of how people ought to work together and how this country ought to work?" And you're it. I mean, basically, this is how I think we ought to approach all of our major challenges. If you want to know how I think we should work and what Government should do, look at what we have done to work with you to basically empower you to work together to take control of your own destinies, to help individuals and families and neighborhoods and communities make the most of their own present and their own future.

I said in the State of the Union Address that these enormous economic changes, our movement to an information and technology age, into a global economy, have created an age of possibility for untold numbers of Americans. But as all of us know, it is a strange and different time.

None of us have ever lived through a time of this much economic change before. The last time this happened was a hundred years ago when we moved from an agricultural to an industrial society. So none of us have the experience of knowing what this is like. But what is going on is we are exploding opportunities at a record rate, and half our people feel like they are stuck in idle. And there's a reason for that.

I mean, if I had told you 3 years ago—suppose I had given the following Inaugural Address, how would you have responded? "My fellow Americans, in 3 years we'll cut the deficit in half, have 8 million new jobs, have 3 years in a row of record new formations of small businesses, record new self-made millionaires, not people who were given it. We'll have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. Homeownership will be at a 15-year high. We will have record exports; for the first time in 10 years our exports to other countries will be growing faster than their imports to us. And after 3 years, half the American people will be making the same thing they were making 3 years ago." You would have said, "That guy is on another planet," right? [*Laughter*] Those things don't follow, but that's exactly what happened. And that's why you see these different stories coming out about the economy and people taking a different tack on it and the rhetoric of the election season, because the good news is true and so is the bad news.

And what is causing that is this great uprooting, this time of change we're going through, where more and more work is more mind and less muscle; where this fine lady and her son do computer programs and work out the software to help the empowerment zone work in their community; and more and more work is being created by people like Vinnie, small-business people in highly flexible, interpersonal relationships with fewer layers of bureaucracy. And more and more people who used to be in big structural bureaucracies are finding themselves downsized, which is a cruel way of saying you're middle-aged and out of work.

And so it is the best of times for America, except for the people who don't quite fit into all the changes when the gears don't quite mesh. And obviously, if you look across America, economically, you will see that there are essentially three big problems. There are places where the recovery hasn't hit, where the unemployment rate is still too high and people want jobs and don't have them. There are the people who are working harder and harder just to keep up because they haven't gotten a raise. And then there are people who happen to be in certain sectors of the economy where they're being downsized, and it's taking them a much longer time to find another job making what they were making before with the same level of benefits.

So the challenge, the economic challenge for America is not, how do we put up a wall and walk away from the world, but how do we cap-

ture the dynamism of the good sectors of the economy, all these great things that are happening, and spread it to the rest of the economy so that everybody has opportunity again, so that when you talk about how the country's doing, you're talking about how everybody can do and not just how some can do?

The same thing is true on the social front. If you look at it, 3 years ago I would not have believed that in 3 years we could have the crime rate, the poverty rate, the welfare rolls, the food stamp rolls, the teen pregnancy rolls all dropping. But that is good. That's the good news; they're all going down. The bad news is, in most places they're still too high.

And the really troubling thing is that if I had told you this 3 years ago—what if I had given you this speech? "My fellow Americans, in 3 years the rate of drug use in our country among people between the ages of 18 and 34 will be going down, and the crime rate in America will be going down, but the rate of casual drug use among people under 18 will be going up and random violence among people under 18 will be going up." You would say, "Wow, how did that happen?"

It's the same story on the social front. We have not—we have not succeeded in revitalizing our institutions, our neighborhoods, in strengthening our families and reaching others. There are still too many of those kids out there raising themselves, with nothing to say yes to and people not touching them and working on them. That's what you're trying to do.

Now, there is no way a Government program alone can either deal with the issue of opening up opportunity for all who will assume responsibility for it or solving all the social problems. And not only that, no big bureaucracy is particularly effective anymore. This Government is much smaller than it was when I took office, 205,000 smaller. It's the smallest Government we've had in 30 years. But that does not mean, as the Vice President said, it does not mean that the answer to America's issues and America's challenges is going back to a time when people were left to fend for themselves or that we need a weak Government.

What we need is a kind of partnership embodied by this endeavor, community-based efforts where everybody does their part. That's what we have tried to do, and that is what you are doing. And I just want to tell you that I am grateful to you for the progress you have made. And I want you to continue, and I want this model to sweep the country.

The solutions to America's real challenges, economic and social challenges, have got to be community driven. The private sector has got to be an integral part. The Government—it's not like the Depression—the Government is broke. We have some money to invest in education and training, to invest in environmental protection, to invest in new technologies, to invest in infrastructure, but we got to get rid of this deficit. So we can't go out and just hire everybody that doesn't have a job. The private sector has got to do that. And we have to have the right kind of partnership to get them involved so that we have 10,000 stories like the one Vinnie told today, or 100,000, or a million, or however many it takes to bring opportunity back to everybody in this country.

The third thing we've got to do is to have Government at every level doing its part. The most important thing, I will say again, about this whole empowerment zone process, I think, is not that we broke 13 years of gridlock to finally pass it into law in 1993 in the budget, it is that after we did that, over 500 communities applied to participate. And even the ones that were not selected wound up being richer and better off because they had to get together and ask themselves, what is our vision for this community and what is my responsibility and what is your responsibility to achieve that vision, and how are we going to do it together?

We cannot afford to be divided anymore. We can't afford to sit home passively and read the papers every day and watch the news every night and be upset about what's not happening and blame somebody else. Instead, we're going to go out and meet together and work together and change it together. If everybody in America would do that, we would be on the way toward the American dream for all of our people in the 21st century—just what you've done.

The first round of the empowerment zones enterprise community initiative was so successful that more than $8 billion in additional commitments of investment in these areas have been made from the public and private sector, in addition to the money that was committed by the Federal Government. That is amazing. One hundred and five communities were chosen in the first round. You heard Vinnie Johnson's story: Detroit alone has attracted $2 billion in local private sector investment commitments,

creating hundreds and hundreds of jobs. We can do that everywhere.

In Los Angeles, Federal funds helped to set up a public/private partnership to form the largest community development bank in the Nation. This country—your country has funded banks in developing nations to make loans to people with far fewer assets, skills, and capacities than we have in the American inner cities. And we have put those people back to work and given them a stake in the future and strengthened the economy of other countries. It is unconscionable that we don't do it in this country. Every community should have one of those.

In one of the smallest and poorest communities in the Mississippi Delta, two new manufacturing plants are coming to Itta Bena, a town that had never had one before. We can do that everywhere. One of the things that we ought to do in this budget debate is to make sure that we leave in the commitment of a modest amount of money to establish these community development financial institutions everywhere. If it works in Third World countries, it will work in the rural and urban areas of America that have been left out. Stay with it. We have to do it.

And let me say that most of what we are talking about here—all of what we are talking about here—need not be a partisan issue. Every American, Republican and Democrat alike, independent, Green Party, whatever, there's nobody in America that says, "I've got a real vested interest in keeping that crime rate up," except people we want out of the way. There's no one in America that says, "I've got a vested interest in keeping more mothers on welfare. I've got a vested interest in keeping our schools substandard." Nobody's giving these speeches. Fiorello LaGuardia once said, there is no Republican or Democratic way to clean the streets. No one in America says, "I've got a vested interest in making sure that that playground a block down from my apartment house never has a net on the basketball goal."

This is basic human values. When we fail to give every person a shot at the American dream, when we fail to grow the economy, when we fail to build up the potential of the American people, and when we fail to work together, we all lose. And when we do it, we all win.

This is not a question of class warfare. Americans don't resent successful people; they admire successful people. Americans want people who are successful to be rewarded. We do expect successful people to do what Vinnie's done, that sometime in their lives to give a little something back to help other people succeed. But nobody resents success.

The only time resentment comes into our society is not when people who are successful have more; it's when people who don't have more never have a chance to do better. That is the problem here. People want their own chance to do better. And we have an obligation to give it to them, and that's what this whole empowerment zone enterprise community endeavor is all about.

Now, let me say that I believe that you have made round one a phenomenal success. There are many other rural and urban and Indian Nation communities that I believe deserve a chance. And so let me say, when the Congress comes back I'm going to urge them to do one more thing; I'm going to ask them in this budget negotiations to give us a round two so that others have a chance to do what you have done. If we are going to have tax relief, we will never give so little tax relief and have spent so little money to have such a big impact, to generate so much private sector and other public sector investment in any other way as we will with this. There is more bang for the buck here than anything else we could do. And I believe we should do it.

I also want to say that I want to challenge, again, every community to come together and devise your own rebirth. There are other ways for communities to work with us. For example, if the Baltimore empowerment zone can develop a plan to transform 600 acres of abandoned industrial land into an eco-industrial park, imagine how many other acres can be reclaimed. If the Kentucky Highlands empowerment zone can create a cooperative to get credit to farmers, imagine how other farmers and businesses could be helped if only credit were available. If other communities have done this kind of thing to help themselves, why can't every community do the same thing?

We want to do everything we can to help everybody in America be a part of the kind of comprehensive strategy for the future embodied in the empowerment zones, in the enterprise communities, taking on tough jobs like reclaiming abandoned industrial sites, improving access to capital, and making homeownership easier, working with the communities with which

we are working and those with whom we are prepared to work.

We are beginning to clean the environment in our cities by taking a commonsense approach. And I wish I had a chance to talk about 10 of these examples, because they're all so thrilling to me. But there are literally hundreds of thousands of old, neglected industrial sites, now popularly called brownfields, that can be redeveloped, as Baltimore is doing. Protecting our environment in the urban areas can go hand in hand with redevelopment. It can create jobs and at the same time make more people want to live in the cities of America again.

Finally, let me say we have to do more to create housing that will encourage vibrant neighborhoods in our inner cities and rural areas. You know, cities used to be places where teachers and firefighters and police officers wanted to live, and they can be again if we can help communities to develop good, affordable housing. If we really want all of our communities to be revitalized again, we not only have to create opportunities for poor people, we have to make the environment so that middle class people will want to live in them again and that the poor and the middle class will live side by side, as they did in the neighborhoods when I grew up. We have to do that. We have to be committed to helping all Americans achieve this large part of the American dream known as homeownership.

I'm very proud of what Secretary Cisneros has done with dwindling resources at HUD, working with the private sector to see homeownership reach a 15-year high this year. And we have to do more. We proposed to reclaim tracts of vacant or blighted land and to renovate whole neighborhoods, to bring back to the city hard-working, middle income families, to stimulate business and private investment. We want to work with private sector and other investment to create scores of livable, inviting, inner-city neighborhoods.

Homeownership initiatives now are working in Detroit, Buffalo, in San Antonio and New York and Baltimore. I say again, let us build on our success. Homeownership is one of the best ways to empower local residents, to give them a stake in the community and to increase the bonds that tie people together. It means commitment. If we have any hope of bringing success back to these inner cities, we have to have people there who care and who are committed. Homeownership can help us achieve that goal as well.

Together, I believe we can find the kind of long-term solutions we need. But I will say again, if we really have a vision of all-American communities where there are good jobs, where there are businesses that are flourishing, where the streets are safe and the environment is clean and the families are stable and the schools work to educate and prepare all children, it begins not so much with any specific initiative as with you, with people like you who are committed to working together, to working in an honest, forthright way. And it ends with having the kind of partnership that you have achieved with each other and with every level of government and with the private sector. The difference is the way you are doing this and your understanding that you cannot succeed unless you work together.

So I ask you when you leave here to continue to prove that we can do this. And I ask you to join us in reclaiming more of our distressed communities and spreading the message throughout America that there is no challenge facing this country we cannot meet if we will get rid of our cynicism, get rid of every excuse for inaction, get rid of the notion that we have the luxury of blaming other people for our problems instead of working together to solve them together. That's what you have done. That's what you can give to all America.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:46 a.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Vinnie Johnson, former Detroit Piston basketball player and chairman of Pistons Packaging, and Hannah Oakman, public information officer, Philadelphia/Camden Empowerment Zone.

Remarks Announcing the Nominations for Chairman, Vice Chair, and Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and an Exchange With Reporters

February 22, 1996

The President. Good afternoon. As we seek to sustain economic growth, there is no more important institution in our country than the Federal Reserve. Its decision can help determine whether businesses can borrow and grow, whether families can buy a home, and whether our financial system is sound. Its independence and its professionalism are an important safeguard for our economy.

Over the past 3 years, my administration has had a respectful and productive relationship with the Federal Reserve. During this time, we have done our job to help grow this economy, first by cutting our deficit in half and, secondly, by increasing important investments in education, technology, and defense conversion.

The Fed, in turn, has done its job making independent and professional judgments on monetary policy. Together our efforts have helped to create a climate for sustained economic growth, the lowest combination of unemployment, inflation, and mortgage rates in 27 years. This relationship has worked.

Today I am pleased to announce my decision, first, to reappoint Alan Greenspan as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. He brings his years of experience as a prominent economist and, I might add, a leading Republican and a career capped by 8 years of service as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. During his tenure he has inspired confidence and for good reason. He has worked with our administration to safeguard the stability of global financial markets, recognizing that today even temporary difficulties in one corner of the globe can have far-reaching effects in another. And more importantly, his decisions have helped us to work toward a period of sustained economic growth.

I'm also proud to announce my intention to nominate two distinguished economists to join Chairman Greenspan at the Fed. First, I am nominating Dr. Alice Rivlin as the Vice Chair of the Federal Reserve Board.

As a founding Director of the Congressional Budget Office, a senior fellow at Brookings Institution, and president of the American Economics Association, she is one of our Nation's foremost experts on how to keep the economy growing. And as my Director of the Office of Management and Budget, she has been my strong right arm as we have cut wasteful spending and moved toward a balanced budget.

I have come to deeply value her independence. She always calls it as she sees it. And I know from working with her for 3 years that her ultimate test is how the decisions we make affect the lives and the future of ordinary American citizens.

Alice Rivlin has the right combination of mind and heart to serve our country well as the Vice Chair of the Federal Reserve. I will miss her, and I appreciate her willingness to take on this new responsibility.

For the position of member of the Federal Reserve Board I am today nominating Laurence Meyer. Dr. Meyer is a professor of economics at Washington University. He is renowned as one of our Nation's leading economic forecasters. This year he received the annual award as the most accurate forecaster among blue-chip economists, an award he also won in 1993. Because of that, his economic forecasts are closely listened to at both OMB and CBO. Now, that is no small feat. [*Laughter*] He consults widely for American businesses, and his judgment and experience will serve our Nation well at the Federal Reserve.

If we all continue to do our part and the Federal Reserve continues to be strong, forthright, and resolute, we can create a climate for sustained growth and prosperity for the American people for years to come. I look forward to working with these nominees, and I hope the Senate will give them speedy and favorable consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Greenspan. Alice, Dr. Meyer, thank you very much.

Q. Do you have any guarantees from the Senate, Mr. President?

The President. I don't know that there are any guarantees left in this old world, but I feel quite confident that this team of people will be confirmed.

Q. Mr. President, do you think these three people will be able to engage in the kind of debate you were talking about in New York last week?

The President. I do. And I feel good about it. After all, what should our objective be? Our objective should be to achieve the maximum sustainable economic growth in our country, consistent with not letting inflation get out of hand. And the Fed can't do that alone. The rest of us have to do our part, too.

I think balancing the budget is an important part of it. I think bringing the benefits of education and technology to all the members of the work force who are stuck in stagnant wages now is a very important part of it. I think creating incentives to invest in the areas where there aren't enough jobs of any kind, in the inner cities and the rural areas, is an important part of it. That's what our empowerment zone meeting today is about. And I think paying some special attention to all those people who have been downsized and trying to devise ways that will speed their reentry into the job market at appropriate levels is an important part of it.

So no one can do this job alone, but I think that the truth is that we're entering a new economy, and it's a subject that ought to be open to honest debate. I was encouraged by the comments that Chairman Greenspan made in his two appearances before the Congress in the last couple of days. And I feel good about this group of distinguished Americans being in the positions for which I have nominated them.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

Q. Can we ask Dr. Rivlin a question?

The President. Sure.

Q. What level of growth would you like to see, Dr. Rivlin? [*Laughter*] And Dr. Meyer as well, if you could.

Alice Rivlin. A sustainable level consistent with low inflation. [*Laughter*]

Q. Dr. Rivlin, could we ask, have you had a change of heart? Didn't you indicate just recently that you weren't really interested in this job?

Dr. Rivlin. Yes, I did. [*Laughter*]

Q. Is the President persuasive or——

The President. I haven't lost all my powers of persuasion. [*Laughter*] Battered and bloody though I may be, I can still once in a while make a good argument. [*Laughter*]

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:47 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Major Narcotics Producing and Transit Countries

February 22, 1996

Dear Mr. Chairman: (Dear Ranking Member:)

In accordance with the provisions of section 490(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (FAA), as amended, I have determined that the following countries are major illicit drug producing or drug transit countries: Afghanistan, The Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Hong Kong, India, Iran, Jamaica, Laos, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Syria, Taiwan, Thailand, Venezuela, and Vietnam. These countries have been selected on the basis of information from the March 1, 1995, International Narcotics Control Strategy Report and from other United States Government sources.

No countries on the 1995 list have been removed from the list this year. I have added Belize and Cambodia to the list for the following reasons:

> *Belize.* In my letter of February 2, 1995, which removed Belize from last year's list of major drug-producing countries, I stated, "We will be watching to determine whether it becomes a major transit point for drugs moving to the United States." I did so because Belize's geographical location south of Mexico's Yucatan peninsula makes it an ideal strategic drug transshipment point for U.S.-bound cocaine shipments. The coun-

try's long, unprotected coastline, large tracts of rain forest, many inland waterways and large unpopulated areas make Belize an inviting feeder site for moving drugs into the mainstream Mexican trafficking routes that carry the bulk of South American cocaine to U.S. markets. Despite a demonstrated commitment to cut off access to these routes, the Government of Belize lacks the human and material resources to control its borders adequately. In earlier years, the British Defense Forces stationed in Belize were a partial deterrent to drug traffic, though cocaine transited the country even then. Their withdrawal in late 1994 cleared the way for new trafficking opportunities.

There is little doubt that traffickers are exploiting Belize's vulnerable antidrug infrastructure, particularly as other countries have strengthened their counternarcotics efforts. The very factors that make Belize attractive as a backdoor to the Mexican cocaine route to the United States preclude a precise estimate of the volume of drugs transiting Belize. But it is clear from a number of airdrops off Belize's coast and important seizures that the trafficking organizations view it as a valuable transit point. Mexico's disruption of the large jets carrying multi-ton loads of cocaine ("cargas") has made Belize even more attractive as a feed-in point for U.S.-bound cocaine.

While shipments transiting Belize are smaller than those entering Mexico directly, they can still be sizable. For example, in a single operation in 1995, Belizean authorities seized more than half a ton (636 kilograms) of U.S.-bound cocaine and arrested two Colombians and a Belizean believed to be connected to the Cali cartel. In all of 1995, Belizean authorities seized a total of 840 kilograms of cocaine, which probably represents only a small fraction of the cocaine actually finding its way to the Mexican conduit to the United States. Moreover, this route is not new, since Belizean authorities reported seizing 850 kilograms of cocaine in 1993, and 650 kilograms in 1990. Consequently, I am now adding Belize to the list as a major drug transit country.

Cambodia. Over the past year we have seen numerous indicators that the heroin trafficking problem in Cambodia is severe. Newly formed and undertrained drug enforcement units have made large seizures of heroin. Cambodian police and customs sources have uncovered narcotics cases that involve the Cambodian military and police. Narcotics-related corruption also seems to be a problem in government and business circles. Cambodia shares borders with Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam—all countries on the list of major drug producing and drug transit countries.

The Cambodian government formally acknowledged that drug transshipment was a significant problem in a royal decree establishing an interministerial committee against narcotics signed by the King on September 7. The head of the Phnom Penh Municipal Counternarcotics Bureau has stated to the press that as much as 600 kilograms of heroin is smuggled through Cambodia each week. While we have no evidence to corroborate this figure, which seems high, seizures in Cambodia give us reason to believe there is a significant volume of heroin transiting the country. On August 11, the Cambodian Customs Service seized 71 kilograms of heroin hidden in a speedboat in Koh Kong province. This is the largest seizure ever made in Cambodia and one of the largest made in Southeast Asia this year. Two west African traffickers apprehended by the Cambodian authorities in July have admitted smuggling heroin to the United States and other destinations.

The extent of narcotics-related corruption suggests that the overall drug transshipment problem in Cambodia may be even greater than recent seizures suggest. There have been investigations and arrests involving both police and military suspects. Local police were arrested in the 71-kilogram heroin seizure in Koh Kong province. In August, Thai police arrested several Cambodians including members of the Cambodian military for attempting marijuana smuggling. For all the reasons listed above, I believe it is appropriate for Cambodia to be added to the list as a transit country.

Major Cannabis Producers. While Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, the Philippines, and South Africa are important cannabis producers, they do not appear on this list since I have determined that in all cases the illicit cannabis is either consumed locally or exported to countries

other than the United States, and thus such illicit cannabis production does not significantly affect the United States. (FAA 481(e)(2) states that a country that cultivates and harvests more than 5,000 hectares per year of illicit cannabis falls within the definition of a "major illicit drug producing country," unless I determine that such illicit cannabis production does not significantly affect the United States.)

Turkey and Other Balkan Route Countries. Turkey and its neighboring countries play a key role as a major transit route for much of the Southwest Asian heroin moving to Western and Central Europe along the so-called Balkan Route. We know that some of this heroin also flows to the United States, but thus far our information has been limited and we have traced only relatively small quantities. We will be looking further into this issue over the next year. Insofar as we determine that heroin transiting Turkey, Bulgaria, Greece, the Former Republic of Yugoslavia, Bosnia, Croatia, the Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia, or other European countries on the Balkan Route significantly affects the United States, I will add such countries to the list.

Cuba. We still do not have sufficient evidence that Cuba plays an active role in the drug trade affecting the United States to add it to the list at this time. However, Cuba's geographic location and evidence of some movement of drugs around the island indicate it could become a target for greater trafficking activity in the future.

Central Asia. During 1995, we conducted probe efforts in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, traditional opium poppy growing areas of the former Soviet Union. These probes did not show significant opium poppy cultivation. If ongoing analysis reveals cultivation of 1,000 hectares or more of poppy, I will add the relevant countries to the list.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Jesse Helms, chairman, and Claiborne Pell, ranking member, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Mark O. Hatfield, chairman, and Robert C. Byrd, ranking member, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, and Lee H. Hamilton, ranking member, House Committee on International Relations; and Bob Livingston, chairman, and David R. Obey, ranking member, House Committee on Appropriations. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 23.

Remarks to McDonnell Douglas Employees in Long Beach, California

February 23, 1996

Senator Boxer, Congressman Horn, Mayor O'Neill, Mr. Stonecipher, Mr. Kozlowski, Betty Cavanagh—I'm glad she cleared up how old she was when she came to work here. I thought I'd have to charge McDonnell Douglas with violating the child labor laws. [*Laughter*] I also thank you, Betty, for the ribbon and for the hug. That's the most fun I ever had hugging a Republican. [*Laughter*] I want to thank you—seriously—all of you for being here and for the work you've done. Before I go forward I think we should all give a hand to the Lakewood High School Band who played for us today and did such a fine job. Thank you very much.

Let me say I value the jacket. I value the wonderful model of the plane I flew to Bosnia. I value this ribbon, and I will save it always. But most important, I value the hard work that all of you have done to make the C–17 possible and to make our country stronger.

The C–17 is the finest military transport plane in the world, or as I said in non-jargon, the best moving van in the world. It was forged with an extraordinary partnership between the Department of Defense and the workers and management here at McDonnell Douglas to cut costs, to increase efficiency, to make the C–17 program a model for public/private sector teamwork.

When I became President I had advocated the C–17. It was obvious to me we needed it for our national defense. There were people in Washington who said the program was in trouble and could not be fixed. Well, you fixed it, and because you fixed it, our country is stronger today. And we all owe you a deep debt of gratitude. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, a few weeks ago in my State of the Union Address, I tried to look with you into the future to describe the seven challenges our Nation will have to meet if we're going to provide the American dream for all of our people who are willing to work for it in a new, highly competitive global economy dominated by information and technology and if we're going to pull our country together here at home and, finally, if we're going to continue to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity.

Those challenges were building stronger families; providing better educational opportunities to all Americans; strengthening the economic security of this country through more good jobs and access to affordable health care, secure pensions, and lifetime training; taking back our streets from crime and gangs and violence and drugs; continuing to protect our environment while we grow the economy; reinventing our Government so that it is smaller and less bureaucratic but stronger when we need it to be strong; and finally, continuing to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity.

If you look at what we have come here to celebrate today and if you consider the work being done here on the civilian aircraft that Mr. Stonecipher mentioned, it represents a number of those challenges being met in the way that I believe America has to meet all of its challenges, not by pointing fingers at one another but by working together.

We have here an example of America doing what is necessary to preserve our security and to lead the world. It happens also to provide a large number of people good jobs and security for their families. Where the civilian aircraft are being made, we have a good example of America leading the world toward prosperity and providing economic security for families. And in both places it happened because there was a partnership.

Why do we have a strong defense today? To defend our immediate interests and our borders but also because we learned in the 20th century that if we want to keep America free and safe, we have to stand up for freedom and safety and security and peace and prosperity around the world. We can't be the world's policeman. We can't be everywhere. We can't do everything. But when we can make a difference and when it is consistent with our values and our interests, we have to try. That's what the effort in Bosnia is all about.

It's also true that if we are going to live in that kind of world where people like you have a chance to have good jobs because we engage in and do well in global competition, we have to reach out and not retreat. We have to break down walls, not build them up. That's why those jobs are on the other side of this pavement.

Later today I will meet with the new Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Hashimoto. Our relationship is beginning to work better than it ever has because we are beginning to work together toward common goals. Our partnership is the strongest force for peace and freedom in the Asian-Pacific region. We've worked on a lot of issues that you now don't have to worry about, from getting North Korea to give up its dangerous nuclear program—the thing I was told was the number one security problem facing our country when I became President—to Bosnia—where the Japanese are helping, even though it's a long way from home for them—to tackling the new threats that know no borders, drug trafficking, global crime, and terrorism, which sadly has affected both the Japanese and the American people.

It is in this environment that you have to see the discussion about our trade relations. So often when I hear people talk about trade, they act as if there are only two alternatives: We just open our borders and let what happens happen, or we close our borders because we think we're not being treated fairly. There is another alternative, and it's the right one. We should be pushing for free but fair trade, for tough but fair trade.

We have concluded over 200 trade agreements since I've been in office. We've worked hard to get contracts like the one that will benefit McDonnell Douglas by the sales of commercial aircraft to Saudi Arabia. With Japan alone, we have concluded 20 agreements, covering everything from auto parts to medical equipment with a simple premise: If the United States' markets are open to Japanese products, Japan's markets should be open to America's products.

In the last 3 years, jobs in this country related to exports to Japan have increased by over 20 percent, 167,000 new American jobs. In California, more than a quarter of a million jobs depend upon trade with Japan. For the first time in history, rice farmers in California can sell rice in Japan. We are moving in the right direction.

We have got to continue to take the right path. If you want your country to lead for peace and freedom and prosperity, the answer is neither to be uncritically in favor of free trade, nor to be for pulling up the rug and closing our borders. The answer is to be for trade that is free and fair so everybody has a fair chance to grow in the global economy. That is what our country should stand for.

Let me say again, we can only do that if we do what you did here to turn this program around and make it the finest transport airplane in aviation history: We have to do it together. If you ask me what is the single most significant lesson I have learned as your President in the last 3 years, it is simply this: Whenever we work together and grow together and live together and learn together, America never loses. And when we are divided, we defeat ourselves. We must do better at working together. That is the answer to our future.

When I became President and I had advocated the C–17 and problems became apparent in the program, there were those who said, "Why don't you just abandon this? After all, the cold war is over. We're downsizing the military. Just forget about it. Walk away from it." It seemed to me that the fact that we were downsizing the military made a stronger argument for the C–17. The more we have fewer forces more concentrated in fewer areas, the more we need the kind of airlift capacity that is given by this plane. The fact that we are in the post-cold-war era, where we need to move people in a hurry in unpredictable ways under very difficult circumstances, shows that we did the right thing, you and I and our friends in Congress in both parties, to stand up for the C–17. I thank Senator Boxer, Senator Feinstein, Congressman Horn, Congresswoman Harman, who is not with us today but who has fought for this program, and all others who made it a bipartisan American effort to say that we have to have the capacity to project America's power quickly and decisively and safely.

This plane has delivered on its promise to the American people. We've had airlifters before that could carry very heavy loads over long hauls, and we've had airlifters before that could land on the most primitive airfields in the worst weather conditions. But we have never had a plane that could do both things until the C–17.

And let me say I wish every single one of you, because you worked so hard to build this plane, could have had the same experience I had to fly in the plane under conditions that would test its capabilities. When I visited our troops in Bosnia, who are doing such an extraordinary job to help peace take hold there, the plane I usually fly on, that other Air Force One—she talked about it—[*laughter*]—was too big to land in Tuzla. And so I flew into Aviano, Italy, and took my C–17 as Air Force One for the day.

The first thing that impressed me was the plane's remarkable cargo capacity. Between my staff, the Members of Congress—there were a huge number, almost 40, I think; I can't remember, a lot of them anyway—security and the press—and there was a really large number of press; some of them are back here with us today—there were more than 100 people sitting on those hard red molded plastic seats. [*Laughter*] I must say I wish someone my size could become the test for those seats in the future. [*Laughter*] We also carried two Army Humvees, lots of bags of mail, 210 cases of Coke, and 5,000 Hershey bars. [*Laughter*] And there was a lot of room to spare. Not only that, even with all the press and the politicians there, the plane carried all the hot air that we could generate in that long flight. [*Laughter*]

I spent a lot of time on the flight deck talking with the crew and seeing what the C–17 can do. The loadmaster, Chief Master Sergeant Mark Smith, told me about his pride in the plane and its capabilities. Those crews are your best advertisement. They are grateful to you. You made their work possible. You made it more fun, and you made it safer. And they all talk about it.

He reminded me about how skeptical people were that we would risk the C–17 in an environment as hostile as Bosnia. He said, "Mr. President, people didn't really think you'd give us these planes." We allocated 12 to the Bosnian mission. They said, "We didn't think you would give us these planes. I mean, it's new. It's ex-

pensive." And I said, "Well, that's why we built it. I thought we were supposed to use it, not show it."

As you know, the fog can be very bad in Bosnia, so we had to fly over Tuzla the first time, go to Hungary, have our meetings in Hungary, see the troops there, come back to Tuzla. They told us that the weather was getting so bad we absolutely had to get out of there. We were coming close to nightfall. Our plane was parked near the middle of the runway. We only had about 4,000 feet of tarmac on which to take off. The aircraft commander, Major Frederick Cianciolo, said we wouldn't even need half that much. I thought he was kidding. [*Laughter*] I said, "You're kidding, aren't you?" He said, "Buckle up, Mr. President." He then threw 160,000 pounds of thrust into those four Pratt & Whitney engines. Twelve seconds and 1,800 feet of runway later, we were in the air, thanks to you.

The C–17 has only flown 25 percent of the missions in Bosnia, but it has carried over 40 percent of the cargo and more passengers than any other transport. At the very start of the operation, you remember, terrible weather and flooding held up the construction of the Sava River Bridge, the main land link for our troops to Bosnia. I might add, the engineers who did that did a magnificent job, too. It's the longest bridge span built like that since World War II. So we had to load the pontoon sections onto flatbeds, and we rolled them onto the C–17's. The plane set down near the Sava. The flatbeds rolled off. The bridges were built, and our troops could move into Bosnia.

This past fall when Hurricane Marilyn devastated the United States Virgin Islands, the C–17 was the only aircraft in our fleet able to land outsized cargo on undersize runways. C–17's flew 18 percent of our relief missions but delivered 30 percent of the supplies, 30 percent of the medicines, 30 percent of the housing materials. Thousands of people came to see the C–17 as the savior from the skies. These exploits are fast becoming legendary, thanks to you.

Now let me just say a few words, if I might, about those of you who work here. As I have said before, after the first C–17's rolled off the production line, there were genuine concerns about cost overruns and scheduling delays. Everyone shared them, including people here at McDonnell Douglas. But you pitched in, and you turned the program around instead of throwing up your hands and giving up.

Working side by side with the Air Force, you made a great plane even better, and you did it for less. Now the fly-away cost of the C–17 has been cut in half. The C–17 parked behind me is the 12th aircraft in a row—I want to say that again—the 12th aircraft in a row you have produced, not on schedule but ahead of time. And we thank you.

Just today, the Air Force delivered to McDonnell Douglas a contract for the production of the last 8 of the 40 C–17's originally requested, a contract worth $1.8 billion. Because of your extraordinary efforts and the exceptional performance of the C–17, I have today sent to Congress a letter seeking approval of a multiyear procurement for another 80 C–17's. This will be the longest and the largest multiyear defense contract ever. It will be worth more than $14 billion to McDonnell Douglas and more than 18,000 jobs to the State of California. It will save our taxpayers nearly $1 billion because we're ordering all the planes we need at once, instead of a few at a time.

Let me say a word of thanks to some of the people who made this possible, starting with Major General Ron Kadish, the Air Force's C–17 program director; Rudy de Leon, who is over here with me, our Under Secretary of the Air Force; to Harry Stonecipher, and your program manager, Don Kozlowski; and to the Members of Congress who supported this program so strongly. All of you have done a job very well.

And let me say, I want you to remember—if you don't remember anything else about today except how many more planes you're going to build—[*laughter*]—how you turned the program around, the partnership between Government and McDonnell Douglas, the partnership between management and labor, the understanding that there was a mission to perform, that it had to be performed by everybody pulling together and working together.

And I want you to think about every single challenge your country faces. Just look around the sea of faces here today. Is there another nation where the head of the nation's government could go and speak to a group like this and see so much diversity in the crowd among the workers? I think not. Is there another place where you could see so many people from so many different backgrounds, so many different walks of life, so many different religious faiths,

working together toward a common goal? What you did here and the way you did it is a model for the way America must meet the other challenges we face.

We have a clear choice facing us in every single area of human endeavor. If you want everybody in your country to be able to have a good job and raise a strong family; if you believe everybody ought to be able to send their children to good schools; if you think everybody should enjoy the benefits of a clean environment; if you believe people ought to have safe streets and that they shouldn't have to worry about their children and their children's teachers being shot at the way the poor man in Los Angeles was wounded just a couple of days ago; if you believe that this country has to continue to lead the world toward peace and freedom, then you must understand that every single challenge we have has to be met the way you met the challenge of the C–17. When we pull together, when we work together, when we have a clear mission, we never lose. You won for America, and America can win in the future.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. on the east ramp at Building 54. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Beverly O'Neill of Long Beach; Harry Stonecipher, chief executive officer, Don Kozlowski, president, C–17 program, and Betty Cavanagh, employee, McDonnell Douglas; and Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan.

Message to the Congress Reporting Budget Deferrals and Rescissions
February 23, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report three new deferrals and one revised deferral, totaling $3.6 billion, and four rescission proposals of budgetary resources, totaling $140 million.

These deferrals affect the International Security Assistance programs as well as programs of the Agency for International Development. The rescission proposals affect the Department of Defense.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 23, 1996.

NOTE: The report detailing the deferrals and proposed rescissions was published in the *Federal Register* on March 15.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan in Santa Monica, California
February 23, 1996

Trade Policy

Q. Mr. President, does it help or hurt matters if trade policy is a campaign issue this year?

The President. I think it should be an issue. I think it's important that the American people know all the facts and make their decisions. But let me reiterate what I said today, and let me begin by saying it's a great honor for me to welcome Prime Minister Hashimoto here to the United States. We know him well and respect and admire him for his work on trade on behalf of his country. And now this is his first trip here as Prime Minister. This will be a good opportunity for us to get better acquainted before I go to Japan on my state visit in April.

Let me also say that we have a broad and deep friendship with Japan which encompasses far more than trade. We have a security partnership that has enabled us to work together to head off the North Korea nuclear threat, something which was an immediate threat to the

security of both the United States and Japan. And we have worked together on issues ranging from terrorism to drug trafficking to global environmental problems.

Now, on the trade issue let me say as I have said many times, I don't mind if this is an issue in the election, but it's important that we look at the facts and the real policy alternatives. To hear the debate you would think the only choice is an open market without regard to how other countries treat our products on the one hand, or a totally closed market on the other. There is another alternative which is trade that is both freer and fairer, and that is the policy we have pursued.

With Japan, thanks to Prime Minister Hashimoto in his previous position, we have concluded 20 trade agreements. And in those areas, our trade with Japan has gone up 80 percent in just 3 years in ways that have enabled us to lower the trade deficit and to provide a broader range of products and services to Japanese citizens, sometimes at lower cost. So this has benefited both of us. There are 167,000 more Americans working today because of those 20 trade agreements and the good-faith effort that has been made in Japan to keep them. And in general, American exports are now growing faster than American imports for the first time in many years.

So I think we should all remember that this trade is a two-way street. When we raise barriers to others, they can also raise barriers to us. The goal should be freer trade and fairer trade, and that is one but only one part of our relationship.

This is good for America. And here in California it's certainly good. You were with me today, all of you, at the McDonnell Douglas plant where they were celebrating, among other things, the sales of their planes to Saudi Arabia.

Q. Is it possible to resolve trade differences without confrontation in the future?

The President. The answer to that I think depends, frankly, on how well all of us can make the new World Trade Organization work. The real problem with international trade dispute resolution in the past has been that it took so long, by the time you got an answer it almost didn't matter what the answer was.

So that's why the United States and Japan and other countries have held back the right to make some unilateral decisions in the trade area. But I think all of us would rather take this out of confrontation and have these matters fairly resolved. And the real question I think is going to be whether the WTO can move not only fairly but quickly.

Japan-U.S. Relations

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Buchanan has said that you will be more scared of him as President than of President Clinton. What do you think of that? And Mr. President, your own assessment?

Prime Minister Hashimoto. Concerning the election, that's a decision the American people have to make. We learn from the United States how important the free trading system is, and also we are promoting further the free trade principles. And also, we're making concrete actions for the elimination of regulation—or deregulation that are necessary for the goal of free trade. So I'm confident that the American people will make good decisions.

I'm not taking any side, I must say.

The President. Let me say, I would hope that the Japanese Prime Minister would never be afraid of any American President. We have a partnership.

You know, let's just remember, when I became President the newspapers in America were full of the threat of North Korea becoming a nuclear power and posing dangers to Japan, to the United States, everyone. Because we worked with Japan and with South Korea and with other countries, that threat is ebbing away. The Japanese play host today to over 40,000 American soldiers that have helped to keep the peace in the Asian-Pacific region, and they pay a higher percentage of the cost of maintaining those military installations than any other nation in the world where we have soldiers deployed. Our relationship should be one of respect and friendship, even when we have different opinions and different interests. It is not based on fear. It is based on respect and friendship.

Now, we've had trade disputes. All I ask you to do is to look at the record that we have established: 20 agreements, an 80 percent increase in American exports under those agreements, from auto parts to medical equipment to telecommunications equipment to California rice.

There have been problems. We have taken these issues seriously, far more seriously than previous American administrations. But we have not attempted to approach them in an atmos-

phere that was based on fear or anger or rancor. We can be firm with each other, strong with each other; we can even disagree with each other. But the American people should know that our friendship and partnership with the Japanese in security matters is an important part of maintaining freedom and peace in the world and helps America. And Japan has lowered its trade deficit with America—or, our trade deficit with them—dramatically in the last 3 years. We are moving in the right direction. Other countries should do as well.

Japanese Whaling

Q. Any hope for progress on whaling? Is there any hope for progress on the issue of whaling that's separating the two?

Prime Minister Hashimoto. Shall we finish the meeting right out here? [*Laughter*]

The President. We just started—[*laughter*]—we haven't started.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The exchange began at 7 p.m. in the garden at the Sheraton Miramar Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's Radio Address
February 24, 1996

Good morning. This morning I want to talk with you about what we can do to break the hold of gangs and violence in our schools and what we can do to create an atmosphere in our schools that promotes discipline and order and learning.

Today I'm visiting Long Beach, California, a community that has helped to restore order to its schools by requiring elementary and middle school students to wear uniforms. I believe that if parents and school officials decide to take this step, the rest of us should support them. Let me tell you why.

As I said in my State of the Union Address, our Nation is in a moment of great possibility, a time when more of our people will be able to live out their dreams than ever before, a time of fabulous opportunity. But we all know it's also a time of uncertainty, a time when we face economic challenges, educational challenges, challenges to our family, to our environment, to the safety of our streets.

We will master this moment only if we meet those challenges together. When we are divided, we defeat ourselves; but when Americans are together, we are never defeated. That's how we have to meet all the major challenges facing our Nation: strengthening our families; building economic security for every working family; fighting crime and drugs and gangs; protecting our environment; maintaining our leadership for peace and freedom in the world; continuing to reform and reinvent our Government so that it is smaller and less bureaucratic but still strong enough to serve the American people better.

And none of these goals can be achieved unless we meet our seventh challenge, to give our children—all our children—a good, world-class education. And we know that our children cannot learn in schools where weapons, gang violence, and drugs threaten their safety or where plain unruliness and disorder and lack of discipline make learning impossible. Most of our schools are safe, but no parent who walks a child to the bus stop and waves goodbye in the morning should ever have to wonder if that child will return home safely when the last bell rings.

Our administration has worked hard to make our schools safer, getting parents more involved in schools, keeping guns out, teaching that drugs are wrong, supporting random drug testing of student-athletes, letting communities know that schools need not be religion-free zones. I have challenged our schools to teach values and citizenship through character education. And if a juvenile kills or maims as an adult, he should be prosecuted as an adult.

But we must do more, and local communities must lead the way. I believe we should give strong support to school districts that decide to require young students to wear school uniforms. We've all seen the tragic headlines screaming of the death of a teenager who was

killed for a pair of sneakers or jewelry or a designer jacket. In Detroit, a 15-year-old boy was shot for his $86 basketball shoes. In Fort Lauderdale, a 15-year-old student was robbed of his jewelry. Just this past December in Oxon Hill, Maryland, a 17-year-old honor student was killed at a bus stop, caught in the crossfire during the robbery of another student's designer jacket.

School uniforms are one step that may be able to help break this cycle of violence, truancy, and disorder by helping young students to understand that what really counts is what kind of people they are, what's on the inside, to remember that what they're doing at school is working, not showing off their own clothes or envying another student's clothes.

Two years ago Long Beach, California, was the first school district in our Nation to require elementary and middle school students to wear uniforms to class. So far, the results have been encouraging. In the first year of school uniforms, both fights between students and students bringing guns to school were cut in half. Overall crime in the schools was cut by more than a third. Just as encouraging was the way Long Beach pulled together: the board of education voting, starting a uniform program; parents actively supporting it; businesses and churches and civic organizations helping to buy uniforms for the students who can't afford them; and students using their new freedom from fear and freedom from insecurity and freedom from envy to learn.

Aziza Walker, a fourth-grader from Long Beach, wrote me this letter. "It is easier to pick out what I want to wear. It's more convenient for my mom, so she won't have to wash so many colors. It also helps me when I walk home with my cousin or by myself. So I won't get shot, beaten, or robbed by a gang or just by some maniac on the street."

We have a basic, old-fashioned bottom line. We must get violence out of our schools, and we must put discipline and learning back in our schools. If it means teenagers will stop killing each other over designer jackets, then our public schools should be able to require their students to wear school uniforms. If it means that the schoolrooms will be more orderly, more disciplined, and that our young people will learn to evaluate themselves by what they are on the inside instead of what they're wearing on the outside, then our public schools should be able to require their students to wear school uniforms.

Let me be clear: Washington will not tell our schools what to do. We know the best teacher for a child is a loving parent, and the decision whether to require uniforms should be made by parents, by teachers, by local schools. But if they want to do it, we want to help them understand how it can be done. That's why today I signed a directive instructing the Secretary of Education to distribute a new manual on school uniforms to every school district in the Nation. Rather than telling schools what to do, we are providing a roadmap for setting up the school uniform policy for schools who choose to start one.

Every one of us has an obligation to work together, to give our children freedom from fear and the freedom to learn. If we act together, we can give them the chance to make the most of their young lives and to build better futures.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 8:15 p.m. on February 23 at the Sheraton Miramar Hotel in Santa Monica, CA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on February 24.

Remarks Prior to a Roundtable Discussion on School Uniforms in Long Beach, California

February 24, 1996

Thank you very much, Mr. Cohn. I am here mostly to listen to all of you. And I thank you for taking a little time to meet with me.

I have spent an enormous amount of my time in the last 18 years now since I became a Governor of my State in 1986—'78—in public schools. And I devoted a lot of time as President

to how we can improve education through higher standards and higher expectations, get higher performance. It is obvious that unless the school is a safe, disciplined, drug-free learning environment, it's impossible for learning to occur.

And what we have tried to do at the national level is to encourage all kinds of grassroots reforms and to make it possible for people to do what they think is appropriate in their schools, not to tell schools how they should go about improving learning and improving the environment but to support them when they wanted to do it. And because there were some legal questions raised, I did send the Attorney General out here.

As you know, I mentioned your school district in the State of the Union Address. And today just before I came here, I signed an Executive order instructing the Secretary of Education to send to all the school districts in the country this manual that we have just done up on school uniforms—that we're going to send to all the school districts in the country, not to tell them they should do what you have done but to encourage them if they want to do it and to show them how to do it.

I also wanted to say something else. As I said, I mostly want to listen to you, but I think it's important to point out that if there is a school uniform or a dress code in a school, you not only have the chance of reducing the violence, I also think it sends a different message to the students. When young people are young, we should try to teach them to judge themselves and others based on what's inside them, not what's outside them. And in that sense, I think the school uniform policy is as valuable for students from well-to-do families as it is for students from poor families because of the message it sends.

And I'm very—I'm pleased to be here, and I wanted to come here mostly to honor you for your efforts and hopefully to publicize your efforts throughout the country. I'm also anxious to hear from the students. I have to tell you I got a lot of hot letters from students—[*laughter*]—after I bragged on your policy. The mail and the E-mail were burning up—[*laughter*]—for the next several days.

So why don't we start and just hear from everyone who is here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:02 a.m. in the library at Jackie Robinson Academy. In his remarks, he referred to Carl Cohn, superintendent, Long Beach School District.

Memorandum on the Manual on School Uniforms
February 24, 1996

Memorandum for the Secretary of Education

Subject: Manual on School Uniforms

Quality education is critical to America's future and the future of our children and families. We cannot educate our children, however, in schools where weapons, gang violence, and drugs threaten their safety. We must do everything possible to ensure that schools provide a safe and secure environment where the values of discipline, hard work and study, responsibility, and respect can thrive and be passed on to our children. Most schools are safe. But we must have zero tolerance for threats to safety in our schools. It is time to make every school the safest place in its community. Parents should be able to send their children to learn free of fear. All of our schools should be permitted to focus on their original purpose: education.

Many local school districts have made school uniforms an important part of an overall program to improve school safety and discipline. Too often, we learn that students resort to violence and theft simply to obtain designer clothes or fancy sneakers. Too often, we learn that clothing items worn at school, bearing special colors or insignias, are used to identify gang membership or instill fear among students and teachers alike.

If student uniforms can help deter school violence, promote discipline, and foster a better learning environment, then we should offer our strong support to the schools and parents that try them. We should applaud parents, teachers, and school leaders when they take courageous

action to make our schools safe and free of gangs, drugs, and violence.

The Long Beach, California, school district recently found that after students started wearing uniforms, there was a substantial decrease in student drug cases, sex offenses, assault and battery cases, and fights. The learning environment improved as teachers could focus more on education and less on discipline. Many other schools—in Baltimore, Cincinnati, Dayton, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Memphis, Milwaukee, Nashville, New Orleans, Phoenix, Seattle, and St. Louis—have also adopted mandatory or voluntary school uniform policies with promising results.

I thus asked you, in consultation with the Attorney General, to develop information about how local school districts have made uniforms part of their school safety and discipline programs. The Department of Education, with input from the Department of Justice, has now developed a new "Manual on School Uniforms," which sets forth the benefits of school uniforms; provides a road map for establishing a school uniform policy for schools interested in school uniforms; and describes various model uniform programs from a number of school districts across the Nation.

Because maintaining safe and disciplined schools is an urgent priority in every local community, I today direct you promptly to distribute the Manual on School Uniforms to each of the Nation's 16,000 public school districts. I also direct you to provide copies of the Manual to appropriate organizations representing parents, teachers, and school administrators, and to make it available to interested members of the public.

School uniform programs are just one of the many initiatives undertaken by local school officials and parents to improve school safety and discipline. Other steps—such as truancy reduction programs, student-athlete drug testing, drug and gang prevention initiatives, zero tolerance for weapons, assisting teachers in addressing discipline problems, conflict resolution programs, and character education initiatives—have also been used to improve the education of our children. The Department of Education, in consultation with the Department of Justice, should continue to develop guidance and information about these and other initiatives so that local organizations, families, and educators throughout the Nation have the tools available to make our schools safe, drug-free, and crime-free.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Remarks to the Community in Long Beach

February 24, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you, Melissa Machit. Didn't she do a good job? Give her another hand. [*Applause*] Mayor O'Neill; Superintendent Cohn; Chief Ellis; our host, the principal, Alexis Ruiz-Alessi, the principal of Jackie Robinson Academy, where we are now; to the president of the board of education, Bobbie Smith; to the JROTC groups from Wilson and Poly, thank you very much for being here. And to the Poly High School band, thank you very much for playing so well.

Just before I came out here I had a little roundtable discussion about the school uniform policy with Melissa and another fine student named Maurice Troutman and a number of—I thought he was going to run for office someday; he's already seeded the crowd—[*laughter*]—and a number of teachers and parents and the chief and your board president. I would like for all the people who were in our little roundtable to stand and be recognized; they did such a good job of educating me about what was done. Thank you very much. [*Applause*]

I'm glad to be back in Long Beach. It seems like only yesterday when I was here last. [*Laughter*] I do have my pin on today; it's sort of my uniform. And I'm honored to be here. I came here today to applaud and support the efforts of this remarkable community.

Yesterday the mayor and community leaders briefed me on the remarkable plan that this community has to revive itself and deal with the impact of the defense downsizing of the last several years. Today I'm here to support what over the long run may have an even more profound impact on the future of this commu-

nity and our country, this remarkable progress you have shown in your schools as a result of the school uniform policy, making them safer, more disciplined and orderly, freeing teachers to focus on teaching and students to focus on their job of learning. You are returning their schools to their original purpose and proving that public institutions can excel when they have high standards, high expectations for all children, and a high purpose with a strategy at the grassroots level supported by everybody in the community for carrying it out.

I have to tell you on a very personal note, as I told the panel, this has made my life at home even a little more difficult because for 10 years—10 years—several times a year, before Long Beach finally took this groundbreaking step, the only person who ever talked to me about school uniforms was the First Lady. And six or seven times a year we'd go to Chelsea's school and we'd go to this or that event at school, or we'd visit other public schools, and she'd come home and say, "You know, if we had a uniform policy, it would make things better in these schools." I heard it over and over and over again. And thanks to you, I have to listen to "I told you so." [*Laughter*] Being able to endure "I told you so" is one of the essential requirements of a successful marriage—[*laughter*]—and I must say I can't think of a time when I have enjoyed hearing it more. I applaud all of you.

I want to take a few moments today to talk about how what you have done here fits into the larger pattern of what I hope is going on in America and what I am trying to do and what we are trying to do to help you to spread this message throughout the United States.

When I became President I was convinced that our country had to go into the next century making significant changes if we wanted to ensure that the American dream was available to everyone willing to work for it, without regard to their race or income or background, if we wanted to bring the American people together instead of seeing them continue to drift apart, and if we wanted to see our country remain the leading force in the world for peace and freedom and prosperity. We have worked very hard over the last 3 years on all those three objectives, and we see that while progress has been made which is very substantial, serious challenges remain, challenges that can only be met if we do a better job of working together. If you were to ask me what the single most significant lesson I have learned as your President in the last 3 years is, I would without hesitation answer, it is that when Americans work together we never lose, and when we are divided we defeat ourselves.

Today California newspapers reported 285,000 new jobs in this State in 1995 alone. We are moving this economy; almost 8 million new jobs, a 15-year high in homeownership, 3 years of record highs in new businesses formed. Businesses owned by women alone in the last 3 years have created more new jobs than the Fortune 500 have laid off. The combined rates of unemployment, inflation, and home mortgage interest rates are the lowest they've been in 27 years. We are moving forward.

But we know—we know—that a lot of Americans have not participated in this economic recovery. They haven't gotten a raise, or they live in the inner city or isolated rural areas where there aren't any new jobs, or they work for one of these big companies where sometimes when they're my age and ready to send their own children to college, they've been downsized. So we have more challenges to meet until we can say to every American, "You're going to live in a more rapidly changing economy, but you will still be all right if you're willing to work for it."

If you look at our most fundamental institutions, many of the social problems we've had, the objective indicators clearly point out the fact that on balance our schools are doing a better job. You should know that the welfare rolls are down in this country, the poverty rolls are down in this country. Every State in the country has reported a decline in violent crime. This is all encouraging. That's the good news.

Everybody knows this country is still too violent. It's still too dangerous for children. There are still too many problems out there. There are still too many people trapped in a culture of dependence when they ought to be out working and being successful in supporting their families and contributing to their communities and country. So we have a lot to do.

Now, a lot of the things we have to do involve modernizing our systems. For example, we have reduced the size of your National Government. We have gotten rid of thousands of pages of regulation. We've made it far less bureaucratic. It's the smallest Government you've had in 30 years. But you don't want it to be weak; it's

still strong enough to be there when you need it if there is an earthquake or a fire or a flood. It's still strong enough to be there to help companies change when they have to go from defense to civilian construction. And these are the kinds of things that we need to focus on. I want to give you a Government that is less bureaucratic and smaller but still able to help every person, every family, every neighborhood, every community make the most of their own lives.

And so all the institutions have to change; we have to modernize. In just a couple of weeks the Vice President and I will be out here to celebrate NetDay in California, the biggest next step in our campaign to make sure that by the year 2000 every single classroom and every single library in this country will be hooked up to the Internet. Twenty percent of California's schools will be hooked up this year.

But it's not all modern. Some of what we have to do is to get back to basic values and basic institutions. I see at least two Members of the Congress out here, Congressman Horn and Congressman Martinez; there may be others here. We know that there are things in Washington we cannot do that you have to do. We have to find ways to reassert the vitality of the basic institutions of this country, of the family, of the schools, of the neighborhood and the community.

In the schools, I have always had a very simple formula. I believe I have spent more time in classrooms, more time listening to teachers and parents and students than any person who had the privilege to hold this office. And I believe that all children can learn. I think that we have to have high expectations. I believe in high national standards. I believe in high technology, nationally spread. But I believe in grassroots reform, giving kids a good head start, giving every person access to college, and giving adults a lifetime chance to always, always get education when they need it for economic reasons. But let's not kid ourselves. None of this is going to work unless our schools work and unless our children feel safe and secure, unless the environments of education are disciplined and drug-free.

We saw the tragic consequences of the time in which we live again just a few days ago with the terrible, painful, agonizing, senseless shooting of that fifth-grade teacher in front of his students in Los Angeles. We are praying—I'm sure all of you will pray along with our family—that Alfredo Perez will pull through and that his wife, who is also a schoolteacher, will have the courage, the bravery to carry on and that those students in that school who underwent that horrible experience will somehow find the courage to believe in their adults who are responsible for their lives, so that they can go and grow and learn again.

We know that most of our schools are safe, but we know that our country is not as safe as it ought to be. We know that every parent who walks a child to the bus stop and waves goodbye in the morning should never worry whether the child will come home safely. Every parent has a right to expect that their children will be safe in school. Every parent has a right to believe that the children are spending their time learning and teachers are able to spend the day teaching.

When we identify national problems that have to be solved by local communities using basic values, what I believe we should do at the national level is to help to define what we ought to do and let you decide how to do it. That's what we're here to celebrate today. We've tried to help promote school safety with the Gun-Free Schools Act. We are educating our children through you, with the funds we provide, about the dangers of drugs with the help of the safe and drug-free schools act. We are tackling student drug use through our random drug testing programs that we have advocated for local school districts. We are getting tough on criminals when they are seriously violent by permitting the prosecution of hardened young criminals as adults. We are promoting greater parental involvement through our family partnership for learning at the Department of Education. We are supporting you and teaching our children the values of hard work, discipline, mutual respect through the introduction of character education programs all across America, again, at the initiative of local school districts, not from Washington. But when you want to do it, we're there for you, and we think you should do it.

And we have worked very hard in this country, where so many people come from such diverse backgrounds and so many different faiths which they want to express in different ways, to say that the first amendment's freedom of religion is the freedom from oppression, but it doesn't make schools religion-free zones. There is a way people can pursue their values and

their faith consistent with the first amendment. We have tried to do all these things.

But I have to say, in the end it matters whether all of you are working together and whether your counterparts in every school district in America are working together. That's why I took some pains in the State of the Union Address to urge that other school districts in our Nation consider following the example of Long Beach on school uniforms.

One of the great hazards of our culture, with all of its wonderful opportunities, is that we can sometimes, as a friend of mine used to say, without meaning to, teach our children to minor in the majors and major in the minors. It's important to be able to make a good living, and it's important to be able to buy things that you'd like to have, but that's not the most important thing in life. And it's tragic when young people without a balanced upbringing, without grounded values, without a secure education wind up believing that it's all right to kill somebody for a pair of sneakers or jewelry or a designer jacket.

In Detroit, a 15-year-old boy was shot recently for his $86 basketball shoes. In Fort Lauderdale, a 15-year-old student was robbed of his jewelry. Just this past December, near where I live now, in Oxon Hill, Maryland, a 17-year-old honor student was killed at a bus stop, just standing there, caught in the crossfire during the robbery of another student's designer jacket.

As parents, every one of us has been wrenched by these stories. We cannot stand idly by while our children are having their childhoods robbed from them and from us by people who place more value on the material things than even human life, not to mention human learning.

The Long Beach Unified School District and the parents here have not stood idly by. I want to again say, the entire United States of America is in your debt because you took the first step to show that elementary and middle school students could wear uniforms to class, reduce violence, reduce truancy, reduce disorder, and increase learning, and as was said more ably than me by my remarkable introducer, give a sense of unity and purpose and teamwork to the students and the schools that are in this school district. We are all in your debt in the United States.

After the first year of this program, fights between students and other students who bring guns to school were cut in half. Overall crime in the schools was cut by more than a third in one year. In addition to safety, learning improved; schoolwork became more important for students than showing off what they were wearing or resenting what someone else was wearing. And maybe most important of all over the long run, I think these uniforms do not stamp out individuality among our young people. Instead, they slowly teach our young people one of life's most important lessons, that what really counts is what you are and what you can become on the inside, not what you are wearing on the outside. And at least on that score, I think you can make a serious argument that this school uniform benefits the children of affluent families as much as it benefits the children of poor families, because that is a lesson all our children need to learn.

But in the end, we should remember it should be safety first. I was so moved in this panel listening to Melissa talk about unity and then listening to young Maurice say, "I can walk down the street now and because I have my uniform on, those gangs know that I'm not a problem. I'm just a student. I don't have to look over my shoulder all the time." It is wrong for a young person to look over his or her shoulder walking down the street of the United States of America. That is wrong. And you have helped to stop it.

And let me say finally about you, you did it, reflecting the lesson I said that was the most important I have learned. You did this together. This was not imposed on you. The parents decided to do it, working with the teachers, working with the school board, working with the police department, working with others. You worked this out together.

And I've learned about the differences from school to school. I've learned about the differences in permissible uniforms. I've learned all about this. It has really pleased me to understand just how much of a grassroots endeavor this is. And that also is important.

I do want to say, though, that in all the years that I have spent in public schools, the thing that has frustrated me most is that nearly every problem in America has been solved by somebody somewhere in some school. But ideas don't travel very well. The most heartening thing to me, although I know it's been a headache for your superintendent, is that you've been deluged

with phone calls. That's good. That means people say, "I'm not too proud to learn from them."

You know, the Founding Fathers of this country set up State governments as the laboratories of democracy with the express intent that they would not be too proud to learn from one another. When I was a Governor, whenever we were the first State to do something, I was always proud of that. But I used to tell our people, I'm even more proud when we're the second State to do something because that meant that we weren't too arrogant, hard-headed, and deaf to learn from what somebody else was doing right.

So we want to support what you have done here. And so we have taken on the job of finding out what works and how. And I want you to know that just before I came here today, I signed a directive instructing the Secretary of Education to distribute this new Manual on School Uniforms to every one of the Nation's 16,000 school districts so they will know how to do what you did. The Department of Education worked with the Department of Justice and the Attorney General to develop this. It's a roadmap for the establishment of a policy for school uniforms for schools that want to use the tool. It provides a central source of information about successful programs, yours and those that have followed, that are making a difference all across America.

Let me be clear, this is not a National Government mandate. This is not Washington telling any school or school district what to do. The decision about whether to adopt a uniform policy as a tool in an overall program to promote safety and improve learning is a local decision to be made entirely by parents, teachers, and local school officials. But at least now nobody will say, "We didn't know about this. We couldn't imagine how to do it, and we're not sure it will work." If they read this, they will know it will work and they'll know about it and they'll understand how to do it.

In the meanwhile, let me leave you with these two thoughts: Please don't grow weary in pursuing this goal. We can never rest until violence against our children is the exception, not the rule; until we are horrified—until we are genuinely surprised when we hear about something bad happening to a child. We can never rest until we have more of our children wearing the colors of school uniforms than the colors of gangs. We cannot rest until that is true.

And please, each and every one of you in your own way, be willing to reach out to your friends and neighbors and anyone with whom you come in contact across this great State and across our beloved country, to tell people the story of how this works. People are desperately looking for ways to restore integrity and meaning and purpose and direction and success to our schools all across America. You have shown that it can be done. Share your knowledge; share your passion; share your conviction. And remember what I said. Whenever we are defeated, we defeat ourselves. If we are divided, we can't win. But when we're together, America never loses.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:03 a.m. in the courtyard at Jackie Robinson Academy. In his remarks, he referred to Melissa Machit, Charles Evans Hughes Middle School student; Carl Cohn, Long Beach School District superintendent; Mayor Beverly O'Neill of Long Beach; and Bob Ellis, Long Beach police chief.

Remarks on the Downing of American Civilian Aircraft by Cuba and an Exchange With Reporters in Shoreline, Washington

February 24, 1996

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I have just been briefed by the National Security Adviser on the shooting down today in broad daylight of two American civilian airplanes by Cuban military aircraft. We are continuing to investigate the circumstances of the incident, including the airplanes' flight plan and the flight route and what, if any, warnings were given.

This afternoon I ordered the following actions: First, I directed the United States Coast Guard units in the area to conduct search and rescue operations. That is now underway in the

waters off Cuba. Second, I have ordered United States military forces in the area to provide support to the search and rescue operations and to ensure that it is fully protected. Third, I have instructed our interest section in Havana to seek an immediate explanation for this incident from the Cuban Government.

I condemn this action in the strongest possible terms. And as events unfold and we know more we will do our best to answer your questions.

I'd like now to ask Mr. McCurry to come up and either now or immediately, I think, when I leave here to do his best to answer whatever other questions you have. Obviously, we will be getting further information throughout the night, and we'll let you know when we have it.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, the United States does have confirmation on the shoot-down?

Q. Do you know where the planes were when they were shot down?

The President. We know—I can't say that for sure. I think Mike can answer all the questions.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:35 p.m. in the automotive training center at Shoreline Community College. The downed aircraft were operated by Brothers to the Rescue, a Florida-based emigre group.

Remarks to the Community in Shoreline
February 24, 1996

The President. Thank you very much.

Audience member. [*Inaudible*]

The President. You know, we've listened to you, now it's my turn. [*Applause*] Thank you very much.

I want to thank Monica, not only for that introduction, which she did very well, but for her example, which millions of Americans will need to follow in the next few years. Let's give her another hand; she was great. [*Applause*]

I thank President Oertli, and I thank Senator Murray, your former faculty member here and a remarkable public servant who is—yes, you can clap for that, it's all right—[*applause*]—she's here along with Congressman Dicks and Congressman McDermott. Let me say that we've done a lot of good things in the last 3 years, and we've made one or two mistakes under the law of unintended consequences. And one of them was the unintended and unwarranted consequence of the way that timber rider has been carried out. And Patty Murray is going to help us fix it, and I thank her for that. I thank her for that.

I want to thank Mayor Connie King of Shoreline and my friends Mayor Rice of Seattle and King County Executive Gary Locke and Governor Lowry. They all came with me today, and we've had a wonderful experience here. I want to especially thank Bill Gates and Microsoft for this remarkable donation. I hope this word goes out all across the country and others try to match him, because this is the sort of thing that we need here. This is a shining example of the kind of partnership between businesses and public institutions that we need more of in America.

Let me say to all of you that when I became President I had a very straightforward vision. I wanted this country to go into the 21st century under circumstances in which every single American could live out his or her dreams and everybody who was willing to work for it could have their shot at the American dream. I wanted to go into the 21st century with a country that was coming together, not being driven apart, and a nation that was still the strongest force in the world for peace and freedom.

Now, to do that it is abundantly clear that we have to meet the challenges of this present moment and that we have to meet them together. One of the reasons I am here today is because I believe the community college in the United States is the daily model of how we are all going to have to behave if we hope to open up the opportunities of the information age to all Americans because it works by cooperation. It is completely democratic—small "d"—everybody is able to come and fulfill their own desires by working together, and everybody

cooperates. And if we all did that in every other way, we would be much better off.

I was here, you know, in Washington just a few days ago when I landed at Portland and just flew over the State line and visited a community that was ravaged by the flood. And I was in this little community of Woodland, walking down the streets, and I went into the home of a man—he and his wife were about 70 years old, and they had lost everything they had. They had lived in this house for 30 years; they had lost everything. He was hard of hearing; even his hearing aid was washed away. So I walked in, you know, really not knowing what to expect. I thought these people would be devastated. And this gentleman shook my hand, and he said, "You know, I'm 70 years old, and you're the first President I ever met. It was nearly worth it to lose my home." And then he said—[*laughter*]—I thought that was pretty remarkable. And then he said, "Not only that," he said, "I wouldn't have been fit to welcome a President before now. But come in here, look, I can offer you an indoor swimming pool." [*Laughter*] I was stunned.

I got out of the car and shook hands with a fellow who was up in his sixties. He was retired from the local utility company, a naturalized American, an immigrant from Norway, who operated a jackhammer in doing his part to try to help deal with the flood. And he operated this jackhammer for 8 hours with a cracked rib. I don't know if any of you have ever tried to hold a jackhammer in place. I'm above average size and not entirely weak, and that's hard work. And that man did that for 8 hours with a cracked rib.

Anyway, when I got ready to leave the 70-year-old fellow said to me, "I have just loved this. You know, as awful as this is, people came in here and tried to help us at least save some of our pictures and our records and our personal effects, tried to help us save a little furniture. They've been here every day since this flood happened." He said, "Don't you just wish we could behave this way all the time?" I say that because if you look at the challenges we face to give everybody a shot at the American dream, to grow together instead of be divided, and to maintain the world's strongest force for peace and freedom, we're going to have to do more of working together all the time.

How do we want that? How do we propose to do that? Well, just imagine what we have to do. In the State of the Union I was outlining the challenges to America. We want people to succeed at home and at work, so we have to build strong families and strong work places. We want people to have a decent quality of life, so we need safe streets and a clean environment. We know that there will be all kinds of changes in this economy, so we have to address the need for greater education and economic security that does not undermine the strength and the dynamism of this economy. We know that we have to do certain things to continue to lead the world. And we know that, just like every other organization, the Federal Government cannot be big and bloated and bureaucratic. So it needs to be smaller and less bureaucratic, but it doesn't need to be weak. It needs to be strong where it should be strong so it can be a valuable partner.

And if you look at all this, the most important areas to building the future we need are two that can be melded together that you are melding together here. One is every single American has got to have educational opportunity that is excellent and that is there for a lifetime—for a lifetime. And the second is we have to maintain the dynamism and the strength of the American economy, but give every American who is willing to work for it the chance to achieve economic security.

Now, before I came in here, I met with a number of students at this community college and some teachers and a labor leader and a businessman who were supporting the activities here. And I want you to just think a minute about the meaning of what Bill Gates did here today. I have worked very hard to increase the educational opportunities available to the America people, based on a simple theory: We should have high standards, high expectations, high technology, and access, access for a lifetime. That's why I believe if we're going to have a tax cut in this budget debate, the first and most important one we could give would be to give a tax cut for the cost of college tuition, a deductibility for that.

If we are here celebrating the work that is going on in this institution, its key to the 21st century, and opportunity for all, then we should stand by those things that are working. We should keep the student loan program and strengthen it. We should keep the Pell grant program and strengthen it. We should keep the

national service program, AmeriCorps, and strengthen it. We should do these things.

But I want to put before you the dilemma that I saw in the lives of these people that a lot of you have experienced. If I were to have told you 3 years ago when I became the President, "Look, here's what's going to happen in our country. Just listen to this. In 3 years we will have nearly 8 million new jobs, and all the other advanced countries in the world together will have a net of zero. The other six big economies, they'll have—a few will create a few jobs, and a few will lose a few, but they'll net out no new jobs. We'll have nearly 8 million. And in each year of the next 3 years, we'll have a record number of new businesses, and we'll be at a 15-year high in homeownership. We'll have a record number of new self-made millionaires, not people who inherited it, people like Bill Gates, people that went out and made it on their own. We will have the lowest rates of unemployment, inflation, and home mortgages combined that we've had in 27 years"—you can clap for that. That's the good news. [*Applause*] "Our exports will be at an all-time high, and we will turn around the trade situation so that for the first time in many years our exports will be growing faster than our imports. We will do that. We'll be opening closed markets in Asia, selling everything from Washington apples to computers to auto parts. We'll be doing these things. But half the American people will be working harder than they were 3 years ago for the same wages they were making 10 years ago." Now, you would say, "Well, how could that happen?"

Well, it's because of the changes we're going through. You heard Monica talk about it. We are changing the nature of work. There's more mind and less muscle in all work. We're changing the nature of the workplace. The information revolution means you don't need as many people in the middle passing orders down and information up. And by the way, these changes are the most profound we've seen in 100 years. The last time this country changed this much was when most people moved from living on the farm to living in towns and cities, and most people moved from working on the farm to working in factories and in businesses necessary to support them. It's a 100-year change.

In addition to that, communication is changing so rapidly. You heard Mr. Gates talk about it. In his book he says the digital chip is the most important change in communication in not 100 years but in 500 years, since Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Europe.

Now, you cannot go through that sweep of change—and understand that the markets in the world where people exchange goods and services and money are changing; the money markets and the goods and services markets are now all global—you can't go through a change like that without a great uprooting.

Now, we have two choices. We can either bore our way through this change until it benefits all Americans, or we can pretend that we can repeal the laws of change and suffer the consequences. I can tell you—you heard what Bill Gates said—remember what I said, for all of our challenges in America, we have 8 million more jobs nearly, and we'll have more than that by the end of this year, and we have a much lower unemployment rate than most of our competitors. Our exports are growing faster than our imports. We're starting record numbers of new jobs. For all the corporate downsizing, listen to this, businesses owned by women alone have created more jobs than the Fortune 500 have laid off in the last 3 years.

So what we have to do—[*applause*]—but the challenge—that sounds great, but if you're one of those people who hasn't had a raise, if you're one of those people who gets downsized, or if you live in a remote rural community or an inner-city neighborhood that has no new jobs, it sounds great, but it doesn't ring true to you.

So our challenge is not to back up, not to give up, it's to go ahead. If you look at technology, today in our public schools where our children are becoming computer wizards in elementary schools, nobody sees technology as a threat. Technology is the equalizer. Technology is the tool that means that poor kids and rich kids can learn together and access the future together. Technology is a tool that I have seen with my own eyes bringing immigrant families into the mainstream of American educational life.

I was in a poor school district in New Jersey all the way across the country a few days ago where the student body is below the national average in per capita income and many of them come from immigrant families. But a company there, Bell Atlantic, worked with the school district and others to put computers in the classrooms and computers in the homes. And you have people who didn't even live in this country

20 years ago now E-mailing the principal to find out how the kids are doing in school. And this school district, which was on the verge of educational bankruptcy, literally about to be taken over by the State, within 2 years had an attendance record, a graduation record, and test scores above the State average. Technology was the great equalizer. We saw that.

So we have to finish that job. One of the goals we have is to do the four things that was up on one of those charts that Mr. Gates had: Put the computers in every classroom and every library in America, have good software, train the teachers, and then hook them all up to the Internet. We want every classroom and every library in every community in the United States on the Internet by the year 2000. And I think we're well on the way to getting that done.

But the significance of what we are here today about is this: The gift that Microsoft is giving to the community colleges, the work that the community colleges are doing, the people that come to places like this fine institution who have been downsized and now no longer feel diminished but feel empowered, that shows us the way to the future. The way to the future is not to back up on the technology revolution but to embrace it, work through it, and don't stop until every single American citizen benefits from it instead of being punished by it. That is what we have to do as Americans.

When we knew changes would have to be made here in the Pacific Northwest in logging practices in order to preserve the old growth forest, preserve the quality of the water, preserve the salmon population, preserve the quality of life, and still permit an acceptable amount of logging to go on, we knew there would be great dislocation in a lot of these small towns and rural areas, just like there has been in all the communities that lost their military bases when we downsized after the cold war.

So the Congress, with the leadership of the people in your delegation whom I just mentioned, appropriated over $1 billion for communities in the Pacific Northwest for the kind of economic transition that Monica is going through. That is what we have to do more of. But we have to do it in a way that makes technology our friend, not our enemy. At least two of the students that I met with here were downsized purely because you can do more work with fewer people because of computers.

The same thing is going on in the Federal Government. The Federal Government is 205,000 people smaller today than it was the day I took office. And I might add, I'm proud of the fact that we've worked very hard to help all these people not feel like they were downsized but feel like they were given an opportunity to go on to a better and more productive life. But we can do more work than we used to be able to do with fewer people, with less regulatory hassle, less bureaucratic hassle. The Federal Government is today as small as it was in 1965. And that's a good thing. But it's also a good thing that these people are going to have a chance to do something else that's more exciting, that's more fulfilling, that society needs done, that the marketplace says, hey, we need, and that they can get a good wage doing.

So I will say to you again: Our great challenge is to take what we know is true in the schoolroom, that technology is the great equalizer, and take it into the workplace. And that will happen through the community college. That will happen through partnerships. That will happen if we continue to invest in student assistance programs, to invest in technology partnerships, to invest in economic transitions, to invest in the people. And it will happen if we continue to work together.

One of the worst things about contemporary political life is that the further you get away from a grassroots political office where everyone knows all the candidates running, the more likely politics and campaigns are to be used to divide people instead of to unite them. When we are together, America never loses, and we will not lose this.

So I ask you to continue to support Shoreline Community College, to continue to support investments in education, to continue to insist that we move forward into the future and that we not stop until the benefits of technology are available to everyone. We cannot go forward as a country where half of us are growing and half of us are stuck. But we cannot pretend that we can return to a time that does not exist anymore.

We have no choice but to do what Americans have always done, to take on the challenges of the present and to march right through them. We can create more high-wage jobs. The Telecommunications Act will create tens of thousands of high-wage jobs. I want you to be trained to hold them. We can win in global

competition if we insist on having an open but fair trading system. We can move into the future. And we have to do it by working together.

More than any other institution in the United States of America today, the promise of technology with a bright future for all Americans is embodied by the way the community colleges work. I want America to work that way, and I want every one of you to remember what that 70-year-old man in Woodland, Washington, said to me: "That's the way we ought to behave all the time." And if we do, there is no limit to America's future.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:13 p.m. in the gymnasium at Shoreline Community College. In his remarks, he referred to Monica Walker, student, and Gary Oertli, president, Shoreline Community College; Mayor Norman Rice of Seattle; and Gov. Mike Lowry of Washington.

Statement on the Terrorist Attacks in Israel
February 25, 1996

On behalf of all Americans, I want to extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to Prime Minister Peres and the people of Israel. Our prayers are with them at this terrible moment, especially the families and friends of those killed and wounded in Jerusalem and Ashkelon.

These brutal acts of terror, which once again have taken the lives of innocent Israelis and at least one American citizen, offend the conscience of the world. They must not only be condemned; they must be brought to an end. The enemies of peace have once more attempted to turn back progress toward a new Middle East in which Arabs and Israelis may live in peace. But they have not and will not succeed. Their dark vision is of the past, not the present; of violence, not hope for a better future.

At this tragic moment, the U.S. stands alongside Israel and with all the peacemakers, as together we continue our work for a comprehensive and lasting settlement for all the peoples of the Middle East.

Statement on the Peace Vigil in Northern Ireland
February 25, 1996

Today, I join the people of Northern Ireland as you gather together in a mass vigil for peace. From where I stood last November in Belfast, to cities on both sides of the Atlantic, citizens are standing up for an end to violence and for the right of the people of Northern Ireland to a normal life.

The bombs that shattered the cease-fire and murdered and maimed innocent people in London must not be the path of the future. As today's outpouring of support underscores, the people want peace. They deserve peace, and we must all work to help them achieve this goal. Those who seek to use violence and terror should hear the voices of today's vigil being conducted across our lands: no to violence, yes to peace.

The United States continues to work with the Irish and British Governments and the parties to help the people of Northern Ireland achieve that goal. I commend all those who are standing today for peace. My hopes and prayers are with you in that effort.

Remarks on Presenting the Presidential Citizens Medal to Bernice Young Jones

February 26, 1996

The President. I want to begin, Bernice, by welcoming members of your family and your friends here, and we're especially glad to have Senator Bumpers and Congressman Hutchinson come.

I learned this morning something I did not know, that this is your first trip to Washington. Well, to have managed to live as many years as you have——

Ms. Jones. Ninety. [*Laughter*]

The President. ——without ever coming to Washington, that alone is justification for this award. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Jones. And that's my sister, and it's her first trip, and she's 92.

Hillary Clinton. Is that right?

The President. Well, neither one of you look it, and we're glad to have you.

Hillary Clinton. That's probably why they look so good. [*Laughter*]

The President. Let me say that for me, personally, this is a great pleasure because I know very well of the extraordinary work you have done for health care in Arkansas, for education, and of course, the center you established in your name and your late husband's name for families in Springdale. The things that you have done and stood for and tried to help are the things that all of us in America should be trying to advance. And you are a shining example for philanthropy in our country.

I can only hope that every State will find someone like you to help do what needs to be done. And it is for that reason that I wanted to give you this President's Citizens Medal. And I'm very glad you decided to take leave of your very good policy and at least one time come to Washington, DC. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Jones. Thank you so much. I appreciate it for myself, my family, my friends, my wonderful Springdale, and Arkansas.

The President. I'd like to ask my military aide now to read the citation.

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

Teleconference Remarks to the National Emergency Management Association

February 26, 1996

The President. Hello.

Federal Emergency Management Agency Director James Lee Witt. Mr. President, good morning.

The President. Good morning, James Lee, how are you?

Mr. Witt. I'm fine, sir. We have a lot of State directors in the room, probably about 200 people here, and we're very appreciative for you to call in.

The President. Well, I'm delighted to do it, and I wish I were there with you.

Mr. Witt. We do, too. [*Laughter*]

The President. You haven't seen Washington today—it just depends—I wish I were there with you even more than you wish I were there. [*Laughter*]

Let me begin by saying that I can imagine that for many of you, having the chance to come to the conference is a welcome relief from being out there on the front lines of disasters in your home States. This has been a tough, a cold, a wet, even a miserable winter for people in a lot of places and may of you are still in response or early recovery from the floods and the blizzards. We also, as I'm sure you know, have these terrible fires in some parts of our country. We've had more than 3 times as many disasters declared in the first 6 weeks of this

year than in this same period in the past 20 years.

I was recently in Oregon, Idaho, Washington, and Pennsylvania to see the devastation, the ruined homes, the businesses, as a result of the recent flooding. And I got a chance to talk with people who have lost their homes and their belongings and literally have to start all over again. I couldn't have known it when I became President, but I suppose that I've seen the widest array of natural disasters, along with James Lee Witt, in the last 3 years as in any period—comparable period—in modern history. We had the great Midwest flood of '93, the Northridge earthquake, the Oklahoma City bombing, Hurricanes Opal and Marilyn, dozens of floods and tornadoes, and of course, these fires.

I did know, though, when I became President that this was an important part of my job. When I became President I promised myself, based on my own experience as a Governor and my own frustrations with FEMA, that I would improve the Nation's response to disasters. For many years FEMA had been regarded almost universally as an agency not up to the job. And I'm very proud that under James Lee Witt's management and with all of your help, FEMA is now a model disaster relief agency and, in some corners, thought to be by far the most successful part of the Federal Government today. That is a breathtaking turnaround in just 3 years.

If I could just give one example: It used to take a month or more for many people to begin receiving relief, and now people can call in to a 1–800 number and see those checks arrive within days.

I am very pleased with the progress that's been made. I also am more impressed than ever before about the importance, the integral importance of FEMA to the Nation's business. It now relates to the Transportation Department, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Labor Department, the Energy Department, right across the line because of all of us having to work with James Lee in the dealing with disasters. So today it's a pleasure for me to announce to all of you that I am extending Cabinet membership for the first time in history to FEMA and to James Lee Witt.

Mr. Witt. Thank you, sir.

The President. Let me also say that I think all of us know that in dealing with these disasters, the most important thing is the spirit of the people. I'll never forget when James Lee and I were in Woodland, Washington, a few days ago. We came upon a 70-year-old man, and he and his wife had lost everything in the flood. He had even lost his hearing aid. And he looked at me and he said, "Well, I'm 70 years old, and I've never had a President shake hands with me before. It was nearly worth losing my home to do that at my age." [*Laughter*]

And I thought to myself, I wished that spirit could kind of somehow capture America. And at the end of my visit with this man he said to me how grateful he was for the help he'd received, how grateful he was for everyone treating him as they had. And then he said, "It's just too bad that we don't behave this way toward each other all the time." And I think that's an important lesson that we could take out of the work that FEMA and all of you have done. The teamwork, the spirit of can-do, the openness to doing what has to be done, the total lack of cynicism that you see in the midst of a disaster and taking care of its aftermath, that's really what this country needs all day, every day. When America works together, we never lose, and if we don't, we beat ourselves.

So I want to say again to all of you how grateful I am to you. I know the American people look to you, your Governors, to James Lee, and to me when they need us in these disasters. I know that they rise to the challenges they rarely do on a daily basis when a disaster occurs. And I just want to tell you how grateful I am to you for your public service and how I want to encourage you to continue to imbue the spirit of service that you demonstrate in times of disasters every day, every week, all year long.

Congratulations for all the good work you do. Have a successful conference, and let's hope and pray that for the rest of this year you won't have quite so much to do as you have had in the beginning.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:24 a.m. by telephone from the Oval Office at the White House to the association meeting in Arlington, VA.

Remarks Announcing Sanctions Against Cuba Following the Downing of American Civilian Aircraft

February 26, 1996

Good afternoon. Two days ago, in broad daylight and without justification, Cuban military aircraft shot down two civilian planes in international airspace. Search and rescue efforts by the Coast Guard, which began immediately after we received word of the incident, have failed to find any of the four individuals who were aboard the airplanes.

These small airplanes were unarmed and clearly so. Cuban authorities knew that. The planes posed no credible threat to Cuba's security. Although the group that operated the planes had entered Cuban airspace in the past on other flights, this is no excuse for the attack, and provides—let me emphasize—no legal basis under international law for the attack. We must be clear: This shooting of civilian aircraft out of the air was a flagrant violation of international law. It is wrong, and the United States will not tolerate it.

Saturday's attack is further evidence that Havana has become more desperate in its efforts to deny freedom to the people of Cuba. Also on Saturday the Cuban Council, a broad group that wants to bring democracy to Cuba, had planned a day of peaceful discussion and debate. Instead, in the days leading up to this gathering, scores of activists were arrested and detained. Two have already been sentenced to long prison terms. They join about 1,000 others in Cuba who are in jail solely because of their desire for freedom. Now the downing of these planes demands a firm response from both the United States and the international community. I am pleased that the European Union today strongly condemned the action.

Last night, on my instructions, Ambassador Albright convened an emergency session of the United Nations Security Council to condemn the Cuban action and to present the case for sanctions on Cuba until it agrees to abide by its obligation to respect civilian aircraft and until it compensates the families of the victims.

Today I am also ordering the following unilateral actions. First, I am asking that Congress pass legislation that will provide immediate compensation to the families, something to which they are entitled under international law, out of Cuba's blocked assets here in the United States. If Congress passes this legislation, we can provide the compensation immediately.

Second, I will move promptly to reach agreement with the Congress on the pending Helms-Burton Cuba legislation so that it will enhance the effectiveness of the embargo in a way that advances the cause of democracy in Cuba.

Third, I have ordered that Radio Marti expand its reach. All the people of Cuba must be able to learn the truth about the regime in Havana, the isolation it has earned for itself through its contempt for basic human rights and international law.

Fourth, I am ordering that additional restrictions be put on travel in the United States by Cuban officials who reside here, and that visits by Cuban officials to our country be further limited.

Finally, all charter air travel from the United States to Cuba will be suspended indefinitely.

These deliberate actions are the right ones at this time. They respond to Havana in a way that serves our goals of accelerating the arrival of democracy in Cuba. But I am not ruling out any further steps in the future, should they be required. Saturday's attack was an appalling reminder of the nature of the Cuban regime, repressive, violent, scornful of international law. In our time, democracy has swept the globe, from the Philippines exactly 10 years ago, to Central and Eastern Europe, to South Africa, to Haiti, to all but one nation in our hemisphere. I will do everything in my power to see that this historic tide reaches the shores of Cuba.

And let me close by extending on behalf of our family and our country our deepest condolences to those in the families of those who lost their lives.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Brothers to the Rescue, a Florida-based emigre group which operated the downed aircraft.

Statement on Tax Provisions for United States Troops in Bosnia
February 26, 1996

Today, in recognition of the sacrifices members of the U.S. Armed Forces are making in and around Bosnia, I am asking Congress to extend to them a series of special tax rules.

Historically, these provisions—which include extending the time to file returns and certain tax relief for those serving under hostile conditions—have been restricted to individuals deployed in "combat zones." However, the men and women of today's military confront hardships and risks in non-combat missions like the one we have undertaken in Bosnia. I believe the law should be extended to cover them. I look forward to working with Congress to enact these changes as quickly as possible.

Remarks Welcoming the World Series Champion Atlanta Braves
February 26, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. Senator Nunn, Congressman Lewis, Congressman Bishop, Terry McGuirk, Harvey Schiller, Bill Bartholomay, Stan Kasten, John Schuerholz, and to Bobby Cox and the coaches, the staff, and of course, the Atlanta Braves, let me welcome you all to the White House. We are delighted to have you here.

Secretary Riley is relocating from South Carolina to Georgia as a result of the outcome of the World Series. [*Laughter*] We're glad to see you here.

This is a happy day for all of us. Three years ago, shortly after I became President, I had occasion to meet the Canadian Prime Minister when he hosted a meeting in Vancouver between President Yeltsin and me. And he wanted to have all this high-flowing policy discussion, and I said, "Now, before anything else, I want to tell you that my number one objective in our relations with Canada is to win the World Series back." [*Laughter*] And I want to thank the Atlanta Braves for helping my foreign policy with Canada to succeed.

It was a great season, and it was a magnificent World Series victory. Since 1990 this team has been the winningest team in baseball, with three National League pennants and four division titles and an absolutely extraordinary level of performance, which for every baseball fan in America has been a thrilling thing to watch. Your victory is very well-deserved, not only because you have been there before but throughout the season you were dogged by doubts and second-guessing. I can identify with that. [*Laughter*] You proved your critics wrong, and you achieved baseball's highest goal by overcoming adversity and criticism.

Casey Stengel once said, good pitching beats good hitting and vice versa. [*Laughter*] Well, the Braves proved that last year. You had great hitting, great fielding, and great pitching. Tom Glavine and Greg Maddux have won every Cy Young Award for the past 5 years. You may have an antitrust suit on your hands, even with baseball's exemption. [*Laughter*]

We were all thrilled by Dave Justice's play and his solo home run in the final game, which put the Braves on top. And we were—I think all of us who grew up around baseball were literally stunned—I think "stunned" is the only word—by the success of your entire pitching staff. We may never see a performance like that again in my lifetime, and I want to compliment all of them, especially since Senator Nunn told me on the way in they were all good golfers as well. [*Laughter*]

I think the Braves have shown us the best side of professional sports: perseverance and hard work and commitment, and a commitment that has endured over seasons. There really does seem to be a spirit of teamwork that has worked for this team. At a time when so many people wonder whether the team spirit and the ties to community still characterize professional athletics, the Braves have demonstrated beyond doubt that in Atlanta and with the Braves that is still the truth, and that it has been richly

rewarded by consistent performance year-in and year-out and finally by the World Series victory.

For all of that, I say on behalf of our entire country, congratulations. Welcome to the White House. It is an honor to have you here. And if you keep doing what you've been doing I expect you'll be here for several more years, and I hope I'm around for a few of them to welcome you back. Thank you very much.

[*At this point, several gifts were presented to the President.*]

The President. Thank you very much. I looked in here hoping I could find out how many strokes I would get from each player. [*Laughter*]

Let me say again to all of you, I welcome you here. We're going to take a little picture now and then have a receiving line next door so we can bring everyone in. It occurred to me that I ought to make one more point since the team is here and we were forced to delay this once because of the operation in Bosnia.

This room is a good reminder of why teams and why this country should never say die. And I think I should tell you this. It was in this room in 1814, 182 years ago, that symbolically the light of liberty in America almost went out. This room was all set up for a fancy banquet, and unbeknownst to the people who were planning to come, in the War of 1812, the British had actually landed a few miles from here.

And our President, James Madison, was the last President of the United States that actually was the operating Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. He was out of the White House, and his wife, Dolley, was basically going to host this dinner we were having. And so James Madison sent his wife word that the British were coming and that she should get out of here before she was killed.

But she had to save that picture of George Washington, which was painted in 1797, 200 years ago next year, by Gilbert Stewart. And we bought it for $500 in 1797. It's worth a dollar or two more today. [*Laughter*] She cut that picture out of a frame, rolled it up, and just before the British rolled in here she cleared out, along with all the party-goers. They came in and had the gall to eat all of our food, and then they burned the house down. And a lot of people thought the next day that America's days were numbered. It didn't turn out that way.

And I think if we all remember that, we can do more in our own lives to help our country, our teams, our families, and our communities. And that's the sort of spirit you've exhibited. I hope you'll—when times get tough, you'll remember that story. That was a long time ago, and we're still here.

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:55 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Terry McGuirk, executive vice president, Turner Broadcasting Service, Inc.; Harvey Schiller, president, Turner Sports; Bill Bartholomay, chairman of the board, and Stan Kasten, president, Atlanta Braves Organization; John Schuerholz, general manager, Bobby Cox, field manager, and Tom Glavine, Greg Maddux, and Dave Justice, players, Atlanta Braves; and Brian Mulroney, former Prime Minister of Canada.

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

February 28, 1996

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex, signed at Washington on December 16, 1994. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to this Treaty.

The bilateral investment treaty (BIT) with Uzbekistan is designed to protect U.S. investment and assist the Republic of Uzbekistan in its efforts to develop its economy by creating

conditions more favorable for U.S. private investment and thus strengthen the development of its private sector.

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

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 28, 1996.

Letter to Representative John Conyers, Jr., on Abortion Legislation
February 28, 1996

Dear John:

I understand that the House is preparing to consider H.R. 1833, as amended by the Senate, which would prohibit doctors from performing a certain type of abortion. I want to make the Congress aware of my position on this extremely complex issue.

I have always believed that the decision to have an abortion should be between a woman, her conscience, her doctor, and her God. I strongly believe that legal abortions—those abortions that the Supreme Court ruled in *Roe* v. *Wade* must be protected—should be safe and rare. I have long opposed late-term abortions except, as the law requires, where they are necessary to protect the life of the mother or where there is a threat to her health. In fact, as Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions except where they were necessary to protect the life or health of the woman, consistent with the Supreme Court's rulings.

The procedure described in H.R. 1833 is very disturbing, and I cannot support its use on an elective basis, where the abortion is being performed for non-health related reasons and there are equally safe medical procedures available. As I understand it, however, there are rare and tragic situations that can occur in a woman's pregnancy in which, in a doctor's medical judgment, the use of this procedure may be necessary to save a woman's life or to preserve her health. In those situations, the Constitution requires that a woman's ability to choose this procedure be protected.

I have studied and prayed about this issue, and about the families who must face this awful choice, for many months. I believe that we have a duty to try to find common ground: a resolution to this issue that respects the views of those—including myself—who object to this particular procedure, but also upholds the Supreme Court's requirement that laws regulating abortion protect both the life and the health of American women.

I have concluded that H.R. 1833 as drafted does not meet the constitutional requirements that the Supreme Court has imposed upon us, in *Roe* and the decisions that have followed it, to provide protections for both the life and the health of the mother in any laws regulating abortions.

I am prepared to support H.R. 1833, however, if it is amended to make clear that the prohibition of this procedure does not apply to situations in which the selection of the procedure, in the medical judgment of the attending physician, is necessary to preserve the life of the woman or avert serious adverse health consequences to the woman.

I urge the Congress to amend H.R. 1833 to ensure that it protects the life and the health of the woman, as the law we have been elected to uphold requires.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 28 but was not issued as a White House press release.

Statement on the Northern Ireland Peace Process
February 28, 1996

I welcome the announcement made today by British Prime Minister Major and Irish Prime Minister Bruton of a path to negotiations for a just and lasting settlement in Northern Ireland. I want to express my admiration for these two leaders, who have shown so much courage and determination in the cause of peace. The clear path they have laid out leads to inclusive talks on the future of Northern Ireland, once the cease-fire has been restored. I am convinced that this is the path supported by the overwhelming majority of the people of Northern Ireland, who have so resoundingly rejected violence and embraced peace. I call on those who have resorted to violence to heed the voice of the people and cease their campaign of terror.

The process that Prime Ministers Bruton and Major have announced will begin with intensive consultations among the Governments and the parties to reach agreement on a broadly acceptable elective process, which will lead directly and without preconditions to all-party negotiations by June 10, 1996. The consultations, to begin early next month, will also address the framework for those negotiations and whether to hold a referendum on support for the peace process. I hope all the parties will commit themselves to participate fully in the process announced today in order to create the lasting peace the people of Northern Ireland deserve.

The United States remains fully committed to supporting the search for peace in which the two Governments, the parties, and the people of Northern Ireland have invested so much. I will remain in close touch with Prime Ministers Major and Bruton, who know they have my full support in their pursuit of peace. We will continue to work with the parties in the same cause.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting With Entertainment and Media Executives
February 29, 1996

Good morning. Let me once again welcome all of you to the White House and thank you for coming for what is a truly historic meeting. Many of you have come from a long way away, and I am gratified by this astonishing and positive turnout.

Three weeks ago today, I signed the telecommunications bill. This is, as all of you well know, truly landmark legislation that will free the full force of American ingenuity and creativity. It will help us to better enrich minds, to create more jobs, to help us understand one another, to help us enjoy more entertainment, and to help us grow together into the future.

Those of you who are gathered here today will be the ones to unleash this American ingenuity. Arguably, you are the most powerful cultural force in the world. But we know, too, that freedom and creativity can truly thrive in a free society that is also a responsible society.

In the State of the Union Address I challenged Congress to pass the telecommunications bill and to include within it the V-chip. Congress did that, agreeing that we should try the V-chip to give parents more control over the content of television programs their children watch, so that those that young people plainly should not watch would at least be subject to some parental control and influence.

I asked you here today so that we could discuss our common responsibilities to help our children and our families. I believe the telecom

bill and the V-chip and, perhaps most important of all, this entirely voluntary gathering of your industry embodies what I see as the three great challenges this country faces as we go through this period of remarkable transformation. The telecom bill plainly will create more opportunities in this new era. The V-chip and your endeavors will enable us to exercise more responsibility to promote the strength and values of family. And if we do these things in a completely voluntary and open way, it will help us to come together as a national community.

There are so many forces in America today that are operating to divide the American people, and I think we should work on uniting ourselves. It's been my experience and observation that when this country is united, we are never defeated; we always achieve what we set out to do. And you have gone a long way toward helping build that kind of community by your very presence here today, and I thank you for that.

We are here to discuss how we can best fulfill our common responsibilities in two ways: first, how we can give parents more control over what their children see on television; and second, how we can improve children's programming.

Two months ago I doubt that many people thought that this meeting, or any meeting like this, could have even occurred. But we have now made so much progress, and we're on the verge of making new progress. I am excited about what I think we can achieve here today for our children, our families, and our future.

And let me say again, for an industry that gets more than its share of criticism, I think it is worth noting that you have all put aside all your vigorous internal, competitive rivalries and dealt with what I think is a very profound set of questions for the future. And so I thank you for being here. I welcome you here, and I must say I'm very much looking forward to our discussion.

And I'd like to ask the Vice President now, who has worked so hard in helping to organize this meeting, to make a few opening remarks, and then we'll get down to work.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:42 a.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

Remarks Following a Meeting With Entertainment and Media Executives

February 29, 1996

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I have just concluded a very significant meeting with the leaders of America's media and entertainment industries. I am pleased to report on a breakthrough voluntary agreement to help parents protect their children from violence and adult content on television.

Our purpose in this meeting has been to find out how we can help parents raise their children in the right way and to protect them as they raise them. In this high-technology age, our goal should be more opportunity, more responsibility, and more community, to make changes in the way we do business that will help people to raise their children and bring us together as a people even as we grow the economy and enjoy the opportunities that this new technological era brings.

Just a little over a month ago in my State of the Union Address, I challenged Congress to pass legislation that requires new television sets to include a V-chip, to give parents the power to screen out violence and objectionable content in television programs. Earlier this month, with the Telecommunications Act, I signed the V-chip into law. Since that time, our administration, spearheaded by the Vice President, has worked with broadcasters, cable firms, production studios, and others to encourage them to find ways to take more responsibilities toward meeting our shared goals. I am gratified that the far-sighted leaders gathered here in this unprecedented meeting have risen to the challenge, and I thank them all.

As a result of our discussions, the media and the entertainment industry has agreed to a voluntary system of ratings for television programs. These ratings will be put in place by the end of this year or the beginning of next year to help parents decide what programs they want their children to watch. And the V-chip will give parents the power to block those programs

they do not want them to watch from their televisions.

We're handing the TV remote control back to America's parents so that they can pass on their values and protect their children. In the next few moments, Jack Valenti will describe the next steps the industry will take. But they've already shown that they recognize their creativity and their freedom carries with it significant responsibility. I applaud them for it, and all Americans are in their debt.

The work we began here is just that, a beginning. In our meeting I invited the industry leaders to come back to the White House to report once they have developed their rating systems, and I look forward to the work they will do.

Let me say on their behalf—I know Jack Valenti will say this—but this is a complicated and difficult undertaking. They talked a lot about some of the challenges that they will face. I think that should cause all the rest of us to be all the more supportive of the fact that they are doing it, doing it together, and doing it with real deliberation and discipline on a specific timetable.

We also had a very good discussion this morning of the urgent need to improve children's programming. It is not enough for parents to be able to tune out what they don't want their children to watch; they want to be able to tune in good programs that their children will watch. We take the Children's Television Act seriously. We want to continue to work with the industry to do the very best we can for our children in both quantity and quality of children's programming. And I believe the executives here today will bring to this challenge the same sense of responsibility they have brought to the issue of TV ratings.

Ultimately, we're trying to raise our children successfully in an age of information overload in which the typical child will watch 25,000 hours of television before his or her 18th birthday. Television is a powerful force to bring people together, to entertain, to educate, to open our minds and hearts. But we also know that young people are exposed regularly to numbing and pervasive violence and other destructive behavior when they park in front of the family television.

I believe what we are doing here today shows how America can meet this challenge and many of our challenges by businesses and parents and Government all working together, each doing our part. It shows what can happen when visionary business leaders do make a commitment to values and the common good, as well as the bottom line, and when they live up to their responsibilities as corporate citizens of our great country.

I want to say, too, that I hope the kind of responsibility these leaders have shown here today will be matched by other executives in other industries, on other problems the American people face in common. That is how we can move forward into this new age of possibility.

Finally, let me give credit where credit is due. This breakthrough we see today is the result of literally years of concerns by America's parents. Ultimately it is only parents who can prevent our children from seeing programs that teach violence that has no consequences or that inappropriate behavior is glamorous. So to all the parents of America, I say: You will be handed a powerful tool; that you must now exercise it with the responsibilities that go with it. And to all the parents who have worked for this day, I say a very special thank you, especially to Tipper Gore, who has worked on this issue for 20 years, and to the First Lady, who has given it so much of her concern.

America's media and entertainment industry is the world's most vital creative force. It would be much more difficult for me to be President were it not for the economic advantages in international trade brought to us by the creative energies of America's entertainment industry.

I hope that this agreement today will ensure that that creativity will forever be a source of learning and values and responsibilities in the lives of our children, even as it continues to be a great source of your own success, our entertainment, and America's strength.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:10 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Jack Valenti, president, Motion Picture Association of America.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion With Families on Television Programming

March 1, 1996

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. I might say, aren't we all glad to be in his big, beautiful office here. I love to come over here. I want to thank all of you for coming and to say to you and to the members of the media who are here, yesterday we heard for 2 hours from a remarkable assemblage of people who are involved in the television industry: people who broadcast the programs; we heard from cable people; we heard from the people who write the programs, people who represent the actors, producers. It was an amazing assemblage of people who got together and came to Washington to announce that they had decided to develop a rating system for television programs like the movie rating system and that as the Vice President said, that that would be able to be used then when the V-chip becomes available in televisions.

Now, the V-chip, of course, will start coming into televisions in a couple of years. And we replace about 25 million televisions a year, I think, in America, so it will quickly be a fixture in a significant percentage of America's televisions. But the rating system presumably will still be helpful for parents even before they have the V-chip.

We wanted to have you in here today because we want to get a feel and we want the country to get a feel for what kinds of things parents feel about this rating system and the V-chip, what the young people feel about it, what you expect out of it. What do you think it will do? What won't it do? What would you like to see? How would you like to see it work? And of course, we have some advocates and professionals here who can talk about the impact of this on childrearing in America and on childhood.

I must tell you, this is going to be a very complicated and difficult thing for these people in television to do in the sense that they have—there are many, many thousands of—tens of thousands of programs on all of these television stations, and as we get more cable channels, they will multiply exponentially. So the job of rating them is very different from the job of rating a couple of thousand movies a year. So as they undertake this task, I think it's important for the people in the entertainment industry and the public at large to get just a feel for how parents feel about it, how young people feel about it, and kind of how it should proceed, because they committed to have this done by the first of next year—no later than the first of next year, and perhaps sooner.

So we really just felt we ought to have this conversation today, and we thank you for joining us. And maybe we ought to start with you, Mrs. Somson. If you could tell the press—everybody, if you could tell the press your name when you speak and how you happen to be here.

[*At this point, parent Barbara Somson praised the rating system and the V-chip as tools for enforcement of parental standards for television programs watched by their children. Another parent expressed her hope that the V-chip and the industry meeting on ratings would be a first step toward production of better children's programming.*]

The President. I want to talk about the better programming in a minute because I think that's a big part of it, especially when I ask the young people about it. But I want to give the parents who are here a chance to say anything they'd like to say about the V-chip and the ratings issue, and then I want to come back and talk about the V-chip with you. I want you to tell your story.

[*A parent said that the V-chip technology would assist individual families in defining their own viewing standards and let them vote for more family programming in a way that advertisers and programmers would understand.*]

The President. I'm so glad to hear you say that, because there were—you made two comments; I just want to say that to kind of resonate with the discussion we had with the people from the industry yesterday. Ted Turner said—and he went out and said in public, so I'm not saying anything in private he didn't say in public—that he strongly supported the rating system and what we were doing, what they were doing, but he did think it would be very costly. And

I think it will obviously cost a lot of money to figure out how to do this and then review all these programs, to set up the system. But I think he meant he thought it would be costly over the long run because programs would not have the same viewership and their advertisers would drop.

I think I see it more like you do; it's a voting system. It would be another—it's like the Nielsen ratings, except you won't have—this won't be a sample, you'll be able to actually know. You'll be able to at least sample all the V-chip homes—you take a representative sample—and it might actually change the content of programming so that the market, the market forces actually produce more positive programs.

The other thing you said I think is important, a couple of the folks who were skeptical yesterday talked about how this wouldn't be a panacea, it wouldn't solve all the problems. And one of the men in the broadcasting meeting said—I mean, the industry meeting—he said, "I'm going to take off my industry hat now and tell you that I'm a parent of three small children. I'm not looking for panaceas; I'm looking for a little help." And I think that's the way all of us who are parents look at this. There is no such thing as a panacea; we're looking for a little help.

So you made that point, and I thought it was very good.

[*A parent noted that the V-chip could replace her husband's use of the television's remote control to enforce their standards.*]

The President. Hillary almost fell off the chair when you said that, the keeper of the remote. [*Laughter*]

Participant. So we're really delighted with both the V-chip and the rating system.

[*Another parent said the combination was a vital first step for working parents who could not always be present when their children watched television. The Vice President then introduced Dr. Robert Phillips, deputy medical director, American Psychiatric Association, who discussed the powerful effect of gratuitous television violence on children and thanked the President and the Vice President for their efforts to address the problem.*]

The President. Hillary, do you want to comment on that, based on what you said in——

[*Hillary Clinton said that more information on the link between television and child behavior would encourage parents to use the rating system and the V-chip in their homes.*]

The President. I want to get to the young people here. And let me tell you, it's okay if you disagree with us about this; we want to hear what you really think. But I want to ask the doctor one more question.

Before I had this job, as I used to say, back when I had a life—[*laughter*]—I was Governor of my State when I ran a big prison system and a big criminal justice system, obviously. And then I was attorney general, and before that I taught criminal law. So I've been following issues of crime and violence closely from that perspective for more than 20 years now. For most of my time, it was an article of faith that 75 percent of all the violent crimes in America were created by people between the ages of 17 and 26 and that there was almost a hormonal problem—if you could literally just get violent people and put them somewhere until they were 27, you could let them out and then they would not do that again—that there really almost seemed to be sea changes.

Now we see an astonishing thing with the crime rate going down among people 18 and over and, I might add, drug use going down among people over 18, and violence going up among people under 18, as well as casual drug use. And I think there are plainly other reasons for increasing violent behavior among young people, including the lives that many of them have to live, virtually raising themselves on some of the meanest streets in America. But I gather from what you said that you really believe that the sort of cumulative, almost deadening impact of all this media-generated violence is at least partly the explanation for rising rates of violence among juveniles.

[*Dr. Phillips concurred, pointing out that the increase in juvenile crime was a multifactorial problem. The Vice President noted that the upcoming White House Conference on Youth Violence would address other factors involved, thanked the industry for taking the steps that they agreed to, and suggested that the children might have a different perspective.*]

The President. I thought maybe we ought to start with Catherine next to me, because Catherine Murphy actually passed the first V-chip

bill—[*laughter*]—in the United States of America. I think you all need to know that. It wasn't us; it was her. And so I think you ought to hear her story. And I'd like to know how you came to propose this legislation and what you think of it.

[*High school student Catherine Murphy described her presentation of V-chip legislation at the Girls Nation Senate she attended, mentioning that it passed but was then vetoed.*]

The President. They'll do that to you. [*Laughter*] Let me ask you this. Do you believe—I want to ask and then I want to go around to the students here—how do you think the V-chip should be used? And how much difference do you think there is in the age of the children in terms of the regulation of the programming?

[*The participant described her family's television viewing habits and said that elementary school children watched too much television.*]

The President. You watch television a lot?

[*A student responded that he only watched the news and a few other programs, but that his peers based their lives on television as a major activity and a model for behavior.*]

The President. If you've actually seen that in your friends who believe it——

Participant. Yes.

The President. ——that they're acting, they model what they do based on what they see on television.

[*The participant confirmed that his peers modeled themselves after television characters, and he then endorsed the V-chip to help parents prevent such behavior.*]

The President. What about you? You're 11, right?

[*A participant said that he spent hours playing on the computer and asked if there would be a V-chip for computers.*]

The President. Let's talk about that because that's going to be a big issue.

[*The Vice President pointed out the need for an industry-wide system to rate computer games and to allow parents to screen the Internet to prevent children's access to inappropriate material. Other children then described their friends' television viewing habits.*]

The President. What do you think? Do you think your mother should have some influence over what you watch on television, or should you decide?

[*A participant said that parents should have influence over what their children watched, and she then described classmates who annoyed her by pretending to be television characters.*]

The President. Playing out what they saw on TV.

Participant. Right.

The President. What about you all?

[*A 13-year-old said that children tended to act out television shows instead of playing and expanding their imagination. A parent said that although watching television could be safer than some other activities, parents should encourage children to be critical viewers.*]

The President. What do you think?

[*After a participant remarked that children could be scared by some television programs, the Vice President said the V-chip would give parents a tool to prevent that. Several parents stressed that older children should be taught to make good choices for themselves. Another parent pointed out the benefits of television.*]

The President. I'm so glad to hear you say that as well. But that—I don't know how much time we have left, but I think we ought to hear from the young people especially on the flip side of this because we believe it's important. We applaud the industry for developing the rating system and making it compatible with the V-chip. But the Children's Television Act, which was passed a couple of years ago, also calls upon producers of the television programs to develop more and better programs that will be appealing to children in a positive way.

And I just want to make two points and then ask anybody who wants to comment to comment. There were two interesting ideas which came out yesterday. One is, the people who were there—not us; the Vice President and I just watched—but in the room there, in the industry, there was a genuine argument about whether particularly younger people would be as likely to watch any kind of educational program as they would a sort of a violent cartoon or something. And there was a woman there from the Discovery Channel who was a very powerful advocate and said, "That is not true.

If you make education entertaining, it will be watched." And she gave some examples. That's the first thing: Would you like to have more positive programming on television?

The second thing I think's important to point out—one of you sort of inched up to it when you were talking about the Internet, young people on the computer—all these technologies, the Vice President knows 100 times more about this than I do, but it looks to me like they're all merging. I mean, it won't be very long before you can call up any movie you want on your computer and before a lot of the things you see on your television screen are interactive. So that I think that basically we're watching, we're seeing a process—and that, by the way, will engage more young people because as they become more computer literate, if they have interactive programs on television, it will bring them up, or if they can call movies up on the computer, it will. So we really need to also focus on the positive things that we ought to be doing for our children.

And so, what do you think? Do you think—would young people be just as likely to watch more constructive programs if they were genuinely entertaining, or do you believe there's just an inherent predisposition to watch the violence?

[*A participant stated that interesting educational programming for young children could open doors of opportunity for them later on. Hillary Clinton pointed out the industry's concern that older children would not choose educational programming for themselves and asked the teens to respond. A 14-year-old stated that she and her friends preferred nonviolent movies.*]

Mrs. Clinton. You are an exception—[*laughter*]—based on the numbers that are out there.

Participant. I think also it has to do with where I live and the family upbringing that I had.

Mrs. Clinton. That's exactly right.

[*Participants discussed targeting programming for high school children, the lack of good children's programming on broadcast television, and local campaigns to encourage better programming. The Vice President then concluded that the V-chip and the rating system would enable parents to make categorical viewing choices for their children rather than just pull the plug on the television.*]

The President. First of all, I would like to thank all of you for being here, especially the young people. Thank you, doctor, it's good to see you again.

Dr. Phillips. Good to see you, Mr. President.

The President. I want to thank Tipper Gore. When she first proposed a rating system for records, it was considered heresy. And now she's lived and worked hard at this long enough to make it a matter of American conventional wisdom in television.

And let me say that for Hillary and for me, based on our experience over the last 15 or 20 years, maybe the most important reason to have this conversation today was the point that Catherine made when she first talked about her work for the V-chip, and that is that technology is intrinsically action-oriented but neither intrinsically good nor bad. It depends on the values and the action of the people in control of the technology. And while this gives more—the V-chip and the ratings information will give more power to parents, it's utterly useless unless they use it.

And so what I'm hoping that this did today is to convince other people in other community settings and every community in our country to begin to discuss these matters and to begin to now, if their community does not have an advocacy group like the one you are involved in, perhaps to form one or at least figure out how friends and neighbors can get together and figure out how they're going to use this ratings information and figure out how they're going to use the V-chip as the V-chip comes in.

But I was glad to hear Mrs. Somson say what she did about this. You don't have to wait for the V-chip to make use of the ratings information. You know, most parents are still influenced—most children still have some influence about what their parents say, and parents are influenced by their children. So I just want to encourage that we need that every place in America.

But this law that was passed and this remarkable effort by the industry will not amount to a hill of beans if the parents do not take action in their homes and if in each community the community activists who know how to make the most of this don't work with the parents to do it.

Thanks a lot. It's great to see you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:55 a.m. in the Vice President's Ceremonial Office in the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Ted Turner, chief executive officer and president, Turner Broadcasting Service, Inc.

Message to the Congress on the National Emergency With Respect to Cuba

March 1, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 1 of title II of Public Law 65–24, ch. 30, 50 U.S.C. 191 and sections 201 and 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*, United States Code, I hereby report that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency in response to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba.

In the proclamation (copy attached), I have authorized and directed the Secretary of Transportation to make and issue such rules and regulations that the Secretary may find appropriate to prevent unauthorized U.S. vessels from entering Cuban territorial waters.

I have authorized these rules and regulations as a result of the Government of Cuba's demonstrated willingness to use reckless force, including deadly force, in the ostensible enforcement of its sovereignty. I have determined that the unauthorized departure of vessels intending to enter Cuban territorial waters could jeopardize the safety of certain U.S. citizens and other persons residing in the United States and threaten a disturbance of international relations. I have, accordingly, declared a national emergency in response to these threats.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 1, 1996.

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

Message on the Observance of Saint Patrick's Day, 1996

March 1, 1996

Warmest greetings to everyone celebrating Saint Patrick's Day.

On this feast day of the patron saint of Ireland, we remember with gratitude the gifts of the Irish people. For generations, the sons and daughters of Ireland have come to America seeking a new life and a new freedom, bringing with them a deep faith in God, a profound love of liberty, and a determination to help shape the American Dream.

As soldiers and scholars, poets and Presidents, Irish Americans have enriched every facet of American society. Today we honor their many accomplishments, their vital contributions in building the cities, industries, and culture of America, and the long friendship and close ties between the United States and Ireland.

Like millions of Americans, I rejoice in my Irish heritage; and like millions of Americans, I pray for lasting peace in the land of our ancestors. We must not permit the process of reconciliation in Northern Ireland to be destroyed by those who are blinded by the hatreds of the past. As we pay tribute to Saint Patrick's enduring message of faith and courage, I salute the people of Ireland for their devotion to defeating the enemies of peace. In this age of hope and possibility, I am confident that their steadfast efforts will be rewarded with lasting tranquility and the blessings of a bright future.

Best wishes to all for a wonderful holiday.

BILL CLINTON

Statement on Food and Drug Administration Approval of an HIV/AIDS Drug

March 1, 1996

Our national investment in AIDS research is paying off. Among scientists, as among many people living with HIV, despair is giving way to hope. We cannot stop now. We must recommit ourselves to finding a cure.

NOTE: The statement referred to the Food and Drug Administration's approval of the second protease inhibitor to treat HIV/AIDS.

Statement on Yellowstone National Park

March 1, 1996

Today marks the 124th anniversary of Yellowstone National Park. Yellowstone is home to more than half of the world's geysers, America's largest herds of elk and bison, and one of the great places on the Earth where we teach our children the mysteries of nature.

Conservation history was made 124 years ago today, when Yellowstone was designated the world's first national park. It is a tribute to the wisdom of the American people that we are willing to set aside and preserve some wild places. Yellowstone was entrusted to our care by our ancestors who had a vision. We now have a responsibility to care for Yellowstone so that our children and their children can experience the wonder of nature and the wisdom of our ancestors.

The President's Radio Address

March 2, 1996

Good morning. Something remarkable happened this week, something that can forever help parents, children, and anybody who cares about what our children watch on television. We took an enormous step toward controlling the images of violence and vice that can enter our homes and disturb our children.

Television is one of the most influential voices that can enter a home. It can be entertaining, enlightening, and educating. But when it transmits pictures or words we wouldn't want our children to see and hear in real life, television can become an unwelcome intruder, one that parents have too often found too difficult to control.

In study after study, the evidence has steadily mounted that television violence is numbing and corrosive. It can have a destructive impact on young children. In my State of the Union speech, I challenged the Members of Congress to give control back to parents. I asked them to require TV's to include the V-chip, a device that lets parents filter out programs they don't want to let into their homes and their children's lives.

Congress answered that challenge, and 3 weeks ago when I signed the telecommunications bill into law, the V-chip also became law. Now it will be standard in new television sets sold in our country. We need this.

To make the V-chip work, I invited leaders of the media and entertainment industry to come to the White House to work with us to help our families. And this past Thursday I met with the leaders of the television networks, the production studios, the cable companies, actors, directors, and writers. Their response was overwhelming, and our meeting was a great success.

For the first time ever, leaders of the television and entertainment industry have come to-

gether as one force and agreed to develop a rating system for their programming that will help parents to protect their children from violence and other objectionable content on television. They said this system will be in place by next January.

Like the movie ratings have done for 27 years, the ratings for television will help parents to guide their children's entertainment choices. The system will provide families with a standard they can rely on from show to show, from channel to channel. Parents are the best judges of what their children should and shouldn't see, and this new rating system will help them to make those critical judgments. The best programming director for our children is a parent.

At my meeting with the entertainment industry, we also discussed the need for more programming that is suitable for children and that is educational and attractive to them. I want to preserve public broadcasting and the innovation it has brought in educational shows for children.

These days, a typical child will watch 25,000 hours of television before his or her 18th birthday. It's up to us whether these shows stimulate their minds or numb them. Let's build on the good shows that we have as models for educating and informing our children. I applaud the entertainment leaders for what they have done voluntarily. Through their action, they are being responsible for the product they produce and they are showing greater concern for our American community and our children's future.

With the V-chip and the rating system, we mark a sea change. We are harnessing technology, creativity, and responsibility, bringing together parents, business, and Government to meet a major challenge to our society. After all, it doesn't do a family any good to have a nice television if the images it brings to our children erodes their values and diminishes their future.

We should look at this breakthrough as part of a bigger picture and as a lesson for even greater achievement. As I have said many times, this is an age of great possibility when more Americans will have more opportunities to live out their dreams than ever before. But we also know that this is a time of stiff challenges as well. If we are to meet those challenges, all of us must take our proper responsibility. Government must play a part but only a part. Only if each of us measures what we do by basic standards of right and wrong, taking responsibility for our actions, moving us together, will we be able to move forward as a Nation.

Let me say again: Only if we work together in our businesses, our schools, our places of worship, our civic groups, will we transform our lives and our country. That is what I mean when I talk about corporate responsibility.

The actions of the television industry show us what can happen when visionary business leaders make a commitment to values and the common good as well as to the bottom line, and when they live up to their responsibilities as corporate citizens of our great country. I hope their example will be matched by the executives in other industries to address other problems and other challenges we face as a people. That means corporations helping to improve our schools, helping to connect them to the information superhighway, helping to demand high standards. That means corporations finding new ways to protect our environment even as they grow the bottom line and improve our economy.

That means businesses recognizing that workers are an asset, not a liability, and that a well-trained work force is any business' most important competitive edge. All these things demand a renewed commitment from business. And I am confident that the leaders of other industries will also rise to the challenge just the way the leaders of the entertainment industry did this week.

We can celebrate a giant step toward realizing the possibility of a great instrument of communication in the homes of our families. I believe we can meet our other challenges as a Nation in the same way. We'll all want to stay tuned for that.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4:42 p.m. on March 1 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on March 2.

Remarks on the Terrorist Attack in Israel and an Exchange With Reporters
March 3, 1996

The President. The suicide bombing in the Middle East last night shows once again how determined the enemies of peace are. In just a few moments, I will be calling Prime Minister Peres to express our condolences, our solidarity, and our outrage. We must spare no effort here in the United States to support Israel and the other supporters of peace in defeating the forces of terrorism. I will also be in touch with Chairman Arafat and others in the region to ask for their support.

It is clear that there are forces at work in the Middle East who don't want peace and who exist based on the continuing misery and division of the people there. And we have got to do everything we can to defeat them and to stand with those in the Middle East, beginning with our friends in Israel, who are determined to defeat them.

This is a troubling moment, but I am determined to see that it does not defeat the peace process, and I am determined to do everything I can on behalf of the United States to support those who are standing against terrorism and standing for peace.

Thank you very much.

Q. What can the Palestinian leadership do to prevent these kinds of attack?

The President. Well, I'm going to encourage them to do more, to do everything that they can do, and we'll be working with them over the next few days. And I'm sure we'll be in touch, and we'll be answering more of your questions over the next few days. But we're going to work very hard on it.

I do believe that Chairman Arafat has made efforts, and I think he will make more. We have to build the capacity of all the forces in the Middle East, including the Palestinian authorities, to promote law and order and to stand against terrorism. It's going to be a long battle, and we knew that when we started, but I believe we can prevail.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, on his return from Camp David, MD. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority.

Statement on the Terrorist Attack in Israel
March 3, 1996

Once again, Americans join with the nation of Israel in their grief. On their behalf, I extend to Prime Minister Peres and to all his people our heartfelt condolence. We share your anguish and anger at this terrorist crime.

Those responsible again have shown the world that they are determined to stop the cause of peace through the brutal murder of Israeli citizens. But there must be no misunderstanding: The Palestinian people and their leaders, as well as the promise of peace itself, will be the true victims if those responsible are not stopped.

It is imperative that everything possible be done to help ensure that these tragic scenes are not repeated. Peacemakers must be as resolute as are the destroyers of peace in taking action now to confront this terror. To Prime Minister Peres and Chairman Arafat, I pledge that the United States will stand with you and with all those—Israelis and Palestinians—who support peace as you take up this challenge.

Remarks to the Community in Taylor, Michigan
March 4, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you, John Dingell, for that wonderful introduction and for your great service to this district. Thank you, Senator Levin. Thank you, Mayor Priebe, for making me feel so welcome. To Congressmen Levin and Conyers and Congresswoman Rivers. I'd also like to say a special word of thanks to all the others who have come here with me, including my good friend, the Wayne County executive, Ed McNamara. But mostly, as a former musician, I want to thank the Taylor Central High Band, the Taylor Truman High Band, and the Kennedy High School Band for playing. Let's give them a big hand. [*Applause*]

You know, the mayor said when we were walking in, "You were supposed to be here last November, and we were going to dedicate the city hall. And then when you rescheduled, it was so cold we just built a new building for you to dedicate, so everybody could get in." And I'm glad to see all of you in this fine new building.

Let me say, too, that I'm sure all of you know when I had intended to come here last November, I had to postpone it because of the tragic assassination of my friend Prime Minister Rabin of Israel. And as I'm sure many of you know, today there has been yet another terrible terrorist attack in Tel Aviv, the second in just a couple of days. Our prayers and thoughts are with the victims there. Our hearts are with those who fight for peace. It is truly ironic that the same forces that brought down the Israeli Prime Minister from within his own country and those who have killed the Israelis in the last couple of days have one clear thing in common: They both want to end the peace process. They live for division and conflict.

And I ask all of you, my fellow Americans, to send a message to Israel: If you fight for peace, we will stand with you. That is the right, the noble, and the good thing to do.

Let me say that I'm glad to be here with Senator and Mrs. Levin, and John and Debbie Dingell. And I want to say a special word of thanks to John Dingell here in his district. I have now worked with him for 3 years. I've never met anybody who worked harder for the interests of ordinary Americans and working families than John Dingell, anybody who stood up more and more consistently.

As you know, he has worked to clean up the Great Lakes. He played a key role in the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act. He has saved American taxpayers literally billions of dollars by investigating and exposing waste, fraud, and abuse. He hasn't just talked about it; he's done it. In large measure, John Dingell's work was the inspiration for the reinventing Government effort that I asked Vice President Gore to head, which has given us the smallest Federal Government we've had in 30 years, enabled us to get rid of thousands of pages of wasteful regulation, reformed the entire way in which we purchase goods and services with your tax money, but is giving you a leaner and still a stronger Federal Government able to stand up for the interests of ordinary Americans. And John Dingell inspired that effort, and we thank him for that.

And let me say, back in 1994, in one of the few efforts of this administration that did not succeed, John Dingell stood there with me and we got caught redhanded and we plead guilty to believing that we should try to make sure that every American working family should be able to afford health care and shouldn't lose it when they change jobs or something happens.

Mayor Priebe has certainly left his mark on this city. This great new public works building is just one example of the revitalization taking place here. Since the mayor took office, he's built new roads. He's given you one of the finest courthouses in Michigan. You have a modern police station, which I might say also has some new community police officers in it, thanks to the crime bill of 1994, which is lowering the crime rate in America.

Now, as you know, I was supposed to be here to dedicate the city hall, and as the mayor said, he just went on and built another new building so we could all meet inside in the wintertime. I have got a flag for the mayor that was flown over the Capitol. I hope he will accept it in the spirit in which it is given. And as far as I'm concerned, he can fly it over the city hall or any other building that he wants to fly it over here in Taylor.

I was surprised when Congressman Dingell told me that I was the first President ever to visit this fine community, because I believe what you do here and the way you do it is really an example of what America at its best is and what America must do if we are going to move into the 21st century and meet the challenges that all these young people in this audience face for their future.

When I became your President, I had a very clear vision for what I wanted America to be like in the 21st century. It's one I still hold today and one I think of every day when I go to work. I want our country to go into the next century as a Nation in which all Americans, every single one of us, all of us who are willing to work for it can have a shot at the American dream. I want our country to remain the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity and security. And above all, I want us to come together as a people, instead of being driven apart. I want us to unite around the basic values that made this country great: responsibility and opportunity, work and family and faith, and perhaps most important of all, the idea that we must go forward together. When we work together, America never loses.

As I said in my State of the Union Address, and as people in Michigan demonstrate every day, this new and very different world we are moving into is an age of great possibility. With all my heart I believe as I look out in this sea of younger faces that are here and I think about what their future will be like, I believe the young people of our country will have more chances to live out their dreams than any generation of Americans ever has. But you and I know that this period of change is so profound that it also presents us with great challenges. We know that even as we create jobs, millions of people feel less secure in the job they have. We know that even as more and more people get higher wage jobs, many, many Americans are working harder for the same or lower wages than they were making 10 years ago. This is a curious time. We know that we are making progress and bringing the crime rate down but that violence is still too high. And we know—we know that it has something to do with this incredible range of change through which we are going.

Let me say to you that we are moving into a period that, as you know, will be dominated by information and technology, out of a period that was dominated by manufacturing. We are moving into a period where work will have more mind and less muscle, even in our great factories. We are moving into a period where more and more workplaces will be dominated by the computer; they'll be less bureaucratic; they will tend to be smaller and more flexible. We are moving into a period where the markets for products and services and money are global. And we are moving into a period where more information can pass more quickly across the globe than ever before.

The last time your country changed this much was 100 years ago, when most people moved from living in the country to the city and town, when most people moved from working on the farm to working in the factory. And many of the same things happened 100 years ago. There were people who made lots of money. There were people who found opportunities that they could not have dreamed of. And there were people who were severely dislocated and disturbed and whose pattern of life was unsettled.

What did we do then? We kept moving until we worked through these changes and all Americans had a shot at the American dream. And it won't take as long this time if we keep moving in the right direction. That is what I ask you to support today and tomorrow and in the years ahead.

We have great challenges, and we must meet them together. And if we are to meet them together, we know that our Government must play its role. For many years we had the wrong debate in America: Are we going to have big Government or no Government? The answer is neither. The era of big Government is over. We have the smallest Government in Washington we have had since 1965. By the end of this year, it will be the smallest it has been since John Kennedy was President of the United States. But that does not mean we should go back to the time when the American people were told, "You're on your own; fend for yourself." That is not the way we can move into the future.

We must have a partnership where everyone is challenged to do his or her part in the workplace, in the schools, in our houses of worship, in our unions, and yes, in our Government. The great lesson of democracy, let me say again—if you ask me, "Mr. President, what is the most important lesson you have learned in 3 years?" I would say, "When this country is divided, we

defeat ourselves. When we are united, we never lose. That is the lesson of America."

Look what has happened just here in Michigan in the last 3 years: The unemployment rate has dropped to 5 percent; new businesses have increased by 10 percent; over 311,000 new private-sector jobs, 6½ times in the last 3 years as in each of the previous 4 years before this administration took office and we began to change the economic direction of America. Our auto industry is back. The world's best workers are making the best cars. And once again, for the first time in 15 years, our auto industry is leading the world in sales and progress and profits.

In the last 3 years, the auto industry has gained 75,000 jobs. In the 4 years before that, it lost 49,000 jobs. Just last week a study by the University of Michigan predicted that there would be 130,000 new hirings by Chrysler, Ford, and GM in Michigan alone in the next 7 years. That is good news.

One of the reasons for that is we are finally beginning to crack open the markets of Japan, and I want to say a special word of thanks to Senator Levin for his work in supporting those efforts that we have made. This, too, is an important decision for America. When you hear the trade debate, normally you would think there are only two choices: We should just open our markets and let anybody sell here who wants to sell, giving us the benefit of the lowest prices and letting the consumers of America have their say; or we should say, "No, that's not fair because so many markets are closed to us, that we will close our markets." But that is not the only choice. I think we should have free trade; I think we should have fair trade. That means we should open other markets to America's products, not close ours and deprive our people of the right to buy what they want.

In the last 3 years, our administration has concluded 20 separate agreements with Japan alone, part of a total of 200 separate trade agreements in the last 3 years. What has been the result? An 80 percent increase in the sales of American products covered by those 20 agreements in just 3 years. I think that's a pretty good record, and that's what this country ought to be doing.

Listen to this. Just in the last year, in one year, our auto exports to Japan increased by 37 percent. That's good for Detroit, good for Taylor, good for Michigan, and good for America. We need more of it.

All across the Nation, we see something that our friends in Europe and Japan have not enjoyed, jobs coming back into this economy. In the seven largest economies in the world, the European economies, Japan, and the United States and Canada, in the last 3 years, a total of 7.7 million jobs have been created. In the United States, 7.7 million jobs have been created. We are growing jobs again in this economy, and that is the right direction for our country.

Homeownership at a 15-year high; an all-time record for 3 years in a row in the number of new businesses started; in the last 3 years, almost 800,000 new construction jobs alone, after losing 700,000 construction jobs in the 4 previous years; and for the first time in 10 years, slowly and too slowly, but at least for the first time in 10 years real hourly wages are starting to rise in the United States. It is about time, and not a moment too soon.

Now, my fellow Americans, that is the good news, and it's all true. But as I said earlier, it's not the whole truth. The whole truth is we're going through a period of change that is still leaving some Americans behind. You know it, and I know it. Too many of our people are still working harder and harder for the same or lower wages. They wonder if they and their children will be able to prosper in this new era. Even with new jobs, with a booming, booming export market, with a huge increase in the stock market, with an increase in the productivity of American manufacturing, many of our people have not gotten a real wage increase in terms of what it will buy in almost 20 years. And we have to do something about that as well.

We also know that even though small businesses are hiring people at record rate, many of our largest companies are laying off workers, some of them because they have to compete in the global economy. Some of them are doing it even when their profits are going up so that a lot of people are insecure even in an economy that is growing. And we have to do our best to do something about that.

We have some serious challenges here if we want to make all Americans winners in this new economic era. We know that there are also challenges that go beyond the economic. Let me just remind you of the seven challenges I set

forth in the State of the Union Address if we want to see the American dream alive and well for all Americans. We have got to do more to strengthen our families and improve childhood. We've got to do more to take back our streets from crime and gangs and drugs. We've got to do more to leave our environment safe and clean for the next generation. We've got to do more to maintain our world leadership so that the world grows in peace and security. We've got to continue to work to give our people a Government that costs less but works better and is stronger. We've got to give every single American citizen the education that all of us need to compete and win in the new century. And we have got to give every American who is willing to work for it a chance to have a decent amount of security at work and at home by growing this economy. We have to keep doing it until the American dream is there for all Americans. Many are winning today. Our job will be done when everybody who is willing to work for it has a chance to compete and win in this global economy. That must be our mission as Americans.

And let me say something that all of you know but we sometimes forget. Economic growth is about more than money. It is not just ensuring that people have a certain number of material possessions, that they can go out to a nice restaurant once a month or take a vacation every year. It is about the idea of America, the idea that this is a place where there is room for everyone to have a shot at the American dream. It is about the idea of fundamental fairness in this country, that we are not a people who object to others being successful, we do not resent people amassing their own wealth fairly won in a free enterprise system. The only thing we resent is when every American who is doing the right thing and working hard and playing by the rules doesn't have a chance to be treated fairly. That is what we want in this country.

So I say to you, we have done step one. We are creating jobs. But we must do more. We have to have an economic growth that reaches all Americans, and that must be our goal in the next 4 years. We have been stagnant now for nearly 20 years in our wages. Now we can do better. And I ask you to join with me in ensuring that we do just that.

Again I say to you, if we fail to grow together there will be more resentment, more frustration, and more division among the American people. When he signed the Declaration of Independence over 200 years ago, Benjamin Franklin said, "We must all hang together, or we shall hang separately." Today we must grow together, or we will surely grow apart and grow weaker as a Nation.

Now let me ask you to think about what we have done and what we should do and what you must do if we're going to grow together. We have cut the deficit in half. We have expanded our exports by being for free and fair trade. We have invested in education and training and technology. We have shrunk the Federal Government and cut regulation. We have tried to expand opportunities for our people. But we must do more if we're going to create jobs and raise incomes and give these people who are being downsized a chance to go right on with their lives and raise their children and live with hope and dignity, instead of frustration and a sense of failure. That is what we have to do, and we have to do more to get there.

And let me say that there is a lot that we can do that does not require us to wait for the next election. As I remind all of my friends in Washington, Democrat and Republican alike, just because there is an election in November doesn't mean we should have a work stoppage in March. It is time to go back to work and get things done.

So I want to challenge the Congress to join with me and pass a growth agenda for the American people in the next 60 days that will keep creating jobs and raise incomes. First, we should grow the economy by passing the right kind of balanced budget. It is wrong to leave our children a legacy of debt. And if we pass a balanced budget plan, it will lower interest rates, lower mortgage rates, lower credit card payments, lower car payments, increase business investment, increase jobs, and grow the economy.

But we can do it and do it in the right way. We do not have to have unwarranted cuts in Medicare or Medicaid or education or environmental protection. We do not have to endanger—neither do we have to increase the tax burden on our hardest pressed working families. And we must not, just to make a little extra money, imperil the pensions of the American working people.

We should grow the economy by targeting a tax cut to the people who need it, the working

families of America. I favor giving people help who are raising children out there and working for a living. Our tax relief for families with children has not kept up with inflation over the last 40 years. But the most important tax cut we could give—look at all the young people in the audience and look at yourself if you're still in the work force. I say, the most important tax cut we could give is to give families a tax deduction for the cost of college tuition and any other education after high school.

We should grow the economy by passing an increase in the minimum wage. Let me say this to you: If you've got a good job, I want to you to think about this. If you've got a good job and you're raising kids, I want you to think about this. If we don't raise the minimum wage this year, it will fall to a 40-year low in terms of purchasing power. There are millions of Americans out there, real heroes in my book, who get up every day and work full time for $4.25 an hour and try to raise children on it. That is not an adequate rate to raise children. We can do this without hurting the economy, and we should raise the minimum wage.

We should grow the economy by passing the right kind of welfare reform. Yes, be very tough in requiring people who can work to work, be tough in requiring people to move from welfare to work, but do not hurt the children. Invest in the children and protect them in their future while you move people from welfare to work.

We should grow the economy by fully funding in this year all of our educational investments. We need the best schools, the best training, the besteducation we can. And one of the things we should fund is my proposal for a "GI bill" for America's workers. When a person loses a job they ought to get a voucher from the United States Government that says, "Here's $2,600; take it where you want to take it, go there as quick as you can, get some new training, and go back to work." That's what we ought to do for the American people.

And we should grow the American economy by giving people a greater sense of security. There is a bill now before the Congress that has passed out of the Senate committees unanimously, supported by almost 50 Republicans and Democrats, and we cannot get it to a vote in the Senate because of the interest groups keeping it down, even though the National Association of Manufacturers and the AFL–CIO are for it.

It's a simple little bill. Here's what it says. It says, you cannot be denied your health insurance because someone in your family has been sick, and you cannot lose your health insurance just because you change jobs. Let's pass that bill and pass it right away and give the American people some security.

We should do this and do it now. Congress must do its part. It's a long way from now until the election, but every week between now and the election the American people will get up and go to work. They still have to pay their bills. They still have to educate their children. They still have to try to keep their dreams alive. We dare not have a work stoppage. Let's pass this growth agenda now for the American people.

Let me say that while Congress and the President, we must do our part, we know that economic growth comes largely from the private sector and that fairness and decency in the workplace must be generated largely in the private sector. Every company in America must meet these challenges. I urge, I urge our employers in America to look at the things that make families strong, that help people to succeed at work and at home.

I want to pass a bill that makes it easier for small-business people to take out pension plans for themselves and their employees, but then they have to make wider use of those 401(k) plans. We need increased day care. We need more flexible working hours. And we need people to really think about whether it's the fair and right thing to do when you see these downsizings. If they have to do it to keep the business afloat, every American can understand that. But no one should lose a job for short-term considerations that are not necessary for the long-term well-being of the profitable enterprise. We all need to do our part to keep America going and growing together.

And every one of you must remember, no one can require you to get further education or training, no one can make you become more productive. This is going to require an effort on the behalf—on the part of every American if we are going to have sustained growth. But we will try to do our part, with access to health care, with welfare reform, with rising wages, with better education and training, with a strategy that will open markets for American products. We can do all these things, again I say, if we do them together.

This is a time when it is fashionable to say the American people are cynical and skeptical. Well, I know there are plenty of things to be skeptical about. But let me tell you something, my fellow Americans, I get to do something none of you get to do. Whenever I leave this country, I become the United States in the eyes of other people. And I can tell you, wherever I have been, people think this is still a very great country.

I ask you to remember what President Kennedy said in the middle of the cold war when he went to Berlin. He said, "Freedom has many difficulties, and our democracy is far from perfect. But we never had to put up a wall to keep our people in." People want to come to the United States because this is a great country.

And when you hear your fellow citizens at work, at church, in the bowling alley on Thursday night, or anywhere else express cynicism about this country, you tell them that that is a poor excuse for inaction. Cynicism is just a cover for laying down and giving up and not going on. We have got to go on and go forward together.

All my life I have been driven by the conviction that it is fundamentally wrong for any human being to be deprived of their God-given capacity to grow and to live out their dreams. That animates everything we try to do in Washington. But this country runs fundamentally on your pulse, on your heartbeat, on your conviction, and on your work. And I ask you, join me in this one simple resolve: We will not permit the American people to be divided in 1996. We are going forward together.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. at the Department of Public Works. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Cameron G. Priebe of Taylor, MI. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks on the Terrorist Attack in Israel and an Exchange With Reporters in Taylor

March 4, 1996

The President. I want to express my deep anger at the news of this latest bombing in Israel and to reaffirm the determination of the United States to do all we can to work with our friends in the Middle East to stop the killing, to bring the killers to justice, and ensure that terrorism does not triumph over peace in the Middle East.

Once again the enemies of peace have murdered completely innocent Israeli citizens, including children, in their hysterical, determined, fanatic attempt to kill all hope of peace between Israel and Palestinians and others in the Middle East. We must again state our determination that these forces of terror shall not triumph.

Together with those who have worked so hard for lasting peace in the Middle East, the United States is committed to confronting this challenge and to prevailing over these forces of hate and violence. As we offer our prayers for the victims of the latest tragedy, we also reaffirm our commitment to the peace.

As I said earlier this morning and I would like to repeat again, it is ironic that I'm here in this community where I was slated to come last November but had to put it off to go to Israel for Prime Minister Rabin's funeral. The forces which led to his killing, as much as they claim to hate the forces that have been behind this latest round of bombing of innocent Israeli citizens, have one thing in common: They live for division. They live for the continuation of the violence and the hatred in the Middle East. They are even willing, as we see today, to kill themselves, members of their own groups, just to keep people living on hatred and division.

We must not give in to that. We must fight it. We must fight it with all the resources at our command. And the United States will do everything we can to support Israel and the other friends of peace in the Middle East.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, are you convinced that Yasser Arafat has done all that he can to control Hamas? Many Israelis believe that he has just

turned a blind eye and has talked about things but not really done what needs to be done.

The President. Because it is a relatively new government it may be impossible ever to know for sure. But I am convinced that he wants peace. And I am convinced that he will now answer the call that I have issued, that the Israeli Prime Minister has issued, that others have issued, to do more.

And what I want to say to all my fellow Americans, what you are seeing here is an example of what has the potential to infect other countries all across the world. You saw it in the Japanese subway. You saw it in the Oklahoma City bombing. You see this going around the world, but it is more prevalent, more sustained, more well-organized in the Middle East. And there are people there really literally willing to die just to keep the division and the hatred and the violence going.

I believe that Mr. Arafat will have to do more. I believe everyone else will have to do more. He will have to do everything he can up to the limits of whatever capacities they have, and the rest of us will have to do our part as well.

Q. Have you talked to him?

Q. To follow on that, sir, do you think the Israelis should exercise restraint and not retaliate?

The President. I think that we will have to do—we have to stand with the proposition that those who are responsible for this should be held accountable for it. And we will do what we can to support them in that regard.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:02 p.m. at the Department of Public Works.

Remarks at a Democratic Luncheon in Detroit, Michigan
March 4, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you so much. Thank you, Senator Levin, for that kind introduction and for your service in the Senate. I'm depending on all of you to make sure he continues that service in the Senate. We need him.

When you remember in 1996 what the other party attempted to do in 1995 to our budget and to our country, remember that the President alone could not stop it. If we had not had a veto-proof Senate and House, it would not have been possible to stop. So I ask you to reelect Carl Levin and John Dingell and David Bonior and all the other members of the Democratic caucus of Michigan who are here. I see Sandy Levin, and I think John Conyers is here. I see Bart Stupak out there, and I'm sure Lynn Rivers is here. And we need more people. So I want you to work hard in these races because they matter. They matter to you. They matter to our country.

It was a pretty long, lonely, cold fight for the last year, until the American people began to be heard loud and clear to make it possible for us to do some positive things which I hope will come forward in 1996. But I'm telling you it really matters not only to Michigan but to the entire United States for these people to be reelected and for you to send others of good will to join them.

So I thank you, Senator. And I thank you, David, for your leadership. And I want to say a special word of thanks to John Dingell. When Democrats lost the House for the first time in a long time, a lot of Members announced their retirement. And it wasn't so much fun anymore if you were a committee chairman or you had a nice subcommittee. And one day Hillary and I were sitting alone in the White House talking—this is a true story—we were talking, and some senior Member of the House had announced his retirement. And I looked at her, and I said, "You know what, I'll bet you $100 John Dingell won't quit. He doesn't think you should quit when you're down; you ought to keep fighting until you get up again. Then you can quit." And I thank you for that.

Thank you, Ed McNamara, for that subtle reference to the airport and the funds you want. [*Laughter*] We were sitting there, and Ed in his nice Irish charm said, "You remember when you started running for President and nobody knew who you were, but I was there for you?"

[*Laughter*] I said, "Yeah." He said, "Didn't you remember when everybody said you were just dead as a doornail and you were dropping like a rock, and I didn't quit you?" [*Laughter*] I said, "Yeah." He said, "I've always been there, haven't I? Well," he said, "the bill's come due. I don't want anything for myself, but my airport needs $15 million a year for the next 10 years." If every public official asked for the bill to come due only for the public interest, this country would be a better place. Thank you, Mr. McNamara. Thank you.

I want to say it's nice to see Ambassador Blanchard here. I had occasion last week to talk to the Prime Minister of Canada, who is a remarkable man. And he was helping us to maintain our mission of peace and freedom and democracy in Haiti. And just in passing he said, "You know, you need to know that Jim Blanchard is the best Ambassador to Canada in my lifetime." He has done a remarkable job. Thank you.

I want to thank all the former Members of Congress who are here, the leaders of labor, the leaders of the teachers organizations, the business leaders, and all others who have come here for the Democratic Party today. And I want to thank all these folks here at our table who helped to sponsor this event for the work that they did. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Mayor Archer for proving that the empowerment zone could work, because Detroit has set the standard for the rest of the country.

The other day we had a meeting in Washington of all the communities who had participated in our empowerment zone enterprise community initiative. And for a modest investment of cash and a modest cluster of tax incentives, it is remarkable what is going on. But in no community in America can it be said that Detroit has been matched by taking this roughly $100 million in cash, and about that much, perhaps a little more, in tax incentives and turning it into a $2 billion private commitment. I thank all the business community who participated in that and the fact that everybody is working together here. But Mayor, more than anything else, it's a tribute to your leadership, and I thank you for what you have done.

I also want to thank the mayor for introducing everybody. He did a good job of introducing everybody. It reminded me of—he kept on introducing people, you know; it reminded me of the very first speech I ever gave as an elected official—was when I became attorney general of my State almost 20 years ago. And I was very nervous, and there were 500 people at a Rotary Club installation banquet in Pine Bluff, Arkansas—I never will forget this—January 1977. The banquet started at 6:30; I got up at a quarter to 10 to talk. [*Laughter*] There were 500 people there, and everybody had been introduced in the entire audience except 3 people, and they went home mad. [*Laughter*] And the guy that got up to introduce me looked out at the crowd and said "You know, we could have stopped here and had a real nice evening." [*Laughter*] And I thought, now, that's not what he meant, but that's what he said. [*Laughter*] Ever since then I've been more careful about what I said.

I also want to thank David Bonior for telling that joke. I used to tell jokes, but they told me it wasn't Presidential, so I had to quit. [*Laughter*] So now I just have to laugh at other people, and I'm always grateful when I get one.

Let me say a special word of thanks to the DNC chairman, Don Fowler, who is here with us, and to Terry McAuliffe and Laura Hartigan for the work they've done. I'm very grateful to them. And let me say to all of you, again, I don't want to give a long talk today, but I want you to understand exactly what is at stake.

In 1992 when I ran for President and the people of Michigan were good enough to vote for me, the real issue was whether we had to have a change or stay with the status quo, whether we would adopt an aggressive approach to the challenges facing America, the economic challenges and the social challenges, or whether we would basically say that the Government could kind of stand pat and wait for things to get better. And so the American people, both those who voted for my candidacy and those who supported Mr. Perot, voted for change.

In 1996 there is a different issue. It may be papered over from time to time, and people may claim they're more moderate or whatever you will hear, but the truth is that the choice will be between two very different changes, two very different approaches to the future. And you will have to decide, along with all our fellow Americans, which approach you favor. At least now, as I think the mayor said or the Senator said—somebody said—you have some basis for comparison that goes beyond rhetoric.

When I became President I was basically driven into the race by the conviction that this coun-

try could not sit by and permit the American dream to be squandered for a generation of Americans, permit the leadership of 50 years to be squandered for the future of America, and permit this country to be divided and to come apart when we ought to be coming together. I had a very simple, straightforward vision for the country that I still think about every single day. I believe we have to go into the next century with the American dream alive and well for every person who is willing to work for it; with America the world's leading force for peace and freedom and prosperity and security; and with America coming together around our basic values of work and faith and family, of responsibility along with opportunity, and more important than anything else, of a sense of community—that we are going forward together if we are going forward at all—and that we don't need to become a place and not a country. We don't need to become a swarm of isolated individuals. We don't need to become a group of people who think that we can only advance if our neighbors fall back, who think that we can only be important if we can somehow diminish the significance of others who share this land with us.

The ultimate, terrible, extreme tragedy of that point of view we saw once again in the Middle East today where a fanatic blew himself to smithereens for the pleasure of killing innocent children. Why? Because if you believe those who are different from you are the embodiment of the devil, then they deserve whatever they get. And then life's animating purpose is continuing the division, turning up the heat until it becomes hatred, and making sure that nothing good or positive ever happens. And in a fundamental way, when you go through a period of change, like we are—thank God we don't face that in that dimension—but when you go through a period of change like we are, when it can be very disorienting, you have to decide, am I going to define myself in terms of who I am or who I'm not; in terms of what I'm for or what I am against; in terms of what I intend to do or in terms of what I want someone to do for me. These are great and fundamental questions.

Now, there has always been a healthy political debate in this country, and there always will be, and well there should be. No one has a corner on the truth. No one has a market for the future. I understand that. But when we decide what kind of change we want, it depends fundamentally, more importantly than anything else, on whether we believe we have to go forward together or whether we think we ought to be left to fend for ourselves, because all of us in this room are more successful than most and we'll do just fine. That is the fundamental change question the American people confront today.

If you look at this period through which we are going, it explains much of the ambivalence, sometimes the outright confusion people have about the present moment. How could we have almost 8 million new jobs after 4 years of having virtually no new jobs, how could we have a growth in manufacturing jobs after 4 years of losing manufacturing jobs, how could we regain the lead in automobile production for the first time in a decade and a half, how could we be voted the world's most productive economy 2 years in a row after having been ranked fifth or sixth or something when I took office—how could all this happen, and still half or more of the American people are working harder for the same or lower pay in terms of purchasing power? How could that happen?

How could it be that we created this many jobs, but there would still be isolated pockets where no new opportunities were coming and children were on the street raising themselves, and therefore the crime rate would be going down nationwide but it would still be going up among juveniles in certain areas? How could this happen?

How can it be if the stock market is at 5,700, big companies are laying people off and downsizing them, and people my age, 50-year-old men, are being told that they're not important anymore, "Thank you very much for the last 25 years; you figure out how to send your kids to college"? How do all these things happen at once?

How could we have 3 years in a row where we have more new businesses started than ever before and 3 years in a row where we have more new self-made millionaires—a great thing; not somebody being given an inheritance, making a million dollars in work for themselves in this system—how could that happen at the same time these other things are happening? How could all the news be overall so good and then there be these specific stories of people riddled with anxiety?

The answer is, it always happens when you totally change the rules in a society and when a period of profound change comes along. And the reason a lot of us cannot understand it is there's nobody here old enough to remember the last time it happened because the last time it happened was 100 years ago.

But you think about what built Michigan. One hundred years ago people started moving from the rural areas to cities and towns. A hundred years ago people stopped having most of their work being on the farm to most of their work being in the factory or in shops serving the factory or serving people who made their living in a factory. And it changed everything. And then after the Depression, there was this great explosion of people out of places where they made their living on the farm, running to places like Detroit and Flint and the suburbs to make a living in the factory. I mean, I'm convinced that one of the reasons I won the Michigan Democratic primary is that every third voter had a grandmother from Arkansas. [*Laughter*]

I mean, why? Because this great exodus that started 100 years ago continued right through until after the Great Depression, the end of World War II, and after World War II. This sea change—from farm to factory, country to city and town. What is the comparable change today? From industry to information and technology. From an American market to a global market for goods, for services, and for money. Changing the nature of work; there's more mind and less muscle, even in the factory.

It's amazing how many factories you go into today and watch either work being done by robots or workers working on computers calculating what the machine should do with ever greater precision. And the change in the workplace—we all know about all these people being downsized, but what we never hear because it's happening in the little places is—in a thousand little places—is that in the last 3 years there were more new jobs created by businesses owned by women alone than were laid off by the Fortune 500. So there's a change in the workplace. The workplace is becoming more numerous and smaller, by and large.

And when all that happens, you have all these new possibilities created. But when you disrupt the established order of things, a lot of people who have worked hard, done everything they should do all their lives, find themselves on the short end of the stick. So the challenge for us today and the challenge America faces is how do we keep the dynamism going? You know, we've actually gotten a modest increase in wages in the last 3 years for the first time in a decade. How do we keep the jobs coming? How do we keep the new businesses being formed? How do we keep the kind of empowerment efforts we see in Detroit going? How do we keep the good things about the economy and still give more and more people their shot at the American dream so that we can say, if you work hard, if you play by the rules, you've got a chance to live up to your God-given potential? That is the challenge.

And I argue to you that the way we do it is not by turning around and going back, because that's denial and we can't get there. As all the kids in my daughter's class say, denial is not just a river in Egypt. [*Laughter*] That is not an option. We have to work all the way through this. But if we're going to do it, we have to do it together. We cannot proceed in a country where people believe they're not going to be treated fairly, that no matter how hard they work they'll never get ahead, that no matter what they do they'll never have their shot at the American dream.

Now, that's the point I was trying to make in the State of the Union when I said—and I believe—that we have to have a program to meet the challenges of the future that focus on what we can do together to make our families stronger, to make our streets safer, to make our environment cleaner, to continue our leadership for peace and freedom and prosperity; what we can do together to have a Government that is smaller and costs less, but does more; not a weak Government, but one that's effective at being a partner with the American people; and in terms of reviving the hopes of all Americans, what we can do together to guarantee a world-class educational opportunity to every single American, starting with our children in Head Start and going through every single adult worker for a lifetime; and what we can do together to create an environment in which people can find a measure of economic security for home and family while we keep the dynamic economy going.

Those are the challenges. And I believe we have to do it together. I believe this idea that we can go back to the era when everybody was left to fend for themselves—that we can say the Government is intrinsically evil and ev-

erything it does is wrong and they mess up a one-car parade—is foolish at best.

Let me tell you something. My friend James Carville has just written a book which I commend to all of you. It's a little paperback book, but in it he points out that in the last 30 years we have spent one-half of your tax money on three things, defense, Social Security, and Medicare. Now, did you get your money's worth? We won the cold war. We cut the rate of poverty among elderly Americans in half. And with Medicare, if you live to be 65, you are in the group of seniors with the highest life expectancy in any country in the entire world. I think we got our money's worth by working together, and we will in the future as well.

So as we go back to Washington today I want to challenge the Congress to continue to work to keep the dynamism of the economy going but give people a greater sense of security and a greater sense of opportunity. And there are lots of things that we can do. We ought to pass a balanced budget plan consistent with the values we've been fighting for for the last 15 months. We can get lower interest rates, which means lower rates to borrow money for businesses to put people to work. It means lower home mortgage rates, lower car payment rates, lower credit card rates. But we ought to do it without undermining our commitments through Medicare, through Medicaid, through education, through environmental protection. We do not need to do what some of the extremists urged us to do last year, which is to make money by raising taxes on the hardest pressed working families and giving people the right to raid their employee's pension funds. We do not have to do that to balance the budget. We ought to do it in the right way.

If we have a tax cut it ought to be targeted to families raising children, to give them a chance to participate in the American dream. And the most important tax cut we could give is a tax deduction for the cost of college education. That is the most important thing we could do. We ought to pass welfare reform that is very tough in terms of requiring people to move to work but understands that people have to succeed at home and at work, so we shouldn't punish innocent children. We should lift up children and strengthen families even as we have the right kind of welfare reform.

And I cannot believe that there is even a debate in Washington about whether we ought to raise the minimum wage. You know, we're having a nice time here today. And I've heard every time somebody says we ought to raise the minimum wage they say, "Oh, that's just going to cost a lot of jobs." It's interesting that the last time the Congress voted to raise the minimum wage most of the people in the other party were for it, maybe because they had a President of the other party in the White House. But the people out there working on the minimum wage don't much care who is in the White House. It's all they can do to keep body and soul together and pay the bills. There are millions of people out there today working 40 hours a week, raising their kids on $4.25 an hour. Now, you want the mayor to go into inner-city Detroit and tell these kids they ought to stay off drugs and stay out of gangs and work hard and they'll amount to something in life and they can have a good life, and "Oh, by the way, here's $4.25 an hour; raise three kids on it"?

This is wrong. The minimum wage will be at a 40-year low in terms of what it will buy if we don't raise it by the end of the year. We do not have to grow the American economy by keeping the minimum wage as low as possible. And I have just reviewed the last 15 studies on this, and all but two say that there is no significant loss of jobs with a modest raise in the minimum wage. Indeed, it may increase jobs because you'll have more people wanting to move from welfare to work if you pay them a living wage. We ought to raise the minimum wage. We ought to do it this year. We ought not to wait until the election.

We ought to have another round of empowerment zones. There ought to be another 100 communities that become empowerment zones or enterprise communities that have a chance to do what Detroit did. There are other cities in Michigan that need a chance to do this as well.

We ought to pass the bill that has now been voted out of the committee in the Senate unanimously, has 50 Republican and Democratic cosponsors nearly—simple little bill—it says you shouldn't lose your health insurance when you change jobs or when someone in your family gets sick. Surely, if we believe in work and family, we can say that you shouldn't lose your health insurance when you change jobs or when someone in your family gets sick. We ought to pass that bill right away.

And finally, let me say, we should pass the education appropriations that is now months and months late. We ought to fund the programs for high standards in our schools. We ought to fund the programs that will help us to bring high technology into our poor schools. We ought to fund the programs that will help our schools be safer and more drug-free.

Let me just give you one example. I was in a school in New Jersey about 2 weeks ago, in a neighborhood that is very modest income, where a significant percentage of the children are first-generation immigrants, where the test scores were so low and the performance was so bad that the State was about to go in and take over the schools. And Bell Atlantic came in with others in the community and put computers in all the classes, made sure they had good educational software, and then they put computers in the homes.

I met a man who came here from El Salvador in 1980 who is now—he and his wife E-mail the principal at school to find out whether their kid is doing the homework and how they're doing. And let me tell you what's happened since they did that in that poor school. And New Jersey, I believe, is the second or third richest State in America. That school district in that poor neighborhood now has a higher attendance rate, a higher graduation rate, and most important, higher test scores than the New Jersey State average, because they were given a chance to be a part of something good and noble. That's what we ought to do for everybody.

Now, that's what I stand for. If we had no Government there would be a lot of good things happening in America. You can see it is some of these countries that we compete with that change governments two or three times a year just to kind of stay in practice. [*Laughter*] And their economies continue to grow. But their unemployment rates are higher. They suffer terrible inequalities of opportunity.

You just have to decide. It's your country; it's your future. And I'm telling you, if we can get our people that agree with us to break through their skepticism and break through their cynicism and break through all the political rhetoric that dominates too many of our elections and show up, stand up, and be counted this year, I know what decision America will make. I do not believe the American people want to continue to go down a road where we are divided for cheap, short-term political purposes at every election. I think the American people understand that when we are divided we defeat ourselves, and when we are united we never lose.

So I ask you, in Michigan, where we have to win to move the country forward, stand up with us and fight with us and reelect these Members of Congress and elect some more and help us so that we can make the right decision. The issue is no longer change versus status quo. There are two dramatically different views of change on the agenda for America, and one of them has us going forward together. That's the right one. That's the one we need to bring to the American people.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:22 p.m. at the Cobo Conference and Exhibition Center. In his remarks, he referred to Ed McNamara, Wayne County executive; James J. Blanchard, Ambassador to Canada; Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada; Mayor Dennis W. Archer of Detroit; and Terry McAuliffe, finance chairman, and Laura Hartigan, finance director, Clinton/Gore '96. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Statement on Representative Sam Gibbons' Decision Not To Seek Reelection

March 4, 1996

Congress has lost a tenacious champion of America's elderly and an unrelenting fighter for health care reform, open markets, and free trade with today's decision by Representative Sam Gibbons not to seek reelection.

From his days as a hero on the beaches of Normandy through his 34 years in Congress,

Sam Gibbons has served his country and fought for what he believed. As a Congressman, Representative Gibbons has been a leader in domestic policy, particularly in the defense of America's senior citizens and the protection of their health care. In recent years, he has worked tirelessly on efforts to provide health care coverage to all Americans.

The American people are grateful for Sam Gibbons' long service. His deep dedication to the Congress and to the American people will be sorely missed.

Remarks to the National Association of Counties
March 5, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you, Doug Bovin. Thank you, Michael Hightower. I have enjoyed working with Doug. I know I will enjoy working with Michael, and I enjoy working with all of you.

I want to talk to you today about our partnership. And we were joking outside—I know that in some States, the States may be too big for the person running for Governor to basically operate from county courthouse to county courthouse, but I never found that an obstacle at home. And I feel right at home here, and I thank you for your warm welcome.

Before I begin my remarks to you I feel obliged to say, because this is my first public appearance of the day, that I'm sure that all of you as Americans share my outrage at the campaign of terror which is being directed at the people of Israel. These are desperate and fanatic acts aimed not just at killing innocent people, including innocent children, but at killing the growing prospects for peace in the Middle East. They must not succeed.

Today I'm announcing a series of steps to support the fight against future terrorist attacks, to bring killers to justice, and to rally support for peace in the Middle East. These steps include immediate emergency transfer to Israel of highly sophisticated detection equipment; the dispatch of American specialists to work with their Israeli counterparts on strengthening antiterrorism measures; the development of a comprehensive package of training, technical assistance, and equipment to improve antiterrorism cooperation among Israel, the Palestinians, and other governments in the region; and contact with foreign governments to ask for their help in the fight for peace and against terrorism. The United States has always stood with the people of Israel through good times and bad, and we stand with them today.

Let me say that in so many ways your work is the polar opposite of the extremism which threatens to tear apart the fabric of so many societies in the world today. When you walk out of your office, the great challenges of our time confront you with human faces. You have no choice but to reach out to your fellow citizens and to try to work together to meet those challenges. As the great former mayor of New York City, Fiorello La Guardia, once said, there is, after all, no Republican or Democratic way to clean the streets. You have shown what can be accomplished if people put aside their differences and work together. And I hope while you're here you'll remind every elected official in Washington that we, too, can do our job here if we do it together.

I came into this community and into my job with a very straightforward vision. I wanted to make sure that our country would go into the 21st century with the American dream alive and well for every single American willing to work for it. I wanted our country to remain the strongest force for peace and freedom, for security and prosperity in the post-cold-war world. And above all, I wanted to see this country come together around our basic values and our mutual respect for one another.

Our strategy started with a commitment to grow the economy to create economic opportunity. In the last 3 years, we have worked on getting the deficit down, interest rates down, investment in our people up, opportunities for Americans to sell their goods and services all across the world up, our commitment to technology, to research, to breaking the barriers to economic opportunity for all Americans up.

In the last 3 years we've made some notable progress. Americans have created almost 8 million new jobs. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. Homeownership is at a 15-year high. For the first time in many years, average earnings are going up, and for the first time in many years our exports are growing faster than our imports. Our auto industry leads the world again, and for 2 years in a row, after many years on the back benches, an international economic forum has said that America is the world's most productive economy.

For 3 years in a row, our people have set successive records for starting new businesses. We're also beginning to come together around our basic values. The crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate, the teen pregnancy rate are all coming down in America, thanks in no small measure to the labors that many of you carry on in communities dealing with these challenges every day.

But if you take a full accounting of America's picture, you have to take the challenges along with the successes. We know still, in spite of the fact that our economy has produced 8 million new jobs, almost—and I might say, just to give you an idea of the magnitude of that achievement, the G–7 economies, the world's big seven economies, in the last 3 years have created, net, a total of 7.7 million new jobs. And America has created 7.7 million new jobs. The other six have created some—some have created some, some have lost. Their net is zero.

It is not easy for wealthy countries to create new jobs. The United States has been doing that, and we can be proud of the people who are doing it, almost exclusively in the private sector with the environment that has been created and the work that they do. Still we know that an awful lot of our people are working as hard or harder than they ever have without a raise. For about half of Americans, their real incomes in terms of what it will buy have not gone up in more than a decade. Too many of our people have gone nearly two decades. And a lot of parents are beginning to wonder whether they'll be able to give their children a better standard of living than they enjoyed.

We know that our economy is becoming highly competitive, but that too many of our people are being downsized in their most productive years, in years when their families are most relying on them, when their children are being raised or when they're about to go off to college. And a lot to these folks have no real idea about how they're going to move in a reasonable time to another job doing as well as they were before. And we know that even though unemployment is below 6 percent and below the 25-year average unemployment rate of America, there are still too many urban neighborhoods and rural communities where there aren't enough jobs for young people to believe that they have a bright future.

If you look at the social front, who would have believed 3 years ago that we could bring the crime rate down but that random violence among juveniles, children under 18, would be going up? Who would believe that the drug usage among people between the age of 18 and 34 would be going down but that casual drug use among children under 18, including—and illegal—tobacco smoking, even though it's illegal in every State in the country, would be going up?

How did this happen? The truth is, no one knows all the answers, but it is clear that a big part of it is that you and I are serving in public life at a time of very profound change; I would argue the most profound period of change in the last 100 years. You have to go back about 100 years to the time when Americans moved from living primarily in rural areas to living primarily in cities and towns, in the time when Americans moved from working primarily on the farm to working primarily in the factory or in businesses supporting factories.

That's what is happening today. We are moving from a national economy to a global economy. The nature of work is changing. Even manufacturing, which is still very strong—indeed, growing stronger in America—is becoming characterized more by information technology than by hard work in terms of muscle power.

Work now in almost every endeavor requires more mind and less muscle. More and more workplaces are less hierarchical, less bureaucratic, indeed, on average, less big. The average manufacturing facility contains 300 or fewer employees. So the work is changing, the workplace is changing, the markets are changing, and information is changing.

Bill Gates, the founder of Microsoft, in his book "The Road From Here" says that the digital chip is the biggest change in information technology in 500 years, since Gutenberg first printed the Bible in Europe. But this is the

dimension of the change through which we are all living.

Now, on the whole, this change has been good for America. There are more possibilities open to young people to live out the future of their dreams than at any time in our Nation's history. But as with any time of change this profound, there is also a great uprooting, a great unsettling, where established patterns of life and living and working together are disrupted. And when that happens, it is imperative that those of us who are charged with the public purpose, with bringing people together, with giving everybody a chance, work hard to see that we make these changes, that we go through this period of change in a way that gives every American the chance to be a full citizen living up to his or her full abilities. How we will master this moment of change is, therefore, the great question not only before the President and the Congress, not only before the business leaders of this country but before every community leader in the United States of America.

In my State of the Union Address I outlined the seven great challenges that I think we have to meet as a people if we're going to fulfill those objectives that I brought to this office, if we're going to guarantee the American dream for all Americans, if we're going to maintain our world leadership for peace and freedom, if we're going to come back together around our basic values.

We have to build stronger families and better childhoods for all of our children. We have to open educational opportunities so that every child and every adult has access to world-class, lifelong learning. We have to provide economic security for families who are willing to work for it. We must take back our streets, all our streets, from crime and gangs and drugs. We must provide a healthy and clean environment for today and tomorrow. We must maintain our leadership in the fight for freedom and democracy, because if we don't do that no one else will. And we must reinvent our Government so that it works better and once again inspires real trust in the American people. None of these things can be done unless we do them together, unless we understand that the old categories by which we thought and the old categories by which we classified one another have to have enough flexibility in them to allow us to reach out across the lines that divide us to meet these common challenges.

One of the things that we must do here in Washington is to understand that while we have an obligation to have a clear vision, to set clear national goals, to challenge people from every walk of life to meet these goals, we cannot solve America's problems for America. We have to instead focus on giving individuals and families and neighborhoods and communities the tools they need to make the most of their own lives and to meet our common challenges. In other words, we need to focus as much as possible on the "what" America needs to do, and do as much as we can to let you and people like you all over America determine the "how," how it will be done.

For more than 15 years now there has been a raging debate in our country about what the role of the Federal Government should be and whether the Government was the problem instead of part of the solution. Well, we all know that the era of big Government is over. We're moving to a time when large bureaucracies are not only not necessary, they're not the most effective way of meeting our common challenges. But I submit to you that that does not mean that we can, under the guise of saying the Government is the problem, return to a time when all of our people were left to fend for themselves. That will not meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

What works in the global economy is teamwork. What works in the global economy is getting diverse people together and finding out who has got what skills and figuring out how people can work together for their mutual benefit. Individuals can be fulfilled in this kind of world only when they are prepared to work with each other to help every one of them fulfill their God-given capacities. I believe that more strongly than anything else. If you ask me, what is the one most important lesson you have learned as President, I would say it is that we must go forward together. We cannot go back to the time when people were left to fend for themselves under the luxury of believing that anything we do together is wrong.

We do not need a big bureaucracy for every problem, but we don't want a weak Government. When I traveled to Washington and Oregon and Idaho, to Pennsylvania the other day to see the effects of the terrible flooding, no one wanted the Federal Emergency Management Agency to be weak; they wanted it to be quick.

When I see that for 15 years now, 15 years, the Fortune 500 companies have been reducing employment—this is not a recent development, but small businesses in America have been creating more jobs every year than big business is laying off. Indeed, in the last 3 years, businesses owned by women alone have created more jobs than the Fortune 500 have laid off. We do not need a weak Small Business Administration. It can be smaller, but it should be strong.

So what I'd like to do today is to talk about what your role is and what our role is and what we have to do together. The idea that Washington can actually solve all problems rather than empowering people and communities to solve their problem is moving rapidly away.

Just in the last 3 years, the size of your Federal Government has been reduced by 205,000 people. It is now the smallest it's been since 1965. By the end of this year, the Federal Government will be the smallest it's been since 1962. We are getting rid of 16,000 pages of Federal regulations. And as I'm sure Carol Browner told you before I came, we are trying to find more innovative ways to work in partnership not only with local government but also with the private sector.

We have approved a record number of welfare reform waivers, 53 different projects for 37 States. We do need welfare reform legislation, but you should know that 10 million people, or almost three-quarters of all the people on welfare in the United States of America, are covered by welfare reform projects already approved by this administration in just the last 3 years.

I want to pass the right kind of welfare reform bill because I'd like to get out of the waiver business altogether. I don't want States or counties to have to come to Washington every time they want to try some new, innovative approach to moving people from welfare to work. We know essentially we're stuck with a system which was designed for a population different from the population now on welfare. We know that what welfare people want and need is the same thing that all of us are living with, which is they need to work, but they need to be successful parents. And one of the great challenges for America is how every family can be successful in the home and at work.

Therefore, welfare reform should be tough on work and supportive of children, not weak on work to save money in the short run and tough on kids but within those parameters and with the objective of moving everybody who can be moved into the workplace who can become independent, who can become self-supporting, who can communicate respect to their own children and help to raise their own children better. That is the kind of welfare reform we ought to have.

We passed the unfunded mandates law, which I know you all support. For years and years and years it was easy for Congress to cut taxes, cut spending, and just solve all the public problems by passing a mandate along to you. I remember when I was a Governor once I asked a Member of Congress in an election season—I said, which one would you rather be, a Member of Congress who cut taxes and cut spending, or a Governor who got a mandate and had to raise taxes and spending to meet an order from the Federal Government so that the responsibility was always different from who was actually carrying the burden of public persuasion? That's what the unfunded mandate law was all about, and we did the right thing to pass it.

We've also given you new flexibility to build roads, to turn public housing projects into safe, affordable, mixed-income communities. The empowerment zone and enterprise community initiative has given Federal support to community-based reform. And I was in Michigan yesterday with the county executive there, Ed McNamara, and the mayor of Detroit, Dennis Archer, at one of our most successful endeavors. I want a second round of empowerment zones and enterprise communities. We need to keep doing this to give incentives to local people to work together to build their own futures. And we're just getting started.

We know that if we're going to continue doing what we've been doing and continue making progress, we have got to give more responsibility, not just in the State capitals but also in the county seats and the city halls of America where the rubber meets the road and the decisions must be made.

Let me talk just a minute about what I think we should be doing and then a little bit about what you and I have to do together for the future. First of all, we have to meet the continuing challenges of this economy. If I had told anybody 3 years ago that we'd have a 27-year low in the combined rates of unemployment and inflation and almost 8 million new jobs and

a record number of new businesses and a 15-year high in homeownership, but half the American people would not have a raise and a lot of people would feel very uncertain in the downsizing, and some communities would be left out still of the new jobs, you would have found that hard to believe. It is because of the nature of the changes that are going on.

The answer is not to try to put a wall around America or turn around and run back into a past that we can never achieve again. The answer is to keep pushing until we get all the way through this period of change in a way that permits all Americans to win. That's exactly what we did the last time we went through a period of change like this. It took us decades before. I believe we can do it in less time now because the pace of change is so great.

But let's look at what we have to do. We have to have more growth to produce more good jobs and to spread that opportunity to more people, and to help people who lose their jobs move through the transition more quickly so that they can once again become productive and support their families and have the kind of self-respect every American deserves who is willing to work for it.

What should we do? Yesterday, I called on Congress to pass a growth agenda within 60 days to build on the work of the last 3 years. I won't go through it all now, but let me just mention two or three points. First of all, we ought to pass the right kind of balanced budget, and we ought to do it now.

The economic plan of 1993, though it was controversial, cut our deficit in half in 3 years, drove interest rates way down. What happened with low interest rates? That helped to bring about the homebuilding boom and the 15-year high in homeownership. That helped to increase incomes by cutting the costs Americans have for their car payments, their credit card payments, their home mortgage payments. That helped to sustain a long period of growth.

If we can pass a balanced budget plan, we'll get interest rates down again, so that we'll not only be lifting the burden of debt off of future generations, we'll be giving the present economy the best stimulus it can have to grow and grow and grow. And that means people at your level will be able to pay tax revenues they get from earning more money to fund the county services that you all desperately need to provide.

But there is another issue in the budget that I know has already been discussed here. We're not only still negotiating over how to balance the budget for the next 7 years, we're still talking about finishing the budget work for this year, and that is very hard on you. You have to plan, after all, for daycare services, 911 lines, for jail cells. You have a road budget to meet. You have all of these things you have to do.

Without a national budget, you can't plan; you can't answer basic questions: What kind of resources can I count on to implement this initiative or that one? How much flexibility am I going to have to make this happen? It is unacceptable for America's counties, for America's cities, for America's States not to know what's coming at them. And the effects of this uncertainty are not good. I read the survey you released on Friday. A good many of you have had to postpone construction projects, reduce services, stop hiring. You're looking at higher costs across the board for health care, for welfare, for summer jobs programs.

Enough is enough. We cannot afford to have our counties stuck in suspended animation. You deserve to know what to expect. So I ask you to join with me in saying to the Congress, "You're back in town. We've got to stop governing by continuing resolution. It's time to come together and pass a budget for this year, but also time to come together and pass a budget that will be in balance in 7 years."

We can do this. I want to make it clear to you that as a result of all the negotiations that went on in the previous months between the congressional leaders and the White House, we have now identified savings that are common to both the Republican plan and my plan amounting to $700 billion. That is more than enough to balance the budget and, done right, to protect Medicare and Medicaid, to protect our investments in the environment, to protect our investments in education, to avoid doing away with the summer jobs program, which I think would be a terrible mistake. It is also enough to provide a modest tax cut to families who have been struggling to stay ahead over the last several years and to give what I think would be the best tax cut of all, a tax deduction for the cost of college education and all education expenses after high school.

But also remember it's important to balance the budget, which means that all of us, including the President, have to deal with cuts that we

may not otherwise like to deal with, because if we balance the budget we get the interest rates down again, we keep the economy going, we keep creating jobs, we give incomes a chance to continue to rise. That is very, very important.

If you have any doubt about whether this can be done by Republicans and Democrats in this environment in an election year, I ask you just to look at what's happening today on Capitol Hill. Members of both parties, led by Senator Kassebaum of Kansas and Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts, are announcing a bipartisan commitment to pass historic legislation that will stop insurance companies from cutting off customers just because someone in the family gets sick or they change jobs. It is high time. This is something that we can do to increase access to all people to health care, a critical component of family security in the modern world. I applaud Congress for their commitment here, Republicans and Democrats alike. I look forward to signing the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill, and I hope they will continue.

We've got 3 weeks until Congress takes a break for Easter. That's more than enough time to move ahead on health care reform and to pass the balanced budget. There are other things that I think should be done, including raising the minimum wage and other aspects of the economic growth issue. But just think what would happen if we could do this by Easter, just these two things, to pass that health care reform bill and to pass the balanced budget plan. Think of the confidence, the spirit, the energy it would send throughout America. Think how people would feel differently about the ability of the Government to solve problems and the ability of the country to move forward and the ability of people in Washington to behave in a bipartisan, even a nonpartisan way, in the way that so many of you have to do, day-in and day-out.

We have to do this. But it is not enough. We also have to work with you in a partnership to meet the challenges that I outlined in the State of the Union. We're working together to strengthen America's families by fighting to end the tragedy of domestic violence. Last month, as a part of our continuing effort, we set up a national domestic violence hotline. This will help, but it won't work alone.

Counties have a special role to play in this endeavor. Your police officers are the ones who respond to the desperate 911 call. Your judges are the ones who have to bring domestic abusers to justice. You have to make sure that members of your community and your officers of the law understand that this is a serious, serious problem in the United States. It can't be solved by simply taking repeated abusers out for a walk around the block to cool down. This is a crime where training and education that you can provide can truly make a difference, a huge difference in the quality of childhood and the quality of life in America. So I ask you to stand with hundreds of thousands of women who are battered each year, with the thousands and thousands of children that are abused, and say, "No more." I salute you for what you're doing, and I ask you for more.

We must bring the same spirit of partnership to our efforts to provide all Americans with the educational opportunities they need for this new era. Let's take the Goals 2000 education reform, for example. It says that we should have nationally competitive standards, standards that will stand us in good stead in the world, and that those standards are needed in a global economy, in the smallest rural community in my home State, and in the biggest cities of America. But it says that States and counties and school districts should agree to meet them but should then have the ability to decide on how to meet them.

Our administration is taking the lead in setting higher national standards and calling for measurable means for determining whether they're being met or not, but in giving more flexibility to local schools and local entities than ever before in determining how to achieve educational excellence. That is a partnership we must embrace with great fervor and with enough dedication that we will keep at it until the job is done.

Let me just give you one example. We're going to have to work together with the private sector to meet the important national goal of connecting every school and every library, every classroom and every library in America to the information superhighway by the year 2000. We have to do that. We at the national level can provide some seed money and some real influence in terms of reaching out to people everywhere to try to help them contribute. But you have to do that as well. People in the private sector in every State and county and community in America are eager to help.

Just later this week, I am going out to California where, on one day, we will connect 20 percent of the classrooms in the State to the Internet in 58 separate counties. That's the downpayment on something that must sweep America in the next couple of years. We have to work together to clean the environment. And I won't repeat anything that Carol Browner said, but you and I know we have to be partners, whether it's in dealing with the Superfund issue or other challenges facing us.

I want to thank this group for the work you did in our development of a sustainable development plan for the future of America. You were consulted, you were involved, and I appreciate it. I was so glad to see one of the officers holding the report when I came in the door today. We have to do this together. We have to disabuse our people of the notion that you have to grow the economy by weakening the environment and that we have to choose a good job over clean air, clean water, and a safe future.

The truth is, over the long run we cannot grow the economy unless we preserve the environment. And you and I have to take the lead in doing that. We have to help working Americans become winners in this time of economic change. I suppose I've spent more time in community colleges than any President in history. I've done it because I believe that they symbolize the kind of institutions that America needs more of if we're going to solve our problems: community placed, driven by the needs of the moment, susceptible and flexible to the personal needs and desires of the individual students; not political in a negative sense but political in a positive sense, in the sense that most of them are highly influential in terms of getting the resources and the support they need from the public and private sector to drive on into a better future. That's what we need more of.

And that's why I've challenged Congress to collapse 70 separate overlapping training programs into a single voucher worth $2,600 a year that we can just mail to anyone as soon as they lose their job, and say, "Here, take this to your local educational institution and get back to work by learning and moving to a better future, not a darker one." That is the sort of support that we all need to give.

And finally, let me say that we have had a remarkable partnership through the crime bill, a crime bill that was written after 6 years of haggling and passed in 1994, largely through the influence of local law enforcement officials; a bill that provides funds for police, for punishment, and for prevention; a bill that is helping to move 100,000 police officers on the street. We are ahead of schedule and under budget in that endeavor because local law enforcement officials know how badly we need more police officers in community policing settings.

I am proud to say that this approach is working all over the country. I see rates of crime coming down, violent crime, property crimes, all kinds of crimes. But we have not succeeded, and we cannot believe we have succeeded just because the crime rate is going down, first, because the crime rate among juveniles is going up and, secondly, because we all know this country still has too many streets, too many neighborhoods, too many schools that are too dangerous and too violent. And we have to keep at it.

We cannot tolerate any attempt to repeal the crime bill and to move away from strategies that we know are working to lower the crime rate. I ask for your support to put more police officers on the street, to keep those prevention programs, and to stand up for giving America a future when we will once again be surprised when we turn on the television and see that a terrible crime has been committed. You want to know when we'll win the battle against crime? When you're surprised when you turn on the evening news and you read about some violent, outrageous, unforgivable act.

Sustained growth, a balanced budget, stronger families, safer streets, a cleaner environment, better education, welfare reform, health care for those who need it most: we can do all these things if we will do them together. You know, I know that a lot of people are so bewildered by the things that are going on in the world today, and I know that it is easy to get disheartened. And I read from time to time about how people have gone from being skeptical to being cynical. But I say to you, my fellow Americans, that is a luxury we cannot afford. If you went to work cynical every day, it would be an excuse for you to do nothing, and soon you would be out of a job.

The only people in this country who can't be fired in their roles are citizens. The Constitution gives our citizens the right to vote or the right not to vote, the right to say what they believe or the right to keep silent. And therefore, they ultimately have the right, if they

choose, to be cynical. But I want to tell you something: This is a very great country. Most people in the world would still give anything to have the opportunities Americans have. Most wealthy countries in the world would give anything to be able to see a private sector vital enough to create the kind of jobs that have been created in this economy. And all the problems we have are simply because we are fortunate enough to be living at the time of most profound change this country has endured in 100 years.

Now, there are problems associated with that change. There is no change that is painless, ever. There never has been, and there never will be. There is no such thing as a painless, consequence-free period of change. But we should rejoice that we have been given the opportunity to serve the public at this moment in our history. And one of the things that you can do, because you are so close to the people, is to go back home and say, "Look, there is nothing facing this country we can't handle if we'll work together, and cynicism is a poor excuse for inaction and is the only thing that will determine our failure."

All my life I have believed it was wrong, fundamentally wrong, for any human being to be denied the opportunity to make the most of his or her own life. That is fundamentally what public life is all about. That is what your work is all about. That is what my work is all about. And a big part of that is involving our citizens in the process of getting through this period of change and transformation.

I believe if we do that the years ahead of us will be America's best years. And if we do it, you can take a full measure of pride and credit in that magnificent endeavor.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:05 a.m. at the Washington Hilton and Towers. In his remarks, he referred to Douglas Bovin, president, and Michael Hightower, president-elect, National Association of Counties; and Carol M. Browner, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

Address to the People of Israel

March 5, 1996

Good evening, and thank you, Ms. Dayan, for inviting me to speak to the people of Israel at this very difficult moment.

Over the last week the world has watched in horror as scores of innocent Israeli citizens have been murdered by suicide bombers. On behalf of the American people, I want to express my deepest sorrow and strongest outrage to the people of Israel and especially to the families and friends of the victims. As I have told Prime Minister Peres, I share your determination to do everything possible to bring this horror to an end and to bring those responsible to justice.

These fanatical acts are aimed not just at killing innocent people but at killing the growing hope for peace in the Middle East. Those responsible for these vicious crimes thrive on division and conflict. They know a new day is dawning in their region. They know the vast majority of Israelis and Palestinians have chosen the path of peace. With every new step that is taken along that path, the enemies of peace grow more desperate. We must not allow their hatred to turn us back to the past. We must counter their senseless violence with resolve and action.

Those who committed the recent bombings brutally attacked Israelis. But make no mistake: The future they darken is their own. Instead of a life of security and prosperity, all they have to offer is violence, poverty, and despair. Chairman Arafat knows that his leadership and the hopes of the Palestinian people are under direct challenge. He must do everything possible to end this campaign of terror.

I have pledged to Prime Minister Peres that the United States will work with Israel and with our friends in the Middle East to stop the killing, to bring the criminals to justice, to permit the process of peacemaking to continue. Today I announced a series of measures to support these critical goals. These include the immediate emergency transfer to Israel of sophisticated equipment for detecting explosives; the dispatch of American specialists to work with their Israeli

colleagues on strengthening antiterrorism measures; the development of a comprehensive package of training, technical assistance, and equipment to improve antiterrorism cooperation among Israel, Palestinians, and regional governments; and urging our friends and allies all around the world to step up their own struggle for peace.

The United States has stood with you, the people of Israel, in times of triumph and tragedy. We stand with you today. Our nations both cherish the same ideals: freedom, tolerance, and democracy. And we know that whenever these ideals are under siege in one country they are threatened everywhere.

We have never been more determined to defend these ideals and to achieve our goal of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The road ahead will not be easy, but think how far you have come. Now is the time to redouble our efforts. Now is the time to be strong. Bullets and bombs must not prevail against the will for peace. And they will not.

NOTE: This address was recorded at 1:30 p.m. on March 5 in the Roosevelt Room of the White House for later broadcast in Israel. In his remarks, the President referred to Ilana Dayan, anchor, Channel 2 TV in Israel.

Remarks at a Memorial Service for Victims of Terrorism
March 5, 1996

Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. Rabbi Simon, Mr. Krauser, Cantor Tasat; to my fellow Americans and all the people of Israel: The American people join in this time of grieving and loss. We mourn Israel's loss—we mourn Israel's terrible loss, and we share your outrage. We stand with you in your determination to bring this terror to an end and to bring to justice those responsible for the senseless violence that has afflicted the land of Israel and taken the lives of innocent people.

In moments such as these our anguish challenges our spirit. Daughters and sons, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers, friends murdered—murdered solely for the blood running through their veins, solely because of where they live, solely because they wish to live in peace and harmony.

Our faith may be shaken, but at times like this it is all the more important to persevere. These fanatical acts were not aimed simply at killing innocent people, they were clearly aimed at killing the promise of peace. Those responsible thrive on division and conflict. It is almost as if they cannot exist without someone to hate, someone to kill.

They know a new day has been dawning in the Middle East. They know the vast majority of Israelis and Palestinians want a new day of peace. With every new step taken along the way, the harshest enemies of peace have grown more and more desperate. We must not allow them to prevail. The best way to defeat them is to first restore security and then bolster the peace they fear; that will take away their very reason for being.

We will counter the threat of terror with unshakable resolve. As I have pledged to Prime Minister Peres, the United States is working with Israel to stop the killing, to bring the criminals to justice, to step up the struggle for peace. But just as important as the strength of our policies is the strength we must carry in our hearts.

I remember the story of Daniel. Because his faith never wavered, even in the face of those who betrayed him and had him cast into the den of lions, God delivered Daniel. Have faith, and I believe God will deliver Israel from those powerful vipers who have the ability to turn young men into mad suicidal mass murderers, those awful people who would slaughter young children to defeat those who only want those children to grow up in peace, and who on this very night have succeeded in terrifying every young child in Israel who goes to bed tonight worrying about whether he or she will be the next to have their life cut short.

One of Sunday's victims in Jerusalem was a Palestinian nurse. She reminds us that the people of Israel are not alone, not only beyond their borders but within the borders. She lived

and worked and ultimately died among her Jewish friends. I was struck by the words I read that her oldest son spoke. He said, "I'm angry at every person who kills. I'm angry at people who make hate and destroy. All the people who were on that bus were peaceful. They were civilians. They only wanted to go to work. There's no difference between you and me because we're human beings. We have eyes and hearts and souls."

Around the world, the world we see today, I believe the fundamental differences are no longer between Jews and Arabs or Protestants and Catholics or Muslims and Serbs and Croats. We see all over the world what the real dividing line is—between those who embrace peace and those who would destroy it, those who look to a future of hope and those who are trapped in a past of hatred, those who open their arms and those who insist on clenching their fists.

Once again under terrible burdens, the people of Israel must choose the fight against terrorism, to restore their security, to stand for peace. Once again as ever, the United States stands with you, shoulder to shoulder, heart to heart.

Ha-zak, ha-zak, vuh-neet ha-zake. May God bless the victims and cherish their souls. And may God bless Israel with the faith and courage of Daniel.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:04 p.m. in Jerusalem Hall at the Embassy of Israel. In his remarks, he referred to Israeli Ambassador to the U.S. Etamar Rabinovich; Rabbi Matthew H. Simon, president, United Jewish Appeal in Washington, DC; Peter B. Krauser, president, Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington; and Cantor Ramon Tasat, Agudas Achim Congregation.

Message to the Congress Reporting Budget Rescissions and Deferrals
March 5, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral, totaling $91 million, and two proposed rescissions of budgetary resources, totaling $15 million.

The deferral affects the Department of State U.S. emergency refugee and migration assistance fund. The rescission proposals affect the Department of Agriculture and the General Services Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 5, 1996.

NOTE: The report detailing the proposed rescissions and deferral was published in the *Federal Register* on March 15.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee
March 5, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 108(b) of Public Law 98–373 (15 U.S.C. 4701(b)), I transmit herewith the Sixth Biennial Report of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (February 1, 1994, to January 31, 1996).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 5, 1996.

Remarks at the Swearing-In Ceremony for Barry McCaffrey as Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy

March 6, 1996

Thank you, Justice Ginsburg. I want to say a special word of welcome to Mrs. Jill McCaffrey, and to all of General McCaffrey's family who are here, to Attorney General Reno and Secretary Shalala, and our FBI Director, Louis Freeh, to Senator Biden and Congressman Zeliff, and to all the distinguished members of the Government and the military who are here.

I would like to begin with a simple and heartfelt thank you to General McCaffrey for accepting this call to lead our Nation's battle against drugs. Service to our country runs in his family. In fact, we have three generations of McCaffrey service in attendance here today, as you saw standing with me.

The general's father, Bill McCaffrey, who is here with his wife, Mary, is a retired lieutenant general who saw combat in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. Two of his three children are pursuing careers in the military. His son, who is also here, drove all night from Fort Bragg, which is a testimony to the fact, General, that the physical training is still adequate to the task. [*Laughter*] He is an Army captain stationed at Fort Polk in Louisiana. His daughter Tara is an Army National Guard nurse. His other daughter, Amy, is a graduate student at Central Washington College. The McCaffrey family is a shining example of what is right with America. We are fortunate to have their service and their presence here today.

General McCaffrey has faced down many threats to America's security, from guerrilla warfare in the jungles of Vietnam to the unprecedented ground war in the sands of Desert Storm. Now he faces a more insidious but no less formidable enemy in illegal drugs.

Drugs are as much a threat to our security as any outside enemy is today. They are a leading cause of crime and violence. They add literally billions of dollars to health care costs every year. There is a new CDC report that says that drugs are the cause of at least half—one-half—of all the new HIV infections in the United States. And drugs are imperiling our Nation's most precious resource, our children.

As I said in the State of the Union, if we ever expect to reduce crime and violence in our country to the low level that would make it the exception rather than the rule, we have to reduce the drug problem. We know it is a difficult battle. We know that overall drug use and crime are down in every segment of our society except one, our young people. And that makes the battle more difficult and more important.

The glamorization of drugs and violence is a big reason for this. That's why I worked so hard for the V-chip and for the television rating system. That's why we need to stop the glorification of drugs in our popular culture. And for those who say we should throw in the towel and just make drugs legal,[1] I say, not on my watch. I don't believe in that. That would be a mistake.

Over the last two decades we have made significant progress in this effort. Just in 1979, more than 22 million Americans used illegal drugs; 5 million used cocaine. Today less than 12 million Americans are regular drug users, and the number of cocaine users has dropped 30 percent in the past 3 years. But the problem is still too great, and I say again, it is perplexing and troubling as it affects our juvenile population. Drug use among people 18 to 34 is down. Casual drug use among people under 18 is up. That may be why the crime rate is down overall in our country but random violence among people under 18—our children and our future—is still up.

Tomorrow General McCaffrey and I will have the opportunity to address this, along with others in the administration, at our National Conference on Youth and Violence. And this is a good way to kick it off, with his service.

In the last 3 years we have tried to take many concrete steps to protect our children and their future. We're working to get hard-core drug users off the street, to make sure they can't commit crimes, and to get them into treatment. We're bringing drug prevention to our schools by teaching our children that drugs are wrong, illegal, and dangerous. We've put more

[1] White House correction.

police on the street, and that is a major cause of the decline in the crime rate.

Two months ago I signed a directive requiring drug testing of Federal arrestees. We are doing all we can to stop drugs at their source, before they get to our borders. Just yesterday our U.S. Customs officials began seizing all imports of the sedative Rohypnol, which has been associated of late with date rape.

But General McCaffrey and all of us know that we have to do more. We have to do much more. There's no one more capable to lead this effort than Barry McCaffrey. He is America's most highly decorated combat veteran. He earned two Distinguished Service Cross Awards for extraordinary valor in Vietnam. He also earned two Silver Stars for heroism and three Purple Hearts. He served two tours in Vietnam, where he was severely wounded by enemy gunfire. He led the now famous left hook maneuver that crushed the Iraqi army in Desert Storm. And for the last 2 years he's been on the frontlines of our efforts to stop drugs at their source in his role as commander in chief of the United States Southern Command based in Panama.

As part of our counternarcotics team, he displayed decisive leadership in strengthening the efforts in Latin America, including forming one of the most successful international coalitions against drugs that has ever existed in that region. In addition to his heroism on the battlefield, General McCaffrey has distinguished himself as a man of ideas, a brilliant man of ideas, especially the one that Justice Ginsburg thought so much of that she mentioned a few moments ago.

He has always taken a comprehensive view towards problem solving, and he knows that our efforts in the struggle against drugs will require a combination of treatment, prevention, education, enforcement, and interdiction. Teamwork and coalition building are not just words to him; he has done it. Teamwork and coalition building literally saved his life and the lives of his soldiers. There is no doubt that he has the talent, the courage, and the vision to take up this fight.

But he cannot do it alone. As I said in the State of the Union, he's going to need a larger force than he has ever commanded before, indeed, a larger force than he and his colleagues who have come from the Pentagon to join him today have ever commanded before. He's going to need every American doing his or her part if we are going to succeed. It means that we have to begin with parents talking firmly and clearly with their children, with our communities, our houses of worship, our schools, our employers, our national and community groups. The fight against drugs must in the end be a citizens campaign because every citizen has a direct stake in the outcome.

General, I want you to have the tools you need. For the last 3 years I have challenged Congress to do its part. In each of those years Congress has appropriated less than I asked for counternarcotics efforts in the Department of Defense and other agencies. America must never send its troops into battle without adequate resources to get the job done.

That's why today I am directing General McCaffrey to take the first step to make sure that we are adequately armed to fight this battle. As your first act of duty, I direct you to prepare a plan to amend the 1996 fiscal year budget through reallocating $250 million from the Department of Defense budget so that it can be added to our counternarcotics efforts. I will submit the plan to Congress this month. I'm also directing you to examine the fiscal year '97 budget to determine if a similar reallocation is needed.

We have to get after this. We have to get General McCaffrey off to a good start. I believe that he will get our country off to a good start. Our national security, the well-being of our children are at stake. We can create a safer, more drug-free society. We can do this if we work together.

As I have said many times in different contexts, when we are divided as a country, we defeat ourselves, but when America is united, we never lose. I believe Barry McCaffrey will help to unite America, and I believe he will help us to win this great and enduring struggle for our character, our soul, and the future of our children.

Thank you again, General McCaffrey, for laying down your four stars to reach for the stars. We appreciate you. Your country is grateful. And I ask you now to come and say what's on your mind.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Remarks on Presenting the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards
March 6, 1996

Thank you. Let me say how delighted I am to be here today to be a part of this again. I want to begin by thanking a few people. First I'd like to thank Secretary Brown and all the others who are here from the Commerce Department for, I think, giving this country the best Commerce Department it has had in many, many decades, and I thank them for that. Mr. Houghton and Mr. Bradshaw, I thank you and all your team for coming here today. And we want to especially welcome Mr. Houghton's brother, Congress' most prominent musician—[*laughter*]—Congressman Amo Houghton from New York. I thank the Baldrige Foundation; its Chair, Bob Allen, is here. Thank you, sir, for your work. I want to thank the people in the White House who are my eyes and ears in outreach to the American business community, Mack McLarty and Alexis Herman.

Let me say, I have some remarks here I decided not to give because I want to just tell you a little bit from the heart what this means to me. When I became President I had worked for 12 years as a Governor, starting in a State with an unemployment rate that was 3 percent above the national average and that never got down to the national average but one month until 1992, the last year I served. We decided that we had to build a partnership with business. We decided that America would not do well unless manufacturing came back. And we decided to put a special emphasis on the whole quality management approach, to make people who were committed to that feel welcome in our State. In the 1980's when there was a dramatic drop in manufacturing employment nationwide, it went up in our State. And we were proud of it, and we worked on it.

So I am very familiar with the Baldrige Award, with the memory of Secretary Baldrige and all those in both parties who have supported this award since its inception. And I just want to say a few words about what the significance of this is.

There's a lot of discussion today about whether things are good or bad in the American economy. The truth is, there's a lot of good, and there's some bad, because, as all of you know who are working in this arena, we are going through a period of breathtaking change, the most dramatic change in a hundred years, since we became an industrial society from an agricultural one. And that is forming great changes in the nature of work—there's more mind and less muscle in it—great changes in the nature of the workplace—there's not a person to waste, there has to be very high levels of productivity—great changes in the market—all the markets for money products and services are global now, either directly or indirectly. And that has put great new challenges on our society.

We should not underestimate, first of all, the importance of a commitment to productivity and to quality. It is the revolution which has occurred in American manufacturing, I am convinced, that has led the way to giving us the kind of economy, with declining deficits and lower interest rates, which has permitted the United States to create 7.7 million new jobs in the last 3 years, when the other 6 big economies in the G–7, together, have netted out at zero. It is not easy to create new jobs in the beginning of this technological revolution. So I cannot tell you how important that is.

The second thing I want to say is that that has been a model for me for what we should do in Government. Our State, when I was a Governor, had the first quality management program of any State government. And the Vice President's reinventing Government operation here has obviously had a significant impact on not only reducing the size of Government to its lowest in 30 years, getting rid of 16,000 pages of regulation but, more important, raising the performance level in many, many agencies.

The third thing I want to say is that one of the ways we have to manage this transition is to continue to create more good high-wage jobs. And we can do that through the passage of specific legislation, as we did with the telecommunications bill, which passed with virtually the unanimous support of the Congress, Members of both parties, and which I believe and Secretary Brown believes will create millions of new jobs. That directly affects, obviously, Corning and this specific division, but it will indirectly affect all of America if we can create 3 to 3½ million more high-wage jobs. It will

help people undergoing transitions in other companies to move to those new jobs.

The third point I want to make is that both of these companies have proved that you can have the right sort of partnership with the Government. The Secretary mentioned that both of them had done work with NIST, which is our technology division within the Commerce Department. The Commerce Department has done two things better than any predecessor, I believe, thanks to Secretary Brown and the others who work there. First of all, they've done a better job in opening the doors around the world for American businesses and American products. And secondly, they have tried to help, in a very effective way, manage the transition by investing in partnership with the private sector in important emerging areas of technology. And that is very important. That's the sort of thing Government ought to do, not deciding exactly how this economy will grow, not picking winners and losers but working with the private sector to provide that extra added measure of cooperation in the new technologies that will enable us to win.

The final thing I want to say is this. These two companies—and I want to say a special word here about Armstrong. Henry said that, well, Armstrong was not—it was a traditional manufacturing company, not a high-tech company. All manufacturing operations that are going to succeed have to be high performance companies. And they have to get the most out of their people. And they are managing this transition in the same way I'm convinced we have to manage it here: teamwork. The people who aren't here whose names we'll never know are just as important as the people who are here in the fact that these two companies won these awards today.

And that's something we need to keep in mind here in Washington. If we had more teamwork we would be more successful at giving the American people a higher return on their tax dollar and in moving more quickly through this transition. That is what works. And in a time of transition you simply don't have the luxury of engaging in politics as usual, just like you can't engage in business as usual.

So that's the significance of this day to me. It's the validation of years and years of effort by people who believe in quality management. It's the validation of the proposition that we can create new opportunities for Americans if we work together to move into the future instead of running away from it. It proves that there is a proper role for the Nation's Government in a limited supportive way to help to create new economic opportunities. And most important, it shows that when we work together, we never lose.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:10 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to James R. Houghton, chairman and chief executive officer, Corning, Inc., and Henry A. Bradshaw, president, Armstrong World Industries' Building Products Operations.

Statement on the Report of the White House Conference on Aging

March 6, 1996

I was gratified today to receive the final report of the White House Conference on Aging, a comprehensive look at aging policy in America developed over 2 years with the input of more than 125,000 men and women. My deep thanks and appreciation go out to all of those Americans who contributed to this incredible grassroots effort.

These recommendations, which demonstrate strong support for many of the priorities I have been fighting for, including the preservation and protection of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, will be given every serious consideration by my administration.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions

March 5, 1996

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1), and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council.

Since my last letter to you on January 4, 1996, on Iraq, the Government of Iraq has come no closer to meeting its obligations under applicable Security Council resolutions. The U.N. Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM), responsible for dismantling Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs, continues to find evidence that Iraq is hiding information on its past weapons programs. UNSCOM also found evidence as recently as a few months ago that Iraq continues to pursue acquisition of prohibited weapons technology. Iraq has made no progress either in accounting for nationals of Kuwait and third countries missing since the occupation or in returning stolen Kuwaiti property. Saddam Hussein continues to provide safe haven for known terrorists. Given all this, the Security Council maintained sanctions without change at the January 5, 1996, review.

Saddam Hussein's unwillingness to comply with the norms of international behavior extends to his regime's continuing threat to Iraqi citizens throughout the country. We and our coalition partners continue to enforce the no-fly zones over northern and southern Iraq as part of our efforts to deter Iraq's use of aircraft against its population. The human rights situation throughout Iraq remains unchanged. Saddam Hussein shows no signs of complying with U.N. Security Council Resolution 688, which demands that Iraq cease the repression of its own people. Iraq's repression of its southern Shi'a population continues, with policies aimed at destroying the Marsh Arabs' way of life and important environmental resources.

We continue to provide humanitarian assistance, along with international and humanitarian relief organizations, to the people of northern Iraq. Deteriorating security conditions forced us to issue notice in late January for all Americans in the area to exercise maximum caution in their activities. We have facilitated talks between the two major Kurdish groups in an effort to help them resolve their differences and increase stability in northern Iraq. However, Iran continues to look for opportunities to expand its influence in the area, as demonstrated by the visit of an Iranian Foreign Ministry official to the area in early January.

Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 986, Iraq is authorized to sell a prescribed amount of oil for the purchase of humanitarian supplies. In early February, the Government of Iraq sent a delegation to the United Nations to discuss the details of implementation of this Resolution. Nonetheless, it remains unclear whether Saddam Hussein is serious about using this mechanism to relieve the humanitarian suffering in Iraq. It is not clear whether Iraq will accept Resolution 986 as written, but the United States and other members of the Security Council have emphasized that the Security Council will not agree to amending the terms of the Resolution.

The Multinational Interception Force (MIF) conducting the maritime enforcement of sanctions against Iraq has, since my last report, encountered the busiest enforcement period since 1991, diverting 24 dhow vessels carrying Iraqi dates worth an estimated $3.5 million. Since October 1994, the MIF has diverted 50 sanctions violating vessels to Gulf ports with oil and date cargoes exceeding an estimated value of $18 million. The expeditious acceptance of these violating vessels by the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, and Kuwait has greatly contributed to the deterrent effect of MIF sanctions enforcement operations. It has also enhanced enforcement efforts by allowing MIF vessels escorting the diverted vessels to return to patrol operations.

We continue to achieve a significant foreign policy objective in maintaining multinational participation in the MIF. Ships from the United States, Belgium, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom participated in MIF operations during the past 2 months. Additionally, we have received firm commitments from The Netherlands and Australia to send frigates to participate in the MIF from March through July of this year.

The United States continues to work with Honduras, the United Arab Emirates, and India concerning sanctions violations committed by vessels under their flags. Honduras has designated its mission to the United Nations to conduct deflagging proceedings for vessels of Honduran registry. India has initiated "registry deletion" proceedings against vessels operating under its flag.

The Commander of the U.S. Fifth Fleet, who serves as the coordinator for the MIF, recently completed a series of briefings for the U.N. Iraq Sanctions Committee. The briefings continued our practice of close coordination and consultation with the Sanctions Committee and members of the Security Council on the issue of maritime Iraq sanctions enforcement. In addition to enforcement of sanctions, the U.S. force presence in the region is intended to maintain the capability to respond rapidly to possible Iraqi aggression or threats against its neighbors.

Security Council Resolution 687 affirmed that Iraq is liable under international law for compensating the victims of its unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. Although the U.N. Compensation Commission (UNCC) has approved some 790,000 individual awards against Iraq, worth about $3.0 billion, it has been able to authorize the payment of only the fixed awards for serious personal injury or death (aggregating approximately $13.5 million). The remainder of the awards cannot be paid because the U.N. Compensation Fund lacks sufficient funding. The awards are supposed to be financed by a deduction from the proceeds of future Iraqi oil sales, once such sales are permitted to resume. However, Iraq's refusal to meet the Security Council's terms for a resumption of oil sales has left the UNCC without adequate financial resources to pay the awards. Iraq's intransigence means the victims of its aggression remain uncompensated for their losses 5 years after the end of the Gulf War.

To conclude, Iraq remains a serious threat to regional peace and stability. I remain determined that Iraq comply fully with all its obligations under the U.N. Security Council Resolutions. My Administration will continue to oppose any relaxation of sanctions until Iraq demonstrates peaceful intentions through its overall compliance with all of the U.N. Security Council Resolutions.

I appreciate the support of the Congress for our efforts, and shall continue to keep the Congress informed about this important issue.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 7.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With King Hussein of Jordan and an Exchange With Reporters

March 7, 1996

Middle East Peace Process

The President. Let me say that I am delighted to have King Hussein here today, especially at this important time for the Middle East. As ever, the United States is grateful for his leadership and his courage. And I look forward to discussing with him today what we can do together to continue to stand against the forces of terrorism and for the forces of peace in the region. We'll have a number of other things to talk about, but I'm so glad that he's here.

Q. Your Majesty, what do you think the prospects are for resuming the peace negotiations? And what do you think the goal is of the bombings?

King Hussein. As far as I'm concerned, I'd like to thank you, sir, for giving me the pleasure and privilege of being with you here today and with our friends.

I would like to say that we are more than shocked; we are really angered by what we have seen in the way of violence in our part of the world. And we must do everything we can to put an end to this.

And I believe it is the action of a small group against an overwhelming majority of people in

our region who are seeking peace, who have seen the taste of peace and the new beginnings and the breaking of a new dawn. I hope that they will be mobilized to do whatever they can to help and be vocal in the face of extremism. And I think the objective is very clear: These people are trying to scuttle the peace process and destroy all that has been achieved. And they must never succeed, and we will do whatever we can towards that end.

Q. Mr. President, is there anything else that the United States can do to help the Israelis and the Palestinians deal with these immediate threats?

The President. Well as you know, we've taken some extra actions in the last few days, and we'll be discussing other options in the days ahead. There may be some other things we can do, but I'd rather not discuss it now until we've actually made some decisions.

Q. Mr. President, Chairman Arafat has called for an international conference to map a strategy to combat terrorism. Do you favor such a meeting?

The President. Well, we've been in contact, obviously, with Chairman Arafat and with Prime Minister Peres and others about all the options, and we haven't ruled out anything. We're working on the things that we ought to do, and we'll have some decisions in the next couple of days about where we go from here.

NAFTA

Q. Mr. President, Canada and Mexico are both raising alarms with the Helms-Burton bill, saying it will violate NAFTA. What's your reaction to that, and would you maybe consider waiving the provision before the election?

The President. Well, I believe that the bill as now written permits compliance with international law, and that is why I said that I would support and sign it.

Q. Does it also——

1996 Election

Q. Are you looking forward to running against Bob Dole?

The President. We ought to give it—I'm looking forward to getting everything settled down here and getting back to work in Washington. We need to go back to work. The main campaign we need to be waging now is a campaign for peace at home—I mean, peace abroad and prosperity at home. We've got a lot of work to do.

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

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, can you give us any reaction from Syria about the bombings in Israel? And are you satisfied with the actions of the Arab world so far?

The President. Well, I think that Chairman Arafat has made some real efforts, but I think that all of us will have to do more. And we're talking together, working together about what we can do to do more. And I have been in touch with all of our friends in the region and all the countries that are interested in what is going on there and all the countries that have a stake in continuing the peace process, and we're going to do everything we can to keep it going and also to combat terror.

Q. Do you think the peace process is endangered now, continuing, especially the Syria-Israeli track?

The President. Well, it doesn't help—what's happened. But I hope that if we all rally to the cause of peace and to the work of combating the terror, that that will permit the peace process to continue. I believe all the leaders want it to continue.

Q. If there was some—[*inaudible*]—against Iran, and the United States said that Iran is involved, would the United States back any action by Israel against Iran?

The President. Oh, I think it's inappropriate to speculate about such matters. I think that what we're going to do is to talk about what we can do to restore security, restore a basic sense of safety, and to keep going with the peace. And I think that's what we ought to focus on.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:07 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority and Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at Eleanor Roosevelt High School in Greenbelt, Maryland
March 7, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mark, for your fine introduction and for your fine example and for reminding us about why this is an important day for the United States. Thank you, Dr. Boarman, for recalling my previous trip to Eleanor Roosevelt. That was a great day. I must say, when I was there then talking about the national education goals, I didn't have any idea I'd be back here a few years later in this role to discuss this issue.

I'd like to thank the Members of Congress who are here and my good friend Secretary Cisneros; Governor Glendening and Lieutenant Governor Townsend; your county executive, Wayne Curry, who was with me just yesterday in the White House telling me about how this is the best county in America. I thank Reverend Jackson and all the people from the entertainment community and the other leaders who are here from across America today at this national conference.

I also want you to know that there are two graduates of this high school who work in the White House: one of my associate counsels, Cheryl Mills, and Andy Blocker, who works in Legislative Affairs. So I am a direct beneficiary of Eleanor Roosevelt High School, and I thank you for that.

When I leave you here we're going over to the conference with the delegates, but I wanted to come here with the Vice President and with General McCaffrey because, really, this conference is about you. And frankly, this is a day when I wish that as President, it weren't my job to give a speech, that I could just spend the next hour or two sitting around visiting with a number of you and listening to you and talking with you about your future, because we're here to try to do what we can to make your lives safer and your future stronger.

You probably don't think about this very much, but already in your lives you have acquired different roles and different responsibilities, and they give you different perspectives: You are students, and you're still children; you're sons or daughters; you may be brothers or sisters; if you have an association with organizations, you're in the ROTC or in an athletic club or in the band; you have obligations, doubtless, to your friends that have become more and more important to you as you get older.

That's the position that I find myself in today. I want to speak with you about this whole issue of crime and violence and drugs from the perspective of a President, the head of our Nation's Government; a citizen who understands that much of this work needs to be done in grassroots, citizens' community-based organizations; and the father of a high school-aged daughter. I see this whole issue in terms of what's good for families and what's good for the country.

You're old enough now that you're being confronted on a regular basis with tough decisions, where you have to choose right from wrong, dangerous from safe. What you may not know is that the decisions that you make also may be good or bad not only for this community but for your entire country.

That's what I want to talk to you about today, the decisions that I have to make as President to try to create more opportunity for you and a more secure environment, the decisions that we all have to make as citizens to try to improve your future and your present, and most important, the decisions that I hope you will make to choose life over death, to choose what is right for you over plainly what is wrong.

You are coming of age at the moment of greatest possibility in all of American history, where young people who are prepared for it will be able to have more options to live out the future of their dreams than any previous generation. And the technological revolution, which is still a mystery to me, is something that many of you just take for granted. It can be the most democratic instrument in our history. It can offer enormous opportunities to children who not so many years ago could never have had them just because they came up in poor households.

The other day the Vice President and I were in a school district in New Jersey that is in a poor neighborhood where most of the children come from immigrant families, the per capita income is way below the State average—and New Jersey is one of the two or three richest States in America. The school district was performing so poorly a few years ago that the State

almost had to come in and close it and take it over. But they got new leadership. Major companies came in with a commitment to help. They put computers in all the classrooms for the kids, and then they even had computer hookups in the homes of these poor parents, many of whom had only been in our country for a few years. Within a matter of weeks, immigrant parents were E-mailing the principal to see how their kids were doing and whether they were doing their homework. Within 2 or 3 years, this district that was on the verge of failure and all these poor children on the verge of being denied the American dream had attendance rates and graduation rates and, most important of all, test scores above the State average in one of the wealthiest States in this country.

That can happen to America. That is the technological age we are living in. But the interesting thing about it, and the perplexing thing about it, is that technology is like every other tool of human beings: That's all it is. And in order for technology to work, it still has to be used by people who have good values, a strong background, and who choose life, who choose their future, who choose what is right for themselves and their country.

Our Nation has a lot of challenges that we have to meet together if we're going to make sure the American dream is available for all young people without regard to their background, if we're going to see that our country remains the strongest country in the world, if we're going to see this country come together instead of being divided by race, by region, by income.

We've got a lot of challenges to meet. Some of them are obvious. We have to do a better job of strengthening all families and giving all children a chance at a good childhood through things like better nutrition programs and immunization programs and Head Start for kids who need it. We have to provide excellence in educational opportunities for a lifetime now, not even just for children kindergarten through 12th grade, through things like a better student loan program and more college scholarships and the national service program and the program that first brought me here, the national education goals, giving schools the grassroots tools they need to meet high national standards of educational attainment for all of our young people; through economic strategies to create more high-wage jobs in the places that don't have them. We've got a lot of work to do. But in the end, if you think about it, we cannot succeed in any of these challenges unless first we deal with the problems of crime and violence and gangs and drugs, for in the absence of safety, people are not free.

I don't know how many of you saw—I'm sure many of you did—the gripping, painful pictures coming across our airwaves from the Middle East in the last few days, where innocent children were killed by suicide bombers bent on destroying the peace process in the Middle East. But I couldn't help—I was so moved by the interviews with children, with young people. And it struck me just so clearly there that Israel is a very great democracy, but if every child goes to bed at night afraid, it is not a free country.

And the same thing is true here. If you are imprisoned from within by drugs, or from without by a fear that you can't even walk down the street without looking over your shoulder, this is not a free country and you are not a free person. And you can never be everything that you ought to be unless you are free. Part of it involves your choice to choose life and a future. Part of it involves what we can all do together to make sure that nothing takes that future, nothing takes that life away from you.

And that is in many ways our most fundamental mission, because from it all else flows: your mission to decide what kind of person you're going to be; our mission to decide what we're going to do to make sure you get the chance to become that person. And in our country it still means—even though the crime rate is down, even though drug use is way down from where it was at its peak, we still have a lot of work to do. We have to get rid of the guns that turn arguments into terrible tragedies, like the one that took the life of C.J. Brown. We have to take back our streets so that mothers and fathers don't have to be afraid when a son or daughter is waiting for a ride after work, like Julie Ferguson was on the night she was killed.

So that's why I want to talk to you about this. And I have a real perspective, I think, about the whole drug and crime and violence problem. I grew up in the sixties when most people your age—when I was your age, they just sort of got into this business. They didn't really believe drugs were dangerous until it

nearly destroyed our generation. I heard General McCaffrey, who served with great distinction and valor in Vietnam, talking about, yesterday, how in our generation when we were younger, the United States military was nearly destroyed by it. I had a brother who nearly lost his life because of a drug problem. I know a lot about this.

And we have seen this incredible progress in the drug issue in the last several years where drug usage has gone way down, still going down among people 18 to 34, but now casual drug use going up again among people under 18. We have to stop that. We see the crime rate going down in America, the murder rate going down, the violence rate going down, but casual violence among people under 18 going up again. There are people in this conference with me today who've become friends of mine who once were members of gangs and have devoted the rest of their lives to stopping young people from making that mistake, trying to get them to choose life. And we have to do that.

I tell you today, the most perplexing challenge facing us is how to make sure that drug use goes down among people who are under 18, that violence continues to go down among people who are under 18. We do not want to lose any more children. We don't want to rob any more people of their future. We have to fight these things whenever and wherever we see them.

Let me begin by saying that one of the most disturbing findings in a lot of the national surveys is that more and more young people in your age group, and maybe you're among them, seem to believe that drugs are not dangerous anymore. That is factually wrong. It's not only wrong about cocaine, it's not only wrong about methamphetamine; it's wrong about marijuana. It is just wrong. We know that the toxic content of marijuana alone, for example, is roughly 3 times greater than it was 30 years ago. It is not true that they are not dangerous. They are illegal and therefore wrong, but they are also dangerous.

And I'll say again, I nearly lost my only brother. I'm not just telling you as a President. This is not a political speech. This is a personal statement. And there is no reason for the people of this country who happen to be under 18 to start seeing drug use go up again and violence go up again when the future for you is the brightest future any group of Americans have ever known, if you can make the transition into this new high-tech age.

So no matter what we do with the laws and all the things that we should be doing, you have to make the right decision first. And I want to say, one of the reasons that we wanted to come here to have this conference at Roosevelt instead of some hotel or Government building is because of what you have done at this school, because the students, the teachers, and the parents of this school are doing such a remarkable job of fighting drugs and violence. They're not a perfect stranger here, drugs and violence, but this community has come together to send them packing. And I thank you for that. The way you're doing it is a lesson for all of America.

I've spent a lot of time saying what the Government can do and what the Government cannot do. We cannot solve the drug problem from Washington. We can't stamp out youth violence just by passing laws. We can't even do it by giving resources to local communities unless they are properly used. Each of us has our own role to play. Our Government has a responsibility which we have tried to fulfill.

The crime bill we fought for in 1994 is helping to put 100,000 more police officers on the street. That helps to deter crime, and it is working everywhere it's being used aggressively.

We banned 19 kinds of assault weapons, and you've already heard that we passed the Brady bill to require a 5-day waiting period before people can buy handguns. And tens of thousands of people who have criminal records now have failed to get guns. This is a safer country because of that.

We passed the "three strikes and you're out" law to put the most dangerous criminals behind bars for life. We are fighting against domestic violence as never before because of that crime bill. And we're trying to help thousands of schools to fight drugs and violence with drug education and gang prevention and increased security. We're supporting programs like the D.A.R.E. program, which I think is doing a wonderful amount of good in elementary schools throughout our country. I know that that can work.

We also made it a national Federal crime for any person under the age of 18 to carry a handgun except when supervised by an adult. Last year I fought for a law requiring every State to expel any student who brings a gun to a school for a year, no excuses. You have

a zero tolerance policy for guns here at Roosevelt. We ought to have a zero tolerance for guns in every school in America. You should never worry about your safety when you're in school.

We've launched an aggressive campaign to crack down on advertising to convince young people to begin smoking. Cigarette smoking is now rapidly becoming the greatest cause of future health dangers to young people in America. Three thousand children start smoking every day, even though it's illegal in every State; 1,000 will have their lives shortened as a result. Don't let that happen to you. If you don't smoke, don't start. If you started, stop. It could be the best thing you ever do for your health.

You heard General McCaffrey a few moments ago. The National Government has a responsibility that is embodied by General McCaffrey to do everything we can to try to stop the flow of drugs into our country, and to try to deal with it after it comes in our country, to try to help people who have already fallen victims to drug abuse. We're doing everything we can in that regard.

We also, in the crime bill, gave communities some funds that I'm struggling with the Congress to preserve now, not only to tell our young people they should say no to drugs but to give young people in difficult circumstances more things to say yes to, more opportunities to be involved in positive activities and engaged in things that will help to build their lives. That is all our responsibility.

But General McCaffrey cannot do this alone. The President cannot do this alone. The Government cannot do this alone. That's why I say the things you've done here may count for more than anything else.

I was given some notes before I came over here about your grad night program, which I think is a remarkable thing. Every school in the country ought to do that. Your parents know that peer pressure to use drugs and alcohol is always strong, especially on graduation night. But they want you to celebrate your achievement, not end your life. And I think it's a very impressive thing that businesses have supported this, parents have supported it; every year they throw you an all-night party. I don't think it's advisable every week, but I think once a year it's a pretty good idea. For the benefit of the press and the others who are here, the seniors come to school at 11, give their keys and bags to their parents, load up the buses; they don't come back until 6 in the morning. They can spend the night swimming, playing basketball, dancing, eating all kinds of food. They even have a chance to win a car. I wonder if that gets the participation rate up. [*Laughter*]

Last year—listen to this—622 seniors here; 597 showed up to celebrate. That's an amazing thing. That's an amazing thing. That's the kind of community spirit and commitment we need all across this country. And today I want you to know that we're getting that kind of community spirit in other ways as well.

Working with the drug czar's office, the leaders of a major American industry have come together to try to do their part. We know the fight against youth drug abuse has to begin at home. We also know that a lot of parents don't always recognize the warning signs of drug abuse and they're unsure about how they should approach their children when they do. Well, what can we do about this? We know that America can do a lot. When people need health advice, they normally turn to their family doctor. We know that the pharmaceutical industry sends sales representatives to see every doctor in his or her office in the entire country. Today I am proud to announce that the 15 major pharmaceutical companies in America are launching a $33 million campaign to put the kind of drug education material that parents need in the hands of 400,000 doctors, so that they can give it to parents and we can work to stop this problem earlier.

We have some pharmaceutical executives who are here with us today. I'd like to ask them to stand up and be recognized. Where are they? Here they are. Let's give them a hand. Thank you very much, gentlemen. Thank you. [*Applause*]

All of us who are parents have a big role to play. We are the beginning of how children learn right from wrong. We are the beginning of what children believe about drugs and whether they're safe or unsafe, how wrong it is to break the law. But in the end, it still comes down to all of you and your counterparts all across America.

I will say again, you have a lot of responsibilities. You have responsibilities as students. You have responsibilities as children, responsibilities as members of various organizations. Your most important responsibility now is still to you. Your most important responsibility is to choose life.

Your most important responsibility is to make the most of your own life. As my wife always says when we have a big argument around our house, life is not a dress rehearsal. That is your most important responsibility.

I know a lot of you have been pressured to do drugs before, and you will be again. And when I tell you you shouldn't do it, you look at me and say, "Look at that—he may be President, but he's still 50 years old and has gray hair. It's easy for him to say." [*Laughter*] I know that's what you must be thinking. And you're right. It is easy for me to say. But believe it or not, all of us who—adults who are here today were once young, and we're not entirely without our memories. We understand what you're going through. And if we're lucky enough to be parents, we see it firsthand, up close.

There are things we can do: things I can do as President, things these pharmaceutical executives can do, things General McCaffrey and the Vice President can do, things the schools can do. But in the end, when you look at this from my perspective, when what I really want to do with the Presidency is to make sure every American has a chance to live out their dreams, I realize that if large numbers of our young people give up on their dreams, nothing I do will permit me to succeed. And I know there are other people that have a lot more influence than I do. A lot of these entertainers that you cheered for, you may listen to them more. My friend Charles Rayoff from Los Angeles, he used to be in a gang, now spends his life telling kids they shouldn't do that anymore. Maybe he's got more influence over the people on his street than I do. I know this: In the end, you're going to make the decisions about what happens to you; I'm not, and neither is anybody between me and you in the chain of command in our society.

So I say to you in closing, I believe that your future can be the brightest future any generation of Americans have ever enjoyed. I believe that the kinds of things you're going to be able to do because of the explosion of information and technology, because the world is drawing closer together, because America is—look around this room here. This is the most successful, multiracial, multiethnic democracy in all of human history. This is a great thing.

The rest of us, we'll keep doing our part. I want to say a word about Reverend Jackson—you clapped when he was introduced. A long time before either one of us knew we'd be sitting here, 20 years ago—20 years ago next year was the first time I went with Jesse Jackson into a school to hear him give a speech to young people about staying off drugs. Twenty years ago, long before it was the fashionable thing to do, he was out there doing it. I thank you for that. Twenty years ago this year. [*Applause*] Thank you.

General McCaffrey will keep doing his part. He'll be a great role model and a great leader. But in the end, you have to do it. And let me say, I know most of you are doing the right thing. I get tired of hearing only the bad things about America's younger generation. Most of the younger generation is pretty great, and that's why we're doing as well as we are. I understand that. But if you're in doubt, don't do it. If you're in trouble, get help. If you're doing the right thing, don't be afraid to be a role model, don't be afraid to be a friend.

This country will be the greatest country in human history 50 years from now if we whip the problems that are afflicting childhood; if we give our children back their childhood; if when you turn on the television at night and you see some act of violence on the news, you are surprised instead of just deadened, "Well, that's what I always see."

We've got to make violence the exception, not the rule. We've got to make drug abuse the exception, not the rule. We've got to make the rule what I see out here when I look in your faces: young people who are committed to themselves, committed to their families, committed to their communities, committed to their own future. Choose life and we'll be all right.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:23 a.m. in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Mark Anderes, student, and Gerald Boarman, principal, Eleanor Roosevelt High School; Gov. Parris Glendening and Lt. Gov. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend of Maryland; Prince Georges County Executive Wayne Curry; and civil rights leader Jesse Jackson.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion at the White House Leadership Conference on Youth Drug Use and Violence in Greenbelt
March 7, 1996

The President. Well, hello, and good afternoon. Let me again thank all of you who are participating and all of you who came to the White House yesterday. I know that the event which we just held with the students at Eleanor Roosevelt was shown here, so I have no further introductory remarks. I'm anxious to get to the panel, except to say one thing briefly.

In the 12 years that I served as the Governor, when I had the opportunity not only to go to every community in my State but from time to time to travel throughout the country, I saw a modern example of what the framers of the Constitution intended when they set up State governments, and they basically devolved a certain amount of authority throughout our country. They wanted the States and, ultimately, communities to be laboratories of democracy. And they thought, the people who set our country up, that once in any laboratory a solution to a problem was found it would be like science, that that then would be adopted and people would go on to another set of problems.

What I think is happening in our country is that nearly every serious challenge we face has been dealt with brilliantly by somebody, somewhere, whether it's in education or in dealing with the crime problem or you name it. The one place where their laboratory of democracy probably fell down is that its human affairs are not like science, and very often, even though things are working well, they're not adapted, adopted, embraced as they should be.

So I think that all of you who are struggling and working to find ways to mobilize the energies not only of your communities, but willing then to see it spread across the country, are doing the most important thing you could be doing because it's the second half of what the framers of the Constitution knew we'd have to do in order to meet all the challenges of the future. I mean, they couldn't have imagined the world that we live in now, but they set up a system that requires the second half—and you are that.

I thank you for being here. I'm anxious to go forward, and I'd like to begin by having, I think, about four opening statements, beginning with Joe Califano. And I want to begin by just thanking you, sir, for the work that you have done at your center and the work that you have done for so many years now to try to help people deal with all kinds of substance abuse problems. And we'd be glad to hear from you.

[*Joseph Califano, director, Center for Alcohol and Substance Abuse, discussed the statistical relationship between substance abuse and and other social problems, particularly among adolescents, and suggested methods of treatment and prevention.*]

The President. Reverend Jackson?

[*Civil rights leader Jesse Jackson explained the effects that drugs have had on the African-American community. He urged parents and clergy to become involved in children's lives, suggesting that 20,000 parents in 50 cities pledge to work with teachers and that 100 ministers in 50 cities work with juvenile court judges. He concluded by challenging children to become involved in the war on drugs and to take personal responsibility for their own lives.*]

The President. Let me just say, yesterday Reverend Jackson and I spent a few minutes together in preparation for this day. And he went through what he was going to say. And the thing I want to say, quite apart from the incredible power of his remarks, is that he has given us a way to take what is working and to spread it across the country. And we now have to see if we're willing to do that.

Can you find 20,000 parents in 50 cities? Can you find this number of churches in 50 cities? Can we prove that we can take these—if you want to prove that you—we know objectively we can't jail our way out of the crisis, but we have never presented, frankly, a constructive alternative that we could spread across the country. You can build a jail in one city and another, and it looks about the same. This program or that program or the other program may not look the same in every community.

So the great—the enduring genius of what he has said today may well be his plan that

would allow us to systematically make a difference across the country and offer us an alternative approach to this in the future. And I thank you, sir.

Jim—Mr. Burke.

[*James Burke, chairman, Partnership for a Drug-Free America, reiterated the link between drug abuse and other social problems but explained that drug use had declined over the years due to changing attitudes toward drugs. He added that more leadership was needed at all levels to continue changing those attitudes and suggested listening to youth for ideas about what could be done.*]

The President. I would like to now call on a remarkable person who has probably laid a costlier sacrifice on the altar of our modern troubles than almost any other American, and who has responded by devoting her life to trying to help us work our way out of it, Dr. Lonise Bias. Thank you for being here.

[*Dr. Bias described her efforts to encourage positive change in the Nation following the drug-related death of her son Len and the murder of her son Jay, explaining her values of unconditional love, community, faith, and a commitment to character over image. She added that parents must monitor the flow of information that their children receive and impress upon them the importance of values and morals.*]

The President. We have a number of distinguished people on this panel, and I'd like to—I think it's time we began with the young people and hear from them. So I will just call on them and then I want to call on some of the other panelists who are here who have done so many important things. But let me begin by asking Karen Lee, who is a senior here at Eleanor Roosevelt, who joined Students Against Violence a year ago, immediately after her classmate, Julie Ferguson, was abducted across from the school and killed. I'd like to ask her what has been happening here, what happened in the antiviolence program and where it's going, and what impact it's had on the students in the schools.

[*Ms. Lee explained that Students Against Violence tried to provide alternatives to violence such as peer mediation and counseling, taught self-defense and stress management, worked to raise community awareness, and organized memorial candlelight vigils.*]

The President. How many students here at the school are involved in it?

[*Ms. Lee said that the group had approximately 20 active members.*]

The President. Thank you. I want to come back to that in a moment with some of our other panelists, but I'd like to go now to Izaak Prado, who is a junior at a community school in Visalia, California. A former drug user, a former gang member who is in the second phase of the Tulare County Juvenile Drug Court in Visalia. He's returned to school; he says his attitude and his outlook have changed and that in his program associated with the drug court he attends mandatory drug counseling, sets goals, and learns from the experience of older men about how to handle peer pressure and stay away from drugs.

There are a lot of people talking here today; you've actually had to walk the walk. And I thank you just for having the courage to sit up here on this panel. I would like to ask you to make whatever statement you would like to make about your experience and what you would say to other young people and what you think you could do to make a difference there.

Mr. Prado. Well, I'm here because I got in trouble. I got in trouble for possession.

The President. I just want to make sure they can hear you. I think they turned the mike up. That's good.

[*Mr. Prado described the program and how his attitude toward drugs and gangs had changed and said that the program should be expanded nationally.*]

The President. Could you tell the people who are here how you happened to be placed in the drug court when you were arrested, or whatever happened to you? How did you wind up going into the drug court?

Mr. Prado. Well, I was arrested, and I was sent to see the judge. And since my case was in affiliation with drugs, they gave me an opportunity to come into the program.

The President. You had the choice about whether to go into the drug program or be punished conventionally in the criminal justice system, right?

Mr. Prado. Yes, and I chose to be part of the program. And it's not like you can just drop out of the program if you feel you can't complete it. You know, once you make it, it's a

commitment and you have to stay in it for approximately 9 months.

The President. Let me say that a lot of people here in this audience will be familiar with the drug courts, but one of the first ones in the country was established in Miami. And I happened to have, just by family accident, the exposure to it many years ago because my brother-in-law was the public defender in the drug court. So I have sat for hours on end on two different occasions in the Miami drug court. And all the people there also have to voluntarily choose to be in the drug court's jurisdiction to choose the path of rehabilitation to avoid automatic jailing of people who just got into this.

And one of the parts of our crime bill that we're still struggling to preserve funding for is a small stream of money to help people establish these drug courts around the country. And you're a pretty good walking advertisement for it, and I thank you for what you've done.

I wonder if any of the other panelists would like to ask Izaak a question before I go on to anyone else. Anyone have a question you want to ask him?

Well, I thank you. You hang in there.

[*Reverend Jackson asked Mr. Prado if he was afraid that he would use drugs again. Mr. Prado responded that the program made him want to live a clean and healthy life.*]

The President. You heard Dr. Bias say it's what happens in your mind that's the most important thing. So, you hang in there. We're for you.

I'd like to ask Margaret Alstaetter, who's here to my left, a freshman at Wilmington College in Ohio, and she's the Students Against Drinking and Driving Student of the Year. To raise awareness of alcohol-related issues, she coordinated a mock accident, planned public service announcements, organized Red Ribbon Week activities, and conducted a lot of other projects involving local elementary schools and young people.

And so I'd like to ask her to say whatever is on her mind and ask her whether she thinks the SADD movement has helped to change the attitude of students about what is or is not the cool thing to do, or is or is not an acceptable thing to do, and whether or not it—whether having a chapter like this at every college and at every high school in the country would make a difference in the culture, to go back to what Mr. Burke said about our ability to change people's views of this. But talk a little about your own experience and tell us what you think.

[*Ms. Alstaetter described the efforts of her SADD chapter to educate schools and communities about the dangers of alcohol and drugs.*]

The President. Thank you very much. Let me ask you this. How many people are in your organization?

Ms Alstaetter. In my high school, we have about 70 active members.

The President. That's good.

Barry McCaffrey. Let me, if I may, intervene. We're scheduled to terminate at 1:15, but Mr. President, knowing how valuable your time is, nonetheless you did make me your drug czar. So could we go beyond this to 1:30, do you think, to get some of the power of these comments out on the table?

The President. He's only been out of uniform for a few days, and he's already off schedule. [*Laughter*]

I would like to stay very much until at least 1:30, until we hear from everybody. Thank you very much, General.

Let me say, I think—I wanted you to hear from these three students. Now, I'd like to come back and sort of pick up the issues, starting with—Karen talked about school violence, and I would like to call on a couple of people now to discuss how they have dealt with it.

Carl Cohn is the superintendent of the Long Beach Unified School District in California. It's the third largest school district in California; there are 81,000 students in this school district. And 2 weeks ago, I went to his school district to one of the schools there, named for the great American baseball player Jackie Robinson. And he was, as far as I know, the first major school district in the country to implement for elementary and junior high school students a school uniform policy.

I went out there because we had worked, particularly through the Attorney General's office and through the Department of Education, through Secretary Riley, to make sure that the school district and that others who wish to do the same thing could do so legally, explain how it could best be done, and then put together a handbook which you could then mail to every school district in the country explaining how Long Beach had done what they've done and

how a school district who was interested in this could do it.

And when I first heard about it and, indeed, when I mentioned it in the State of the Union Address, my last State of the Union Address—I always try to keep up with the reaction—on balance, it was the most positive reaction I ever got, except for all of the nasty letters I got from kids saying, "How dare you suggest that school uniforms would be a good thing. It would be the most boring, awful thing that ever happened; our liberties would be trampled." And in one fell swoop, one remark, I turned myself into an old fogey before the entire country. But I must say, having gone out there since the State of the Union, I think that at least every American needs to hear about the Long Beach experience, particularly in light of what Karen said and others have said.

So, Carl, the floor is yours.

[*Mr. Cohn said that since introducing the uniforms, there had been a dramatic reduction in school crime at the elementary and middle school level.*]

The President. Let me just inject a couple of facts here, in case any of you are thinking about this. First of all, there was not a uniform school district policy. He allowed every school, by some process or another, to choose their uniforms. And they were basically just comfortable school clothes, like I saw one of the young people was in a—the uniform for the boys was blue slacks and a white shirt with a collar every day. It wasn't—and there was some variation within that. And then the uniform for the girls was the same thing or a skirt.

And each school got to choose their own colors and got to decide what the parameters of the uniform were. If the school chose, the teachers and the principal also wore the uniform, but that varied by school. But the young man that he mentioned, for example, said his school was located in a high crime area where the gangs associated gang membership with the colors red and blue, so the school chose black, white, and green for the school uniform. And to see this young, attractive African-American student saying, "I don't have to look over my shoulder anymore when I walk to and from school; I feel safe," that's worth something.

The other student who spoke was a young—I think a 13-year-old student, who is a terrifically powerful young woman who said that she felt one of the reasons that the learning had gone up and discipline and behavior problems had gone down is that it gave all the children a sense of unity and that all of them were being judged based on what was on the inside, rather than on the outside. It's interesting. And in that sense, she said she thought the children who came from well-to-do families were helped as much by the policy as children who came from poor families. And they also had to set up a system so kids who came from families who couldn't afford it and all that, and they covered all that.

But if you have any interest in this I would urge you to write to Carl because it's hard to quarrel with the results and what the kids said. Maybe it's not the thing for every school district and every school, but they had a lot of problems and to see them drop in a breathtaking fashion I think is a real tribute to the courage and vision of the people of that school district. And I thank you for what you did.

[*Reverend Jackson stated that school uniforms would have a positive impact regardless of a student's economic background. He also suggested that students learn to sew their uniforms themselves.*]

The President. Before you laugh too much about the last comment Reverend Jackson made, let me remind you that the most famous cloth spinner of the 20th century was Mohandas Gandhi. That was his main non-work activity.

So I'd like to call on Yvonne Green who is the director of the safe schools initiative in and around East Capitol and Marshall Heights in Washington, DC. She has a very challenging job. And she is helping to establish the kind of school and community partnerships that the rest of us so often talk about. So I'd like to ask her whether the safe and drug-free school funds out of the crime bill have helped her and what she's done with it and what she thinks it's making a difference.

[*Ms. Green explained that the program established community and school partnerships to reduce violence and create a safe learning environment for children. She added that program participants, including parents, police departments, and civic organizations, served as peer mediators and met regularly to discuss improving the schools. She concluded by suggesting that De-*

partment of Education funds be given to individual groups directly.]

The President. Thank you very much. That's a very good idea.

Now, if you will remember, Izaak said that he was involved in the drug court system in his hometown of Visalia, California. I'd like to call now on Judge Jeff Tauber, who is here, who initiated the design implementation of the Oakland drug court program, which was one of the Nation's first. He's now president of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, and he advises Federal, State, and local agencies about how to establish these drug courts.

So I'd like for him to talk about this. In view of—you heard the statistics Reverend Jackson mentioned. We know more than half of the individuals that come into the criminal justice system in the country have some sort of a substance abuse problem. And I'd like for him to tell me what he thinks the results are from the drug courts that have been established enough—in time for us to evaluate them and what he believes the future of the drug courts movement is.

[*Judge Tauber described the drug courts program, indicating that research showed that the program dramatically reduced recidivism by 40 to 60 percent. He described how the drug courts had successfully collaborated with other organizations and agencies in the communities.*]

The President. I want to open the floor if anybody has questions of Judge Tauber. But I want to emphasize to all of you—remember Izaak's story. Not only are these courts reducing the recidivism rates, these people are not going to prison in the first place—they are not going to prison in the first place. And as far as I—the only courts that I've any experience with, the option to go through the regular system or to go into the drug court, since the drug court imposes certain responsibilities on the defendant going in, is left with the person who is charged, as it was in Izaak's case.

But I think the question of what the aggregate impact on this country would be if every community of any size had a court like this—which requires a community support system because you've got to show up on a regular basis and all that—is quite significant. And the one I watched in Miami for long periods of time on two separate occasions, the whole atmosphere was different, the chemistry of the court was different, the way that the defense lawyer and the prosecutor and the judge related to each other was different, because they knew what they were trying to do was to save the defendant and in the process get the law observed and make the community safer.

It's a very exciting thing. I would like to see it done everywhere. And I think what you're doing is very important.

Would anyone like to ask any questions of Jeff before we go on?

Judge Tauber. I would like to add one thing, if I may. I just wanted to thank you and this administration for its support of drug court and the Attorney General and the Department of Justice, because I think that we had the opportunity to grow and to grow in a very, I think, a very thoughtful and responsible way because of that support.

The President. Thank you.

Judge Tauber. Thank you.

The President. Now, if you remember, our third young person, Margaret, talked about the Students Against Drunk Driving and what they were trying to do to keep our young people sober and drug-free. I'd like to now call on Kurt Landgraf, who is the president and CEO of DuPont Merck Pharmaceutical Company, who is now the representative of the National Pharmaceutical Council here. And he will discuss the $33 million program I announced in my speech.

I say this because we know that the students need help and support at home. We also know, whether you believe—you know, there's this endless debate that started that basically was the study of people who had an alcohol addiction, about whether it's all a matter of weak will and bad habits or whether some people are biologically predisposed to it have problems. We know that whether you believe it's totally determined or not, there are all kind of differences both in the home situation and in people's makeup that makes it more important than ever that we get the parents involved early, making good decisions and understanding what to do.

So I'm excited about this, and I'd like to ask Kurt just to talk a little bit about this program, why the pharmaceutical companies decided to do it, and how they expect it to work.

[*Mr. Landgraf explained that the National Pharmaceutical Council enlisted 17,000 sales representatives from 15 pharmaceutical companies to distribute Office of Drug Control Policy information to health professionals, saying his industry recognized a problem and offered its resources. He added that business was a important social institution, like government, and should help address social problems.*]

The President. Thank you. I want to say a special word of thanks to you, sir, not only to you, individually, but to the people in your business. You know the United States has the most successful pharmaceutical industry in the world. And it depends, in part, for its success on a decent partnership with the Federal Government, especially through the Food and Drug Administration.

And the statement you have just made is the statement that I think is very important, that in many respects the collective influence of American business practices is far greater on the American people than the influence of the Government is, and that's as it should be in many respects because we have a free enterprise system, we believe in a private economy and it has served us rather well.

But the statement you just made is a very important statement—that even in a global economy, when you have to worry about the worldwide competition, the home base still matters. And in the end business has to be able to do well by doing good, because America must be strong for the private economy to flourish. And that's a very important statement, and I thank you for it.

I have intentionally saved for last among our panelists—and I want to give the Governor a chance to say a word as we close—but the sheriff of Jacksonville, Florida, Nat Glover, because he is one of the most unusual success stories in our country. He was elected sheriff in a community in which is a majority white community and which is also a majority of the other political party. [*Laughter*] And he was elected sheriff because people of all races and both political parties and all backgrounds trusted him to take the lead in lowering the crime rate and making the streets safer. It wasn't a political issue, at all; it was a human issue.

And he was elected by promising, in effect, to have his office on the street. And I had the extraordinary opportunity to spend a day with him, not just at a rally of young people giving a talk, which I got to do, but actually walking the streets and watching him relate to people, the young and old alike, and seeing how they looked at him as the source of energy for delivering them from their own fears. And it was an extraordinary thing.

So I wanted him to talk about what he's done in relating to the community and what the successes have been and to just thank him publicly for being a role model for law enforcement around the country. But I'd like to ask him to say a few words and maybe reflect on what he's heard here today and what he's trying to do in Jacksonville.

Sheriff Glover.

[*Mr. Glover described how the President's community-policing strategy improved a low income community in Jacksonville.*]

The President. Thank you.

Governor.

[*Gov. Parris Glendening of Maryland stated that many families in the Nation had been affected by violence and people must take personal responsibility for themselves and for future generations. He said that education, job training, and drug treatment programs were more effective than prisons in deterring crime and disagreed with recent cuts in funding.*]

The President. Thank you very much. As we—yes, Jesse? [*Laughter*]

[*Reverend Jackson stated that the roundtable discussion and community-policing efforts would have positive effects on the war on drugs but voiced his concern about police corruption. He concluded by asking students who were registered to vote to stand.*]

The President. That's pretty good.

[*Reverend Jackson asked the students who were not registered to stand and then encouraged them to register and exercise the power of their votes.*]

The President. I would like to thank Eleanor Roosevelt again for hosting us and thank all of the others who made this possible. I want to thank the panelists. I hope all of you who came to this conference got something out of their moving statements, their personal experiences, and perhaps some ideas you can take home. I want to assure you that the Vice Presi-

dent and General McCaffrey and I and the other members of our Cabinet will read the reports of all the various sessions of this conference.

I have only two regrets as I leave here. One is that we couldn't spend all day hearing from all the young people who are here. And the other is that we couldn't spend all day listening to all the people who are here from the conference who could have just as well been on this panel.

I want to thank you for the life you're leading, the work you're doing. Many of you out there in this audience I've had some personal involvement with, and I feel personally indebted to you—you know who you are—and I thank you for that.

This is our country's great challenge. And if you look at these fine young people that were here, the rest of us owe it to them to meet it. And I feel more optimistic than I did before I came here today that we'll do exactly that.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:18 p.m. in the auditorium at Eleanor Roosevelt High School.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Cyprus
March 7, 1996

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

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous submission covered progress through November 30, 1995. The current submission covers the period December 1, 1995, through January 31, 1996.

The continuing lack of a solution on Cyprus is in marked contrast to the recent advances achieved in Bosnia and the Middle East. My Administration remains committed to pursuing a settlement in 1996. We are confident that if the parties to the dispute are prepared to engage seriously and with flexibility, we can move to active negotiations and to a final settlement, which creates a bizonal, bicommunal federation. We will need the full support of Greece and Turkey for our efforts. My Special Emissary, Richard Beattie, travelled to Cyprus in December for further discussions with the two Cypriot leaders. The progress he made, although modest, gives us a basis to pursue our initiative once circumstances in the region are more favorable.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the U.N.-sponsored settlement process and Cyprus' course toward accession to the European Union (EU) affect each other. For that reason, my Administration will strive to ensure the closest possible coordination among efforts by the United Nations, the EU, and ourselves to address the question of Cyprus.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

Statement on the Report of the President's Council on Sustainable Development
March 7, 1996

I was pleased tonight to accept a report from my Council on Sustainable Development, an advisory group which I established to outline a new direction in environmental policy. In my State of the Union Address, I said that the era of big Government is over, but I also said that we can't go back to a time when citizens were left to fend for themselves. As we move toward

a new, smaller Government, citizens must work together to tackle the challenges of a new century. We must reach across the lines that divide us to find common ground.

When I first appointed the Council almost 3 years ago, some of them knew each other only as adversaries. But with this report, they have shown us the power of partnership. They have demonstrated that when business, environmentalists, and Government work together in good faith, we can pursue simultaneously the goals of economic prosperity, social equity, and environmental quality.

This report will make a major contribution to the challenge I set forth: to enable all our people to make the most of their own lives with stronger families, more educational opportunities, economic security, safer streets, a cleaner environment in a safer world. I want to thank all who contributed to making this difficult undertaking such a success.

The work, however, is not finished. This report will not sit on a shelf gathering dust. Instead, I am announcing the following actions: First, I ask the Council to continue its work in order to begin implementing some of its recommendations. I hope Jonathan Lash and David Buzzelli will continue to serve as co-chairs through December. Second, I have asked the Vice President to lead these efforts within the administration. Finally, I will ask White House offices and Federal agencies to support the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties in establishing a new Joint Center on Sustainable Communities. This new partnership will work to implement the recommendations in this report in communities across the Nation.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on International Agreements

March 7, 1996

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

Pursuant to subsection (b) of the Case-Zablocki Act, (1 U.S.C. 112b(b)), I hereby transmit a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Jesse Helms, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. An original was not available. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 8.

Address to the People of the Middle East

March 8, 1996

Greetings to all the viewers of "Dialogue With the West." I'm pleased to have this opportunity to speak with you today. This has been a difficult week for all of us who have cherished the growing prospects of peace in the Middle East and Israel. Dozens of people lost their lives to an inhuman campaign of terror.

Think about the victims for a moment. Each was a human being, a son or a daughter, a husband or a wife, a mother or a father. Each wanted only to live and to love, to work and to dream in a land of peace.

Those responsible for these terrible acts have but one aim: to stop the peace process that so many people throughout Israel and the Arab world so strongly desire. The enemies of peace know that a new day is dawning in the Middle East, a day in which all its peoples can enjoy the simple blessings of a normal life. With each new step along the way, these enemies grow more and more desperate, and so they sow the

seeds of division and conflict, of hatred and destruction.

But make no mistake: The future they darken is their own. For instead of a life of security and prosperity, all they have to offer is violence, poverty, and despair. We must not allow them to prevail. If we do everything we can to strengthen the peace they fear, they will not prevail.

In the midst of this week's horror, there was one especially powerful moment of hope. In Gaza City, 10,000 Palestinians came together to make a simple, urgent plea: Say no to terrorism; say yes to peace. They know that their own dreams and aspirations are at risk, to provide for their loved ones, to raise a family in security, to see their own children enjoy lives free from violence and full of possibilities. And they understand a truth that we see all around the world.

Today the fundamental differences are no longer between Arab and Jew or Protestant and Catholic or Muslim, Serb, and Croat. The dividing line today is between those who embrace peace and those who would destroy it, between those who look to the future and those who are locked in the past, between those who open their arms and those who still clench their fists. Each of us must decide which side of the line we are on; the right side, the only side, is the side of peace.

Now more than ever, the choice we make matters. Choose peace.

NOTE: This address was recorded at 2:15 p.m. on March 7 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for later broadcast and was embargoed for release until 1 p.m. on March 8.

Remarks to Harman International Industries Employees in Northridge, California

March 8, 1996

Thank you very much. If you have a seat, please take it. Thank you very much, Bertha. She said that she was nervous before she spoke, but I think she did a terrific job, don't you? When she told me that she'd been here 30 years, I thought that the company must have violated the child labor laws when she was hired. [*Laughter*] But I'll take her word for it.

I want to thank Dr. Sidney Harman for that fine statement that he made. And I thank Sidney and Congresswoman Jane Harman for riding out with me this morning. We did come out on Air Force One; we did talk for an hour. Actually, what we did for an hour was I listened to him rave about you. That's what he talked about. He talked about how great you were, how creative you were, how you had proved his faith in the United States and in California and in the proposition that people from all different walks of life could work together in a common enterprise. And you would have been very proud if you had heard him talk about you this morning in the privacy of our conversation.

I want to thank the State and local officials who are here today, and most of all, I want to thank you for giving me a chance to share some time with you. When I was Governor for 12 years before I moved to Washington, I spent, I suppose, more hours in factories and schools than anything else I did. I think I visited at least an average of a factory a week in the 12 years I was Governor. And I went through the terrible, difficult times of the 1980's for manufacturing in America, and I watched it come back. So my attention has been riveted on the whole question of how people produce and when in America for a very long time now.

I'm honored to be back in Northridge. I was here, of course, shortly after the earthquake devastated you 2 years ago, and I was struck by the spirit and the determination of the people here; even more remarkably, by the way the community pulled together to rebuild. And I can't help but acknowledging another thing that Dr. Harman told me this morning, which was that you were back up and running here about 3 days after the earthquake because all the employees came back in and cleaned it up and moved it forward. And that is a truly astonishing accomplishment, and I want to compliment you

on that as well. You should be very proud of that.

I'm also glad that the National Government was here, quickly, to be of help in the earthquake—the emergency management agency, the Small Business Administration, the Housing and Urban Development Department, the Transportation Department. We were doing what I think Americans do best; we were working together.

If I can tell you on the front end, the one point I want to make today is that whether it's in an earthquake, after another natural disaster, or working day to day in a facility like this one, that's how we have to meet the challenges that we face today as a people. We are going to meet them by working together if we're going to succeed.

We have to prove in the United States that it doesn't matter what your racial or ethnic or religious background, where you come from, or even what you start with, if you start with nothing; that if we all work together with the goal of making sure every single person in this country has a chance to live the American dream, that everybody has a chance to be treated in a fair and equal way, and that we can work and raise good families and have successful children and have strong communities—the only way we can do that is if we're committed to working together. In this time of great transition, teamwork, a respect for one another, and a commitment to seeing everybody succeed is more important than it has ever been in your lifetime. And that is my commitment to you. Our whole country needs to work together every day the way you work together here every single day.

Four years ago when I sought the job that the American people were good enough to give me, I made a commitment. I said that I was convinced that if we would work together to get this economy going again, and if we in Washington could do our part by bringing the deficit down and getting interest rates down, by investing in our people and education and training, by investing in new technologies and helping places like California to convert from a defense-based economy to a more diversified economy in the wake of the end of the cold war, if we open new markets based on trade that was fair and free, that our economy would respond and create 8 million jobs in 4 years. It is a tribute to the hard work and the ingenuity of the American people and to our uncommon partnership that we announced officially today that the United States economy has created 8.4 million jobs in 3 years. And I am very proud of that.

And let me put that in some sort of perspective for you. I hear people say all the time that, well, even if we create new jobs they're not very good jobs. That's just not true. These 8.4 million jobs represent more new jobs than were created in all of Europe and Japan combined. And increasingly, they are in higher wage industries. By the end of December, our economy had created 7.7 million new jobs; 3.3 million of them were higher wage jobs. Four years ago only 20 percent of our new jobs were in high-wage jobs. In 1995, well over half of the new jobs created in our economy were higher wage paying jobs. We can create good jobs for the American people if we work together.

I am very glad to be here today to make this announcement for three reasons. First of all, I have enormous respect for Dr. Harman and for Congresswoman Jane Harman. They have the sort of partnership that is much admired in the Clinton household by not only the President but by the First Lady. We admire the way Sidney has combined a commitment to innovative ideas and being at the cutting edge of new products with a commitment to the success of all of you, the people who work for Harman, and your families and this community.

And I very much admire the work that Congresswoman Jane Harman has done in the United States Congress. She is, I think, the best of a new breed of political leaders who want to see our country go beyond the old division of stale, partisan political debates to find creative ways for Government to work with you to create better jobs and brighter futures for all Americans. If every person in the Congress had the same sort of practical yet idealistic approach that she does, willing to discard all the kind of hot air that we hear too much of in Washington, this country would be in better shape today. And I thank her for her service as well. Thank you.

But the most important reason I wanted to come here, even though I can't afford a Jaguar to get one of those fancy speakers you make that go in them—[*laughter*]—is because I respect what you are doing. I respect all of you who work here in all your various roles because you have proved that by working together as a team, you can create the world's best stereo

and electronic equipment, and you can help to move our country forward while you make your own lives better.

I'd like to talk just a minute today about the nature of all these changes that are transforming our economy and what we can do to make all Americans winners in this period of change; about what Government can do and about what people like you must do, employers and employees alike, to move our country forward.

Harman International shows how a cutting-edge company can do well while doing right by its people. That's why I wanted Bertha to talk today as well. A company that believes employees are the most important asset; a company that, when layoffs are necessary, workers are given a chance to find other work within the company. Workers are fully trained to keep up with new skills. And this is one I especially like: Senior executives work the production line 18 days a year so they'll know what the rest of you are experiencing.

While others may have downsized and even moved away from our country and taken the jobs with them, Harman has stayed true to Northridge. And their new factory within a factory that we—I've heard about for the first time today is a true testament to a commitment to community and to the bond that should exist in every workplace in America between employers and employees. It shows how the transforming power of technology can create new opportunity. So many Americans are threatened by the technological changes that are going on today, but believe me, if we do the right things we will generate far more jobs from technology than we will ever lose because of it. And you are proving that as well.

When you make audio equipment for computers that rivals the sound quality of a stereo, you're making the promise of the information superhighway real. With better products and more productivity, more jobs and good profits, Harman shows us that our leading edge toward the 21st century is the people of the American work force and that if we work together we can boost our competitiveness, push ever upward the American standard for excellence, and also open the American dream to every single person who is willing to work for it. That is your commitment. That is my commitment. That must be America's commitment.

Now, all of you know from your own experience that this extraordinary period of change is transforming the way we work and the way we live. I watched it in your assembly lines, the couple you left open for me today while the rest of you were here. I have now been in American factories for nearly 30 years, looking at them, learning how people work, seeing how people work together. There's a lot more mind and a lot less muscle in manufacturing work than there used to be. The information revolution has made it possible for there to be far fewer layers of bureaucracies in most thriving companies than there used to be.

We are changing the way we work. We are changing the way we structure the workplace. And the information revolution has also made possible global markets for information, for money, for products, and for services. That means things are changing very rapidly, and change brings good things, but it is also always, always disruptive. And there are a lot of Americans whose lives have been disrupted by this time of change. Many of them feel that they've been uprooted, and they wonder, even though they have carried their traditional values of hard work and family close to their heart, they wonder if they're going to be left behind.

We have to deal with that challenge. But it's important how we deal with that challenge. I submit to you the way to deal with it is to build on what works, on models like Harman International, on the economic policy we have implemented. We cannot turn back to try to recover a past that is not there anymore. We have to keep going into the future until every single person has a chance to work in a workplace where everyone is winning. That is the way to a better future.

Let me say to all of you, we have been through a period of change like this not very often. But we have done it before. The last time the American economy changed as much as it's changing now was about 100 years ago when we moved from the farm to the factory. A hundred years ago, most people were living in rural areas; they moved to towns and cities. Most people were working on farms or in jobs that depended on farmers; then they began to work in factories or in jobs that depended on factories.

When that happened, there was a great deal of ferment and change. Millions of new immigrants came to America. Many, many people did better than they had ever done before. But for a period of years, there was a great uproot-

ing and a lot of people didn't do so well, either, as they were displaced. But because we kept pushing through and pushing ahead and learning new ways to work together, to do the right thing by people as well as to do well economically, to push profits and productivity and fairness—because we did that, we created in the 20th century a nation with the greatest period of unparalleled prosperity ever known, a nation with the greatest middle class ever created, a nation with the greatest dreams for children ever forged. That is what we have to do today.

When I took office, we put in place a comprehensive strategy to try to create a modern economy. We didn't want to deny change and try to hold back for a past we couldn't recover. Neither did we want to say, well, we ought to just let whatever is going to happen, happen, and let whatever happens to people happen.

I knew that we couldn't go back to the time when all Americans were told, "You've got to fend for yourself." So we put in a strategy, first, to cut the deficit and get the interest rates down; second, to invest in education and training for people; third, to open new markets—to have free trade, yes, but also fair trade to enable Americans to sell their products all over the world as you do, and to invest in the new technologies of the future in partnership with the private sector.

It has worked. We cut the deficit in half. Exports are at an all-time high. Homeownership is at a 15-year high. We've had 3 years of record formations of new businesses in each of the last 3 years. And we did it while shrinking the size of the Federal Government to its smallest size in 30 years. And it is working. This strategy is working.

Just think about where we were 4 years ago. Our economy was drifting. Now we've had 8.4 million jobs in 3 years and 1 month. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment, inflation, and home mortgage rates in 27 years. Four years ago construction and auto industries were flat on their backs. Today, we've had about 700,000 new jobs in America in construction, and the automobile industry, for the first time in many years, is selling more cars than Japan. I am proud of that, and you should be too.

It is true that in many large companies there has been substantial downsizing. But it is also true that in the areas of new opportunity, millions of new jobs are being created. Just a few days ago I signed the telecommunications bill into law which will create vast new opportunities for Americans and American companies to increase information, education, and entertainment. And the last economic analysis I showed estimated that that bill alone, with the energies of the American telecommunications sector, would create 3½ million new jobs over the next few years. That is what we should be doing more of.

Four years ago, California had lost about 170,000 jobs. Today, California businesses in the last 3 years have created almost a half a million new jobs. Business failures are down; new businesses are up. Industries like aerospace and entertainment and computers are leading the world with new markets, new production, new products, helping to overcome the terrible burden that California bore because of a good thing that happened: The cold war ended. And we were able to downsize our national defense, but it caused great economic dislocation here. By emphasizing the resources, the strength, the people of the State of California and focusing on the opportunities of the future, the turnaround has begun, and it will get better.

As I said, you can say all you want about how Government is the problem. I accept the fact that in times past Government has been a problem. We have shrunk the Government to its smallest size in 30 years. But we dare not go back to a time when people were left to fend for themselves. It is the Government that helps to open those markets. It is the Government that helps to invest in people and help working families send their children to college. It is the Government that helps provide opportunities like Head Start for families that need help getting their kids off to a good start in life. I am proud of those things.

As I said in my State of the Union Address, I think there are seven big challenges we have to meet now if we're going to fulfill our mission, if all Americans are going to have a chance to have the American dream, if we're going to be able to raise strong families in good communities with good values, if we're going to continue to lead the world.

We have to do more to strengthen our families and give all of our children a decent childhood. We have to do more to improve our schools and open the doors of college education to all Americans. We have to do more to give working families the security they need with health care and pensions and training that they

can have even if they have to change jobs. We have to do more to fight crime and drugs and gangs so that violence will become the exception rather than the rule. I'd like to live in an America again when people are surprised when they turn on the evening news and there's been an act of violence as the lead story.

We have to do more to preserve our environment and to convince ourselves—all of us—that we can preserve the environment and grow the economy. I have to tell you that one of the side benefits of what you do with your Ole program in using your extra materials to build those clocks is that you're using something for a productive purpose that doesn't just go to a scrap heap. And I appreciate that. That also is contributing to the environment while growing the economy and helping people deal with the problems of economic change.

The Congress has more to do, and I challenge the Congress to pass another growth budget for the next 60 days to keep this economy going. We ought to finish the job. We've cut the deficit in half; we ought to go on and pass a balanced budget plan. But it should be the right kind of plan. We can eliminate this deficit without devastating cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, without undermining our obligation to you to invest in education, in research, and environmental protection. That's what I want to do.

There are millions of good Americans out there who aren't as fortunate as you are to have a job here, millions of them trying to raise children on the minimum wage. If we don't raise the minimum wage this year, it will fall to a 40-year low in terms of what it will buy within a year. We ought to raise the minimum wage. You can't raise a family on $4.25 an hour.

And there is a bill in Congress now called the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill which would give American workers and their families an important protection; it says that you don't lose your health insurance just because you change jobs or somebody in your family gets sick. That bill ought to pass, and it ought to pass immediately. It's an important part of dealing with the change.

There is more that we ought to do. I have asked the Congress to collapse about 70 different education and training programs that unemployed Americans have to figure out how they fit into, or some State and local official has to figure out how they fit into, if they lose a job. I'd like to see all those programs collapsed into a big pile of money, and when somebody loses their job, I think they ought to get a voucher from the Government worth $2,600 a year that they can take to the nearest community college or other training institution to get the training they need—a "GI bill" for America's workers. I believe it's an important thing.

And there's a lot of talk about tax cuts in Washington. Three years ago, we cut taxes on the lowest income working families through a doubling of what's called the earned-income tax credit. This year, every family in America with children with an income of under $28,000 will have a considerably lower income tax burden than they would have had if we hadn't changed the law back in 1993.

There are other things that I'd like to see done. I think we ought to give some relief to families with children. But the most important tax cut we could give is the one that I have proposed to give families a tax deduction for up to $10,000 of the cost of college tuition and other education after high school. That would really help working families.

There are some other things that the Government ought to do in partnership with businesses and schools. One of the most important thing we have done—things we've done since I became President involved an act called the School-to-Work Act, signed in 1994, to help to create a national network of programs that would give young people who don't go on to 4-year colleges the opportunity to get work experience and learning experience at the same time, to abolish what I think is an artificial distinction between what is vocational learning on the job and what is academic learning. What a lot of you are doing looked pretty academic to me, at least; I don't believe I could do it without a lot of training.

Businesses work with schools and community colleges and universities and technical schools to design courses while they open their workplaces and provide on-the-job training. This has helped us over the past year and a half to generate activity involving 42,000 employers and 116,000 young people in learning new skills in 42 of our 50 States. And today the Departments of Education and Labor announced another 37 communities, including 7 here in California, will be receiving more school-to-work investments to enable them to train more young people so they can move from school into a job with the prospect of a growing income and a brighter future

instead of into a job that they may not be able to hold or may never get a raise in. That is the sort of partnerships that I think we need more of.

Our strategy has been to enable the private sector to generate this growth. Keep in mind, these 8.4 million new jobs have come into our economy at a time when we have reduced the size of the Federal Government by more than 200,000.

We are trying to work with you to help generate jobs here in the private sector in places like Harman International. We know that means that business has an even more important role in the future in terms of what your life is like, in terms of whether you have security in return for your work, in terms of whether you have a chance to go on and find other opportunities if something happens in the market and it goes bad. And this is a difficult time for business because people who run businesses face enormous new challenges. If they have to compete for investment money, they know that money can be put anywhere in the world in a split second with a wire transfer. They know that technology can be put anywhere in the world. And that means that they're under more and more pressure always to be changing the nature of the products, always to be upgrading the quality of the products, always trying to produce more with fewer inputs of cost, whether it's labor or technology.

Sidney told me on the way out here today that the labor costs in your products are only about a third of what they were just a few years ago because you're all so much more productive because you're using more machinery, because you're working in more efficient ways.

These new pressures put great challenges before the business leaders of our country to be not only productive and profitable, to be good citizens not only for their shareholders or their investors but also for their customers and their employees and their families, their communities, and the natural environment.

Since I became President I've tried to go around from time to time to places like this to celebrate companies that are both profitable and competitive on the one hand and good citizens on the other. And I've tried to do things that would support policies that would help our companies to do a good job. It is especially important when changes in the economy bring instability and uncertainty that we lift up the companies that are trying to help people deal with it.

Now, consider this: Since most parents work, one of the most important things is to help people succeed at home and at work. And all of you—I bet every working parent out there has felt some tension at some time in your life when your children were sick or there were problems at school or something else happened. The great challenge of our society—there is no more important work than raising children. That is still every parent's most important job. So unless we can find ways for people to succeed as parents and in the workplace, the country can't be as strong as it ought to be.

A lot of businesses are trying to accommodate this by things like flexible work hours or child care centers at or near the places of business. The family and medical leave law, the very first law I signed as President of the United States, helped about 300,000 California workers take a little time off from work for a sick child or a sick parent or when a baby was born without losing their jobs. That's a very important thing as well.

Health care benefits and retirement benefits are important. Training is important. Education is important. One of the things I've been so impressed about is the training programs that you have here. You know, in a lot of our military activities now, we regularly give annual training programs to all the people involved in them because the needs are changing and also because we want those people to be able to succeed even after they leave uniform. That is terribly important.

The other thing that I think is very important is to find the best possible way for companies to share the good times as well as the bad times. And that is something that I think you have done a remarkable job of. I am so impressed by the way programs like—well, like this Ole program of yours works—to have the opportunity when the market goes down for the product you're producing to be called back to find innovative ways not only to produce, but I understand some of you have even worked as salespeople selling your own products, trying to find ways to keep people busy so that you can not only maintain benefits but a livelihood. That is walking the extra mile, but that's a good thing to do.

People are the most important—the most important—element in a production process today.

The technology can be anywhere. We could pack all this technology up today and fly it to some other country. The people and how they work together and whether they feel good on the job and whether they feel a loyalty to the enterprise and whether they think everybody is being treated fairly, that is the secret of America's future success. You are the secret of America's future success.

And what this company has done is what every company should strive to do within the limits of their capacity because if we don't treat our people right and they don't feel good about the work enterprise—or to use Dr. Harman's words, the old employer bargain used to be less for less. When the industrial revolution first started, people got paid as little as the employer could get away with paying them, and the workers did as little as they could get away with doing without getting fired. He says what you're trying to get is a more-for-more bargain. You get paid as much as they can afford to pay you and you're expected to do as much as you can possibly do, and even in the down times, there is the other enterprise, a sort of factory within a factory. That is a remarkable thing.

And I hope by coming here today and by having people learn about what you're doing, that all over America, people will ask themselves, "I wonder if I could do something like that. I wonder if that would help increase the security my workers feel. I wonder if that would strengthen the families of the people that work here. I wonder if that wouldn't improve our long-term productivity. Wouldn't it be nice if I could find a way to keep all my workers, year-in and year-out, even in the down times."

It's just one solution, but it's a solution that deserves to be considered all across America. And just by your being here and by my being able to tell your story today, you may be helping to save not only a lot of jobs in the future and other parts of America but also the vitality and the productivity and the profitability of other American companies. We have to learn from each other, and we could all learn a lot from you, and I thank you for that.

So that's the point I want to make. This economy has a lot of possibility. I believe that your children will grow up in the period of greatest possibility any generation of Americans has ever known. There will be more opportunities for young boys and girls as they grow up to live out their dreams than ever before. I believe technology will prove to be a great equalizer, giving people across racial and ethnic divides, giving children who grew up in poor households as well as those who grow up in middle class and wealthy households the opportunity to learn and grow and do things they could never have otherwise done.

But all this will happen only if we find ways to work together. The Government has a role to play, but the jobs are being created in the private sector. We can create the environment; we can create the incentives; we can try to deal with the places which don't have any real improvement yet—that's what we tried to do when we gave to Los Angeles the $400 million to set up a development bank to make investments in the neighborhoods there where there are no new jobs. We can do extra things like that. But in the end, whether the businesses work, employers and employees working together, family-friendly workplaces, health care, pensions, training, sharing the burdens and the benefits of the year-to-year ups and downs of the company, keeping the workplace safe and hearing the workers' voices as well; all of these things which you have done here are things we need more of in every American workplace.

And if we do this, then we will create the kind of opportunities millions of Americans are now enjoying for every American willing to work for it. That is the answer: to work together and forge into the future, not to try to turn back, or not to say to people, "You're on your own, I hope you do well." It's to work together, join together, and move into the future together. Your success is the model for America's success, and I am determined to see that we follow it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:28 p.m. on the factory floor. In his remarks, he referred to Bertha Torres, employee, and Sidney Harman, chief executive officer, Harman International Industries.

Statement on the National Economy
March 8, 1996

Four years ago, I said if America met its economic challenge by bringing down the deficit, investing in education and training, rewarding work, and opening markets, we could spur a strong recovery that could help this economy create 8 million jobs in 4 years. It is a tribute to the hard work, ingenuity, and strength of the American people that our economy has created more than 8 million jobs in just 3 years instead of 4.

Even as we celebrate the creation of 8.4 million jobs, we must remember that much more must be done to ensure that our economy is working for all of our working families. This is no time to rest or move backwards. To keep America's job machine humming and our economy growing, we must get back to work on balancing the budget in a way that puts our people first.

Message to the Congress on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Development of Iranian Petroleum Resources
March 8, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency declared on March 15, 1995, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706) is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 1996, to the *Federal Register* for publication. This emergency is separate from that declared on November 14, 1979, in connection with the Iranian hostage crisis and therefore requires separate renewal of emergency authorities.

The factors that led me to declare a national emergency with respect to Iran on March 15, 1995, have not been resolved. The actions and policies of the Government of Iran, including its support for international terrorism, efforts to undermine the Middle East peace process, and its acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them, continue to threaten the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities that are in place by virtue of the March 15, 1995, declaration of emergency.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 8, 1996.

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

Remarks on NetDay in Concord, California
March 9, 1996

Thank you so very much. I want to say again how much I appreciate the wonderful welcome we have received here today. I thank your principal, Sheila Walker; Superintendent Allen; your fine superintendent of public instruction, Delaine Eastin; and Lieutenant Governor Davis;

my good friend Senator Boxer; and Representative Miller. I want to say again what a good job I thought—I want to join the Vice President—I thought Brian DeGrassi did a good job up here. We didn't even need to speak after he talked.

I want to thank John Gage and Michael Kaufman for originating the idea of NetDay. The country will long be in their debt. They have come up with something truly remarkable. And I want to thank the Merrills and all the wonderful volunteers here. And because of my own past I don't want to leave here without acknowledging your award-winning band and flag team. I thank them for being here as well. Thank you very much.

And I want to thank Vice President Al Gore, who 20 years ago—20 years ago—coined the term information superhighway and is now helping every American child to become a part of it. I thank you for that.

The Vice President and I have looked forward to coming back for this day ever since last September when we came to California and met with leaders of the communications industry. That day we challenged Californians to connect at least 20 percent of your schools to the information superhighway by the end of this school year. You didn't fret about it; you're simply doing it.

Think about it. On this day, March 9th, 20,000 of your fellow citizens are meeting this challenge. I am honored to be here with you.

Today one out of five California schools will be wired to the future. Within 4 years every school in the State will be wired to the future. We are putting the future at the fingertips of your children, and we are doing it together in the best American tradition.

We are living through a moment of absolutely astonishing transformation, a moment of great possibility. All of you know that the information and technology explosion will offer to you and to the young people of the future more opportunities and challenges than any generation of Americans has ever seen.

Our country is changing just as profoundly as it did when we moved from farm to factory, from the country to the cities and towns 100 years ago. The microchip and the global marketplace are opening up undreamed-of prospects but real challenges. If we want to keep the American dream alive for every single person who is willing to work for it, we know that more than ever before we have to give all Americans the skills, the education they need to be winners in this time of change. We must not send our children into a 21st century unprepared for the world they will inhabit and the jobs they will have to fill.

All of us are here today because we know purely and simply that every single child must have access to a computer, must understand it, must have access to good software and good teachers and yes, to the Internet, so that every person will have the opportunity to make the most of his or her own life.

I have spent a great deal of the last 3 years trying to open up educational opportunity and help educators and parents raise educational standards in America. There is more that we must do. Of course we need high standards and high expectations. Of course we should open the doors of college education to every single American who needs to go.

That's what the new student loan program is about, which cuts costs and makes repayments easier. That's what the national service program is about, promoting this kind of community service in return for funds to go to college. That's why I believe the most important tax cut we could give in passing a balanced budget is to give every American family the opportunity to deduct up to $10,000 a year of the costs of college tuition.

But whatever else we do, we must bring the information and technology revolution to every, every classroom in America. Every child in America sees a computer at work in a grocery store, in a video arcade, many at home. One of the few rooms that you can't enter in America today and know for sure that you will see a computer and to see computer technology is a classroom.

We are changing this today in the same way our Nation has always changed for the better, by working together united as one America. We understand there is no generation gap between old-fashioned American values of hard work, teamwork, and optimism in our forward march into the technological world of the 21st century.

In a way, NetDay is a modern version of an old-fashioned barnraising. Government's not doing this alone, nor is business, nor can schools do it alone. All of us are joining together, students, scientists, business leaders, engineers, parents, and old-fashioned American citizens who have no other interests other than a love

for their country, a love for their children, and a belief in the future of America. What you are doing today is America at its very best, and it is guaranteeing America's future.

Just think about it. Today in California we are installing 6 million feet—6 million feet—of computer cables and plugs. That's a message that all America will hear tonight and tomorrow and be proud of, and I hope will emulate.

I want to say a special word of thanks, as the Vice President did, to the business leaders all across the State, from Sun Microsystems to AT&T, MCI, Netcom, America Online, the Scholastic Network, Apple, which is donating computers, Netscape, and Microsoft giving free software—we're having trouble with these speakers. Just pretend you hear it even if you don't. [*Laughter*]

I want to ask every one of you to stop and give a special applause to every single business in California that is supporting this endeavor today. This is corporate citizenship at its best. I thank the IBEW and all the labor organizations that are helping today.

There are some truly impressive things being done by students today. In San Diego, one class sold cupcakes to pay for the cost of their NetDay kit. All across the State, teenagers today will be able to teach their parents a thing or two about the Net. In Palo Alto, one school which was wired a short time ago this NetDay is providing the first time many parents will see their child's classroom. But after the classroom is wired, the parents are painting the classrooms and repairing a decayed building.

I say that to make this point. One of the most probing comments I have seen in reading the press out here in California in preparing to come is that some have said, "Well, should the President and the Vice President, should the State be emphasizing computers in all the classrooms when some of our school buildings are falling down, some of our play yards are in disrepair?" My answer to you is yes. If everybody has those skills, our school districts will be wealthier and better. But we do not have to choose; the same volunteers that are wiring the schools can also fix them up. And I hope people will do it all across California.

I also want to thank the teachers that are working today. And what I think is a real picture of what is so special about today, the teachers on strike in Oakland are putting their pickets down and participating in NetDay.

We are trying to do our part. In the telecommunications bill I signed a few weeks ago, thanks to the long efforts of the Vice President and many in the Congress, there is a guarantee that schools and libraries and hospitals will all be able to be hooked up at affordable rates. And last month I announced a $2 billion technology literacy challenge to help communities all across this country get the right kind of computers in every classroom and every library by the end of the century.

But more than anything else, we need volunteers, trained teachers, good software. That is what we are celebrating today as well. I cannot think of a single endeavor which has involved so many different Americans from so many different walks of life to do something that is so clearly in the interest of every single American citizen. And again let me say to all of you who are here, thank you. Thank you for the enthusiasm. Thank you for the numbers. Thank you for your commitment.

I want to make just one more point, and I want to emphasize something the Vice President said. The other question which has been raised is whether or not somehow this advance of technology will divide our people more, whether or not the poor children or the poor school districts will be left behind, whether or not this will inevitably give greater advantages to those who already enjoy them. Let me just give you one story that will refute that, I hope, forever.

Last month, I had the opportunity with the Vice President to visit the Christopher Columbus Middle School in Union City, New Jersey. Just a few years ago the schools there were so bad the State was on the verge of taking them over and taking them away from the local school board and the parents. But it was a revitalized community effort, involving Bell Atlantic and all the local citizens we celebrate here in California today, that put computers in every seventh grade classroom and in every student's home in a school district that had a low per capita income where most of the families are first generation immigrant families.

New Jersey is one of the wealthiest States in America, and in a matter of just a couple of years in this far from wealthy school district with first generation immigrants, the children have an attendance record, a graduation rate, and most important of all, test scores that are above the State average. Technology is going

to liberate Americans and bring them together, not hold them back.

And that's what I want to happen to California. Look at this sea of faces here. You are America's present and America's future. Now the children will not only be able to access the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, they will be able to, how uncomfortably it might be, follow how Congressman Miller and Senator Boxer vote—[*laughter*]—and send E-mail to me and the Vice President, telling us what mistake we have made that day.

To the younger people in this audience, I hope you will never forget this day. Someday your children will marvel at the idea that there ever was a classroom without a computer. You can tell them you were a pioneer. Just as our parents and grandparents built our schools and libraries and highways for their children, you will leave your children a legacy of opportunity along the information superhighway.

The 21st century is America's for the taking if we are bold enough and strong enough and confident enough to go forward together. We will make the best of this new technology together. We will educate our children with it, improve our businesses with it, make our Government more democratic with it, and build a brighter, freer, more prosperous future with it. That is the American way. Let the future begin.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:04 a.m. at Ygnacio Valley High School. In his remarks, he referred to Paul Allen, superintendent, Mount Diablo School District; Lt. Gov. Gray Davis of California; Brian DeGrassi, student, Ygnacio Valley High School; John Gage, director, science office, Sun Microsystems; Michael Kaufman, director, information services, KQED; and Charlie and Margie Merrill, NetDay volunteers.

The President's Radio Address
March 9, 1996

Good morning. Today I want to talk about our economy and about the progress we're making, and how to keep our economy moving forward.

When I ran for President I said we could create 8 million new jobs over the next 4 years if we followed the right strategy, if we followed the strategy of giving all Americans a shot at the American dream by reducing the deficit and investing in the education and training of our people, in the new technologies of the future, in our communities, and in our commitment to open markets with more fair and free trade.

Well, we've followed that strategy for 3 years now, and yesterday we had some terrific news. Last month America came roaring back from January's blizzard to create over 700,000 new jobs. That's the best single month of job creation we've had since 1983, in the middle of President Reagan's first term. That means that in just 3 years and 1 month, America has created 8.4 million new jobs, even better than I predicted back in 1992.

Unemployment is down to 5.5 percent. It's been under 6 percent now for 18 months in a row. Four years ago America was only creating an average of 27,000 private sector jobs a month. Now we've averaged 211,000 a month since I became President. I'm proud of that, but this is America's achievement, and all Americans should be proud of it.

Our administration has helped by pursuing our economic strategy. We fought for tough, serious deficit cutting. Four years ago the deficit was $290 billion and heading higher. Today it's down to $164 billion. It's the smallest percentage of any major economy in the world, and that means lower interest rates for business loans, for home mortgages, for car and credit card payments. That's one of the reasons we've had a record number of new small businesses in each of the last 3 years, and we're at a 15-year high in homeownership.

We've worked overtime to expand trade, giving American businesses access to millions of new buyers around the globe with 200 separate trade agreements. For the first time in years American exports to consumers around the world are growing faster than imports to this

country. In fact, our exports are at an all-time high.

We've invested in America's workers so they can learn the skills they need to get and keep the high-paying jobs of the information age. And we've invested in the education of our children and our young adults, in the new technologies we need to grow the economy and help our defense industries to transform and protect the environment while we create jobs. And we've invested in our communities that have been left behind in the mark of economic progress. We've also been able to give tax cuts to a significant number of working families—17 million of them with incomes up to $28,000 a year.

This strategy is working. But we still have more to do. We have to build on the progress we've made and keep this economy moving forward. And the very first thing we need to do is to finish the job we started back in 1993. Let's eliminate the deficit completely and balance the budget over the next 7 years in a way that upholds our values and advances our economy.

I have proposed a detailed plan to balance the budget, to provide a modest tax cut to working families, and to keep our commitments to Medicare, to Medicaid, to education, and the environment. In the last few months the congressional leadership and I have spent hours and hours negotiating together. There are now enough cuts common to both Republican and Democratic plans that we could balance the budget tomorrow. It is time for Congress to put politics aside and get this balanced budget done.

Meanwhile we need to pass the rest of this year's budget and restore the deep cuts in education and the environment that Congress has made in the continuing resolutions it has passed after the two previous Government shutdowns.

I have shown Congress a way to restore the investments for education and the environment and still keep cutting spending in this year's budget. But in a new twist, some in Congress have offered to reduce their cuts in education for our children and the protection of our environment this year if I will agree to even harsher cuts on health care for the elderly and for poor children. Now, we don't need to cut any of those efforts beyond the hundreds of millions of dollars in savings we've already both identified.

These savings this year permit us to avoid harsh cuts in education and the environment on the one hand, and in health care for the elderly and for poor children on the other. A deal to trade education spending for Medicare cuts is no deal at all. It's wrong to choose between our parents and our children, leaving hard-pressed working families squeezed in the middle and undermining our economy through reduced investments in education.

I want to work with Congress, but we don't need to do things which will undermine our ability to support our families through Medicare and Medicaid, or undermine our ability to protect the environment, or undermine our ability to grow our economy and raise the incomes of all Americans through investments in education. And there should be no threat—let me say again—there should be no threat of another Government shutdown. It was wrong the first time. It was wrong the second time. And three wrongs certainly don't make a right.

I know we can balance the budget in 7 years, provide a tax cut to the families who need it, and uphold America's values by honoring our commitment to each other. We can support work and family, we can have more opportunity and more responsibility if we will work together.

Now let's get on with it. The American job engine is in high gear. It's not time to slam on the brakes or make the same old wrong turns. Let's do the right thing for the American people and keep our economy moving forward. That's why we're here.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 12:57 p.m. on March 8 in the briefing room at Harman International Industries in Northridge, CA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on March 9.

Statement on the Death of George Burns
March 9, 1996

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of one of the great entertainers of all time. Like all Americans, we are grateful George Burns kept us laughing for so long. As a young boy I enjoyed the Burns and Allen show every week. His sense of timing and captivating smile touched the hearts and funny bones of more than three generations. He enabled us to see humor in the toughest of times and laugh together as a Nation.

We will miss him greatly. Our prayers and sympathies go to his family and friends.

Remarks to the Community in Hackensack, New Jersey
March 11, 1996

Thank you very much. President Mertz, thank you for making us feel so welcome at Fairleigh Dickinson. And Mayor Zisa, thank you for making us feel so welcome in your hometown; we're glad to be here, sir.

I want to thank all the New Jersey public officials who are here. I thank Senator Lautenberg, especially for his work on the environment. I thank Congressman Torricelli and Congressman Menendez and Congressman Payne. I thank my former colleagues, Governor Florio and Governor Brendan Byrne. And I want to thank Carol Browner for the fine job she has done here and in every State in the country, at the EPA. And most of all I want to thank the Vice President for being a constant inspiration to me on the subject of America's environment.

I thank the two families who are here who were introduced by Senator Lautenberg, the Dukers and the Flatows; and I thank them for their incalculable sacrifice and their continued devotion to the integrity and the freedom of Israel and the cause of peace in the Middle East. God bless you, and thank you both very much.

I know that, as President Mertz said, my friend Leah Rabin was here just a week ago to accept an award on behalf of herself and her late husband from this distinguished university. Yitzhak Rabin was a good friend of mine, and he always took issue with those who characterized the creation of Israel and its continuance as some sort of a miracle. He didn't think there was anything miraculous about it. He thought it was the direct result of thousands and thousands of people being able to devote a lifetime of hard work and effort and courage and ultimate sacrifice to a common cause. Tomorrow I will go to Egypt to try to advance that cause and beat back the terrorism that threatens it today.

But I want to talk to you today about the common cause we must make in our efforts to preserve and enhance our environment for ourselves and for our children. It will not be a miracle that preserves America's environment and the global environment; it will be the result of thousands and thousands of people, ultimately millions of people, devoting themselves to a common cause.

When I became President, I had a pretty straightforward vision. I wanted our country to come together, to create the opportunity that would permit every American who was willing to work for it a shot at the American dream. I want to go into the next century with our country still the strongest force for peace and freedom and security and prosperity in the world. I want this country to come together around its basic values of responsibility and opportunity, of work and family, and of community. I was then weary, and I remain even more impatient, with those who seek to divide the American people for short-term political gain.

In the State of the Union Address I gave all of you and our fellow Americans a report on where we are, where we have been, and where I think we have to go, and on the seven challenges I believe we have to address in order for those objectives to be reached as we begin a new century and a new millennium. We have

to have stronger families and better childhoods for all our children. We have to open educational opportunity to every person so that every child and every adult has access to learning throughout life. We have to provide economic security for families who are willing to work for it, including those who have worked hard without raises, those who live in places that have not felt the impact of the recovery, and those who are being downsized today but still have much to contribute to their families, their communities, and the future of our country.

We have to take our streets back from crime and drugs and gangs. We cannot walk away from our obligations to lead the world in the fight for peace and freedom. And we must continue to work to reinvent our Government so that it works better and inspires more trust. But finally, we must also recognize that if we want this country to be the greatest country in the world in the next century, we have to provide for a clean and healthy environment.

This is not a luxury; it is not an option. It is about self-preservation, about the preservation of our children's future. It indeed is at the core of the spiritual beliefs of nearly every American, for Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Muslims, all could embrace the words of the psalmist, "The Earth is the Lord and the fullness thereof."

It is incredible to me now that the environment has for the first time in a generation become a source of political division. I just came from Wallington, and you know there are some people here from there. You heard from them earlier. There in the middle of a residential neighborhood the Vice President and I looked up a hill toward Jefferson Elementary School and then across a field that is a toxic waste site, the land that is being cleaned up under the Superfund law.

Not so very long ago there was a factory there that had been abandoned. It was an unsafe building; there were barrels full of unsafe chemicals. They were all taken away as evidence of the success of the law. The problem is the cleanup is not finished. There is still the fence topped with barbed wire that severs the 9-acre site from the rest of the community. And land within that fence remains contaminated with PCB's, which are known to cause cancer. Families can't walk there, children can't play there. This is a hole in that community, when it could be the source of a new, revitalized neighborhood.

The mayor said he wanted new housing for the people. He said perhaps senior citizens could live there. All that remains to be done is to finish the job of purging the soil of that site of the poisoned chemicals. I can't think of why we ought to tolerate this in Wallington or anywhere else in the country. But listen to this: 10 million children under the age of 12 live within 4 miles of a toxic waste dump—10 million. In New Jersey alone there are 100 toxic hot spots that need to be cleaned up; 800,000 children live a mere bicycle ride away from these places. Well, this is America, my friends, and that's not good enough for me. It ought not to be good enough for you.

No child should have to live near a toxic waste dump. No child should have to drink water contaminated with chemicals. No child should have to eat food poisoned with pesticides. And I am determined that every child will have the safe and healthy future that every child should have as a God-given and a legal right in the United States of America.

Make no mistake about it; just as others have said before me, this has for a long time not been a political issue in the traditional sense. America is indeed a much cleaner and healthier place after a generation of bipartisan commitment to cleaning up the environment. Since our laws were put into place 25 years ago, toxic emissions from factories have been cut in half. Lead levels in children's blood have dropped 70 percent. Once, because it was so polluted, a river of ours caught on fire but no more, and Lake Erie, which was once declared dead, is now teeming with fish.

So should we say, well, since we've done all this, we can just treat this as an ordinary issue now and start fighting about it again? There is more to do. A third of us still breathe air that endangers our health. Our national parks are the envy of the world. But as the First Lady and our daughter and I found last summer when we visited two of those parks, they're still in need of repair and continued maintenance if they're going to remain the Nation's treasure. And in too many communities, the water is still not safe to drink.

We've worked hard on a broad-based environmental agenda. The Vice President has been of great inspiration to me in that. When I was a Governor, the preservation of the environment

involved things that I understood from my own experience. I was lucky enough to grow up in a national park surrounded by three lakes. I was never, I don't suppose in my whole childhood, more than 10 minutes away from the mountains and the woods and the creeks that became all too easy for me to take for granted. And when Hillary and I had our daughter, we loved to go to the State parks in our home State and to expose her to the world of natural beauty that I took as a given as a child.

Thanks to the Vice President, I've learned how all of this relates to things that are going on all over the world and how the phenomenon of global warming can radicalize our own weather patterns here in America and disrupt the future of America if we do not deal with the environment in a comprehensive way from the grassroots communities all the way up to the international issues. And that is what we are committed to doing.

And our agenda included expanding the community right-to-know law, which requires industries to tell our citizens what substances are being released into their air and their water. We're cutting toxic air pollution from chemical plants by 90 percent. Because of tougher clean air laws, 50 million Americans in 55 cities are now breathing easier. Stricter meat safety tests have dramatically reduced the chances of a child eating a hamburger with the lethal *E. coli* bacteria. Working with some of our country's best corporate citizens, we kicked dozens of dangerous chemicals out of the marketplace and quickly replaced them with safer substitutes.

And just as important as what we have done is how we're doing it. The laws and regulations that brought our environment back from the brink worked well for their time. But what worked yesterday may not work today or tomorrow. We believe in higher environmental standards, but we also believe in more partnership between environmentalists and people working in the private sector. We believe in more flexibility and more focus on results instead of rulemaking. We know that going through Washington may not be the only road to a safer and cleaner world.

And so under Carol Browner's leadership, we're cutting paperwork at the EPA by 25 percent. We're working with the auto companies to develop a clean car, a partnership that could triple automobile mileage in the next few years and dramatically reduce toxic emissions into the air. We're asking businesses and communities to work together. The EPA's new Project XL encourages responsible companies to find inexpensive, efficient ways to exceed pollution standards, and if they can, they can get rid of the rulebook. We're interested in the results, not the rules.

Our commonsense initiative for small business emphasizes results, not punishment. If a small business makes a mistake and is committed to fixing that mistake, we will waive the fine if they repair the problem—excuse me, my wife and daughter and I have been passing around the last cold of winter, you'll have to indulge me. This new way of doing business overturns the conventional wisdom that we have to somehow choose between the health of our environment and the health of our economy.

Look at the last 3 years. We have stepped up efforts to protect the environment in the last 3 years. We've also stepped up efforts to advance the economy. We have a cleaner environment and 8.4 million new jobs. You do not have to choose between the two.

It used to be said that if you had a commitment to a clean environment it would be especially burdensome for small businesses. Well, we not only have the lowest combined rates of employment and inflation in 27 years, we have set records in each of the last 3 years for new small business formation. It is a myth. You do not have to choose between the environment and the economy. Indeed, I submit to you that good environmental policy will grow the economy, especially the kind of good high-wage jobs we need more of in America.

Now, if this legacy of environmental protection has been good for all Americans and it's been bipartisan for 25 years and it clearly is not hurting our ability to generate jobs in a world where the other wealthy economies of the world are struggling, struggling to create jobs, why would we abandon 25 years of bipartisan commitment when there are new challenges that have to be met and when, in fact, a lot of people who worry about their ability to have these good high-wage jobs in yesterday's economic organizations should be looking to tomorrow's environmental opportunities as a way to create those jobs? Why would we do that?

Because in the last year a small army of very powerful lobbyists literally have descended on Capitol Hill as if they owned the place. They have mounted a full-scale attack on our environ-

mental laws and on our public health protections. Some in this Congress actually allowed these lobbyists to sit down at the table in the committee rooms and rewrite these important environmental laws, from gutting enforcement of clean air and clean water, to weakening community right-to-know, to selling off our great and precious store of public lands to the highest bidder, to tying up our enforcement agencies in litigation. This Congress has mounted the most aggressive antienvironmental campaign in our history. And I am proud that we have stood against that.

Now, because the Congress knew that the American people would never put up with an outright repeal of these laws, they also took another, more subtle, approach. They tried to take the environmental cop off the beat by simply cutting resources for health and safety protection. And I'm proud we stood against that, too.

We have fought off a lot this year, but you know and I know the fight is far from over. This budget impasse has been used by Congress, and this crazy way of running the Government by continuing resolution instead of a budget, to slowly and quietly keep the EPA from doing its job. The EPA is now operating at about a 15 percent cut from its last year's budget.

So what happens? They get what they want by indirection. The Agency is running behind on its inspections. There have been delays in putting in place safeguards to keep things like cryptosporidium out of our drinking water. Now, that's a big word, but you'll know what it is when I remind you that that's what killed all those people in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. We don't want it in our drinking water. We need to get it out and get it out now.

And cleanup has stopped on more than 60 toxic waste sites around the country, including the one the Vice President and I just visited at Wallington. There are 14 in New Jersey, 17 in New York, and it is wrong. And if that weren't enough, the funding on the current continuing resolution runs out on Friday. And Congress again is threatening to shut down the Government for a third time unless I accept their drastic cuts in the environment and education, Medicare and Medicaid. Let me make something clear. It was wrong for them to shut down the Government the first time because I wouldn't accept the cuts. It was wrong the second time. And three wrongs on the environment do not make a right.

Let me remind all of you, my fellow Americans, without regard to your party, we can balance the budget in 7 years and protect the health and safety of our people. We have identified $700 billion in savings common to both plans that will still permit us to protect the environment, invest in education, protect Medicare and Medicaid, grow the economy, and get rid of the deficit. That is what we ought to do.

And in this budget I challenge Congress also to join me in adopting our brownfields initiative. The brownfields initiative encourages businesses and communities to turn old polluted sites into homes for safe and sustainable businesses. Now, this effort that we've had under way has already created jobs in 29 different communities. To include more of them, we have made it clear that brownfields purchasers will not be liable for the mess they inherited and neither will those who lend to them to finance the cleanup.

Today I'm proposing the next step in revitalizing these communities, a brownfields tax initiative for those who clean up and redevelop contaminated abandoned properties, a $2 billion tax incentive targeted specifically to areas where the poverty rate is 20 percent or higher, to make it possible for brownfields investors to deduct their cleanup expenses immediately and cut the cost for this type of investment in half. That will bring jobs to the places that have missed out on this recovery.

This proposal is expected to spur $10 billion in private investments nationwide, to return to productive use as many as 30,000 brownfields throughout the United States. It is fully paid for in my 7-year balanced budget. It is good for Americans, and I urge Congress to join me in making it happen.

Now, this brownfields effort is only part of the larger picture of environmental efforts we are making. Look what I saw today in Wallington. We have to repair the Superfund toxic waste cleanup program. Superfund has been an important tool in helping us to protect the environment. In the past 16 years, toxic waste has been removed from more than 3,000 sites. And in the last 3 years, I am proud of the fact that our administration has completed more cleanups than in the previous 12 years. We need to keep doing this until the job is done.

My fellow Americans, we have reached the limit, unfortunately, of what we can do alone.

We have to have help with Congress to cure the remaining problems with the Superfund. Small businesses and communities trapped in the liability net, lenders afraid to finance clean-ups—all these have to do with the way the law is written. And only Congress can change it. Only Congress can finish the job. They should do it the right way, by making sure, as Senator Lautenberg says, that polluters pay. Right now, Congress is moving forward with Superfund legislation that would let polluters off the hook and make the taxpayers pay. I don't think the taxpayers should pay when the polluters can pay. That is wrong.

All of you have been very patient to listen to us today make our plea for a new bipartisan commitment to the protection of the environment. But all of you here know that our ability to make America strong in the 21st century and to keep our people living in the place of greatest possibility in the world is clearly, clearly based on our ability to continue to make progress in the environment.

As President I take no particular pleasure in exercising the power of the veto. I like to get things done. I like to move things forward. I like to work with people who have different ideas in a positive way. But when it comes to protecting our air, our food, our water, I cannot sacrifice America's values and America's future, or America's health and safety. It is important to remember—let me say again, as so many have said—that this current state of affairs that we have endured for over a year now is a drastic aberration from the pattern of a previous generation.

When Jim Florio was in Congress working with Senator Lautenberg and Congressman Torricelli and others on the Superfund legislation, people knew that these were things Republicans and Democrats did together because it was good for America. The natural blessings God gave this country were not given to Democrats or Republicans because of their political party. They were given to people who live on this particular piece of God's good Earth, and we had better go back to protecting them together.

Robert Frost once wrote, "The land was ours before we were the land. Our environment is fundamentally us. Its well-being is ours. And when we revitalize it we nourish our souls and restore our communities." I thank you for coming here today. I thank you for your good citizenship. I ask you in this coming year to exercise that citizenship to make sure that when we leave this Earth it is cleaner and fresher and purer than we found it. That is our fundamental obligation.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. in the Rothman Center Auditorium at Fairleigh Dickinson University. In his remarks, he referred to Frank Mertz, president, Fairleigh Dickinson University; Mayor John F. Zisa of Hackensack; James J. Florio and Brendan Byrne, former Governors of New Jersey; the families of Sarah Duker and Alyssa Flatow, U.S. citizens killed in terrorist attacks in Israel; and Leah Rabin, widow of Yitzhak Rabin, former Prime Minister of Israel.

Interview With the New Jersey Media in Hackensack
March 11, 1996

Corporate Downsizing

Q. You talked briefly in your speech, and you talked more about it last Friday, about the new jobs that have been created while you've been President. Yet here in New Jersey there's a terrific amount of economic insecurity on middle management people—AT&T laying off thousands; two major drug companies have just announced a merger, more people are going to be laid off. What do you see as the Government's role in—or the Government's response to the fact that people are losing good jobs and they're not interested in how well you say the economy is growing?

The President. First of all, I think we do have a responsibility to them. And I think to address the responsibility, you have to ask yourself first what is the problem and what is the answer to the problem. It is clear—what's happening basically is that in—this is the second great wave

of restructuring. The first one occurred in the early eighties when a lot of manufacturing jobs were lost, and it went on for about 10 years. Now, in our administration we've been able to rebuild the number of manufacturing jobs. They're coming back up slowly, partly because we targeted automobiles and related industries and partly because the productivity of American manufacturing is so high.

But what's happening—there are basically, I think, two things driving this. The overwhelming fact is that the information and technology revolution, the sort of the digital chip revolution, means that organizations in the future probably won't have as many middle managers and won't have as many people passing instructions down and information up. And then, of course, there are—the second problem is there are just differences from company to company over—particularly really big companies—if they think they have to sell off subsidiaries or other things that may change. There may be facts from company to company that are different, but it's obviously a sweeping change.

So what is the answer? The first answer is to keep creating jobs and to create a higher percentage of high-paying jobs. In the last—in each year of the last 3 years, we have increased the percentage of our new jobs in the high-wage category from—in '92, before I became President, only about 20 percent of a very small number of new jobs that were created that year were in higher wage categories. In '93 it was 35 percent, then 45 percent, and in '95 over 55 percent. So the first thing we have—I know it's cold comfort if you're losing your job, but if you look at the economy as a whole, we have to keep trying to create higher wage jobs.

For example, a lot of the middle managers from AT&T—let's just take AT&T—I'm going to come to the specific problem in a minute, but if you look at the problem all across the country, the fact that we finally passed telecommunications legislation that will unleash a lot of competition there will, it is estimated, create over 3 million jobs in the telecommunications area in the next few years; and a disproportionate share of those jobs will be higher wage-paying jobs in the range of those being lost by people being laid off by the big companies. So that's the first thing.

Now, let's focus on the people themselves because—some of these people are being laid off, I think, just because of the drastic changes in the economy. I'm concerned that some of them feel that they're being laid off just because their companies want to save future—either earnings or health care or pension costs. We need to look at—and for the simple reason that a lot of these people are about my age. A lot of people who are losing their jobs now are about 50 years old. Their kids are just getting ready to go to college.

And if you're in northern New Jersey, for example, and you just heard that—I'll just make this up—let's say Sprint is hiring 3,000 people in California, and 300 of them are going to be in doing more or less what you were doing, some area that you were trained for. If you've got a child who's a senior in high school, a child who's a junior in high school, and a child who's a sophomore in high school, it may not be so easy just to up and move. You know, if everybody in your neighborhood is losing their job and you've got a mortgage on your home, it may not be so easy to sell your home at a profit or at least to even net out.

The real fundamental problem here is not only that there may not be enough jobs for these folks but they may not be where they live now or close enough to where they live to allow them to change their circumstances.

Now, I think—we're looking at—first of all, let me say, we're looking at a number of things that we might be able to do to facilitate people who have been victimized by downsizing moving to a new life. And I don't want to get into a lot of specifics until I have time to research them all, but let me just say what the general problem is. The general problem is that most of the social safety nets for people who lose their jobs were constructed for a more static economy.

For example, if you look at the unemployment system, the unemployment system we have today was constructed for a time when 85 percent of the people were called back to the same job they were laid off from. Today, 85 percent of the people are not called back to a job they were laid off from.

If you look at the pension system, we thought as a nation that we had done a great thing, probably nearly 20 years ago now, whenever it was, when we reformed the ERISA system; you know, we passed ERISA and said if you worked 10 years for a company, you had pension rights that vested so your pension rights couldn't en-

tirely be taken away from you. But now we know that you still have to work a long time to get full benefits, and pension rights aren't as portable as they might be. So we're going to have to look at ways to make—and a lot of these people, for example, who might leave a big corporation and want to set up a small business—we need to look for ways for them to somehow always be able to have greater portability in the pension system.

The same thing is true with health care. A lot of people are reluctant to start their own businesses or go to work for a small business instead of a large business because they're afraid they won't have access to health care.

And if we're going to move into a new world where a higher and higher percentage of people work for smaller companies and where there is more volatility in the job market, then you have to have lifetime access to education and training that starts immediately with no delay. You have to have access to health care and pensions, and they have to be somewhat portable. And then there have to be special, I think, efforts made for people who are in these higher wage categories where the jobs themselves may be disappearing from all big corporations to try to help them either start new businesses or find others to go into business with within reasonable distance of where they are now living.

And there may be—another thing we're looking at is the question of whether the people who are being downsized who are near high unemployment urban areas, whether there might be some marriage that could be made between what we're doing with our empowerment zones and our enterprise communities and trying to encourage people to invest in the inner cities by giving certain special incentives for people who lose their jobs, to give them extra help through the SBA or otherwise to start a new venture of some kind.

Q. In the city?

The President. Yes, or they hire people who come out there. Either they relocate there or hire people who come out of there so that—but we're looking at—there are seven or eight things that I've got our staff working on now, where we're looking at various things that we could do to try to facilitate people who are going to be downsized, moving back into the work force. Because the truth is a lot of these people are at their most productive years. We don't need to be without the benefit of their experience and their efforts. And it is devastating to them psychologically as well as economically to be without a job and without prospects of a job. So it's a terrible problem.

And so when I talk about it, the economy is doing better. To give you an example, if you look at the other six big economies in the G–7, all of us together have created a net of 8.4 million jobs, the American figure. The other 6 have created a net of zero jobs. So we shouldn't sneeze at the fact that we're creating new jobs. That's a good thing. The European unemployment rate is twice ours.

But we shouldn't be insensitive to people who are being downsized and people that these huge structural changes in the economy—are having their lives disrupted because of them. This is, after all, let me say again, this is a period of most profound change in the American economy really in 100 years, since we moved from farm to factory, from the rural area to cities and towns. We're now moving into an age where all production and services are dominated by information technology and all markets are global. And that is changing not only the nature of work, it is changing the nature of work organizations.

And our society—no society has kept up. And that's why I've pushed for all the things I have, for lifetime learning and portable pensions and constant access to health care, because in a volatile environment like this, what our objective as Americans should be is to keep the job engine going. We should keep trying to create more jobs and, as I said, to make them more and more high-wage jobs. But we should also recognize that all the high-wage jobs in the world are cold comfort if you lose a good job and there's not another one anywhere near you, particularly if you have a lot of built-in family responsibilities. And we're going to have to develop a whole new set of flexible systems of family and work security that will allow the economy to continue to be dynamic and grow but will help people like those folks that are being displaced now.

Q. If instead of President you were a CEO of a large corporation—and we had heard that, for instance, you had, I guess, maybe met with Bob Allen sometime in the recent past—and you were facing these same pressures from Wall Street to international competition from technological change, would you do anything differently with the corporation in mind than what

these corporation heads are doing in ending up on the cover of Newsweek as corporate killers?

The President. Well, first of all, some corporations are doing different things. If I tell you that—I mean, if I answer the question in the way you asked it, the inference will be inescapable that they could have done something different. I've never looked at AT&T's books. I've never looked at their long-term prospects. I don't know what their corporate strategy is. So I make no judgment about any of this. I don't know enough about any of these companies' specific situations to know. I know AT&T got into some businesses that they couldn't make run; they had to get out of them. And when they got out of them and divided, they had more folks than they needed. But I don't have a judgment about what else could be done.

I will tell you what I would do. I can tell you what I would do if I were running my own company that had a defined mission, where we were in the line of business like—whether it would be steel manufacturing or digital chips or whatever. I think the first thing you'd want to do is to set in motion—set up a relationship between the management and the work force so that the work force feels it's always involved in the corporate culture and the corporate mission and they know what the deal is. It's always easier to live with a tough decision if you know what the deal is, if you really trust it and believe it.

Secondly, I would set up a system in which both the gains and the losses of the company were evenly shared. If you look at Nucor Steel, for example, it's a very popular steel mill, a profitable steel mill. They've got 15 mills, I think, in the United States. They have a no layoff policy. And they tell you when you go in, "We have a no layoff policy, so if we lose money, you're going to get your pay cut, but at least you won't lose your job. And if we lose money your pay will be cut, but management's pay will be cut by a higher percentage than yours will be, if we lose money." And they explain to you how it works. So needless to say, it's easier to bear the burdens—it depends on whether they—if they're doing well, you do well; if they're doing poorly, you do poorly, but so do the people running the show.

Then I think when you have—if you're in some—but not everybody can have a no layoff policy. If we had to have a layoff policy, I would attempt to find something for these people to do while they're being laid off, if they could ever be called back. For example, I was at Harman International in southern California a few days ago. They are among the most successful makers of electronic speakers in the world. Sometimes the orders fall off. And they depend on orders from Europe as well as here. So they set up something called Ole. They've got a lot of Hispanic—Latinos in their work force. It stands for off-line enterprises. And they took all the scrap materials in their main line of production, and they said, "What all kind of products can we make out of this?"

They made clocks out of it—like the wood that they didn't use for the speaker cabinets. And they gave all the people—whenever they had to lay them off, they gave them an opportunity to work in the off-line enterprises. And they even gave the manufacturing workers a chance to become sales people in their stores and to their distributors and all that. The point is all the—not that they save every job, but all the work force can see they were making an extra effort to save people.

If I had to downsize a lot of middle managers, I would—and I had the money to do it—I would do an exhaustive study of what kind of options were available to find other productive endeavors for them and to what extent I could afford to maintain their benefits until they found something else to do—how could they keep the integrity of the retirement benefits and their health care benefits, for example—and whether or not in the severance between the company they could cash out some benefits and do something else which might help them to either go into business for themselves or form partnerships or do other things.

And again, I would say, I make no judgment on any of these companies. I do not know enough about the facts in any of the operating—but I basically believe that some people think that global markets and technology means people aren't very important. But I believe that global markets and technology mean that people are more important than ever before, because if you look at what's going to happen—technology is mobile; money is mobile; management is mobile; and labor costs—even if you have high labor costs, labor costs will become a smaller and smaller and smaller element of most productive enterprises, even services; certainly manufacturing. And therefore, people that have a fanatically loyal work force that is highly pro-

ductive, that feels that they're involved in a common enterprise, and can take a punch—because times won't always be good in business; that's what a free enterprise system is all about—they're going to tend to do very well.

But I do want to say to you, look, this is not an easy problem. And I'm going to do everything I can to take this issue and do what I've tried to do with every other issue with the American people, and that is come up with a very constructive solution. I don't think it's particularly productive for us to spend a lot of time in idle criticism. What we need to do is to find ways for these people who are being downsized to go on with their lives.

And I want to say, too, the American people need this. This is not just a matter of sympathy. This is a terrible waste for the American people to have to see people at this level of talent and capacity, who can serve our country so well in so many different ways, lie idle and fall on serious misfortune. So we've got to find ways to do it.

But it needs to be seen for what it is. It is something that is happening because of this period of transition when the instruments of flexible—we haven't developed a flexible safety net to deal with the problems these people have.

Q. Can the Government and should the Government have a role in encouraging this kind of behavior in corporations in any way that you talked about? Should it use incentives somehow to make sure that they do take these kind of flexible approaches?

The President. Perhaps. But it depends on what—let me just give you an example. I'll give you an example of something I've studied. Right now, we give corporations, right now, a deduction for the cost of health care and education and other fringe benefits up to a certain ceiling. And some companies go beyond that ceiling.

The chairman of United Technologies, for example, gave a speech to the Washington Press Club the other day in which he pointed out what their policy was. And their policy is if you want to go back for any degree program, undergraduate or graduate, whether or not it's related to your job, they will provide half the time—you have to do half of it on your time; they'll give you half the time—and they will pay the tuition costs up to—I forget whatever it is. It's a pretty hefty chunk of money for them, but they're in a position to do it, of course. Maybe it's $11,000 a year or something. You can get a copy of the speech he gave, the United Technologies chairman—it was a couple of months ago—before the Washington Press Club.

So he suggested—he pointed out, he said, "I can afford to do this, our company can, because we're a high-tech, high-wage company, and we're in an area of growing opportunity." But he was saying that he thought that there, in effect, should not be caps on the deductibility for corporations for the education of their work force. It shouldn't be subject to the same constraints that you—there's a social policy subjecting health care to it because otherwise you'd give everybody all their pay raise in health care—you can argue that. But he said, "In education I think the tax law should be changed to give an even bigger deduction, not that we need it, but other companies do."

Well, that's one of the things we're looking into, because we know that there are still many areas of economic endeavor in this country where there's a chronic shortage of skilled people. And most of the people who can make it into a successful career at the companies that are now downsizing could do a lot of other things. The trick is to find a way for them to do it that doesn't have their lives disrupted for a year.

Gambling

Q. I'd like to ask a question related to the spread of gambling nationally. It has been reported that you would sign a bill to create a national gambling study commission. The casino industry opposes the bill, saying its backers are all antigambling and they see the study as a prelude to Federal regulation or taxation or even a ban on gambling. Why do you support the study, and do you think the Federal Government should have a role in regulating or taxing gaming?

The President. Well, the answer to the second question is no—that is, unless gaming becomes—we may be forced into some sort of role if it becomes a complete interstate activity so that there's something other than what's involved now. But basically I don't favor Federal taxation of gambling, and I don't favor any greater Federal role for gaming.

The reason I think the study is appropriate is—and I think the gaming industry should think about it before opposing it—is at least from my point of view, I'm not trying to get into

the regulation, the taxation, or even the extinction of gambling. That's up to—I think it ought to stay the way it is; let the people decide from State to State. Most of our States require the vote of our people.

I grew up in a town that had one of the most successful race tracks in America—still does—and when I was a boy, a young boy, until the early sixties, had the largest illegal casino gaming operation in the country. So I know quite a bit about this. And the reason I support Representative Wolf's legislation is that I am afraid that if you line up with gambling in every third corner in America without considering the consequences, the social consequences will be devastating and the economics won't be very good in the end. But there's got to be a limit to this.

And I think that no one has sort of backed off and said, "Well, what is the capacity of America to absorb extra gaming enterprises?" Whatever advantage New Jersey has would be obviously significantly eroded if every State in the country decided to have an Atlantic City, right?

So I think that, given how explosive this has been—I'll give you another example. As a matter of constitutional right, now the Native American tribes have been held to have the right to engage in gaming. Well, how are they doing with it? How many of them are diversifying their enterprises and really using the gaming revenues to build the kind of independent economic system that was envisioned when this whole thing was started? Is there anything else we can do to encourage that?

I mean, in other words, there are a lot of things short of Federal regulation, Federal prohibition, and Federal taxation that a national study might point up. And I have to tell you, when I was Governor of my own State—I'll make full disclosure here—and there was a referendum to legalize casino gaming in my State, I opposed it, and the voters voted it down. But I told them if they voted it up, I'd do my best to run it in a completely honest and straightforward way. It was their decision, and they were entitled to know my opinion.

So that's the position I have. I have no agenda here. Maybe somebody who's behind this does have one. All I can tell you is I know very little more about this legislation than you do. It was proposed by someone in the Congress. I reviewed it. I asked the staff for an analysis of it, and I sent the sponsor a note and said if it passed I would sign it. But I thought that the gambling industry has grown so much so fast that it would be appropriate to study it. And that's it.

But I'm not—I can tell you right now, I'm not for a national tax. It's an important source of State revenues. And if we subjected it to a national tax and thereby depressed the activities in any given State, it would undermine the State revenues. So that's not a part of—that's not where I'm going with it.

Taiwan

Q. Mr. President, how far is the United States prepared to go to defend Taiwan?

The President. Well, first of all, I think it is not helpful for me to say anything that would add to the tensions which already exist in that region. I believe what is going on in terms of the military exercises that China is undertaking is related to the elections in Taiwan and the fact that Chinese apparently see the elections themselves as a step in Taiwan attempting to become more or less permanently independent. I'm not sure that's right, but that's, anyway, their view of it.

Our view is that we have had a—we have adopted a one China policy. We have strictly adhered to it. But a part of the one China policy was the clear, indeed, the explicit understanding that China and Taiwan would work out their differences peacefully over time. And we think—we still believe that's how it should be done, and we hope that's how it will be done. And in terms of getting into contingent "what if" questions, it's my belief that the tensions there right now are tough enough already. I don't think I should contribute to them.

Q. When you were—before you shook John Kennedy's hand as a young man, he ran for President guaranteeing the security of two islands. Is there a parallel here? [*Laughter*]

The President. No. I remember that——

Q. There's no parallel?

The President. I've had occasion to think about it since then. No. We're attempting to maintain constructive relationships with the Chinese, to work together when we can and to find ways to disagree in a forthright way when we have to disagree. And as I said, I don't want this to get out of hand, but neither do I—we would view any attempt to violate the understanding of the agreement that had already

been reached that this would be resolved in a peaceful way very negatively. But I don't want to get into any hypotheticals.

Q. You wouldn't put American troops on Taiwan to show that commitment, would you?

The President. I'm not going to answer any more questions about it right now.

National Economy and the Legislative Agenda

Q. In 1992, you spoke pretty eloquently about people who played by the rules. And then in the sense of Presidential politics you've been playing by the rules. You have all these jobs created, but yet the pollsters will tell you that because of the downsizing and other factors, there's a great deal of anxiety over there, and perhaps this administration is not being given credit. And I was wondering if that's a frustration for you that there's a disconnect between what's happening economically and what people feel about where their country's headed?

The President. Well, I think there are—I think people see apparently contradictory facts because of the nature of the time we're living in. There really are three groups of people that are—that could rightly feel some anxiety. There are the people that are downsized, and there's a lot of them in New Jersey. So you're sensitive to that. Then there are the people who live in the inner cities and the isolated rural areas who haven't had any of the new jobs at any level. There's still some places like that. And then there are those who are working at the same jobs they've been working at for several years and, in terms of purchasing power, they haven't gotten a pay raise.

All three of these groups of people are basically living in a global economy which is highly competitive, where there's a lot of structural change. And the last two groups are suffering in part because they don't have as much education and training as they need. The first group, the downsized groups, are suffering in part because of the traumatic changes in the nature of corporate life in America.

And so that does not mean that the new jobs haven't helped anybody and that it's not a good thing to get more new jobs and to change the job mix. But it does mean that the old pillars that people viewed as completely stable, reliable sources of economic security are changing. And we have to learn to define our security in different ways.

But I believe that the American people know there have been more jobs. And I think they know there are some people who still feel at risk and that it's apparently contradictory. And you can only understand it if you understand how the work and the workplace are changing in this new world and why our obligation is both to create jobs and more good jobs and to create a new kind of social safety net, if you will, that enables people to get a good new start without messing up the dynamism of the economy. And that's what a working on.

I think the American people—who gets credit or not, that will take care of itself. I just want them to know that I understand what the problem is, that I've got some ideas about how to deal with it, and that I'm going to work as hard as I can to see us make progress on dealing with it.

I'll say this: There's a bill right now before Congress that they've just been sitting on in the Senate for weeks and weeks. It's out of committee, and the Senate won't pass it, the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, which says you can't lose your health insurance benefits if you change jobs or someone in your family gets sick. That's a classic example of a clearly defined, precise thing we could do that I think will make a difference.

I sent a bill to the Congress over a year ago, the "GI bill" for America's workers before the Congress now, asking them to collapse all these 70 different Federal job-training programs into a big pool and just send a voucher to people who lose their jobs so they can immediately take it to the local community college to get new training and start again. That again would make a difference.

So I want the American people to know that I understand what the problem is, that I'm not misleading them about how difficult it is to solve but that we are moving in the right direction; things are better now than they were in 1992 for the country as a whole in terms of employment, in terms of crime, in terms of poverty, in terms of our peace and security in the world; and that we need to build on these things, not try to put a wall around our country or go into denial and say that we have no responsibility. There are some that say, "Well, there is no responsibility. You're just out there on your own." I don't believe that either.

Health Care Reform Legislation

Q. Why do you think Kennedy-Kassebaum is just sitting in the Senate?

The President. Well, let me first of all say, the manufacturers association is for it and all the labor unions are for it. The whole productive society, labor and management, is for it. Because the health insurance companies are against it, that's why. And it got out of committee. It's got almost as many Republican as Democratic sponsors. And the health insurance lobby has kept the leadership of the United States Senate from bringing it to a vote on the floor, and it's just wrong. It is just wrong. And I keep hoping that surely the Senate will bring it up now and send it out and that the House will pass it without undue amendment.

Q. Is this Harry and Louise at work again?

The President. I don't know. Maybe it's just—part of it may be the Presidential politics over there. I don't know. There may be—but in any case, I think—at one time Senator Dole endorsed these concepts, so I would like to just see—let's just get a vote on it, pass it to the House, and let me sign the bill. It is a—it's not the biggest measure in the world, but it's kind of like family and medical leave; it's a specific thing that could help millions of Americans who are being dislocated now in this new economy. And I'd really like to see it passed. It's just something that we can do that we've got business and labor agreed on, and the health insurance companies will make their adjustments. It will be fine. They'll work out. They'll do fine.

Welfare Reform

Q. Mr. President, you promised in 1992 to end welfare as we know it, and there is ample evidence that that is happening as we speak. What I want to know is whether you envisioned back in 1992 that States, particularly those led by Republican Governors with names like Whitman, Rowland, and Engler, would be the laboratories for the change to the degree they have? And philosophically, are you on the same page with these Governors on how to change welfare?

The President. Well, first of all, philosophically, I did envision exactly what would happen. I thought the States would have a lot of room to experiment, and I'm glad—I've kept my word. I have granted more freedom to States to experiment in welfare and health care in 3 years than Presidents Reagan and Bush did in 12 years. That is, even though we have not passed a welfare reform bill, there are now, because of the 50 experiments in 37 States that we've granted, there are now almost three-fourths, 73 percent of the welfare population in America is under welfare reform right now.

Q. Did you have to grant waivers for that?

The President. Yes. And I have done it because it is consistent with my philosophy that the States ought to be able to experiment with new ways to move people from welfare to work. And there are some very exciting things out there.

For example, Oregon and Missouri and one or two other States are saying to employers that if you'll hire somebody off welfare, we will give you the cash value of the welfare check and the food stamp check for a month as a supplement. We can't afford to hire all these people in public service jobs, but we need to have jobs for them. We're not just going to put them in the street. So we'll give you the welfare check and the food stamp check as a cash supplement, and you've got to pay them more than that, obviously. You pay them more than that. You pay them for a few months, and if you're not going to hire them for good when the supplement runs out, then you have to give us some advance notice. And at least they will have gotten the training. They will have something on their resume, they will be that much closer to being a member of the job market. I mean, that's just one example of exciting things that are being done there to try to reduce the welfare rolls and increase independence.

Now, I agree with a very great deal of what these Governors are doing. The one thing I do not think it's advisable to do is I don't think it's a good thing to hurt children. That is, I don't think it's a good idea to say you can stay on welfare 2 years, and then we're going to cut you off no matter how young your children are or whether you have a job or not. In other words, I've been for a 2-year hard cutoff as long as the people have a job. And if you turn down a job, we ought to cut you off. As a matter of fact, I'd be for cutting people off ahead of 2 years if they turned down a job.

I think we ought to be very tough when it comes to work. But we shouldn't be weak on work and tough on kids. That is, the only direction that I've seen some of this welfare reform take that kind of bothers me out in the States

is that sometimes I think they're just trying to save the money, even if it hurts the children, you know, some of these experiments. And I think what we want to do is to move people from welfare to work, to make them independent, taxpaying citizens so they're paying taxes, not drawing taxes, and so that they're independent and they're successful at home and successful at work.

And if that means we have to invest in child care and we have to invest in some training and we have to give employers some incentives to put them to work in the short run, I think it's worth it to get these welfare rolls down in the long run.

But I don't believe the Federal Government knows how to do this very well. And I think that the circumstances of the welfare population, for example, in a State with a 2½ percent unemployment rate—or a community with a 2½ percent unemployment—are very different from the circumstances of one with an 8 percent unemployment rate. And the circumstances in a rural area may be very different from those in an urban area. So I believe that States and the community should have the widest possible flexibility on the welfare reform.

Q. But I've been to Governors' conferences when you were Governor and as President, and my recollection when you were Governor, you were saying just what the Republican Governors are saying, "Give us the responsibility. Give us the money. Let us do it." Governor Whitman says you're welshing on your word.

The President. No, no, no, no. I'm not welshing on my word. Some of them want me to send them a check of Federal money, "Send me a check with Federal money, and I want no accountability at all. Give me the money and go away. I want no accountability. If I want to use the money on welfare, fine. If I want to"—and another thing they say is, "I want you to give me your money, but I want to stop putting up my money. And if it hurts children, fine." Some have said, "I want you to give me your money and I want to stop putting up my money, and then when I get good and ready I want to cut these people off even if their children don't have the funds they need to be well-nourished and well-raised."

When I was a Governor, it never occurred to me to ask the Federal Government to send me a check and then be unaccountable. I believe in accountability for everybody—everybody. I don't believe anybody in our society should be unaccountable. It never occurred to me as a Governor to say, "Why don't you folks send me a check and then tell me I don't have to come up with my match anymore. I'll spend your money, but I won't have to spend mine anymore."

Q. Why don't you put those caveats in there, that they get the checks, but they're accountable for——

The President. That's what I'm trying to do. That's exactly what I'm trying to do. Look, I have given—you ask Governor Whitman or anybody else, did Bill Clinton, Ronald Reagan, or George Bush give the Governors more permission to experiment with welfare and health care reform. The answer is, Bill Clinton. Much more. In 3 years I have given the Governors more elbow room to do whatever they want to do in welfare and health care than President Bush and President Reagan did in 12 years.

But when I was a Governor, it never occurred to me to ask the Federal Government to send me a blank check and let me quit putting up my part of the money and then just go do whatever I wanted to with the money. That never occurred to me.

Q. So your answer is no to that compromise, right? The compromise by the Governors, you're saying no to that?

The President. No, I didn't say no to that. I don't think that's a fair characterization of their compromise. I thought their compromise was actually pretty good.

Q. Then why don't you sign it?

The President. Well, because it hasn't passed into law. The bill I vetoed didn't bear any relationship to their compromise.

Q. And if the compromise is——

The President. The bill I vetoed was a rejection of the reasonably good bill that passed the Senate. What the Governors said in their compromise was that they were prepared to keep coming up with at least some of their match—the vast majority of it—and that they wanted more money for child care, which would have to be spent on child care. We're talking about two different things now.

What I was referring to was some of the positions taken and some of the waivers—a couple of the waivers that I haven't yet granted. But their basic compromise, I thought, was pretty good. And we're working with them. And I actually think we're getting pretty close to

passing a welfare reform bill. It's my impression—is that we've made real good progress.

Q. One last question. It doesn't sound like a carefully thought-out question—[*laughter*].

The President. Anyway I believe we're getting close on—and in their compromise—in the Governors' conference when I met with them, they did not ask for the right to just cut people off whether or not the kids had a way to be supported or not. At least that's my impression.

Flat Tax Proposals

Q. The flat tax issue is one issue that's been up in the Republican primaries. Can you see yourself or the Democrats agreeing to some kind of a progressive flat tax, not the one Forbes proposes, but one that has different levels but eliminates a lot of deductions?

The President. Well, of course, that's what Senator Bradley and Congressman Gephardt tried to do in '86. Basically, Bradley-Gephardt, the Tax Reform Act of '86 which President Reagan signed, was supposed to be that kind of bill. And what the—and it did move in that direction.

Let me answer you this way. I think it would be a mistake to eliminate the charitable deduction and the home mortgage deduction. They're both a big part of our culture. And they also have a lot to do with the way America works now. And we learned in '86—we got a lot of things out of the Tax Reform Act of '86. We also learned that there were even then some unintended consequences which are not salutary, even though on balance—I mean, there was a lot of good in that bill.

So I wouldn't be in favor of that. Now, the problem with all the flat tax proposals, notwithstanding what the candidates say about them, that every one—that the Treasury Department and the Congressional Budget Office, if you study them all—and there has been no flat tax proposal yet made for one tier anyway that would not either explode the deficit on the one hand, or if it's deficit neutral, it would raise taxes for everybody that makes less than $100,000 a year in the country. That's the basic problem with a flat tax. Now, to whatever extent you have more than one rate and it's more progressive, you can overcome that. But to whatever extent you do that, you get closer to the present system. So that's really the problem.

I've looked at a lot of other ways of going at this to see if we could make it easier on people. You should know that the last year I have figures for, which was '92 or '93, 57 percent of the American people filed the simplest 1040 form—what is it, 1040 EZ—and paid taxes at 15 percent and took the standard deduction. So it's obvious that a lot of them made the decision that at least for their incomes they'd be better off just having a de facto flat tax. And I've asked the Treasury Department to come up with some other ways to simplify. We're also letting more people file electronically. We're trying to work it into the computer so everybody who has a State income tax or a local income tax can file one time for both the State and the Federal.

I've asked people to study the British system. It's interesting—Britain has an interesting system where two-thirds of the people never come into contact with the income tax system. If you decide at the beginning of the year that you're going to take the standard deduction, then you work out a deal, and they deduct it all, so you never have to file. You don't even have to file. You don't have to put anything in. Two-thirds of the workers never even touch the tax system. And they're by definition never audited because they didn't put it in. So they're not audited; they don't file; they don't do anything. They don't have to do anything. It's over.

So there may be some—there may be a number of things we can do to simplify the system. But I have never seen a flat tax proposal that I thought would be both progressive and simple.

Q. Are we going to get any kind of tax cut this year?

The President. I think so. If we pass the budget, we will. We've got the money there to do it. We've got over $700 billion common to both these budget plans. And that is more than enough money to pass a 7-year balanced budget plan that every economic expert would say is credible and have a reasonable tax relief package that would benefit the vast majority of the American people. I hope it will include what I think is the most important thing we could do for the future growth of the economy. I hope it would include the deductibility of all cost of education after high school.

I think it would be very big in some of the things you and I have been talking about here today. But I still hope and believe we can get an agreement on the budget. There's no reason for us not to have an agreement on the budget. We are very, very close if we just take what

we have agreed in common and we can get there. And the Governors also helped us, I think, on Medicaid. We're getting closer on Medicaid. Their position is slightly different from mine and from the Republican Congress position, but we're trying to get there.

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. Let me do one thing, tell you guys that we had—Carol Browner and Larry Summers from the Treasury Department did a little briefing on Air Force One on the way up about the brownfields initiative the President announced today. I've got a copy of the transcript. I don't think you got it earlier.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, did you meet with the two families—[*inaudible*]—before you came in? I realize it was a private conversation, but could you sort of tell us what sort of thoughts you sent to them, especially on the eve of your trip to the Mideast?

The President. Well, they—first of all, they were enormously impressive people, very brave, very—they were very compelling people. And as you know, the sister of one of the young women of the Duker family, she's about to go back over there. She's going, I think, at the end of this week. And so, she is also a very brave young woman. And her mother urged me to just keep working with them and not to give up on the quest for peace.

And the other family, the father has spent a lot of time traveling around the country talking to young people about it, and he said—I also agreed with him—he said, "There can't be any peace unless there's security, and the Israelis can only sacrifice so much. Arafat has got to do his part as well." And of course, he's right about that. And the United States has been very insistent that Chairman Arafat take stronger steps to crack down. And in recent days there's some encouraging signs that he has. Some important arrests have been made.

And of course, these suicide bombers and the people that are running them, they're not just the enemy of Israel and the enemy of the peace process, they're also Arafat's enemies, too. I mean, if they get their way, it's hard to see what his legitimacy is as well.

But those families are—they're pretty incredible people I would say.

1996 Election

Press Secretary McCurry. Wald [David Wald, Newark Star Ledger] wants to ask you if you're confident you're going to carry New Jersey in the fall. [*Laughter*]

Q. No, I really want to ask you is—the prospect of running against Dole and Colin Powell. [*Laughter*]

The President. I don't know, that's up to them. I'm going to let them handle their politics. They've got a lot to——

Q. You've worked closely with Dole. What do you think some of his strengths are as a person or——

Press Secretary McCurry. No mas. [*Laughter*]

The President. Their side can run a 4-year campaign. I don't want to. [*Laughter*] There's too much of this already.

NOTE: The interview began at 2:30 p.m. in Dickinson Hall at Fairleigh Dickinson University. The following journalists participated: Larry Arnold, Newark Star Ledger; Thomas Fitzgerald, Bergen Record; John Froonjian, Atlantic City Press; Jim Goodman, Trenton Times; Robert Ingle, Camden Courier Post; and David Wald, Newark Star Ledger. Participants referred to Robert E. Allen, chairman and chief executive officer, AT&T Corp.; "Harry and Louise," characters in a series of commercials sponsored by the Health Insurance Association of America; Governors Christine T. Whitman of New Jersey, John G. Rowland of Connecticut, and John Engler of Michigan; Malcolm S. (Steve) Forbes, Jr., Republican Presidential candidate; and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

March 11, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12957 of March 15, 1995, and matters relating to the measures in that order and in Executive Order No. 12959 of May 6, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) (IEEPA), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c). This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12957 and matters relating to that Executive order and Executive Order No. 12959.

1. On March 15, 1995, I issued Executive Order No. 12957 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 14615, March 17, 1995) to declare a national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to IEEPA, and to prohibit the financing, management, or supervision by U.S. persons of the development of Iranian petroleum resources. This action was in response to actions and policies of the Government of Iran, including support for international terrorism, efforts to undermine the Middle East peace process, and the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. A copy of the order was provided to the Congress on March 15, 1995.

Following the imposition of these restrictions with regard to the development of Iranian petroleum resources, Iran continued to engage in activities that represent a threat to the peace and security of all nations, including Iran's continuing support for international terrorism, its support for acts that undermine the Middle East peace process, and its intensified efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. On May 6, 1995, I issued Executive Order No. 12959 to further respond to the Iranian threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

Executive Order No. 12959 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 24757, May 9, 1995) (1) prohibits exportation from the United States to Iran or to the Government of Iran of goods, technology, or services; (2) prohibits the reexportation of certain U.S. goods and technology to Iran from third countries; (3) prohibits transactions such as brokering and other dealing by United States persons in goods and services of Iranian origin or owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; (4) prohibits new investments by United States persons in Iran or in property owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; (5) prohibits U.S. companies and other United States persons from approving, facilitating, or financing performance by a foreign subsidiary or other entity owned or controlled by a United States person of reexport, investment, and certain trade transactions that a United States person is prohibited from performing; (6) continues the 1987 prohibition on the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iranian origin; (7) prohibits any transaction by any United States person or within the United States that evades or avoids or attempts to violate any prohibition of the order; and (8) allowed U.S. companies a 30-day period in which to perform trade transactions pursuant to contracts predating the Executive order.

In Executive Order No. 12959, I directed the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize through specific licensing certain transactions, including transactions by United States persons related to the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal in The Hague, established pursuant to the Algiers Accords, and related to other international obligations and United States Government functions, and transactions related to the export of agricultural commodities pursuant to preexisting contracts consistent with section 5712(c) of title 7, United States Code. I also directed the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to consider authorizing United States persons through specific licensing to participate in market-based swaps of crude oil from the Caspian Sea area for Iranian crude oil in support of energy projects in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, and Turkmenistan.

Executive Order No. 12959 revoked sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order No. 12613 of October 29, 1987, and sections 1 and 2 of Executive

Order No. 12957 of March 15, 1995, to the extent they are inconsistent with it. A copy of Executive Order No. 12959 was transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President of the Senate by letters dated May 6, 1995.

2. There were no amendments to the Iranian Transactions Regulations, 31 CFR Part 560 (the "ITR") during the reporting period.

3. During the current 6-month period, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions under the ITR, issuing 54 licensing determinations—both approvals and denials. The majority of denials were in response to requests to extend contract performance beyond the time specified by Executive Order No. 12959 and by FAC general license. Licenses were issued authorizing the continued operation of Iranian diplomatic accounts, powers of attorney, extensions of standby letters of credit, payments for trade transactions pursuant to contracts prior to May 6, 1995, and exportation of certain agricultural products contracted for prior to May 6, 1995. The FAC continues to review under section 560.528 requests for authorization to export and reexport goods, services, and technology to ensure the safety of civil aviation and safe operation of U.S.-origin commercial passenger aircraft in Iran. In light of statutory restrictions applicable to goods and technology involved in these cases, Treasury continues to consult and coordinate with the Departments of State and Commerce on these matters, consistent with section 4 of Executive Order No. 12959.

During the reporting period, FAC administered provisions on services related to maintaining Iranian bank accounts and identified and rejected Iran-related payments not authorized under the ITR. United States banks were notified that they could not process transactions on behalf of accounts held in the name of the Government of Iran or persons in Iran, with the exception of certain transactions related to interest accruals, customary service charges, the exportation of information or informational material, travel-related remittances, donations of articles to relieve human suffering, or lump sum closures of accounts by payment to their owners. United States banks continue to handle certain dollar payment transactions involving Iran between third-country banks that do not involve a direct credit or debit to Iranian accounts. Noncommercial family remittances involving Iran must be routed to or from non-U.S., non-Iranian offshore banks.

The FAC continues to coordinate closely with the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and the California banking authorities concerning the treatment of three Iranian bank agencies—Banks Sepah, Saderat, and Melli. Licenses have been issued to the Iranian bank agencies authorizing them to pay overhead expenses under the supervision of the California and New York banking departments while meeting obligations incurred prior to May 6, 1995. Authorization expired at the end of December, which had enabled them to make payments to U.S. exporters under letters of credit advised prior to June 6, 1995, where the underlying exports were completed in accordance with the Regulations or a specific license issued by FAC. The FAC also had permitted the agencies to offer discounted advance payments on deferred payment letters of credit under the same conditions.

4. The U.S. Customs Service has continued to effect numerous seizures of Iranian-origin merchandise, primarily carpets, for violation of the import prohibitions of the ITR. Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods are continuing and new reports of violations are being aggressively pursued.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from September 15, 1995, through March 14, 1996, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Iran are approximately $965,000, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, the Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, and the Office of the Legal Adviser), and the Department of Commerce (the Bureau of Export Administration and the General Counsel's Office).

6. The situation reviewed above continues to involve important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals

and presents an extraordinary and unusual threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The declaration of the national emergency with respect to Iran contained in Executive Order No. 12957 and the comprehensive economic sanctions imposed by Executive Order No. 12959 underscore the United States Government's opposition to the actions and policies of the Government of Iran, particularly its support of international terrorism and its efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. The Iranian Transactions Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Orders No. 12957 and No. 12959 continue to advance important objectives in promoting the nonproliferation and antiterrorism policies of the United States. I shall exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 11, 1996.

Remarks on Receiving the Irish-American of the Year Award in New York City

March 11, 1996

Senator Kennedy, Ambassador Kennedy Smith, Niall O'Dowd, ladies and gentlemen. Senator Kennedy just told me that I could keep the gift under the new ethics law passed by Congress, and I intend to do it. [*Laughter*]

To John Hume and Albert Reynolds and all my many friends in the audience, all the distinguished Irish-Americans who are here—mayors, other public officials, leaders of business, to Anjelica Huston and Liam Neeson. It's a great tribute, don't you think, to the versatility of Irishmen that Liam Neeson could make such a big impression wearing a Scottish kilt. [*Laughter*]

I feel a great deal of gratitude to many here in this audience. It's a great privilege to me to accept this award from one our Nation's most extraordinary Irish-Americans, Jean Kennedy Smith, and your last year's honoree. She had a large hand in the positive developments of the last 3 years. Her commitment was tireless and so was her willingness to pick up the telephone and call the President. [*Laughter*] She has earned the gratitude of everyone here.

I also want to thank Senator Kennedy, not only for his work on this issue but for standing up for the interests of ordinary Americans and forgotten people here and all over the world for more than three decades now. This country is more in his debt than most will ever know. I thank Senator Dodd and Congressman King and Congressman Manton and the other Members of the United States Congress who have stood for the cause of Ireland.

I'm delighted to be here with a number of the Irish-Americans in my administration who are among those being honored tonight: Secretary of Education Dick Riley; the Peace Corps Director, Mark Gearan; those on the White House staff, Kitty Higgins, Katie McGinty, Susan Brophy, Nancy Soderberg, who wanted to put an "O" and an apostrophe in front of her last name, so as not to be questioned. I want to thank Niall for what he said about Nancy Soderberg and Tony Lake. They also had a very profound role in the work that our administration was able to do.

I would also, since I'm here in New York, like to begin with something that's not in my notes. I was a young student in England when the Troubles began. And as an American acutely aware of his Irish roots, I was deeply interested in it and troubled by it. But time took me in a different direction. I went back home, I lived a different life, I missed a lot of what happened between then and 4 years ago.

My second Irish journey really began here in New York City, and at least three of those who took me on it are here tonight, and I'd like to thank them for what they did: my law school friend and long-time friend former Congressman Bruce Morrison, Congressman Tom Manton, and Paul O'Dwyer. Thank you, Bruce; thank you, Tom; thank you, Paul.

We all know that we come tonight in celebration that is not as unambiguous as we might have hoped. We come here to face the continuing challenge of our Irish heritage. Tonight, in the land of our ancestors, the future once again is at a crossroads. And once again, each of us must do our part to safeguard the promise, the precious promise of peace.

This matters to America, to all who believe that those children have a right to grow up free of fear. That is why we have worked so closely with all of the parties and the people on all sides of the conflict: the Catholics, the Protestants, the Nationalists, the Unionists, the Irish, and the British. That is why I granted a visa to Gerry Adams and why I hosted the White House Conference on Trade and Investment, why we were the first administration ever to support the International Fund for Ireland, why I was willing to ask our remarkable natural resource, former Senator George Mitchell, to go and stick his hand in the wheel, and why I became the first President sitting in office to visit Northern Ireland last year.

As Senator Kennedy was talking about President Kennedy's trip there, I couldn't help remembering those days, even though they deprived me, because of what we were trying to do to make peace in Bosnia, of the opportunity to play Ballybunion. They were still the best days of my life. [*Laughter*]

And when I came home with the seared, vivid memories of the faces of the people in the Shankills and the Falls lining the roads to greet us as we made our way through town, the men and women of both traditions on the floor at Mackie's plant, the two little children, one Catholic and one Protestant, who introduced me and who have now been to visit me in the Oval Office, the crowd I saw in Derry, all the music I heard, all the things I saw, I realized that in my life I might never have 2 days like that again. But I also realized that the romance of the moment cannot strip us of the keen awareness that the work is not yet done.

The people of Northern Ireland have clearly chosen peace. They have chosen dialog over division. They do not deserve to have a small group choose bloodshed and violence and shatter their dreams. And we must not allow those who have been hardened by the past to hijack the future of the children of Northern Ireland.

I want to say, as I have on many occasions, how much I appreciate the risks that have been taken and the efforts that have been made by both the Irish and British Governments, by Albert Reynolds and his successor, John Bruton, Prime Minister Major. The February 28th announcement by the Governments was a milestone achievement. A firm date has been set for all-party talks. And that is, after all, what we have all been working for. Violence has no place in this process. The cease-fire has got to be restored.

We Americans who so proudly call ourselves Irish must speak with one voice on this issue. Those of you who stood with me when we took the first steps here that no American Government has taken before, you especially must speak with one voice on this issue. The future must belong to those who build, not those who maim and destroy. All the Irish-American community must—must—urge our friends on the other side of the ocean to banish the specter of violence once and for all.

For our part, we will continue to work closely with the Irish and British Governments and the parties involved to support their efforts to end the violence and to achieve a lasting peace. From our battle of independence right down to the present day, the Irish have defended and built and blessed our Nation. Of all the gifts we can offer them in return, perhaps the most precious is the example of what can happen when people find strength instead of weakness in their diversity. We know it is hard to do, but we also reaped the richness of the prize.

We are proud to walk with those who seek peace, from Northern Ireland to the Middle East, to Bosnia, to Haiti, all across this planet. Our aim there, as everywhere, is not to impose peace. We couldn't do that even if we were asked to do so. People must make their own peace in their minds and in their hearts. But we know that America at this moment in time, and especially with regard to Ireland, can play a special role. We will keep our commitment to do all we can to create a climate for peace to take hold and to flourish, to stand with those who take risks for peace through the good times and the bad, to counter the forces of hatred and division wherever they appear.

Since the first settlers came to our shores, Irish, Protestant, and Catholic together have added to our strength. Tomorrow, as I'm sure most of you know, I leave on a different mission of peace. I'm going to Sharm al-Sheikh in Egypt, where leaders from the Middle East and

around the world will stand as one for peace in the Middle East, together to combat the merchants of hatred with every means at our command, together to join our strength and our commitment to carry the peace process forward there.

We must not let the terrorists in the Middle East have the victory they seek, the death of the very hope for peace. I ask for your prayers on that mission as well. The solidarity of peacemakers in this world today must be stronger than bullets or bombs. The will of the people for peace is more powerful than the impulse to division, and we must not stop until peace has been secured.

I have a better understanding now than I did when I went to Ireland of the long struggle within the souls of the Irish people over the last few decades. When I came home, having had the opportunity to meet Seamus Heaney, as he said in his letter to the Ambassador, I was profoundly honored that he autographed a copy of the "The Cure at Troy" for my wife, not for me—[*laughter*]—wisely picking the more literate in our family. [*Laughter*]

But for me he hand-wrote out the lines from that magnificent work that I spoke in Derry. And so I framed them and put them in my personal office at the White House, "The moment where hope and history rhyme." And after I got back I asked a friend of mine who is a writer to get me a copy of Seamus Heaney's address upon receiving the Nobel Prize. And I read it. And if you have not read it, I commend it to you. It is an astonishing journey of the soul, a journey of personal courage, a fight against cynicism and giving up, a fight against the anger and anguish that comes from feeling impotent in the face of larger events.

I imagine it describes the same journey of the heart that our friend John Hume has taken in his own way over the last several years. I say that because the truth is, no one knows whether human nature craves dominance and division over peace and hope, but we all believe we know, and in the believing we can make a new reality.

We cannot let our children grow up in the world toward which we are moving, where events are unfolding at such a rapid pace and people are being thrown against each other with greater intensity than ever before and huge decisions that involve the very survival of the ecostructure of the planet will have to be made. We cannot afford to let another generation of young people grow up believing that it's more important to define themselves in terms of who they are not, instead of what they are. And that, in the end, is the great struggle that every generation, that every nation, that every community, that every family, that every person must wage.

If we believe we are children of God, then what is important is what we are, not what we are not. And that is the gift that Irish-Americans must give to Ireland in our lifetime.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:58 p.m. in the ballroom at the Plaza Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to U.S. Ambassador to Ireland Jean Kennedy Smith; Niall O'Dowd, publisher, Irish America; John Hume, leader, Northern Ireland Social Democratic and Labour Party; former Prime Minister Albert Reynolds of Ireland; actors Anjelica Huston and Liam Neeson; civil rights lawyer Paul O'Dwyer; Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams; Prime Minister John Bruton of Ireland; and Prime Minister John Major of Great Britain.

Remarks at a Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Dinner in New York City

March 11, 1996

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker—[*laughter*] It has a nice ring to it. Thank you, Dick Gephardt, for your words and for your work, and thank you for not losing heart in the last year and for helping me to carry on the struggle that we have fought in Washington.

Thank you, Martin Frost, for your energy. When Martin Frost was up here announcing that this was the most successful event by the

Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee ever held outside Washington, I thought, my God, even people in New York can't tell him no. [*Laughter*] Just anything to get him off the phone. [*Laughter*] I still don't know how many things are in Martin Frost's district just because I wanted to stop having him walk a dog to the bone. He's great. We are very fortunate to have Martin Frost in this position of leadership at this time, and I am making fun of him only because of my affection and admiration for him and for the efforts that he's made.

I thank Congressman Rangel and all the members of the New York delegation, all the members of the New Jersey delegation who are here; all the other officials; my former colleagues and good friends Jim Florio and Mario Cuomo; and to all of you who have come to help in this important endeavor, thank you very much.

I was thinking tonight about what, if anything, I could say that you all haven't heard before, or whether I could say it in a different way. Some of you have heard me say this, but a few years ago Tina Turner came to Little Rock to give a concert, and the man that ran the place where the concert was knew that I was a big Tina Turner fan so he gave me six tickets. And so I got up a bunch of my staff and we went to the concert. Normally, I had these tickets. When I got tickets they were carefully buried in the middle of the crowd so I wouldn't be noticed. The Governor doesn't like to be noticed at rock concerts. [*Laughter*]

This time, he put them on the front row. So there I was watching Tina Turner and that tenor saxophone player of hers that looks like he could bench press 500 pounds on a cold day; and she gave the whole concert and at the end of the concert she sang her first big hit, "Proud Mary." And she started to sing it, the band was playing the introduction, the crowd started clapping, and she said, "You know something? I've been singing this song for 25 years, and it gets better every time I sing it." [*Laughter*] So I was thinking, what can I say that would kind of replicate that? [*Laughter*]

You all know why you are here. What I'd like to do is to put it in some larger context. You heard Dick Gephardt say what I believe deeply to be the truth: The American people are living through the period of most profound change in the way we work since we moved from being an agricultural to an industrial society. And when you do that it changes the way you live, just as it did 100 years ago when we moved from the rural areas to cities and towns.

Now we are changing the way we work; we are changing the nature of the workplace; we are changing the nature of the global markets, and it's thrown everything up in the air. It is an age of enormous possibility in which people expect those in public life to change in a manner that is appropriate to the challenges of the time. That is at least the consistent thread you can see in the recent elections.

Now, in 1992 most people thought the race was between candidates who wished to have change in America and those who thought we were getting along all right just by going along. In 1996 the election will be between two very different visions of change. And it is very important that every American understand that. There is no status quo option in this election. There should not be a status quo option in this election, but the change could hardly be more profound than the two different visions offered in this election, as you can see now from 3 years of experience.

When I ran for President in 1992 I did it for pretty straightforward reasons: I wanted my country to go into the 21st century with the American dream available to every man and woman, every boy and girl, without regard to race, religion, or background, who was willing to work for it. I wanted to see our country continue to be the world's leader for peace and freedom, for prosperity and security, in an evermore interdependent but still quite dangerous and unsettled world. And I wanted to see this country come together again around its basic values of responsibility along with opportunity, of family and work, and of community. I was tired then and I'll tell you something, I'm more tired today at seeing people who try to constantly divide the American people at election time for short-term political advantage in ways that clearly undermine the long-term interests of this country, and I hope you are too.

Now, if you look at the last 3 years and you look at where we're going, for my money it is clear which direction we should take and what kind of change we should have. In 1993, the Members that are here took a very courageous stand against unanimous opposition from the other party and said we had to reduce the deficit, but we had to reduce it in a way that would still permit us enough funds to invest in edu-

cation, in research, in technology, in building the future of the American economy. They said if we did it our way we would have a recession, and therefore they would not support us. We now have 3 years of evidence. They were wrong. They were wrong. Interest rates came down; investment went up. We learned last month now that in the last 3 years and 1 month, 8.4 million jobs have come into the American economy—each year higher wage jobs than the year before.

Four years ago only 20 percent of a modest number of new jobs were high-wage jobs. In 1995 over 55 percent of the new jobs were high-wage jobs. We're generating more jobs and they're better jobs because the strategy is the right one. Why, if we're following a strategy that is right, would we want to take a right turn, a severe right turn to follow a strategy that was wrong the last time it was tried?

If you look at the role this country is playing in the world, I am proud of the fact that there are no Russian missiles pointed at the United States. I am proud of the fact that the United States Senate has ratified the START II treaty. I am proud of the fact that we have been a force for peace and freedom from Haiti to Northern Ireland, from the Middle East to Bosnia. I'm going to get on an airplane tomorrow and fly to Egypt to try to help get the Middle East peace process back on track by establishing the conditions of security without which no people can make an honorable peace. And I want your support in that.

I'm proud of the fact that after 6 years of haggling around, the Members here passed a balanced crime bill that put another 100,000 people on the street in police uniforms and that the crime rate is coming down all across America and that the poverty rate and the welfare rolls are down. I am proud of that. Now, does that mean that we should run on our record? No. But our record is an indication that we know what we're doing and that the direction is right, that the pace of change—the direction of change is right.

As I said in my State of the Union Address, there are all kinds of things going on in this world because of the pace of change that are apparently contradictory. I was in New Jersey today, and they were asking me about the corporations that are downsizing their employees there. How can we be creating 8.4 million jobs and people be losing jobs? I know that there are hourly wage earners that have not gotten a raise. I know there are areas in the inner cities and rural areas that have still not gotten the benefits of the economic recovery.

But let's start with first things first: Do no harm. The 8.4 million jobs we have in this country in the last 3 years is the sum total of the net jobs generated by all the big seven economies in the world; that is, the other six have netted out zero, and we've netted out 8.4 million. So let's not diminish what has been done. We have to continue to create the jobs.

Then we have to create the conditions of economic security without undermining the dynamism of the economy. The old safety net systems we had don't work anymore because the nature of work and the nature of the workplace is changing. We have to find new ways to do that without undermining the dynamism of the economy. We can do it. We can do it.

I'll just give you one example. There is a bill on the floor of the Senate right now that has been voted out of the committee that has about 50 cosponsors, Republican and Democrat, which says simply that you can't lose your health insurance if you have to change jobs or if somebody in your family gets sick. The business lobbies and the labor groups are all for it; only the health insurance groups are opposing it. And it has not been brought to a vote. But that is wrong. That bill should pass. That is the kind of thing we need to do, and you ought to ask for it to be.

We have to find new and innovative ways to make it easier for small businesses to take out 401(k) pension plans and for people to keep their pensions when they change jobs. We have to set up education and training opportunities that are immediately there when people are dislocated and that are there for a lifetime. In the tax cut proposal that I have made, I think the most important tax cut we could give the American people is a tax deduction for all costs of education after high school for up to $10,000 a year. That is the sort of thing we ought to be doing.

If you look at this whole area of education, this is a big area. We know that the added benefits of education to income, to productivity, to being able to find a new job when you're dislocated are far greater now than they were just 10 years ago. The earnings gap between high school graduates and college graduates in their first year of work has doubled in a decade. We know that.

Therefore, we should be investing in the potential of our young people, starting with Head Start. We should help schools who are willing to go for national standards of excellence and be held accountable for them but who have poor children and limited resources to get the help they need as long as they're shooting for higher standards and they're being held accountable. We should do more to help people with good loan programs and good scholarship programs, not less. The people who want to cut education funding would make all of our economic problems worse. If you want to see the American people grow and grow together, be for the party that is for investing in education in ways that will have returns to the American economy and for all people.

Today the Vice President and I were in New Jersey talking about another one of our great challenges. We visited a Superfund site that has only been partially cleaned up. And we cannot finish the cleanup because the Congress in this year is running the Government by continuing resolution with a big cut in environmental enforcement. And they wanted to pass a huge cut in environmental enforcement as a part of the budget bill that covers the EPA.

Now, you have to decide. They believe that we have to give up on a lot of environmental protection to grow the economy and that the best thing you can do for the economy is just to get out of that whole business and let the people who were affected come in and rewrite the laws however they like. We believe that you can grow the economy over the long run only by protecting the environment. We have not been bullheaded about this. We've cut back on a lot of bureaucracy that was unnecessary. We have moved prospective Superfund sites that really weren't polluted out of that category so that they can be developed in cities all across America. We have worked in unique partnerships with businesses, from the Big Three on a clean car that will triple automobile mileage to 50 or 60 companies now that we have said if you could meet the clean air and clean water standards on your own, you can throw away the rulebook; all we want are results. But we will never, never knowingly do anything that will undermine the environmental future of this country.

If you want to create more high-wage jobs, if you are concerned about people in a lot of these big companies that are being dislocated, invest more in the companies of the future that will be cleaning up the environment and preserving the environment. It is good for the economy, and it is essential for our quality of life. It's a big choice for you to make, two very different views of change.

If you look at the challenge of crime and drugs and violence, it is still a huge challenge. Last week we kicked off the new tenure of our drug czar, General Barry McCaffrey, who was, until he retired as a four-star general and the commander of our Southern Command south of our borders, the most decorated American soldier still in uniform. He is a good man and a brilliant man who believes we have to have a combination of enforcement to interdict drugs before they come into the country, enforcement of the laws here, and prevention and treatment programs.

If you believe that we have to have a balanced approach to that, that is our view of the world of the future. If you look at the crime bill, we finally have done something as a country that is working on crime. For years the American people thought it wouldn't work. Mr. Schumer carried on his long and lonely battle for the assault weapons ban. Thank you, sir.

The battle for the Brady bill—far more partisan than it should have been. When I went up to New Hampshire not very long ago, I was talking to a lot of those folks and I said, "You know, in New Hampshire and Arkansas, where I come from, more than half the adults have a hunting or fishing license or both." We lost a Congressman in New Hampshire in 1994 because he voted for the assault weapons ban. I told him, I said, "You know, you folks just had a great deer season. And contrary to what they told you in 1994, every New Hampshire hunter who wanted to go deer hunting with a weapon that he had in 1994 got to do it. They didn't tell you the truth." But I'll tell you who doesn't have guns: Over 60,000 felons couldn't get a gun because of the Brady bill. We were right, and they were wrong. They were wrong.

The program to put 100,000 police officers on the street is plainly working to drive down the crime rate. The police commissioner of this city was on the cover of one of our major magazines just a few weeks ago because of the success of community policing. We are now making community policing possible all across America. I have been in community after community

where police chief after police chief has come up and said, "Mr. President, the National Government never did anything for us before, never really did anything for us to help us fight crime. But those community police officers, they're helping us to prevent crime."

We can't jail our way out of this crisis. We have to get to know the people on each block. We have to get to know these kids. We've got to make it safe to walk to school. We've got to increase security by preventing crime. Community policing works. Their answer is to turn it into a block grant and hope for the best. Our answer is to stay with the law enforcement people of this country and do what works. It's a big difference, two different views of change.

And the American people will have to decide. If we're bringing down the crime rate and people desperately, desperately want to be safe on their streets, why in the wide world would we take a dramatic U-turn and move away from a strategy that is making the American people safer? That is the right thing to do, and these Democrats need your help so that we can stop any attempt to back away from something that is lowering the crime rate and making the American people safe.

You know, we talk a lot about families and family values. Well, in the last 3 years, maybe the best thing we did for family values was to pass the family and medical leave law. I'm proud of that. I wish it hadn't been as partisan an issue as it was. We had a few Members of the other party for it.

We've worked hard, the Vice President and I have, for the V-chip and the telecommunications bill, and I thank Congressman Markey who is here, who really was the father of that fight, trying to improve the quality of television that our children see.

I guess it just depends on how you define it, but you know, the real family heroes to me in this country are the millions of parents that tomorrow will get up and go to work. They'll work full time, all week, for the minimum wage, for $4.25 an hour. And they'll come home and try to raise their kids on it, and they'll obey the law and pay their taxes, do their best to get by. If we don't raise that minimum wage within a year, it will be at a 40-year low in terms of what it will buy. I don't know about you, but that's not my idea of the 21st century America I want. The Democrats are, I believe, to a person for raising the minimum wage. And we can't even get a vote on it. That is the difference in our approach from theirs.

And let me just say, in the end I think it all comes down to what you think our role is together. If you were to ask me, "Mr. President, what is the most important lesson you have learned as President," I would say it is that we don't do very well when we're divided, but when we're united, the American people never lose. And I believe the role of our Government in Washington should be to help individuals and families and communities make the most of their own lives and to meet these challenges of the future, to build stronger families and better childhoods for all children; not—not—under the guise of a popular label like welfare reform, be tough on children. We should be tough on work, not tough on children.

We should build an educational system that gives everybody opportunities for a lifetime. We should build a new fabric of economic security for everyone willing to work for it that does not undermine the dynamism of the American economy, which is the envy of the world. We should continue the fight against crime and violence in ways that will work. We should continue the struggle to meet our environmental challenges in ways that will enhance our economy and protect our precious quality of life. We should not withdraw from a world that needs our leadership for peace and freedom.

And yes, we should continue to reform the Government. But my fellow Americans, let me remind you that the Federal Government today is the smallest it's been since 1965, under legislation adopted entirely by Members of our party, without a single, solitary vote from the other side, not one. We are removing 16,000 pages of regulation from the books that we think are not necessary. But what we do not wish to remove is the ability of your Nation to work together, to strengthen the childhoods of poor children in America, to help those working families out there who have children with disabilities, to recognize the dignity of people who have to rely on Medicare and Medicaid for their health care in this world.

We don't believe we should walk away from our partnership with the police on the beat or our partnership with the teachers in the classroom or our partnership with our allies around the world for peace and freedom.

So I say again, if you ask me to put it in a word, it is: Do you believe we're all in this

together, or would you rather go back to the time when Americans were left to fend for themselves?

This is not about big Government. The era of big Government is over. It's about whether you want a weak, divided Government that says, "I hope you do well, but you're out there on your own." The American people don't want that. When there is a disaster, nobody wants a weak emergency management agency. When a small-business person needs to start a business, nobody wants a weak SBA. Do you know that your SBA, your Small Business Administration—we've cut the budget and doubled the loan volume in the last 3 years? And we had to, because we have to make up in new businesses what we're losing in big businesses. Businesses owned by women alone have created more jobs in the last 3 years than the Fortune 500 have laid off. And the Small Business Administration helped that.

So we can do a lot of talk about how nice it would be if we had 20 more seats and Dick Gephardt were Speaker and all of that; that would be really nice for all of us who have to work for you. But the main thing is what your life and your children's life and your country is going to be like. And I'm telling you this election is about two very different visions of change. There is no status quo option.

And you now have a clear, unambiguous record of where we stand and where they stand on all the critical issues for the future. And I ask you not just to stop with the contribution you made tonight, but as citizens in every way you can, with all your voice and all your heart and all your energy to say to all your friends from now until November, "We have to go forward together. We have to do this together. We can't go back to a time when the American people were told to fend for themselves. When we are together, we never lose. The 21st century can be America's greatest time if we will go there together."

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:30 p.m. on the roof at the St. Regis Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Congressman Martin Frost, chairman, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; James J. Florio, former Governor of New Jersey; Mario Cuomo, former Governor of New York; and entertainer Tina Turner.

Remarks on Signing the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996

March 12, 1996

Thank you very much. Welcome to the White House. Senator Helms, Senator Gramm, Senator Mack, Senator Lautenberg, Senator Coverdell, Congressman Menendez, Congressman Torricelli, Congressman Diaz-Balart, Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Congressman Deutsch, Congressman Burton, Congressman Kennedy—I hope I haven't missed any Members of Congress who are here—to the family members of those who were tragically shot down, Ambassador Albright, Assistant Secretary Watson, my fellow Americans.

We are here today around a common commitment to bring democracy to Cuba. Two and a half weeks ago, the world received a harsh reminder of why a democratic Cuba is so important, not only to us but to the people of Cuba. In broad daylight and without justification, Cuban military jets shot down two unarmed United States civilian aircraft, causing the deaths of three American citizens and one U.S. resident. The planes were unarmed, the pilots unwarned. They posed no threat to Cuba's security.

This was clearly a brutal and cruel act. It demanded a firm, immediate response. On my instructions, Ambassador Albright convened the United Nations Security Council, which unanimously deplored Cuba's actions. Dozens of countries around the world expressed their revulsion. Cuba's blatant disregard for international law is not just an issue between Havana and Washington but between Havana and the world.

I ordered also a number of unilateral actions. One of those steps was to have my representa-

tives work closely with Congress to reach prompt agreement on the Cuban Liberty and Democracy Solidarity Act. Within 2 days, and with the extra efforts of our friend Congressman Menendez, Democrats and Republicans came together and produced a better bill. It will strengthen the embargo in a way that advances the cause of freedom in Cuba. Today I sign it with a certainty that it will send a powerful, unified message from the United States to Havana, that the yearning of the Cuban people for freedom must not be denied.

This bill continues our bipartisan effort to pursue an activist Cuba policy, an effort that began some 4 years ago with the Cuban Democracy Act. Under the provisions of that legislation, our administration has encouraged Cuba's peaceful transition to democracy. We have promoted the free flow of ideas to Cuba through greater support for Cuba's brave human rights activists, a dramatic increase in nongovernmental humanitarian aid to the Cuban people, long distance telephone service. And the more the Cuban people are free to express the freedoms and rights their neighbors enjoy the more they will insist on change.

We have also kept the pressure on Cuba by maintaining a tough embargo policy. The legislation I sign today further tightens that embargo. It sends a strong message to the Cuban Government: We will not tolerate attacks on United States citizens and we will stand with those both inside and outside Cuba who are working for a peaceful transition to freedom and democracy.

Finally let me say as I sign this bill into law, I do so in the name of the four men who were killed when their planes were shot down on February 24th: Armando Alejandre, Carlos Costa, Mario de la Pena, and Pablo Morales. In their memory, I will continue to do everything I can to help the tide of democracy that has swept our entire hemisphere finally, finally reach the shores of Cuba.

The Cuban people must receive the blessings of freedom they have been so long denied. And I hope and believe that this day is another important step toward that ultimate goal that so many of you in this audience have worked so hard for, for so very, very long.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:37 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. H.R. 927, approved March 12, was assigned Public Law No. 104–114.

Statement on Signing the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996

March 12, 1996

Today I have signed into law H.R. 927, the "Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996." This Act is a justified response to the Cuban government's unjustified, unlawful attack on two unarmed U.S. civilian aircraft that left three U.S. citizens and one U.S. resident dead. The Act imposes additional sanctions on the Cuban regime, mandates the preparation of a plan for U.S. assistance to transitional and democratically elected Cuban governments, creates a cause of action enabling U.S. nationals to sue those who expropriate or "traffic" in expropriated properties in Cuba, and denies such traffickers entry into the United States. It is a clear statement of our determination to respond to attacks on U.S. nationals and of our continued commitment to stand by the Cuban people in their peaceful struggle for freedom.

Immediately after Cuba's brutal act, I urged that differences on the bill be set aside so that the United States could speak in a single, strong voice. By acting swiftly—just 17 days after the attack—we are sending a powerful message to the Cuban regime that we do not and will not tolerate such conduct.

The Act also reaffirms our common goal of promoting a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba by tightening the existing embargo while reaching out to the Cuban people. Our current efforts are beginning to yield results: they are depriving the Cuban regime of the hard currency it needs to maintain its grip on power; more importantly, they are empowering

the agents of peaceful change on the island. This Act provides further support for the Administration's efforts to strengthen independent organizations in Cuba intent on building democracy and respect for human rights. And I welcome its call for a plan to provide assistance to Cuba under transitional and democratically elected governments.

Consistent with the Constitution, I interpret the Act as not derogating from the President's authority to conduct foreign policy. A number of provisions—sections 104(a), 109(b), 113, 201, 202(e), and 202(f)—could be read to state the foreign policy of the United States, or would direct that particular diplomatic initiatives or other courses of action be taken with respect to foreign countries or governments. While I support the underlying intent of these sections, the President's constitutional authority over foreign policy necessarily entails discretion over these matters. Accordingly, I will construe these provisions to be precatory.

The President must also be able to respond effectively to rapid changes in Cuba. This capability is necessary to ensure that we can advance our national interests in a manner that is conducive to a democratic transition in Cuba. Section 102(h), concerning the codification of the economic embargo, and the requirements for determining that a transitional or democratically elected government is in power, could be read to impose overly rigid constraints on the implementation of our foreign policy. I will continue to work with the Congress to obtain the flexibility needed if the United States is to be in a position to advance our shared interest in a rapid and peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba.

Finally, Title IV of the Act provides for the Secretary of State to deny visas to, and the Attorney General to exclude from the United States, certain persons who confiscate or traffic in expropriated property after the date of enactment of the Act. I understand that the provision was not intended to reach those coming to the United States or United Nations as diplomats. A categorical prohibition on the entry of all those who fall within the scope of section 401 could constrain the exercise of my exclusive authority under Article II of the Constitution to receive ambassadors and to conduct diplomacy. I am, therefore, directing the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to ensure that this provision is implemented in a way that does not interfere with my constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities.

The Cuban regime's lawless downing of two unarmed planes served as a harsh reminder of why a democratic Cuba is vitally important both to the Cuban and to the American people. The LIBERTAD Act, which I have signed into law in memory of the four victims of this cruel attack, reasserts our resolve to help carry the tide of democracy to the shores of Cuba.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 12, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 927, approved March 12, was assigned Public Law No. 104–114.

Remarks on Departure for the Summit of the Peacemakers
March 12, 1996

Good afternoon. As you know, I am on my way to Sharm al-Sheikh for an unprecedented summit in support of peace in the Middle East. I will meet there with the leaders of Israel, many of the Arab countries, Russia, Europe, and other nations to condemn the appalling acts of terror that have occurred in Israel in the last several days and to find ways to combat those who still seek to kill peace with violence.

The will of the people for peace is clearly greater than the forces of division. As we have seen in Northern Ireland and Bosnia and around the world, America must continue to support those who seek peace, and America will continue to support those who seek peace.

This Summit of the Peacemakers can be an important step in the process toward peace in the Middle East. After the summit I will also make a short visit to Israel to stand with the

people there in their time of grief. I will also bring a message that in this time of difficulty and in the battle against terror and the struggle for peace, Israel is not alone.

Before I leave I would also like to say something to the Congress. We face here urgent domestic issues that demand our attention and our action. This Friday the Government will shut down for a third time if Congress does not pass a funding bill. Today I signed a temporary measure to ensure the creditworthiness of the United States until approximately the end of the month. But to preserve the full faith and credit of America, Congress must pass a long-term, straightforward debt extension.

Other significant legislation also awaits action. We should pass a balanced budget plan that reflects our values and supports our economic growth. The Congress and I have identified in common over $700 billion in savings, more than enough to balance the budget in 7 years and to protect Medicare and Medicaid and our investments in education and the environment, and to provide modest but important tax relief.

We should also pass a bipartisan welfare reform bill that genuinely moves people from welfare to work and strengthens families. And we should pass the Kennedy-Kassebaum health care bill so that working people do not lose their health insurance when they change jobs or when someone in the family gets sick.

Agreement on all these bills is clearly within reach. Our Nation must move forward. We cannot wait until after November to do the people's business. We have an obligation to keep the Government open and funded, and we have a distinct opportunity, if we act now, to pass the right kind of balanced budget, welfare reform, and health insurance reform.

I say again to Congress what I said in the State of the Union Address and what I have said repeatedly since: My door is open. I am ready to meet with the leaders of the Congress at any time to move forward on any or all of these matters of national urgency. It is time to put partisan politics aside and work together in the national interest. Spring is coming, and we ought to give the American people a rebirth of bipartisan, productive accomplishment in this new spring.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:46 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With King Hussein of Jordan Aboard Air Force One

March 12, 1996

President's Health

Q. How's your cold?

The President. It's okay. Like I said, Hillary had a cough and then Chelsea was sick and I sort of got it. It'll be gone in a day or two. It's just a head cold, it's not any big deal—just from the neck up.

Q. Does it bother your ears?

The President. No.

Air Force One

Q. You know—[*inaudible*]—is a certified pilot of this aircraft.

The President. Right. Well, he was up there on takeoff. I don't know if he lifted us off or not.

King Hussein. I watched and was very impressed by the wonderful, professional team up there.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. What are you guys going to talk about?

The President. A lot of—[*inaudible*].

Q. Any surprises coming out of this summit, Mr. President? What do you expect?

The President. I don't know. I think a very strong statement will come out of it and that we may have some pretty good ideas come out of it for what we can all do together. I hope so. But I thank His Majesty for standing up for the right thing in the Middle East and helping to get so many other countries involved in this. He's got quite a remarkable array of people actually coming together on short notice.

Q. What would make the meeting a success?

The President. Well, I think a strong united stand for keeping the peace process going and standing against the terror as a precondition of that, because unless people are secure they can't go forward. I think that's the most important thing. And then, obviously, we want to come out with some more concrete steps. We've taken some already; we intend to take some more.

Q. Anything on Iran?

The President. Well, wait a minute, we've got to have the meeting. We haven't had the meeting yet.

Q. What about Syria? What about the lack of Syrians present?

The President. Well, I wish they were there, the Syrians. I wish they were there. But I believe that in terms of continuing the peace process and keeping commitments, that President Asad will do that. And that's very important, very important.

I hope you all get some sleep.

Q. You, too.

The President. It's 10 minutes after 10 Egyptian time—[*laughter*]—so watch a movie and go to bed. It's real important. You're going to have a hard day tomorrow.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10 p.m. In his remarks, the President referred to President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at the Opening of the Summit of the Peacemakers in Sharm al-Sheikh, Egypt

March 13, 1996

Thank you very much. President Mubarak, Your Majesties, Your Highnesses, heads of state, heads of government, Foreign Ministers, and Mr. Secretary-General.

I'd like to begin by thanking President Mubarak for his extraordinary efforts in the last few days to convene this meeting, to host us here, and to make us feel welcome. I thank President Yeltsin, my distinguished cosponsor of the peace process, and all the rest of you who have come so far on such short notice to this very important meeting.

From all around the world we have come to the Sinai to deliver one simple, unified message: Peace will prevail. This summit is unprecedented in the history of the Middle East. It would have been inconceivable just a few short years ago. It stands as proof and promise that this region has changed for good. Leaders from Israel and the Arab world, from Europe, from Asia, from North America, 29 of us, shoulder-to-shoulder, joined in support of peace. We have gathered before to celebrate new milestones in our journey; today we join in common defense against those who would turn us back. We are here because we know what is at stake.

In the 18 years since Egypt and Israel made a miracle at Camp David, Israelis and Arabs have changed the course of history in their lands. Step by step, courageously they have broken with the past, laying down the arms of war and opening their arms to one another. But with every milestone passed along the road of peace and progress, the enemies of peace have grown more desperate and more depraved. They know they cannot compete in the marketplace of ideas; they know they have nothing to offer but hardship and despair. And so they resort to murderous attacks that are an affront to the civilized world and to the moral precepts that lie at the core of the three faiths represented here, as President Mubarak has so eloquently stated.

In the busy streets of Jerusalem, Ashkelon, and Tel Aviv, suicide bombers launched a wave of terror to kill as many Israelis as possible: ordinary men and women riding the bus to work, families shopping for the holidays, innocent children in their Purim costumes, murdered for the blood in their veins. Our hearts go out to the people of Israel and to all the victims of these atrocities, which include also Palestinians and Americans. Many of the nations here today have experienced the nightmare of terror. Death does not discriminate among the terrorists' victims. Over the last 2 weeks, as I

have said, losses were felt not only in Israeli but also in Palestinian, American, and Moroccan homes.

The hard-won achievements of the Palestinian people are under direct assault. The merchants of terror would sell out their future and trade their dreams for despair. And Arab mothers and fathers who seek a better life for their children understand the enemies of peace have targeted them as well.

Let no one underestimate the significance of our gathering here today. Today the wall of division we face is not really between Arab and Israeli. It is instead between those who reach for a better tomorrow and those who rail against it, between those who traffic in hate and terror and those who work for peace.

To the forces of hatred and violence I say, and let us all say, you kill yourselves and others in the aim of killing peace. Yet today, as you see, peace survives. And peace will grow stronger. You will not succeed. Your day has passed. You have plowed the fields of hatred, but here we are coming to reap unity and new strength to defeat you and to keep the promise and hope of peace alive.

We who have gathered in Egypt today are committed to the search for peace. Our very presence here underscores the depth of our dedication. But words and symbols are not enough. The world looks to us now for action, and we must direct our collective resolve in three specific areas.

First, we must be clear in our condemnation of those who resort to terror. Violence has no place in the future we all seek for the Middle East.

Second, we must reinforce our common search for a comprehensive peace. We must press forward until the circle of peace is closed. And we must work to bring the benefits of peace to the daily lives of the people here, for if people lose their hope in peace, the terrorists will have succeeded. This would be the cruelest victory of all, and we must not let it happen.

Third, we must actively counter the terrorists with all the means at our command, combining our efforts tangibly and joining our strength to defeat their evil aims. Chairman Arafat and the Palestinian Authority are responding to that challenge. Each of us here must do our part to help them succeed in their mission. We know we cannot guarantee 100 percent success, but all of us must demand of each other and of ourselves 100 percent effort. The danger we face is urgent, the challenge is clear, but the solidarity of the peacemakers will conquer the forces of division if we will resolve to keep that solidarity.

We stand today as one not far from the mount where God gave the word to Moses, the law of humanity, tolerance, and faith that guides our way today. We are the heirs of that moral legacy whether we be Muslim or Jew or Christian. From many lands and many different traditions we come, today all speaking the language of peace.

In the Bible we are told that when they were grown, Isaac, the patriarch of the Jews, and Ishmael, the patriarch of the Arabs, met but once. They came together at the death of Abraham, the father they shared, the father of both peoples. Today the descendants of Isaac and Ishmael have joined together in a spirit of rebirth to secure the shared promise of a life of peace for all the peoples of this region. Those of us who come here today to stand with them must not allow the forces of the past to deny them the future they seek, that we all seek.

Let our charge go forth from the Sinai today: We will win the battle for peace.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:20 p.m. in the Orangerie Room at the Movenpick Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt, United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, President Boris Yeltsin of Russia, and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority.

The President's News Conference With President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt in Sharm al-Sheikh
March 13, 1996

Summit of the Peacemakers

President Mubarak. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Once again, the nations of the world have rallied together in order to enhance peace and promote security in the Middle East. Many leaders who are not present with us today contacted us to express their solidarity and support for the objectives of the conference.

This site where the Peacemakers Summit was held was the theater of many battles in the unhappy past. Today it has become the living symbol of the new era of peace and coexistence. Our gathering represented all worldly cultures and reflected the real concern for peace and stability in this troubled area. It is our consensus the Sharm al-Sheikh conference was a big success.

All leaders and delegates demonstrated a profound commitment to the promotion of peace and security throughout the region. All of them spoke their minds and discussed the issues in a spirit of openness, candor, and objectivity. Our discussions remained focused on the issues of peace and security. Many valuable contributions were made in the course of the two sessions we held.

There were no sharp disagreements or disputes. The interventions went beyond the customary generalities and dealt with specific points which were quite relevant to the purpose of the summit conference. The outcome of the discussions were properly reflected in the statement which has been distributed to you a while ago.

You have certainly noticed that the conference adopted a set of policies and measures in order to enhance the chance for peace and reinforce the security of all parties directly involved in the peace process. Concrete measures and mechanisms were agreed upon for the purpose of combating terror and the terrorists. All the peoples of the region view terrorism as one of the most dangerous threats to their security and stability, individually and collectively.

It is our hope that the believers in peace and reconciliation who constitute the great majority will triumph over the forces of doom and gloom. Hope will ultimately prevail over despair and fear. It is our hope also the peace process would be activated and revived without delay. As greater security and tranquility are achieved in the area, restrictive measures would be eased and lifted as soon as possible. The living conditions of the innocent people who are suffering in the aftermath of the violence should be improved markedly.

Finally, I would like to say a few words to all those wise leaders who attended the conference. I want to state in this gathering that we are indebted to each and every one of them for their significant contribution and positive spirit. The leaders of the parties who are immediately concerned exhibited their courage and vision. They spoke candidly and positively.

Our Arab brothers exemplified the true spirit of Islam and the Arab culture. Our European friends demonstrated once again that they are fully aware that our two regions are inseparable. Our destiny is one and the same. The cosponsors of the peace process showed the depth of their commitment to peace and security in the Middle East. Each participant in the conference was equally helpful.

President Clinton, who cochaired the meetings, who shares the podium with me, has made invaluable contributions. He worked with me day and night during the past few days. The 7 hours time difference was no barrier or hindrance. He's a statesman of vision and courage.

Before I open the floor to your questions to both of us, I would like to thank you, representatives of the media, for your cooperation and patience. I realize that you are hard-pressed by time and space, but you'll prevail as we will. Thank you.

President Clinton. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Let me begin by thanking President Mubarak for his willingness to host this historic meeting and by the work that he did to help get this amazing group of people together.

This is an historic showing of the strength of peace in the Middle East today. And as the cochairman's statement makes clear, this unprecedented meeting of leaders from this region and from all around the world has been very serious, has been very successful, is very productive. The

statement has been passed out, I believe, to all of you, but I would like to summarize it for the benefit of those who may not have read it yet. And I see some of the members of the press nodding their heads they don't have it yet, so let me just—it's very brief, so let me go over it.

The Summit of Peacemakers has just concluded. This meeting took place at a time when the peace process confronts serious threats. The summit had three fundamental objectives: to enhance the peace process, to promote security, and to combat terror.

Accordingly, the participants here today expressed their full support for the Middle East peace process and their determination that this process continue in order to accomplish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the region; affirmed their determination to promote security and stability and to prevent the enemies of peace from achieving their ultimate objective of destroying the real opportunity for peace in the Middle East; and reemphasized their strong condemnation of all acts of terror in all its abhorrent forms, whatever its motivation and whoever its perpetrator, including recent attacks in Israel, considering them alien to the moral and spiritual values shared by all peoples of the region; and reaffirmed their intention to stand staunchly against all such acts and to urge all governments to join them in this condemnation and opposition.

To that end we decided to support the Israeli-Palestinian agreements, the continuation of the negotiating process, and to politically and economically reinforce it; to enhance the security situation for both with special attention to the current and pressing economic needs of the Palestinians; to support the continuation of the negotiating process in order to achieve a comprehensive settlement; to work together to promote security and stability in the region by developing effective and practical means of cooperation and further assistance; to promote coordination of efforts to stop acts of terror on bilateral, regional, and international levels, ensuring instigators of such acts are brought to justice; supporting efforts by all parties to prevent their territories from being used for terrorist purposes and preventing terrorist organizations from engaging in recruitment, supplying arms, or fundraising; to exert maximum efforts to identify and determine the sources of financing for these groups and to cooperate in cutting them off; and by providing training, equipment, and other forms of support to those taking steps against groups using violence and terror to undermine peace, security, or stability.

Finally, to form a working group open to all summit participants to prepare recommendations on how best to implement the decisions contained in this statement through ongoing work and to report to the participants within 30 days. I can say that President Mubarak and I asked the participants to support an effort by the United States to coordinate an early working group meeting of these—of all the participants here, and we expect to do that within a couple of weeks.

Let me just make one last point. This is a remarkable day because of the number of people from the region who came here, as well as those who came from all around the world. When I leave President Mubarak and Egypt, I will go to Israel with a clear message that Israel is not alone. Now, throughout the region as well as the world, there are peacemakers who stand together against terror, for security, and for the cause of peace. The meeting today and the statements which were made in public by the leaders who were here today would have been unthinkable just a short while ago.

Let me say again to President Mubarak, you, sir, deserve a large share of credit for the fact that this meeting could take place, and it could have taken place in no other place than Egypt. We are grateful to you. And let me say on behalf of the United States, to the people of this region who stand for peace, you can all draw courage and strength and inspiration from what we have achieved here today and what we are committed to do in the future.

Thank you very much.

Palestinian Territories

Q. President Mubarak and President Clinton, I have a question for Egyptian television. President Mubarak and President Clinton, what is your opinion on the closure of Palestinian territories and collective punishment pursued by Israel? Has this conference come up with any decisions to safeguard innocent Palestinians as well, because certain measures were taken against Palestinians right before the conference took place? Thank you.

President Mubarak. Anyway, I think that the closure is starting to be released. We have discussed this—I discussed this with Prime Min-

ister Peres, and it was not going to last long. They opened the gates for supplies for the people, and I think this situation will not stay for a long time.

President Clinton. Yes, we discussed it, and I know that there are many more trucks going in today with basic supplies than yesterday. And I expect to see some changes. But if I might say, viewed through one eye, this is collective punishment. Viewed through another, it is an elemental security measure at a time when it's hard to tell who may be wrapped in plastique. So it's very important that this be seen as a process of strengthening our common efforts against terrorism and for security, and opening the borders.

Obviously the peace cannot succeed unless the people in Gaza have a chance to flourish economically, to reap the benefits of peace. And it is clear that peace and security are two sides of the same coin, not only for the Israelis but for the Palestinians. And having voted for peace, as the Palestinians have, they now are bound up together in a mutual destiny. And it is in all of our interests to see that both of them succeed in becoming more secure and more peaceful.

Terrorist Nations

Q. President Clinton, Prime Minister Peres and John Major both talked of Iran as a source of terrorism. He also mentioned Libya. Why did this conference not single out any of the nations that you accuse of sponsoring terrorism, point fingers, and impose or try to impose any kind of sanctions on these nations?

President Clinton. Well, I think you know my statements on that issue have been quite clear and forthright, and the United States has taken very strong actions there. Let me answer you in this way: The nations here in what they agreed to do—and if you go back to my statement, this is a remarkable statement that every person here agreed that we would together take specific steps, including dealing with funding sources. I believe that's a pretty explicit commitment on our part to do what we can within our means to reduce terrorism in the area. And I believe that we shouldn't diminish what we did do by focusing on what was not done or said. What was done and said is far more than has ever been done and said by people working together in this region.

President Mubarak. We don't want to accuse so many—mention any country now in the time being, but we condemn all kinds of terrorism wheresoever. And to condemn some countries who have—[*inaudible*]—should have definite reasons for that.

Syria

Q. President Mubarak and President Clinton, aren't you gentlemen worried or even bothered that something in the success of this conference is lacking as a result of the absence of a major player in the peace process in the Middle East, and I mean Syria?

President Mubarak. Look, Syria is committed to peace. This conference is dealing with the peace process in general, and to see that or to condemn the terrorism and seek for security. Syria, although she didn't attend the conference—and it had its own reasons—but she said she is committed to peace, and I think she is ready to start negotiations for peace.

President Clinton. Obviously, from our point of view, we wish the Syrians had come. President Mubarak invited them; we had urged them to come. But I wouldn't overread their absence here; it's part of a general pattern of going their own way.

I was encouraged by the statement which was issued today, and I do believe that the Syrians still want to achieve a peace with Israel at the earliest practical time. Again I say to you, you can focus on what didn't happen today, but if you do, it will blind you to what has happened, which no one would have conceived of happening even a few months ago.

And if you watch, we're going to follow up on this, and this agreement is very specific about what we're going to do. I should also talk about—we're talking about what didn't happen—no one can promise in Israel, in Gaza, in the United States, that—in Egypt—that there will never again ever be an act of terrorism. What we can promise is that we are working hard, we are increasing our capabilities to combat it, and we are going to reduce it and raise the price of doing it. And that is what we committed to do.

Likud Party Leader Binyamin Netanyahu

Q. President Clinton, can you tell me why you decided on this upcoming trip to Jerusalem to visit Mr. Netanyahu and what you plan to tell him?

President Clinton. Oh, I visited with him when I was there last time, and I always—typically, when I'm in any country, I visit with leaders of both parties. And I expect what I will do is to reaffirm my determination to fight for both peace and security for Israel, and I will listen to him, which is what I did the last time I was there.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. President Mubarak, President Clinton, do you have the feeling or the conviction now, in the light of the last days' and even hours' discussions, that—and decisions, probably—that the peace process will continue soon and that there will not be a long gap? And do you share the view of some political observers who believe that a long pause now will be extremely detrimental to the whole peace process?

President Mubarak. I would like to tell you that the peace process, although she is meeting some problems, and we expect every now and then until we reach the final goal, we expect that we are going to meet some problems, but that doesn't mean that the peace process will stop. The peace process—we met here today just at least to stop the deterioration of the implementation of the peace agreements.

I think it's a very important point for the peace process to continue. The Syrians have already declared that they are committed to peace. So we shouldn't worry because peace is so precious and it is going on and there is no other way else for the region except to go through the peace.

President Clinton. Let's be candid here. The purpose of the terror was to kill the peace. I mean, the purpose of the terror was to make the Israelis feel so insecure that peace seemed worse—that pursuing the peace process seemed worse than some reversion to the status quo. And the purpose of the terror was to make sure that the Palestinians wound up suffering economically so much they no longer wanted to pursue the peace.

Our purpose here is to try to bolster the level of confidence among Israelis and Palestinians to say that we need peace and security and basic prosperity, and we need to pursue all three at once. The pace of these processes is not within anyone's total control, as President Mubarak said. But what we know is if we keep pushing forward, if we don't permit it to slip backward, that in the end we believe we will succeed because all the parties not only want peace but it is in their interest to achieve it. And so the short answer to your question is, I believe we will prevail on whatever timetable, unless the enemies of peace can raise the pain of pursuing peace to the Israelis or to the Palestinians so high it seems pointless to them.

Iran Sanctions and Security in Israel

Q. Mr. President, you answered this question in a more general way but I wondered, after listening to Prime Minister Peres, if you are willing as the President of the United States to issue a challenge to all of the countries here to isolate Iran, not to do business with them, since it appears that they are in fact the major sponsors of Hamas? And I also wanted to ask you in regard to some of the other points you made here, if you were a family member of one of the victims in Israel—we've watched all of these anguished faces—do you think that you would feel, with so many of today's accomplishments yet to be achieved, that you would want this to go forward without a lot more security, the things that the Israeli people are demanding?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, let me remind you that last year I took far stronger steps against Iran than any of our European allies had taken up to that point. And many of them disagree with me honestly. They believe that it's better to maintain some dialog, to have some engagement. I have continued to argue for the isolation of rogue states. I did it in the United Nations last year, and I continue to do that, and I will continue to do that based on the evidence we have at hand.

In answer to your second question, I don't know how I would feel if I had lost a child. Anyone who says that you know exactly how you would act if you had lost a child, unless you've lost a child, you don't know that. I can tell you this, that I met with the two American Jewish families who lost their children recently, two of them, in New Jersey the other day, and their reactions, I think, are pretty reflective of the Israelis.

One family—a woman who lost her daughter, her other daughter is about to go back to Israel to continue her studies and feels strongly that the peace process should continue because unless it continues there will never be any long-term security for the people of Israel. The other family, the father of a slain daughter, has spent

a lot of time going around our own country speaking up for the importance of peace, but he is very concerned about security because he knows unless people are secure they won't feel free to make peace. And I don't think that means they're ambivalent or wishy-washy. I think it means that they understand that these are two sides of the same coin.

There must be a certain level of security in order for people to feel free to pursue peace. But unless we ultimately resolve these questions in a peace agreement, there will never be the kind of security that normal life brings and that people expect in the normal course of day-to-day events.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. Mubarak, in the light of the discussions of the day and in the light of the final statement, what are the steps adopted by this conference for us to guarantee that the peace process will go back to its normal course? Another question—that is, the guarantees presented by this conference so that the peace process might not run into difficulties again.

President Mubarak. Well, in reality when it comes—[*inaudible*]—you cannot guarantee 100 percent that it will not be met with obstacles. I think nobody on Earth can guarantee this. Nobody on Earth can guarantee that there will be no terrorist acts to stop the peace process or to impede it. We must make sure that this will not happen, and this is why we have to take steps for security.

Now, there are steps that were mentioned in the statement. We also decided to set up a committee to follow up this statement and to guarantee the peace process, and we talk about terrorism because terrorism seeks to impede this peace process. So it's two aspects. We wish to denounce terrorism, to struggle against it, and there are also means and ways, procedures specified in the statement to struggle against terrorism.

Extremist Movement

Q. President Clinton, I'd like to ask this question of you. Have you not adopted a series of mechanical means to combat what is essentially an ideological movement, namely Islamic extremism, a movement which in fact has caused great tragedy not only in Israel but also in Egypt and even in the United States and other countries? Should you not deal with the problem directly instead of through euphemisms?

President Mubarak. I'll surely tell you that you are mentioning only Islamic—Muslims, like any other religion—Islam, like any other religion, is against violence, against any act of violence under any title.

President Clinton. I want to support President Mubarak. He has taken action within Egypt to deal with the problems here. I am gratified that in our most serious terrorist incidents we have made arrests quickly, and in the cases where the legal process has run its course, we have achieved convictions with strong sentences.

That does not mean—and in each of these countries, the facts may be somewhat different. So I don't think we're speaking in euphemisms when we talk about the terror here being tied up with the question of getting peace in the Middle East. But Islamic—to equate Islam with terror I think is a big mistake. I mean, the Japanese dealt with it in the Tokyo subway with the sarin gas. We dealt with it at Oklahoma City. People all over the world are coming to grips with it. The British are having their buildings blown up again.

So I think you have to look at this in every country, in every place it rears its head, and see how it can be dealt with. The problem here is that the terror is associated with people who do not want a peaceful resolution in the Middle East. If we had a peaceful resolution in the Middle East and if the Palestinian Authority had time to develop as an ordinary government, they would have more and more and more capacity to deal with the terrorism on their own. And that's what we're talking about.

One last question. Shall we take one last question?

Middle East Peace Process

Q. A question for President Mubarak. Madrid Conference II is an idea which was presented by Russia and by Syria, and again today it was presented by Saudi Arabia. What's your point of view about it, and will it be proposed to save the peace process?

President Mubarak. Look, Madrid Conference, Cairo Conference, Moscow Conference, Washington Conference—it is—are issues which should be tackled and discussed and come out with a resolution to help the process to continue. When the Saudis said about Madrid—just to check if the peace process continues or

to help. We have discussed a very important issue which is handling the peace process, security, and terrorist action. This is very important because it is laying the peace process. So I don't think Madrid or Washington or Moscow or Egypt or France doesn't deal—the name of the town will solve the problem.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 115th news conference began at 3:50 p.m. in the courtyard at the Movenpick Hotel. Participants referred to Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel and Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom.

Remarks on Arrival in Tel Aviv, Israel
March 13, 1996

Thank you. Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, members of the Israeli Government, representatives of the people of Israel. I am honored to be here today, again, to stand with you in a time of pain and mourning and challenge. We grieve with you in the loss of innocent lives; we pray with you for the scores who lie wounded; we stand with you in the unceasing battle against those who commit these awful crimes. Your journey is our journey, and America will be with you every step of the way.

The attacks we mourn claimed Israeli lives, although others, including Americans, died as well. But these attacks were aimed at all who yearn for a better day for this region, for all who believe that peace is better than war. The enemies of peace have grown desperate and more vicious as the reality of peace has moved closer. But we must not let the acts of the wicked few destroy the dreams of the many. Together we must restore the security that building peace requires. Those who practice terror must not succeed. We must root them out, and we will not let them kill the peace.

In this time you are not alone. I have flown here with the Prime Minister, as he said, from Sharm al-Sheikh, from a Summit of Peacemakers that is unprecedented in the history of the Middle East. At the urging of many who were once Israel's sworn enemies—Egypt, Jordan, the Palestinians—29 leaders came together, 13 of them from Arab countries. There were Israel neighbors, there were other Arab nations, nations from Europe, North America, and Asia. All have long labored for peace. All are now united against the terror aimed at Israel. They came to support with deeds as well as words the peace process and the restoration of security and new efforts against terrorism.

Only a few years ago, such a meeting would have been inconceivable. Only a few weeks ago, such a meeting would have been hard to imagine. Just a few days ago, this remarkable meeting was put together.

The leaders of this area have met only a handful of times, and then always to celebrate events on the road to peace. But today they met in common cause to take action to confront the urgent threat of terrorism, to show that Hamas, Hezbollah, the Islamic Jihad will not succeed in killing the peace.

Now many of Israel's neighbors in the region have demonstrated that they share your desire for peace, and they understand that extremist violence is also their enemy. The nations that met in Sharm al-Sheikh sowed the seeds for a new cooperation to build peace and to confront those who would destroy it. The Middle East is changing; we must not, we will not let terror reverse history.

Sharm al-Sheikh was a beginning. Tomorrow we will press forward when I and senior administration officials meet with the Prime Minister and his key security advisers. We will discuss concrete steps the United States can take to help the IDF and the Israeli police defeat those who would murder and maim. No one takes greater personal risks on behalf of peace than the brave men and women of Israel's security forces, like those who are standing here. America is determined to support them in every way and to provide them with the means they need to prevail against extremism and violence.

I have visited this beautiful and holy land before. I have celebrated a great event on the road to peace. I have mourned Prime Minister Rabin. Today I come again in sorrow but also in determination with this message from the

American people: The United States stands more strongly than ever, shoulder-to-shoulder, with Israel. We will work with you as you strive for a secure peace. We will stand by your side until Israelis come to know that peace with security within this land is a reality, "until," in the words of the prophet, "the voice of joy and the voice of gladness are heard again in the cities and the hills of Israel."

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:21 p.m. at Ben-Gurion Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel and Sheval Weis, Speaker of the Knesset.

Remarks Following Discussions With President Ezer Weizman of Israel and an Exchange With Reporters in Jerusalem, Israel

March 13, 1996

The President. Let me say that it is a great honor to be back at the President's house and with the President again. And along with the Prime Minister, we were able to give a report on our impressions of what happened at Sharm al-Sheikh today and what the significance of it was, and then we talked a little bit about the challenges ahead. We spent about an hour in a very good discussion, and as always when I'm with the President, I learned a lot and I leave with a lot of food for thought.

But I feel much better about our prospects for presenting a united front against terror and for security and therefore creating and maintaining conditions under which the peace process can proceed than I did before I went to Sharm al-Sheikh today. And I thank the Prime Minister for his work, and I say again, I came here more than anything else just to once again express the solidarity of the United States with Israel, grief at your loss, and our determination to do what we can both to restore your security and to preserve the march of peace.

Israel's Capital

Q. President Clinton, do you have any reflections on President Weizman not going to the airport, obviously intending thereby to demonstrate Israel's historic commitment to Jerusalem being its capital, a position that you endorsed yourself during your campaign but we haven't heard much from you on since? Do you have any feeling about that situation you'd like to share with us?

The President. No. My feeling is what it has been ever since the first agreement was reached in which Israel and the Palestinian Authority agreed that that would be part of the final negotiations. And the United States agreed that we would support the process that Israel had fashioned, and that's what I intend to continue to do. I haven't changed my position on anything. I just—I believe that we are a partner in a process that primarily affects the Israelis and the neighbors of Israel, and we ought to support the process that the parties agreed to for resolving all those matters.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 p.m. at President Weizman's residence. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel in Jerusalem

March 14, 1996

Prime Minister Peres. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, under the administration of President Clinton, this is the fourth important move that took place in the Middle East. The

first was the agreement, the first agreement with the PLO; then the agreement with Jordan; then the second agreement with the PLO; now the fourth agreement in the Middle East to confront terrorism.

Those are events that exceeds any normal political achievement. The Palestinian conflict looked like insolvable. The Jordanians were not quick at the beginning to make peace, and then it became a great success. Then we have encountered the danger to all these three achievements by the acts of terror. In my eyes, President Clinton is the first world leader that put on the agenda peace in our time as the major goal.

If you look back at history, most of the time was spent on wars, on cold wars, on confrontations. It was a chance for the first time to escape all the bitter histories of blood and terror. And then we have encountered again another uninvited and unprecedented problem, how to go ahead with peace when you have acts of terror. I think yesterday a foundation was laid down to do both, namely to go ahead with peace and reject terror. I tell you, Mr. President, that in our eyes, you, your administration, the American Congress, have changed the whole destiny of the Middle East.

The importance of the Middle East is not just because it has produced religions and Bible, the importance of the Middle East that, in our times, it is the first testing ground to take many conflicts that were so difficult to solve and try to solve them. If we shall succeed, I think it may serve as the model to other places.

For us, President Clinton is really a great leader, but not less than that, a moving friend. He has a tear in his eyes when we go through a difficult period of time, and we have a tear in our eyes when we are listening to his reaction and involvement. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you. First, I would like to express my appreciation to the Prime Minister and his Cabinet for the meeting that we had this morning just before coming over here to discuss the situation with regard to terrorism and the recent bombings. We have decided that the United States and Israel will immediately begin negotiations to conclude a bilateral agreement on combating terrorism. I told the Prime Minister that the United States will commit more than $100 million to this effort.

I am taking this step because I am determined that we must have every tool at our disposal to fight against extremist violence. Last night I sent to the Congress an urgent request for the first installment of this counterterrorism effort. I expect Congress to act quickly on this important measure.

The agreement will strengthen our attack on terror in three important areas. First, the United States will immediately begin to provide Israel with additional equipment and training. Second, our nations will join together to develop new antiterror methods and technologies. Third, we will work to enhance communications and coordination between our nations, as well as other governments who have joined with us in the war against terror.

In addition to what we propose to do under this agreement, the United States will also increase its intelligence sharing and coordination. At my direction, our Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, and the Director of Central Intelligence, John Deutch, will remain in Israel to speed the progress of this agreement. We must do everything we can to track down those responsible for the recent violence, and we must work to prevent them from shedding more innocent blood.

The forces supporting peace and security are stronger than those that pursue destruction. We must prove that. Whatever effort it takes, whatever time it takes, we must say to them: You will be tracked down; you will be rooted out. The message of the pact to the people of Israel should also be quite clear: Just as America walks with you every step of the way as you work toward peace, we stand with you now in defending all that you are and all that has been accomplished. Without security, there is no peace. And ultimately, without peace, there can be no permanent security. Therefore, we are resolved to work with you until the day that Israel achieves peace with security. To give up hope for peace now or to fail to stand up for security after all that has been done would be to give the terrorists their victory.

To speak of Israel is to speak of courage and character, to speak of strength in the face of decades of hardship and bloodshed. David Ben-Gurion once said, "I have seen what a people is capable of achieving in their hour of supreme trial. I have seen their spirit touched by nobility."

For those of us in the rest of the world, after the ordeal of these bombings we have seen once again the nobility that is Israel. As a result of the meeting in Sharm al-Sheikh yesterday, I have seen for the first time a broad-based commitment to making sure the noble people of Israel and the peace-loving peoples throughout this region may be able to live and work together against terrorism and for a peaceful future.

Thank you.

Israel-U.S. Security Relationship

Q. Mr. President, you just announced the signing of an agreement between Israel and the United States about combating terrorism. I would like to ask you, will you consider positively the idea of signing a defense pact between Israel and the United States, and will you discuss this idea with Mr. Peres when he will come to the United States toward the end of April?

The President. Well, first of all, the United States is committed to the security of Israel. We have long been committed to the security of Israel, and it is not a new event with my administration; it has been a bipartisan American commitment for a long time. And we are always looking for ways to improve the nature of our security relationship and the strength of Israel's security. We have, in fact, in addition to the announcement that I made today, a small group of people working on the question of what we should do next and where we should go with this relationship. The Prime Minister and I discussed it a little bit today, and I expect we will discuss it further when he comes to the United States in April.

President's Visit

Q. Mr. President, the opposition in Israel is quite skeptical, I may say even cynical about your visit here. They say you came mainly to rescue the Prime Minister before the coming elections. They say the conference in Sharm al-Sheikh will do nothing in order to prevent terrorism. What can you tell them?

The President. Well, I don't want to put words in their mouth, but I came here because you have over 60 people dead in the last few days as a result of terrorism; because the United States is your ally and friend; and because we believe without an effort to reestablish security and a feeling of security, it will be difficult for the progress of peace to go forward. In addition to the Israelis who were killed, there were Americans killed, there were Palestinians killed, there were Moroccans killed. So that's why I came here at this moment.

We put together the meeting in Sharm al-Sheikh along with President Mubarak because I felt that the time was right for other countries in the region and around the world to demonstrate to the nations here most affected, especially Israel, and to the Palestinians who have rejected terror, that they are not alone, that it's about time that other countries stood up and said, this is wrong, we're going to stand against it, and we're going to work against it.

I do not interfere in the internal politics of other nations, and I believe that, at least if the American experience is any indication, it would be more of a hindrance than a help. This is a democracy; I respect the results of democracy here and at home. I came here because of what happened to you and because of our relationship with you.

America stands with Israel in times like this and because we have to act to go forward. Now, nobody—let me just say this—nobody can guarantee to the people of Israel or the people of the United States or the people of any open, free nation in the world absolute protection against any terrorist act. We have been victimized by terrorism; the Japanese have been victimized by terrorism—essentially a very peaceful society. But we can do more to identify the sources of support, to try to dry up money, to develop better technical and other means to prevent things from happening.

So there is no guarantee here. There are no guarantees in life against this, but we can do a lot better. And I've thought that the shock of the impact here was so great—not only in Israel, but in the other areas—it was high time we showed up and did more about it, and that's why I came.

Antiterrorism Efforts

Q. Mr. President, the type of terror attacks that have been going on in Israel have been going on for quite a while. Why hasn't something like what you announced today been done quite a while ago, and to what degree was the delay, if you can call it that, a result of opposition from within the Israeli Government?

The President. Oh, I would say not at all, on the latter question. I think, frankly, we all thought that the effort—first of all, we have

been making a lot of extra efforts since, at least—I can speak for since I've been President. We have constantly tried to upgrade our capacity to deal with the problems of terrorism. And we have met with some considerable amount of success both in dealing with terrorism within the United States and in cooperating with our friends around the world.

But what I think has happened is, I think that the impact of these incidents coming so close together and being so clearly directed at derailing the peace process and undermining those who want peace—primarily in Israel, but also among the Palestinians and in the region—has had such a shocking impact on other Arab nations and others around the world that we were able to put together this meeting at Sharm al-Sheikh in a hurry as a result of their changed sense of urgency. And if you listened to those—I know it was difficult for those of you who were there, particularly those of you who came from the United States with little sleep—but if you listened to those 29 separate statements yesterday and you compare that to anything that Arab leaders especially had said before about Israel or about terrorism, there was a remarkable shift there.

And so I wouldn't say that we're just trying to do more now, and I think we have the capacity to do more. I also think it's obvious that we have to do more to support and insist on greater effectiveness in the Palestinian Authority. I think that's the other thing that hit home to everyone as a result of these events.

Is there another question from an American journalist?

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you about Congress' handling of your antiterrorist legislation. Yesterday the House voted to delete a provision to ban foreign fundraising in the United States. Do you think this bill is on the right track?

The President. Excuse me, would you—they voted to delete what?

Q. Foreign fundraising in the United States. Do you think this weakens the bill? Is it on the right track? How do you think they're handling it?

The President. Well, of course I think it should have passed months ago, and I don't know why it wasn't. We have a lot of resources to combat terrorism now; we would like some more. The bill had been transformed and things have been added to it that weren't necessarily urgent, but I'm very concerned that because of the hearings we had earlier in the year about some of the developments in the United States, I'm afraid there's a little too much domestic political considerations maybe in the debate of the antiterrorism bill and not enough focus on the global aspects of terrorism and how we need these tools to combat terrorists from abroad and what terrorists from abroad might do within the United States. That's the reason I put forward the legislation, and I would hope that Congress would focus on that and keep those two elements in mind in moving through this bill and passing a good one.

Palestinian Territories

Q. I would like to ask the President and the Prime Minister about the closure that could jeopardize the whole peace process according to the Palestinians' claim.

Prime Minister Peres. Well, the closure is not aimed against the Palestinians in Gaza or the West Bank. There are really, to answer, some security needs. The minute we shall overcome it, the closure will reach its end. We are trying very hard not to create any starvation or any suffering in the territories. This is clearly a security measure and nothing else.

The President. To be fair, I mean, I think that's a legitimate concern. But that's one of the—that's clearly one of the objectives of the terrorists. And I think that's the point we were trying to make at Sharm al-Sheikh yesterday, that the Israelis and the people who are not only—the people who died, their families, their friends, this country, your attitudes, that's primarily the target of the terrorists. But they're also trying to get to the people in the—the Palestinians who would like to have a peaceful future. And so they know that if they can put Israel in a position of closing the territories as a security measure, they then have a chance to change the attitude of the Palestinians.

So it's a deliberate attempt by them to make the Palestinians as miserable as possible. And in that sense the Palestinians are the targets of the terror as well; that was the point we were hammering home yesterday in Sharm al-Sheikh and why it's so important that Mr. Arafat and his administration do everything possible to cooperate with us in rooting this out so that we can keep the free flow of transportation open and so that they can enjoy their jobs and have access to food and do all the things that they

need to do, because if it becomes—look, countries are like individuals and families. If you have to choose anything over your continued existence, you will always choose your continued existence. Security will take preference. So these people are not stupid. They're doing this to provoke the reaction that they got. And we have to stand against them together.

Terrorism

Q. Mr. President, in an editorial this morning highly critical of Mr. Arafat, the Jerusalem Post makes the point that the bloodshed here would be the equivalent of killing 10,000 Americans over 31 months, and they further say that American people would not "be pacified by the mindless platitudes" that went on yesterday in Egypt. Your reaction?

The President. Well, I think the—I do believe if you think about the American people losing 10,000 over 30 months, or several thousand in a matter of just 3 weeks, and if you compound that by saying that every American felt that that had happened within about 50 miles of where he or she lived—that's another thing you can't overlook, the density, the geographical dimension of this, so that every Israeli feels that this happened next door—that our people would be off the wall. They would be angry, they would be furious, they would want action, they would want what the Israeli people want.

But I think if you look at the extent to which the terrorists' networks which are active in this area have mobility and have ties beyond Israel proper, beyond the Palestinian areas proper, it is wrong to say that the rather specific commitments that we got from those countries to work together to try to dry up their sources of support and move as one against them was an empty commitment. I showed up here today to say I will be the first, the United States will stand up first, here's our $100 million, here's what we're going to do with it, here's how we're going to work together. These are not empty commitments.

It is not easy for democratic societies to defeat organized forces of destruction. The end of the cold war means that there will in all probability, and we hope, be less conflict among nation-states. There will be more conflict in the future by people who organize themselves for illegitimate means through terrorism and who try to access the dangerous weapons—traditional, biological, and chemical weapons—who try to use the forces of organized crime and the money they can get from drug trafficking to build a network of destruction, if you will, that can cross the boundaries of nation-states. I believe this is a problem—the Prime Minister alluded to this earlier—this is today Israel's problem, it's the Middle Eastern problem, but it will be the principal security problem of the future, and I think we had better get after it. And that's what we're trying to do.

Israel-U.S. Security Relationship

Q. Mr. President, would a defense pact between Israel and the United States limit Israel's ability to strike at Hezbollah for example?

The President. Well, first of all, the decision has not been made, either in Israel or in the United States, to go beyond the agreement that we announced today and our clear, unambiguous, longstanding commitment to Israel's security, to maintaining its qualitative advantage in defense capacity. But the discussions that we have under way about what we can do from here on out obviously would have to encompass every conceivable contingency. And that's why I urge you not to jump ahead. We're going to really have serious discussions about what we should do to strengthen Israel's security and our relationship. But let's not undermine the impact of what we're announcing today, which will do just that. It's very important.

Syria

Q. Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, I have a question about Syria for both of you. First of all, Mr. President, you have on two occasions met with President Asad. You went to Damascus once, you met with him in Geneva once, even though the State Department continues to include Syria on the official list of countries that support terrorism. Syria's decision not even to send a representative to Sharm al-Sheikh must have been a severe blow to you personally given your courting, if you will, of President Asad over the past few years to engage in the peace process. How much of a setback will that be in terms of Israeli-Syrian negotiations?

And to you, Mr. Prime Minister, you mentioned that Iran was a capital of terror yesterday, but you didn't mention anything about Syria and its absence from this conference yesterday. Can you continue negotiations with Syria at this point after President Asad decided not even to send a representative to Sharm al-Sheikh?

Prime Minister Peres. Well, both to the first question of the previous question and this one, let's take things seriously as they are.

About the Palestinians—I'm referring to the editorial in the Jerusalem Post—yes, we can mobilize the whole of the Palestinians against us. It is very easy. We can take measures and steps and return to the time of intifada, push back the PLO to become a terroristic organization, or work gradually with all the pains from a majority of the Palestinians who support today peace to a complete support of peace by the Palestinians. We shouldn't submit to minorities.

Now, frankly about Syria and Iran, there is a similarity because there are headquarters of terroristic organizations in Damascus. But there is also a difference. Syria does not call today, like Iran does, for the destruction of Israel. Syria is negotiating with Israel to look for a peace, which Iran refuses completely. So we didn't reach yet the necessary agreement, but we don't want to close all the doors. And to be fair I think what we have to do is to impress the Syrians with the need to depart from any support or shelter to terror and terrorism, but not to kill the future.

And I agree that the peacemakers do have a much more complicated road to go. It's not black and white. It's like climbing a mountain; it is difficult, it takes time, you don't reach the peak in one jump. So what is necessary to retract we shall retract in clear terms, and I think we shall clearly make it known that we cannot support terroristic headquarters in Damascus or elsewhere. But at the same time and by the same token, we shall continue the peace effort. Our purpose is not to submit to terror, but to overcome it when it is necessary by force and otherwise by hope.

The President. My answer to your question is I was disappointed that no Syrian representative came and I think it was a mistake, but I was not surprised because if you look at the pattern of all these developments since I have been President and indeed, before, President Asad tends to deal with these matters with people one-on-one. And to have Syria steer a different course, I think it was a missed opportunity for the Syrians and I wish that they had been there. But I do not believe that undermines the fundamental fact that the United States is committed to support Israel if Israel is involved in negotiations and is taking risks for peace.

And as long as there are fruitful negotiations going on—we know there will never be a comprehensive peace in the Middle East until there is a resolution of the differences between Israel and Syria. We also know if those differences were resolved the capacity of the Syrians to help to live up to any agreement they might make and to create a more secure region is very considerable. So my position is that the negotiations should absolutely continue as long as Israel is prepared to be a part of that, and we should support that.

Antiterrorism Efforts

Q. With your permission, I would like to relate to a question I heard several times yesterday from different people. The question was, how can a conference like yesterday's persuade a person who's got a bomb strapped around his middle to turn it off or take it off or not set it off? I think they're asking, do you have any short-term answers for terrorism or are your solutions only long term?

Prime Minister Peres. We have a collection of answers, not one—short terms and long terms. But you know, it's again a very simplistic way of putting the question. For example, if we can dry out the sources of finance to this man that goes finally with the bomb, will it help or not? My answer is yes. If we can stop the traffic of arms, will it help or not? It will, yes.

I mean people are confusing; we are fighting on three different fronts in order to create one system and do it systematically. One is domestically, to increase our forces, to fortify our borders, to control the passages, and when necessary, to put a closure—instead of the conference in Sharm al-Sheikh. As a matter of fact, what is so interesting is that in spite of the closure and in spite of this measure, the conference in Sharm al-Sheikh took place. So even the Arabs understand that those were necessary measures.

Then we have demands from the Palestinian side. We don't ask them to defend us, but we ask them clearly to have just one armed authority in Gaza to put order at home, that Gaza cannot become a headquarter for terror in other ways. And then, by the leadership of the President, we are organizing practically the whole world to stop the traffic of arms, the supply of money, the shelter to the murderers, the mobilization of the existing systems, police, or intel-

ligence, whatever it is, to cooperate and put an end to it, because terror is becoming an international phenomenon; it is also in a way global.

So I don't understand all this criticism. I think people simply—those who criticize—didn't think about the question.

The President. If I might follow up, if you had to answer the question the way you asked it, the answer would be no, no one can do that. But no one could have done that before this meeting, and no one can do that 6 months from now.

I wish I had it in my power to reach into the hearts of those young men who have bought some apocalyptic version of Islam and politics that together causes them to strap their bodies with bombs and blow themselves to smithereens and kill innocent children. I wish I could do that. I don't pretend to be able to do that. But that's not the question. The question is, can we improve the capacity of Israel and of the Palestinian Authority to prevent these things from occurring? The answer to that question is yes.

Second question, can we improve our capacity to break up the networks of money and materiel that make these things possible? The answer to that is yes. Can we create a risk-free world here in Israel? No. Can we reduce the risks and do much better? Yes. That is the way we should look at this and that is the focus we should take. You know, I couldn't do that in the United States. Is it less likely that someone could do what happened in Oklahoma City again in the United States? I think it is because of steps we have taken. Is it absolutely certain that nothing like that will ever happen again? No.

As long as you have free societies where people have some ability to move, some right of privacy, some ability to transfer funds, and some ability to get access to materials that can be made into bombs, you cannot have a totally risk-free world. What we are trying to do is to reduce the risks, to reduce the likelihood of this, to prevent more of these things from happening, to catch more of the wrongdoers. That's what we're trying to do. We can absolutely do that, and that should be the focus.

Iran and Saudi Arabia

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you specifics, two specific questions related to yesterday's conference. You met with all the European leaders privately. Do you feel you have an assurance from them—they last week had asked the Iranians to condemn terrorism; they didn't get what they asked for. Do you sense from them they're now willing to go forward and get tougher in their relations with Iran? They haven't really followed your dual containment program with the Iranians. Do you see this as a turning point in their policy toward the Iranians in your discussions with them yesterday, because people are looking for very specifics?

Second, do you sense in your talks with the Saudis that they're now willing to turn off the spigot because they've allowed funds to go to Hamas? I just would like to know, I think the Israeli public would like to know, do you have a sense of assurance on specifics? Because the principles were set out, and you said in a month there will be this working group, but can you just give us a sense from these European and Gulf leaders what they are willing to do specifically? Thank you.

The President. Well, I would have to give you two separate answers. To the first question, when I announced an even stronger policy against Iran last year, I think it's fair to say that the leaders, most European leaders thought I was wrong and disagreed with me. I believe now they're having second thoughts. And I received some indications—I think it's quite important that I not speak for them and go beyond what they're prepared to say in public, but based on my private conversations, I did believe that there was a change in attitude and direction in the minds of some of the European leaders with whom I met.

With regard to Saudi Arabia, that specific question was not discussed, nor as you would imagine could the Foreign Minister discuss that on his own. We didn't have a bilateral meeting yesterday. But the thing I will say about it is that we know that the Middle Eastern leaders, the Arab State leaders are quite careful about what they say. And a lot of times the phrases and words they use carry a lot of historic either meaning or baggage, depending on the perspective you have, about what they say. He said some things yesterday that no Saudi leader had ever said before. So I am hopeful, but I had received no explicit commitments, because we didn't have a private conversation.

On the European front I can tell you that I had the distinct impression that our view, which I think is the view broadly held in Israel,

I know it is, is making some inroads among the Europeans. I mean, you only—how many times does it have to be demonstrated to them what the facts are, and we are perfectly prepared to do everything we can to demonstrate to them what the facts are, and obviously we need their help if we're going to really keep turning up the heat on this issue.

It is regrettable, but the Iranians are committed to supporting these terrorist activities and glorifying them, totally ignoring the progress of the last several years, totally ignoring the facts, totally ignoring what is happening. Now, that's just the fact. And every country in the world that deals with them is going to have to just wake up in the morning, look in the mirror, and decide whether they're going to stay with the policy they have or change it, and whether the policy is based on principle or some other basis.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 116th news conference began at 11:19 a.m. in the auditorium at the Jerusalem Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Minister of Foreign Affairs Saud al-Faysal bin Abd al-Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Likud Party Leader Binyamin Netanyahu in Jerusalem

March 14, 1996

Q. Mr. President, if Mr. Netanyahu comes into power, will you cooperate with him as deeply as you cooperate with Prime Minister Peres?

The President. I will certainly cooperate with him. Israel is a democracy. The Israeli voters will make their decision in a few weeks, and the United States relationship with Israel is deep, strong, and enduring. Of course I would.

And I don't think there is much partisan difference in our country or yours on this question of fighting against terrorism. It's one of the great challenges the world faces. We've go to do a better job. We've got to strengthen it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:10 p.m. in the Presidential suite at the Laromme Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With Students in Tel Aviv

March 14, 1996

The President. Thank you, Liad, for your introduction and for your fine remarks. She did a good job representing the young people of Israel, didn't she? You did a great job. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, thank you for your welcome and your vigorous and important statement. My friend Prime Minister Peres, thank you for your many wonderful words. I hope that in our common pursuit of peace I can be worthy of them.

I want to thank all of you for making me feel so welcome here today, and I would like to say a special word of thanks to the people who provided the wonderful music, the Sheba Choir, the Moran Choir, the Tel Aviv-Yaffa Youth Orchestra, Danny Robas; thank you all very much.

You have made me feel very welcome here today, in this time of pain and sorrow, also a time of challenge for all of Israel, and especially for the young people of this great nation. Only a few blocks from this hall, only days ago, 13 Israelis were murdered as they went about their daily business, the latest victims of the latest campaign of terror. Four bombs in 9 days in Jerusalem, Ashkelon, Tel Aviv—dozens murdered, scores wounded. Your neighbors, your friends, your classmates.

Here every death is a death in the family. But let me say to the mothers and fathers, the brothers and sisters, the grandparents and children, the friends of those who have died, we know your pain is unimaginable and to some extent unshareable, but America grieves with you and prays that you will be comforted among the mourners of Zion and Jerusalem. Indeed, America lost its own children in these attacks 3 weeks ago in Jerusalem, Sarah Duker and Matthew Eisenfeld; before them, Joan Devenny and Alyssa Flatow and Nachshon Wachsman, a young American who was also a soldier and whose grave, along with those of soldiers of the IDF killed in recent bombings, I recently visited, just a few hours ago in Har Herzl. I'm glad there are many American students here today because we must stand together, and you must stand together.

America knows also the wounds of terror because of experience on our own soil, in the tragedies of Oklahoma City and the World Trade Center in New York. One of terrorists' greatest consequences is the awful persistence of fear, fear that the bus is not safe, that a shopping center might be a target, that there is no haven from danger, that friends or family will be taken in an instant, that the fear itself will never end. But fear must be conquered, security must be restored, and peace must be pursued.

I wanted to have this opportunity to speak with you, the young people of this country, because it is vital that you believe that fear can and will be defeated, for you are the future, and your response to these cowardly acts will shape your nation's future.

I spend a lot of time at home going around America telling the young people of my country that they and this whole generation of young people all across the world are growing up in the age of greatest possibility ever known; a time when more people will be able to fill out their dreams in life than ever before; a time when the information and technology revolution is literally bringing things to the doorstep and the fingertips of young people that only a couple of years ago were unimaginable. Indeed, this is the greatest period of change in economics in society in at least 100 years, since the industrial revolution. And our country's great computer magnate, Bill Gates, says that the digital chip is bringing about the greatest revolution in world communications in 500 years, since Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Europe.

If that is true, it seems especially painful that a country like Israel, full of people with such great intellect and energy, with such a great devotion to learning and hard work and to exploring all of life's possibilities, should still be in the grip of such ancient hatred. It must seem to you an enormous burden and at least a great paradox. But I am afraid it is part of human nature.

It seems that there is always some war going on in the history of humankind between hope and fear, and that within each of us there is some balance scale of hope and fear that is rooted in human nature. And each of us has to decide whether we will live for our dreams, whether we will define our lives in terms of what we are and what we wish to become, or whether we will live by our fears and our hatred, defining ourselves by what we are not and what we are against.

Those who still pursue the terror here in the face of unbelievable opportunities for learning, for prosperity, for growth, for living in harmony, for enriching their lives by living with people who are other than they are, they are in the grip of that ancient fear that life can only be lived if you're looking down on someone else, if you're hating someone else, if you're grateful just for the fact that you're not like someone else. It is the great challenge of your generation to overcome those fears in perhaps the hardest place in the world to do it. For you can live out your dreams only if you can convince others to lay down their fear and define themselves in terms of what they can become, not who they can hate.

We are determined to stand with you in that effort. We know that overcoming adversity is the genius of the Jewish people and the history of the State of Israel. No nation on Earth knows better that the path of triumph often passes through tragedy. No people know better through millennia of exile and persecution, inquisition, and pogrom, the ultimate evil of the Holocaust, that you must deny victory to oppressors, that you must flourish—indeed flourish, not just endure—against all the odds.

And Israel is proof of your extraordinary resilience. Here in modern times, an ancient people have performed a miracle, forged a great and prosperous democracy, caused the desert to bloom, and given rise to great cities. Tel Aviv,

a hill of spring and rebirth, a vibrant culture and thriving business, has grown up where not so very long ago there was only a hill of sand. Against overwhelming danger and war, through the ordeal of isolation, for more than four decades of bloody struggle, Israel has not only persisted, Israel has flourished. Your achievements in the face of this adversity have inspired free men and women the world over. We all draw strength from your example, and you teach us anew the power of the human spirit to build realities out of dreams.

At this time of year we are reminded especially of the resilience of the Jewish people, for in only a few weeks it will be Passover, time for retelling the story of the Exodus, the story of the struggle for freedom, the story that has inspired the world for so many centuries. And at Seder Jews everywhere will say the words that have been repeated every year for ages, "In every generation someone rises up to destroy us." Well, the Jewish people have overcome every one of these would-be destroyers and denied them their goal, and reaffirmed that what is good in human nature can prevail.

Perhaps there will always be someone, some group, some nation that seeks to destroy Israel. Even if peace is made here in the Middle East, there will always be those who seek to take advantage of others, who seek to deny others their rightful place in human destiny, who even seek to deny the realities of human nature and the humanity we all share. It is not in our power to rid the world of evil. But today it is within our power to fight on for peace that will give your generation the age of possibility you so richly deserve.

More nations than ever before have risen up with Israel to defeat the destroyers, those who would kill and maim, those who explode human bombs on buses and on busy streets, those who seek to destroy the peace by violence. And here more people are willing to come and share your faith, for along with the Israelis who died in these last round of bombings there were also Palestinians and Americans and others.

The lesson of the meeting we held yesterday in Sharm al-Sheikh was that Israel is not alone. It was an unprecedented event in the history of this region. At the urging of Israel's neighbors—Egypt, Jordan, the Palestinians, and the United States—29 leaders, 13 of them from Arab States, came to demonstrate their support for peace and their opposition to the terrorism that is bent on wrecking peace. It was the largest such meeting ever. We there rededicated ourselves to the battle against extremism. We began to work closely together to root out those responsible for the bloodshed.

A meeting like this would literally have been unthinkable just a few years ago. For the first time Arab nations recognized and said publicly that pain in Israel is a danger to them as well. They understand that the destruction of hopes and dreams and innocent life in Israel is a threat to the future they want for themselves and their children. And that is a cause for hope in itself.

Today, large majorities of Palestinians, Jordanians, Egyptians are saying that they wish to raise their children in peace. They want to go about their work to build a better life. They too have had enough of war and enough of tears, as Prime Minister Rabin said. They have understood that for all peoples in the region security does not lie just at the end of the road to peace; there must be security every step of the way or there will be no peace. Peace and security are indivisible.

Twenty-nine years ago, when the Straits of Turan were closed, Sharm al-Sheikh stood as the symbol of Israel's isolation from the world. But in 1996 Sharm al-Sheikh has become a symbol of Israel's acceptance in this region and in the world.

The division today in the Middle East is not between Arab and Jew. It is between those who are reaching for a better tomorrow and those who have retreated into the pointless, bloody hostility of yesterday. We must be clear: Those who are reaching for the future will prevail.

The bombings of recent days have been the act of desperate men who see that peace is coming closer, that support for peace is growing in the West Bank and Gaza and throughout nations of the region. They know that stirring these old embers of hatred is their only chance to burn down all that has been built. We must not let them succeed in continuing their violence or in breaking our will for peace.

Just a few months ago I was here in Israel on another journey of great sorrow, to mourn the death of my friend Prime Minister Rabin. Just as the bullet that struck him down renewed our determination to press ahead then, if he were here standing with his partner Shimon Peres he would say we must have these tragedies move us forward with even greater conviction.

I know Israel will not lose resolve for peace. Just before coming here, I visited in Jerusalem the Bet-Haruch where a number of students had lost their lives in the recent bombings. I talked to their fellow classmates, and I was amazed at the resilience and the determination of these young people to press ahead for a better future. And then on the road to Tel Aviv, I called two young men, Tal Loel and Uri Tal, who were badly injured in the Tel Aviv bombing. And they wrote me from their hospital beds a marvelous letter in which they said, and I quote, "Peace is the only true solution for this area." I salute those young men for not losing hope even while they are dealing with their own injuries in the hospital. Their extraordinary spirit is the spirit of Israel.

Yesterday in Sharm al-Sheikh, nations from this region and around the world strengthened their resolve to defeat those who would destroy peace. Today Prime Minister Peres and I, along with our top security advisers, set a course to deepen our own cooperation and intensify our war on terror. We agreed to increase intelligence sharing, to develop new methods to combat terror, to enhance coordination between our nations and others who have agreed to join us to fight against terror. I committed $100 million to this effort, and last night I sent a message to the Congress asking them to take urgent action to fulfill our first installment in this endeavor.

America stands with you in the pursuit of peace and in the war on terror. And we will do more. In the days of the Bible, the foreign prophet Balaam looked upon the children of Israel and called them "a people that shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned upon the nation." Today, looking at all this nation has achieved, the acceptance it has won in the Middle East and around the world, we know his words were and are and will be wrong.

Israel is not alone. America stands with you, and with every passing day so do more people here and abroad. But we will not rest until, in the words of the Psalm, "There is peace within Israel's walls and security in her towers." And we know that Israel will never give her enemies the victory they seek, never abandon the hope of peace, never lose *hatikvah leshalom.*

Thank you, and God bless you.

Q. Mr. President, do you have any advice for young people that want to become leaders? What should young people do in order to grow up and become leaders?

The President. I believe it is important to do at least three things. One, follow the advice of the Prime Minister. That is, it really matters that you develop your mind, that you develop the capacity to learn for a lifetime. The world in which I live and govern is changing very rapidly. The world in which your generation will live and govern will change even more rapidly. So it is important that you make the most of your school years. It doesn't matter so much what you learn but that you learn how to learn and that your mind will work for a lifetime to take in new changes and to grasp the ability to understand what is going on, first.

Second, I think it is important to develop a genuine interest in people, and especially people who are different from you, not just in terms of religion or ethnic group, but I mean people who are genuinely different, people who maybe don't have as much money or have different ways of living or making a living. Because it is impossible to govern effectively in a free society unless you can understand the experiences, the attitude, the challenges other people face.

And then the third thing I would say is it is important to figure out what you believe, and when you do, throw yourselves into election campaigns. [*Laughter*] Support people who believe as you do. Even if you can't vote, stand up for them, talk to them, provoke arguments and discussions and learn to stand up for what you believe in. But if you have a good mind, if you care about what happens to other people and you can understand them, and you're willing to fight for what you believe in, then you have an excellent chance of success.

Q. How do you see the future of the—in your following the Middle East, its ups and downs?

The President. Well, I think first of all, I believe that it is highly likely that sooner or later in the relatively near term—that is, sometime in the next few years, if not this year, sometime fairly soon—that Israel will make peace with her neighbors on terms that will guarantee your security and theirs. And then I believe that the region will begin to grow together economically and culturally, and people will begin to work together. That does not necessarily mean that there will be no more violence, because this problem of terrorism and of fanaticism and of extremism is a problem

that the world faces. Remember it wasn't so long ago that a religious fanatic walked into a Japanese subway and broke open a small vial of sarin gas and killed many people. It was only a year ago, or 2 years ago, I guess now, that the tragedy in Oklahoma City occurred in America.

So the great problem for the world of the future—and when I was your age, the great problem was the free countries of the world against the communist countries of the world, both sides had nuclear weapons, and we all hoped they would never be used because society could be wiped out. Now the great challenge will be in a world that is increasingly interconnected, where you can literally get on a computer now and have conversations with young people in the United States or research an academic paper on volcanoes out of libraries in Australia, to do all kinds of things like that in an open society like that, people are vulnerable to the organized forces of destruction, to organized crime, to drug gangs, to terrorists, to people who would develop biological and chemical and other dangerous weapons.

So for your lifetime, I do believe you'll have to fight these organized forces of destruction. But I believe you will do it within a framework in which the nations are at peace and are growing together economically and you will be more secure. That's what I believe will happen.

Q. Israel gave priority to education. What is the role of education in America and what are the most important parts of it?

The President. I would say that—first, let me deal with the conditions of education in the United States. I believe we have a system of higher education that is second to none in the world. And our great challenge there is to make sure that all of our young people have the opportunity to go on to get a university education, that they are not prohibited from doing it because of economic problems. So what I have tried to do largely there is just to find new ways for young people either to get scholarships or loans or work their way through universities, so everyone can go, because the income differences between young people in the United States who have a college education and those who don't are breathtaking today in America.

In the earlier years, I would say there are basically two great problems. One is we have a highly decentralized system of education in America where children from the age of let's say 3 or 4 to 17 and 18 until they finish high school, most of them are in public schools that are essentially under the legal control of each of our 50 States and under the operational control of school districts in all those States. So what we have to do is to find a way—and many of our schools are doing a great job and many aren't—and America has always rebelled at doing anything that in anyway undermines the decentralization of education, which is good. But what we're trying to do is to figure a way now to have high standards that we articulate and that we measure for all students in our large country, but that we don't tell the schools how they have to meet the standards, they decide that; but we have standards, and that in the continuing emphasis on those standards and in rewarding those that are meeting them, we bring up all the schools in their performance. Overall educational performance in America is improving, but improving slowly, and it's too uneven.

And then, the third big problem we have is just an enormous percentage of our children are poor children, about 15 to 16 percent of them, and they're coming from homes where the parents often don't have the resources they need. And we don't have the same tradition in our country that you do, that a lot of other countries do, where, if you will, the community, or what my wife calls the village, works with each family to help each child succeed. And we've got to find a way to do better by our children who come from very poor backgrounds and difficult homes. Those are the three challenges we face, and we're working very hard on them.

Now, let me just say one other thing, one other thing. The great opportunity we have is the same opportunity you have. We are trying to hook up every classroom and every library in America to the Internet by the year 2000, every single one. And we want them all basically in a worldwide network so that you can all have your common communications and share information and learn and grow together and hook into all the libraries of the world together. And if that happens, it will effect a revolution for all children without regard to their incomes and it will lift the standards everywhere. So that's the great opportunity we're working on, and I believe we're going to get there. I think we'll get there ahead of schedule. I hope we will.

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

The President. Well, I intend to do two things. First of all, I intend to set a good example. That is, we are setting a good example. On the next day after we had the conference, I said that in addition to the things that the Prime Minister has already mentioned, we would commit over $100 million to working with Israel to fight terror here in the region and working with others who are committed to fighting the terror.

Secondly, we intend to work to make sure the Palestinian Authority has the capacity and fulfills its capacity to do its part in fighting the terror. You cannot do this alone. They have to do their part for the peace to work.

And thirdly, we intend to start immediately meeting with every other country that was there to work out a joint plan for what we can do. And keep in mind, this is not work just for the countries of the Middle East. There are things that the North Americans, the Europeans, and the Asians can do to help to defeat the terrorist networks that wreak their violence here in your back yard. Their reach goes beyond your back yard.

So I did not intend for this to be a cordial meeting in which nothing happens. This—we will give everybody a full opportunity to put their actions where their words were yesterday. I assure you of that.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:43 p.m. in the Tel Aviv Center for the Performing Arts. In his remarks, he referred to Liad Modrik, student council representative; Mayor Ronni Milow of Tel Aviv; and singer Danny Robas.

Remarks at a Saint Patrick's Day Ceremony With Prime Minister John Bruton of Ireland and an Exchange With Reporters

March 15, 1996

The President. Mr. Prime Minister, welcome back to the White House.

Prime Minister Bruton. Thank you. And now may I present this bowl of shamrock.

The President. Thank you. It's very beautiful. We're delighted to have you here, and we'd be glad for you to make whatever remarks you'd like.

Prime Minister Bruton. Mr. President, first of all, this gift of a bowl of shamrock symbolizes an Irish greeting. And it's a greeting, first and foremost, which says thank you, thank you to the United States for making a home for so many generations of Irish people who have come here to participate in the greatest democracy in the world.

It's also a way at this particular time of saying thank you to you personally for your contribution to giving us peace in Ireland. The 17 months of the cease-fire during which so many lives were saved, those 17 months would never have come were it not for the courage that you showed and the interest that you took in bringing peace to Ireland. Your interest gave confidence to peacemakers in Ireland, and that interest is something that I believe will be crucial in bringing peace back to Ireland now that it has been, unfortunately, interrupted.

I believe that the important thing we need to reestablish the cease-fire has already been achieved. That is the setting of a fixed date for all-party talks, the 10th of June of this year. As we know, those who are concerned about progress in Northern Ireland, those who are concerned from a republican perspective, a nationalist perspective, that adequate progress was not being made, were demanding consistently the setting of a fixed and unconditional date for talks. That date has now been set. The talks will start on the 10th of June.

Meanwhile, difficult discussions are taking place, mapping out the route towards the talks, the various things that need to be done so that talks will start in the best possible atmosphere on the 10th of June. I want to stress that the only qualification required of any party for participation in those talks is that they should not support a campaign of violence. Thus the only qualification required for something that we want very much, which is full Sinn Fein partici-

pation in these talks, is the reinstatement of the cease-fire. And I ask the IRA to reinstate the cease-fire so that Sinn Fein will be able to take their unique and deserved part in the talks that will be starting on the 10th of June.

I want to say also, from the point of view of the Irish Government, that it is extremely important that these talks, when they start on the 10th of June, do not become logjammed on one item. Of course, the issue of the decommissioning of arms and the very important and difficult questions that were so lucidly dealt with by Senator George Mitchell in his report—of course those are critical issues which must be dealt with in the talks from the very outset and dealt with in a serious way. But I want to say that, from the point of view of the Irish Government—and we will be participating fully in these talks—we're not willing to allow any one item, be it decommissioning or anything else, to prevent progress on other items. We want to see a total and comprehensive engagement on all of the issues across all of the problems by all of the parties.

And I want to stress that the goal of these talks is truly ambitious. It is a comprehensive agreement, not an internal settlement within Northern Ireland, a comprehensive settlement dealing with the relations between Britain and Ireland, dealing with relations between Northern Ireland and the rest of Ireland, and of course, instituting justice within Northern Ireland and fairness within Northern Ireland itself.

What we're aiming at in that three-stranded approach is a system of government for the people of Northern Ireland to which both communities can give equal allegiance. All throughout the world where problems of this nature exist, where there are two communities mixed together with differing national allegiances, the tendency has been in the past for one community to be predominant and the other to be subordinate. What we're looking for in Ireland is something different. It is a system of government where both communities will feel equal, where both will have the same loyalty to the institutions each share and each live under. That's something which I believe that deserves to happen; it deserves to happen in this generation.

And I recollect, when I first came to this house, and you, Mr. President—I've given you some shamrock today—you made me a presentation of a book which was entitled "How the Irish Saved Civilization." It was about the role of Irish monks in preserving learning during the Dark Ages after the fall of the Roman Empire. And it quite properly, I think, indicated your realization that we of Irish heritage have a capacity to do some things that affect the whole world.

And it's my view that if we in Ireland can devise political institutions, form a society where you have two communities with radically different allegiances, and let us not minimize the differences of allegiance that exist between unionists and nationalists, if we have the imagination, the spirit, and the confidence to devise institutions in these talks that will start on the 10th of June, I believe that we, Irish people and people of Irish heritage, will again be contributing a model to the world, a beacon of hope to the world similar to the one to which you drew my attention when you presented me with that most excellent book.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Prime Minister, Mrs. Bruton, members of the Irish delegation. Senator Mitchell, it's good to have you back. And I want to thank you in the beginning for the beautiful Irish crystal and the shamrocks. Especially this year, I need a shamrock or two—[*laughter*]—and I will try to put them only to public use. [*Laughter*]

When the Prime Minister hosted me in Ireland last year at Dublin Castle in a room called Saint Patrick's Hall, it struck me that he would be back here for Saint Patrick's Day. And I'm glad to have him back in this house which was itself designed by an Irishman more than 200 years ago, especially since one in four of all American Presidents trace their roots back to Ireland.

I want to thank the Prime Minister for being here especially this year because of the extraordinary physical efforts he has made in the last few days. He first accepted my invitation, along with President Mubarak of Egypt, to join us at Sharm al-Sheikh in Egypt. So he has been to Egypt just in the last couple of days before coming here. And I know he was at an event last night and made a speech. So we certainly can attest to his physical stamina as well as his leadership ability and to the evidence that this gives once again to Ireland's willingness to stand for peace, not only within Ireland and in Northern Ireland but throughout the world.

And that's something that all of us are very grateful for.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank you in front of the American people for the wonderful way you made me and the First Lady feel at home when we were in Ireland. I will never forget that great sea of Irish and American flags on College Green in Dublin. And I will also never forget that I have not yet collected on my golf game at Ballybunion. [*Laughter*] I expect to be back there as soon as I can.

I thank you for also recognizing the importance of the historic bonds between our countries. This Nation is flooded with Irish-Americans in every walk of life, contributing mightily to our welfare and to our future. And just as Irish-Americans love our own country, we also love the land of our ancestors. So there is a fervent and deep desire in this country to do what we can to support the peace that took root in Northern Ireland a year and a half ago, to see it grow stronger, to see it endure. I want to thank two Irish-Americans who have worked so hard for that, our Ambassador, Jean Kennedy Smith, and Senator Mitchell. I thank them for their efforts.

Let me say that when I was in Northern Ireland last year—the American people have heard me say this repeatedly, but I want to repeat it again—the thing that impressed me most was the obvious deep desire of people in both communities for peace. It was overwhelming. It was palpable. It was loud. It was unambiguous. It was exuberant. It was determined. It seems to me that that alone is enough to send a message to those who would resort to bombs and bullets that their ways are the ways of the past and that the people cannot be denied the future they have decided upon.

So I want to salute again the Prime Minister for all the work he has done to move the peace process forward, from the joint framework document to the twin-track process with Prime Minister Major. He has shown that he's willing to take risks for peace, and he's achieved some significant breakthroughs for which we're all grateful.

In the aftermath of the terrible bombings in London, his courage and his commitment are making a difference again. The February 28th announcement by the Irish and British Governments was truly a milestone achievement. It sets a firm date for all-party talks on the future of Northern Ireland. And that is the goal we have been working for; June 10th, a firm date, is the goal we have been working for. Violence has no place in this process.

I applaud what the Prime Minister said today: The cease-fire must be restored. It must be restored because it is a right and decent and honorable thing to do. And it must be restored because, as the Prime Minister said, that is the only way the talks can be inclusive. And unless everybody is involved in all-party talks, unless the all-party talks are all-party talks, that process cannot truly go forward. I want to commend the loyalist leaders on the restraint they have shown at a time of significant challenge and for working to maintain the cease-fire in the face of the recent assaults.

We want to do all we can here to sustain the momentum for peace. We want to work closely with Prime Minister Bruton and his colleagues, with John Major and the British Government, with all the parties involved to support their efforts to end the violence and move the process forward. We can't allow anyone to hijack the future of peace in Northern Ireland. We can't allow anyone to deny the children their hopes and the just destiny they should have. Again let me say, I will do everything I can to support this process. The Prime Minister and I had a very good meeting before coming out here. I think we are in clear and complete accord on how we should proceed.

And finally, let me thank again—the American people should know that there is no country in the world that has contributed more consistently over the last several decades to peace in other parts of the world than Ireland. And I thank them for the work that they have done. From Lebanon to Cyprus to Bosnia, the Irish are always there to take on the most demanding issues in the rest of the world. They have made an important contribution to the international police task force in Bosnia, which is now led by an Irish commissioner.

And I certainly look forward to working with Prime Minister Bruton when Ireland assumes the European Presidency in July. Even to Americans who are not Irish, I would say to you, with Ireland making so many labors for peace in so many places in the world more consistently over more years than any other nation in the world, it is the obligation of the United States to work hard to help to achieve peace in Northern Ireland. We are going to do some good work. I think we are going to prevail.

And so on this happy day for all Irish-Americans, I thank you for remembering the book that I gave you. I read it with great fascination. It gives every Irish person in the world a unique set of bragging rights. [*Laughter*] And on this day of bragging rights, Mr. Prime Minister, I am delighted to welcome you and all of your delegation back to Washington.

Thank you very much.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, how far can your administration go in helping to guarantee that the talks will actually take place on the date stipulated and that there will be progress after that?

The President. I'm not sure how to answer your question in the sense that I don't know that any country can guarantee the results of a peace process within another country. I can tell you that Senator Mitchell is still on the case, and we are still on the case, and we plan to reach out to all the parties, to stay in touch with all of them, and to make our views known and to do whatever we can to support the disciplined, coordinated, and, we believe, proper approach that has been announced by the Prime Minister and by Prime Minister Major on February 28th. My own view is if we can start the all-party talks and all the parties are part of the all-party talks, which means we have to restore the cease-fire, and then if all issues are approached in good faith and in a comprehensive and disciplined fashion, the chances of a successful outcome are pretty good.

You know, again, it's not for me to comment on the substance of these things, but it seems to me that if you look at the differences between the parties on a lot of these matters about what life for the people of Northern Ireland would look like on the other side of this process, those gaps are not too difficult to bridge. I have seen wider gulfs bridged just in my time here in the White House.

So I believe that the real problem is overcoming this enormous accumulation of distrust, the emotional scars and baggage of the past, and the belief that somehow somebody is going to be tricked by somebody else into an outcome in which one side gets what it wants and the other side is left standing at the station. I think if we can overcome that and get this process started with everybody in good faith, that the actual facts of the matter can be resolved. That's what I believe.

Q. Mr. President, if you had an opportunity to directly address the seven people on the ruling body of the IRA, as opposed to Gerry Adams, these people who have total mistrust and distrust of the British administration, what would you be saying to them to convince them that they should trust John Major and the British administration at this point in time?

The President. Well, first of all I would say to them, you don't have to trust them at all. You can take these things as they come. But I can say that the United States—that our involvement here presumes the integrity of any agreement which would be made, and that what you ought to do is to realize that all you do, as every poll shows, is weaken your case among Irish, whether they're Catholics or Protestants, every time you blow up a building and kill somebody when we can get these talks started with people representing you and your views in the talks.

There's no—you don't have to all of a sudden start trusting people. You just have to show up, start, go to work, and if your representatives and people who have the same concerns that you do reach an agreement in good faith, then it will be very hard for that agreement not to be carried, first of all, because the United States has placed its good faith, if you will, in the ultimate outcome of the product and, secondly, because the whole world is looking at this. You can't go through an agreement like this, come out and have everybody say, okay, these are the following six things we're going to do, and then see it come a cropper. I mean, that's what I would say to them.

I'm not asking all these people to start trusting each other and loving each other overnight. That's not what all-party talks are about. All-party talks are about everybody shows up; here's the agenda; here are the four or five items we have to resolve; you go to work on them. If you don't resolve them, you certainly haven't lost anything. If you do resolve them, you have perhaps given yourselves and everybody else a chance to walk away from a terrible way of spending your life toward a more fruitful future for your children.

Q. Mr. Clinton, how confident are you that the IRA will listen to your words and the other impassioned words that have been addressed to them?

The President. I don't know the answer to that. I just know that if you look at—what's

happened in the past hasn't worked. What's happened in the last couple of years has a chance of working. And the people whose lives are most affected prefer peace to war and prefer progress to violence.

And I would say again, if you look at the substantive differences here, yes, there's the decommissioning issue that has to be addressed and has to be resolved. Senator Mitchell did a very good job, I thought, of dealing with that whole issue. But if you look at the other—the sort of governance questions, the questions about how the people in Northern Ireland will live, how do you assure that everybody will be treated with dignity, that everybody will be treated fairly, that everybody will have their say, those issues, it seems to me, can be resolved.

There is nothing to be lost here by taking a leap of faith. You know, everybody can always go back to behaving in the terrible way they once behaved. I mean, you know, there's nothing—that's true, by the way, of every human being in the world. Every time somebody decides to try to make a change in his or her life, one of the things you always know is, if the change fails, you can always go back to doing what you were doing. If it's ultimately unsatisfying, if it leads to a dead end, what is to be lost in trying? Nothing, nothing.

That's the argument I make. It's in everyone's self-interest to go forward. It is in no one's self-interest to keep their foot on the brakes of this process.

Q. At what level, Mr. President, is your administration in contact with Sinn Fein or the IRA?

The President. I think the only thing that's appropriate for me to say to you, sir, is that we have worked hard over this entire process to maintain what we thought was an appropriate level of communication with the parties involved. And that's all I think I should say about it.

Q. Do you feel that the administration's allowing Gerry Adams to enter this country at this time has been beneficial for the peace process?

The President. Yes. If I didn't think so, I wouldn't have done it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:47 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Finola Bruton, wife of Prime Minister Bruton; former Senator George J. Mitchell, Special Assistant to the President for Northern Ireland; Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom; and Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams.

Remarks at a Saint Patrick's Day Reception
March 15, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. And welcome to the White House. Happy Saint Patrick's Day. To the Taoiseach and Mrs. Bruton and all of our friends from Ireland and my fellow Americans, we are delighted to have you here with us again. To our friends from Northern Ireland, party leaders John Hume, David Trimble, John Alderdice; the Lord Mayor of Londonderry, John Kerr; thank you for traveling all this way to be part of this celebration.

To Senator Mitchell and Ambassador Jean Kennedy Smith, and to all the Irish-Americans here who have played a special role in strengthening the bonds between our peoples, let me say to you a very special thank you and urge you to redouble your efforts in the days and months ahead.

I want to say a special word of appreciation, too, to the Irish-American members of our administration, our Secretary of Education Richard Riley; the Director of the Peace Corps, Mark Gearan. And General McCaffrey is here; I take it he's elevating his Irish roots today, our new drug czar. And since our trip to Ireland, the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, has asked for honorary designation—[*laughter*]—leaving himself open to all sorts of unusual historical analogies. [*Laughter*]

I want to say to all of you it's no secret that Hillary and I love this time of year. This day got off to a very promising start; the Taoiseach gave me a bowl of shamrocks. It had two benefits. First of all, this being an election year, I need all the shamrocks I can get. [*Laugh-*

ter] And secondly, this is the one day of the year when I am more green than the Vice President. [*Laughter*]

When Hillary and I came home from Ireland, I told her that I didn't know whether I would ever have 2 such days like that again in this lifetime, but if I didn't, I couldn't imagine two better ones anyway. I will never forget the waving sea of Irish and American flags at College Green in Dublin, never forget the relatives I met at the pub in Dublin. [*Laughter*] I've gotten used to meeting unexpected relatives in this job, and—[*laughter*]—it was nice to meet some I was genuinely glad to see.

We can't wait to return President Robinson's hospitality when she comes to Washington in June. And we think that today we ought to take just a moment once again to celebrate the ties that bind us together. In countless ways, Irish-Americans have helped to form the core of the American identity, proving that our diversity is our strength and reminding us that becoming an American does not mean forgetting your roots. Now all Americans of Irish heritage have a great responsibility, for in the land of our ancestors, the future is at a crossroads and each of us must do our part to safeguard the promise of peace.

Over the last year, all of us who care about peace in Northern Ireland have shared some dramatic highs and lows. For us here in America, it has been an emotional roller coaster. For us here in Washington, it has as well. And I would be remiss if I didn't say a special word of thanks to the bipartisan congressional delegation of Irish-Americans who have supported the efforts of this administration to forward the cause of peace in Ireland. Many of them went with the First Lady and me to Ireland, where we shared the crowds in Belfast and Derry, the courage of young Catherine Hamill and David Sterrit as they joined hands to tell the world what peace meant to them. And we were all saddened and outraged by the bombs in London that killed innocent people and threatened the peace on which so many hopes are riding.

Now, more than ever, we have to support the people of Northern Ireland who have made already and clearly the choice for peace, for dialog over division, and for hope over fear. The enemies of peace have fallen back on the bullet and the bomb, but we must go forward.

Over the last 3 years I have made an honest effort to listen to all sides of this story, and I have come to the conclusion that in Northern Ireland, as I have seen in the Middle East and Bosnia, in so many places around the world, the deepest divide is not between those with opposing backgrounds or faiths or even opposing views. Instead it is between those who are willing to find a way to reconcile their differences in peace and those who still wish to clench their fists, those who look to the future and those who are trapped in the past.

Will we teach our children to define themselves in terms of what they are for or what they are against? Will we teach them to define themselves in terms of what they can become or the limits that have been put on them by their shared pasts, to be proud of who they are or to look down on those who are different from them? These are the decisions that face people all over the world, and they face the people of Northern Ireland.

I know and you know, everyone who saw the faces and heard the shouts of the people in the Shankill and the Falls knows that the people of Northern Ireland have chosen peace. And America must support them until they find that peace. And so, on behalf of the United States, that is the commitment I make again today to the Taoiseach and the people of Northern Ireland and to the Prime Minister and the British Government.

The February 28th announcement by the Irish and the British Governments is truly a milestone achievement, and we strongly support setting a firm date for all-party talks. Violence has no place. The cease-fire must be restored. That is the only way these talks can be inclusive, the only way they can be all-party talks.

We Americans who proudly call ourselves Irish must speak with one voice on this issue. We must stand with those who long for lasting peace. We must stand with those who have broken with the past and who are working for a better future for their children. And so on this Saint Patrick's Day, I ask Irish-Americans of all traditions to remember the spirit of the saint whose faith triumphed over violence and suspicion and to join me in a moment of silence and rededication for the peace in Northern Ireland.

[*At this point, a moment of silence was observed.*]

Thank you very much. Happy Saint Patrick's Day. God bless you all, and please welcome the Prime Minister.

[*At this point, Prime Minister Bruton made remarks.*]

The President. Before we go down to the receiving line, I want to say something to you. Our piper, Mr. Blair, and his wife prepared the song that we marched down the stairs to. It's called "Ireland at Peace." And they did it, in a way, fulfilling the responsibility that each American has, of Irish heritage, to support that. I thought it was a remarkable thing that he and his wife did. It was a lovely melody. You heard it when we came down the stairs. And I'd like for you to give him a hand. [*Applause*]

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:10 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Mary Robinson of Ireland and piper Richard Blair.

Statement on Signing the Tenth Continuing Resolution
March 15, 1996

Today, I have signed into law H.J. Res. 163, the Tenth Continuing Resolution for fiscal 1996.

H.J. Res. 163 provides for a temporary extension of appropriations—March 16th through March 22nd—for activities funded in four of the five appropriations bills that have not been enacted into law. The District of Columbia receives no new Federal funds, but retains authority to use local funds.

It is regrettable that I must sign yet another continuing resolution. However, Congress still has not passed five of this year's thirteen appropriations bills in acceptable form, so this measure is necessary to prevent a third government shutdown.

We are now nearly halfway through the fiscal year. Continuing uncertainty over funding levels and authorities has impaired the ability of our Federal agencies and State and local governments to provide critical services to the public.

I urge Congress to meet its responsibilities by sending me legislation for the remaining fiscal 1996 appropriations bills in an acceptable form. I have made it clear to the Congress what changes need to be made to make them acceptable.

The purpose of those changes is to ensure, as we work to balance the budget and control discretionary spending, that we protect our nation's investments in education, the environment, law enforcement, and technology.

Unfortunately, while the Senate has made improvements, the current House and Senate versions of an omnibus appropriations bill for the remainder of the year still do not protect these national priorities. Moreover, they contain harmful and unacceptable legislative riders affecting the environment and other issues.

We have a responsibility to the American people to act together to resolve our differences. I am committed to doing so. I urge the Congress to act quickly to enact acceptable appropriations legislation for the remainder of the fiscal year.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 15, 1996.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 163, approved March 15, was assigned Public Law No. 104–116.

The President's Radio Address
March 16, 1996

Good morning. I have recently returned from an historic meeting in the Middle East. Twenty-nine leaders from the region and around the world came together in support of peace and against terrorism. Our summit was called to confront an urgent threat. Recent terrorist atrocities in Israel have taken scores of innocent lives, including those of two young Americans. They have jeopardized the hopes of Israelis and Palestinians who long for peace, and they menace the dreams of all the mothers and fathers there who seek a better life for their children.

But the merchants of terror will not succeed. By their acts of violence they have only reinforced the determination of the peacemakers. Whatever the effort, whatever the time it takes, we will prevail because we must.

The violence in Israel is a terrible reminder of the challenges we all face to protect the security of our Nation and our people. For while we live in an age of great possibility, we face new perils as well. Open societies and open markets are on the march. And the dawn of the information age is creating exciting new opportunities to build a brighter future. But as barriers fall, the freedom and openness that make our Nation strong can also make us vulnerable. The freedom and openness that will bring Americans almost 3 million new jobs in the next few years in telecommunications alone, spurred on by the telecommunications bill I signed just a few weeks ago, also mean that our democratic societies, which have to be open to new people and products and information, are also more vulnerable because they're open to threats that all too easily can cross national borders.

Terrorism is a part of the growing web of threats that include the spread of weapons of mass destruction, drug trafficking, and organized crime. I have made our fight against terrorism a national security priority. And in order to defeat these forces of destruction, we need every tool at our disposal. The United States maintains strong sanctions on states that sponsor terrorism. We have stepped up cooperation with other nations to root out terrorists before they act and to capture them when they do. We have increased funding, manpower, and training for our law enforcement agencies to combat terrorism. And our efforts are yielding results. We made swift arrests after the attacks on the World Trade Center and Oklahoma City. Today those responsible for the World Trade Center bombing are behind bars. In the last 3 years the United States has arrested more terrorists than at any time in our history, plucking them from hiding all around the world and bringing them to justice for their crimes. This progress is dramatic, but we must do more.

Yet on the same day I was in the Middle East rallying the world community to fight terrorism, some in Congress, led by Republicans, were taking apart piece by piece the tough legislation designed to beat back that very threat. More than a year ago I sent a bill to Congress that would strengthen our ability to investigate, prosecute, and punish terrorist activity. After the Oklahoma City bombing I made that legislation even stronger. My efforts were guided by three firm goals: first, to protect American lives without infringing on American rights; second, to give law enforcement officials the tools they need to do the job; and third, to make sure that terrorists are barred from our country.

The congressional leaders promised to send me that bill by last Memorial Day, 6 weeks after the Oklahoma City tragedy. The Senate passed counterterrorism legislation last June. But now, less than 6 weeks before the anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing, the House has finally acted to gut the bill. The House took the teeth out of our efforts to fight terrorism. Unbelievably, the House voted to give law enforcement officials fewer tools to fight terrorism than they have to fight far less horrible crimes here at home.

First, the bill had a provision to chemically mark the explosive materials terrorists use to build their deadly bombs. If we know where explosives come from, we have a better chance of figuring out who used them. The House voted to strip this law enforcement tool because for some reason the Washington gun lobby opposed it. The House and the Washington gun lobby are against giving law enforcement the ability to trace explosives. I know we should

be able to keep up with materials terrorists use to build bombs.

The House also voted to let terrorists like Hamas continue to raise money in America by stripping the Justice Department's authority to designate organizations as terrorists and thereby stop them from raising funds in the United States. The House voted against allowing us to deport foreigners who support terrorist activities more quickly, and it voted to cripple our ability to use high-tech surveillance to keep up with stealthy and fast-moving terrorists.

At the same time the bill went easy on terrorists, it got tough on law enforcement officials. The House stripped a provision that would have helped protect police officers from cop-killer bullets. And it ordered a commission to study not the terrorists but the Federal law enforcement officials who put their lives on the line to fight terrorism. Even the Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Henry Hyde, couldn't believe what his colleagues did, saying the House eviscerated the terrorism bill. I urge the Senate to stand firm and turn this bill back into the strong antiterrorism legislation I want to sign and America needs.

Our Nation has felt the lash of terrorism. We know its terrible costs, and we know that only America can lead the world's fight against it. We can't let the gun lobby turn America into a safehouse for terrorists. Congress should get back on track and send me tough legislation that cracks down on terrorism. It should listen to the cries of the victims and the hopes of our children, not the back-alley whispers of the gun lobby.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:08 p.m. on March 15 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on March 16.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Product Liability Legislation
March 16, 1996

Dear Mr. Leader:

I will veto H.R. 956, the Common Sense Product Liability Legal Reform Act of 1996, if it is presented to me in its current form.

This bill represents an unwarranted intrusion on state authority, in the interest of protecting manufacturers and sellers of defective products. Tort law is traditionally the prerogative of the states, rather than of Congress. In this bill, Congress has intruded on state power—and done so in a way that peculiarly disadvantages consumers. As a rule, this bill displaces state law only when that law is more beneficial to consumers; it allows state law to remain in effect when that law is more favorable to manufacturers and sellers. In the absence of compelling reasons to do so, I cannot accept such a one-way street of federalism, in which Congress defers to state law when doing so helps manufacturers and sellers, but not when doing so aids consumers.

I also have particular objections to certain provisions of the bill, which would encourage wrongful conduct and prevent injured persons from recovering the full measure of their damages. Specifically, the bill's elimination of joint-and-several liability for noneconomic damages, such as pain and suffering, will mean that victims of terrible harm sometimes will not be fully compensated for it. Where under current law a joint wrongdoer will make the victim whole, under this bill an innocent victim would suffer when one wrongdoer goes bankrupt and cannot pay his portion of the judgment. It is important to note that companies sued for manufacturing and selling defective products stand a much higher than usual chance of going bankrupt; consider, for example, manufacturers of asbestos or breast implants or intra-uterine devices.

In addition, for those irresponsible companies willing to put profits above all else, the bill's capping of punitive damages increases the incentive to engage in the egregious misconduct of knowingly manufacturing and selling defective products. The provision of the bill allowing judges to exceed the cap in certain circumstances does not cure this problem, given Congress's clear intent, expressed in the Statement of Managers, that judges should do so only in the rarest of circumstances.

The attached Statement of Administration Policy more fully explains my position on this issue—an issue of great importance to American consumers, and to evenly applied principles of federalism.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Bob Dole, Senate majority leader, Thomas Daschle, Senate minority leader, Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Richard Gephardt, House minority leader. A statement of administration policy on H.R. 956 was attached to the letter. The letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release.

Remarks to the United Jewish Appeal Young Leadership Conference
March 17, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Audience members. Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

The President. You know, I've been trying to convince everyone else in Washington to delay the onset of this year's campaign, and you aren't helping very much. [*Laughter*] But you have my permission to vary from the official line. [*Laughter*]

I thank you so much. I want to thank my friend David Hermelin for his wonderful remarks and his remarkable service. I don't know that I've ever known anybody that had such a remarkable combination of energy and commitment to the common good. He is indefatigable, and all of his energies seem to me to be directed toward good causes, including my own. [*Laughter*] And I thank him for that.

To Ambassador Yaacobi, Mrs. Rabinovich—Efrat—members of the Young Leadership cabinet, and all of you, thank you for giving me the opportunity to come by tonight. And let me begin by saying that a lot of people speak about trying to advance the cause of humanity, but you actually do something about it. So I want to begin simply by thanking you for everything you do, from the hot meals for the homebound to wheelchairs for the disabled to shelter for refugees to comfort for victims of Alzheimer's and AIDS. And thank you, of course, for your many services to the cause of Israel.

You know, I was trying to think of something I could say tonight, just one line that would capture our country's rich diversity and the common commitment we should all feel to the cause of peace and standing up against terrorism everywhere in the world. And it seems to me the best line I could give all of you at this great Jewish event tonight is "Happy Saint Patrick's Day." [*Laughter*]

Let me say that the 2 days and 9 hours I spent going from here to Sharm al-Sheikh to Tel Aviv and Jerusalem and back to Tel Aviv again and then home were a remarkable experience for me. I am grateful that the United States is a friend of Israel and a friend of the cause of peace. I am grateful that the United States is an implacable opponent of terrorism. And I am grateful that at this moment I was able to go on behalf of all the American people to stand with the people of Israel in their time of pain and sorrow and challenge to express the outrage of our people at the latest campaign of terror and to show our solidarity.

All of you know this, but it bears repeating that the terrorist attacks claimed not only Israeli lives but also those of Palestinians—and some of the most gripping tales I heard when I was there came from their family members, who also long for peace—and two young Americans, Sarah Duker and Matthew Eisenfeld.

Now, it is important, quite apart from the peace process, that we once again say to the world, we know no country is safe from terror. We have seen it in the World Trade Center and in Oklahoma City in the United States. We know our friends in Japan have suffered it in the terrible attack of sarin gas in the Tokyo subway. But we know that in the Middle East it has too often been employed as an instrument of politics. And it is wrong. We stand against it now. We redouble our efforts against it, and we will be against it forever.

The symbol of our solidarity on this trip was perhaps best conveyed by the stone from the South Lawn of the White House that I was privileged to place on the grave of my friend Prime Minister Rabin, along with all of his family members. That is the place where the first accord with the Palestinians was signed. It represents our hope for progress, our belief in the chances of peace, and our unwavering solidarity.

As you know, we have resolved to strengthen our cooperation with all those who will stand against terror in the Middle East. We are committing more than $100 million to the task. We are increasing our intelligence sharings, and we are developing new methods to combat violence there. We are convinced that ultimately fear will overcome the adversity of terror, because overcoming that kind of adversity is the genius of the Jewish people and the history of the State of Israel. No nation on Earth has experienced more often the painful truth that the path of triumph often passes through tragedy. No people knows better that we must deny victory to oppressors. The Jewish people have overcome every one of their would-be destroyers, denying them their goal, and in so doing reaffirming that what is good in human nature can prevail.

It may be that until the end of time there will always be some group that will seek to do harm to others for their own advantage. We cannot rid the world of evil. It may be that until the end of time there will always be some group that will seek to distort the meaning of a religion, to demonize those who are different from them. But it should be heartening to you to know that today more nations than ever have risen up with Israel to oppose the destroyers of the present day, to oppose those who would kill and maim and who seek to destroy the peace through violence.

That really was the message of the meeting at Sharm al-Sheikh, that Israel is no longer alone. The Summit of Peacemakers was the largest and highest level meeting of its kind ever held. At the urging of Israel's neighbors, 29 nations, including 13 from Arab States, came to demonstrate their support for peace and their opposition to terrorism.

I believe that that summit marked the beginning of a truly unified regional effort to root out those responsible for the bloodshed. It produced concrete results. And soon there will be a followup conference here in Washington within the month, at which representatives of all the nations will be present. And we will press ahead to implement the commitments that all made at Sharm al-Sheikh.

Just think about it. A meeting like this would have been unthinkable just a few years ago. But for the first time, Arab nations in the region are beginning to realize that pain in Israel is a danger to them as well. Large majorities of Palestinians and Jordanians and Egyptians know that the destruction of innocent life in Israel is a threat to the peaceful future they have declared as their goal for themselves and their own children.

They understood that security must not lie only at the end of the road for peace. There must be security every step of the way, or there can be no peace. No one seriously believes anymore it is fair to ask Israel to give up its security until the peace is made. That is wrong, and we will not support it.

When I read the story of the Palestinian nurse who was killed in the bombing and what her son said about her loss, it convinced me that what I see in Bosnia and what I see in Northern Ireland is also true now in Israel and in the Middle East. And it is a great cause for hope and a sobering reminder of the dimension of our challenge, and that is that the great division today in the Middle East is not between those of different religions or ethnic groups just as it is no longer between Croatian, Serb, and Muslim in Bosnia or between Catholic and Protestant in Northern Ireland. It really is between those who are reaching for a better tomorrow and those who have retreated into the pointless, bloody hostility of yesterday; those who are willing to open their arms to their neighbors and those who want to remain with their fist clenched; those who are willing to raise their children based on what kind of people they are inside and what they stand for and what their character is and those who wish to continue to raise their children based on who they are not and whom they can hate.

That is the clear decision that all peoples of the world confronted with these kind of conflicts have to make. And even though this is a time of mourning it is also a time of hope, for the rest of the world is coming to know what America has long understood: Israel must be strong and secure and confident if we want peace and justice for every person in the Middle East. And I assure you we will continue to support

those who take risks for peace in the Middle East, in Bosnia, and around the world.

The fight against terrorism must be a national security priority for the American people. Last year when I announced the stronger steps we in the United States were prepared to take alone against Iran because of their policies, many of my colleagues around the world declined to join in. Some of them, my friends and freedom-loving people, openly said I was wrong. I didn't hear that so much in Sharm al-Sheikh. People are beginning to see the truth. You cannot, you must not countenance people who believe it is legitimate to fund and arm others to kill innocent civilians, no matter where they are.

Let me remind my fellow Americans that we have challenges here at home and that if we want to truly be effective in the transnational fight against terrorism, we must have the tools to deal with terrorism here at home. Well over a year ago I sent to Congress a bill to improve our ability to investigate, to prosecute, to punish terrorist activity. After our own tragedy in Oklahoma City I made that legislation even stronger and challenged the Congress to pass it.

Last June the Senate passed the counterterrorism legislation. Until last week, the House of Representatives, letting more than a half-year go by, had not acted. Then last week when it did act, unbelievably it acted to destroy the bill, to gut it, indeed to mock it. The House voted, for example, to delete a provision of the bill that would allow us to tag explosive materials so that if a bomb is exploded somewhere in America, it will be marked and we can trace it back to its source. Now, if you have your car stolen in Washington, DC, tonight and somebody drives it to West Virginia—I hope it doesn't happen—[*laughter*]—but think about it, and you call the police and you tell them your name and the serial—and the license plate of your car and the car has any serial numbers on it, and it's found tomorrow morning in a parking lot of a grocery store in West Virginia, under the national computer network system we have, within 30 seconds it can be identified as your car. And you can be told that it's your car.

We have serial numbers on guns that are sold in America, unless they're filed off. Now why in the world the Washington gun lobby is opposed to our tagging explosives which could be used to blow apart the bodies of innocent civilians is beyond me. If people want to use the explosives for appropriate construction work, they can still do it. Their civil liberties are not going to be impaired. But as soon as the objection was raised, the House says, thank you very much, we'll take it right out.

We had a provision in that bill that would allow us to deport more quickly people who come into this country and are obviously involved in raising funds for terrorist organizations. They took that out. We had other provisions that would enable us to move more aggressively against organizations that clearly engage in terrorism. They took those out.

And they imposed a commission not to study terrorism within our borders or beyond our borders but to study the Federal law enforcement officials whose primary job it is to combat this kind of terrorist activities. That is the wrong response, and it sends a terrible signal to people throughout the world who believe that if they can just get the right kind of extremist opposition to standing up to terrorism in America, it will weaken our resolve. They are wrong about that, and we should pass a good antiterrorism bill immediately.

I just want to say, if I might, one more word about why you're here in this leadership conference and to say I admire this organization for many things, but not the least of it is always trying to develop a new generation of leaders.

I sought this office more than 4 years ago because I believe that our country had to change direction if we were going to achieve the objectives that I feel are important for America. One is to guarantee the American dream for every person who is willing to work for it. Second, to maintain America's leadership in the cause of peace and freedom and security and prosperity throughout the world, we cannot withdraw; we must continue to lead. And third is to continue to build the American community, to forge a new unity amidst all of our diversity based on shared values and genuine honest respect for diversity. Now, if we can do those three things, this country is going to be just fine, and the world will be a better place.

As I have said many times, in order to achieve those objectives, we have to grow the economy in a way that gives everybody a chance to participate. We have to squarely face our shared social challenges, from a high crime rate to abject poverty rates among our young people to teen pregnancy rates and other problems that make childhood more difficult. We have to work

hard to overcome the impulses that so many Americans understandably feel to withdraw from the world at the end of the cold war, and to try to chart a new course. And we have to continue to try to inspire more faith and trust in the American people in their Government.

Now, in each of those areas we're better off than we were, but we have significant challenges ahead. We should be grateful that we have 8.4 million more jobs than we did in 1992, because a lot of our other competitors have no new jobs. And we should be glad that every year for the last 3 years we set a record in the number of new businesses. We should be glad that businesses owned by women alone have hired more people than the Fortune 500 have laid off. We should be glad about that.

But that should not make us insensitive to the fact that there are pockets in the inner cities and isolated rural areas of America that have felt no economic recovery. It should not make us insensitive to the fact that the educational divide in the new economy into which we're moving has become so great that about half the hourly wage earners in America in the bottom half are earning about the same wages as their counterparts were 20 years ago, once you adjust for inflation. We should be sensitive to the fact that even though we're creating far more high-tech jobs than we're losing, if you happen to be one of those 50-year-old people who gets downsized about the time you're trying to send your kids to college, there needs to be an answer for you as well. So we're better off than we were, but we have to build on our successes and face our challenges.

If you look at the fabric of American society, we should be grateful for the fact that as compared with 4 years ago, the crime rate is down, the welfare rolls are down, the poverty rolls are down, and the teen pregnancy rate is dropping. But we should also say, compared to any appropriate standard for a civilized, disciplined, orderly hope for society, all these problems are still far too great. And we must keep going until we have literally wiped them from our concerns.

We can be grateful for the progress that's been made in political reform. The rules on lobbying, for example, are much more open and much stricter than they were when I became President. Now Congress has to apply to itself the laws it imposes on the private sector. Those are good things; we can be glad about that.

But we also know that there are other things that have to be done, not the least of which is a legitimate, genuine campaign finance reform bill that gives every citizen the opportunity to run for office and all citizens the same influence in the electoral process. Until that is done we will not have finished our work.

And while the world is clearly a safer place not only for Americans but for virtually all other people than it was 4 years ago, we know that we have to keep going. We have to keep going not only in the Middle East and in Northern Ireland and in Bosnia, we have to keep going until children everywhere no longer fear that their legs will be blown off by landmines when they're walking in fields. We have to keep going until we know that we have done everything that can be humanly done to remove from people everywhere the threat of biological or chemical or small-scale nuclear weapons. We have to keep going until we have concluded all possible agreements to ban nuclear testing, so that that will be the beginning of the end of any nuclear threat for the people of the world.

And we have to remember that nations are like children. You can't just say that they should say no to bad things; you have to give them some good things to say yes to. And therefore, it is right and decent and in our self-interest to keep expanding the frontiers of economic opportunity and not to forget that all those people in Latin America that still worry about whether their children will even grow to be adults deserve to be part of a new economy, and if we do it right, they'll be our best customers; that all those people in Africa we long to see free of the kind of carnage we see in Rwanda and Burundi deserve to have some hope for a better future if they work hard and do the right thing; that the people who live in India and Pakistan that we long to see walk away from their old, bitter conflicts have to also be able to walk toward a future of brighter hope; and that for America to do well we have to continue to be committed to creating that kind of future. It's in our people's interest to do what is right in the world.

And so that brings me to you. For except for those of us who are, in effect, hired by you to tend for a little while to the public interest, all other Americans necessarily have to be preoccupied with their own interests, with the work they must do and the children they're trying to raise and the things within their imme-

diate reach. But we must—we must—reassert in this country a commitment to citizen leadership among the younger generation of Americans.

You know, when I was in Israel I spoke in Tel Aviv to a large number of young people. And afterward the Prime Minister asked me if I would take questions. And I was fairly apprehensive, but I said okay. [*Laughter*] And a young person said, "Well, what advice would you give to someone my age who wanted to be involved in a position of leadership and responsibility? What would you tell me if I wanted to go into public life; what should I do?"

And I said, "Well, in my country when young people ask me that question I tell them to do three things: One, to get the best education you can, so that you'll be able to learn for a lifetime. Because the world is growing more complex, there is more to know, there is more to understand, and more importantly, there are more connections to be made. You can't just isolate one body of knowledge or one experience from another."

The second thing you have to do is to develop a genuine interest in people. You know, I hear a lot of people in my line of work talking, and it's hard to imagine from the anger in their voices that they like people very much. You don't have to give up on your own heritage to try to stand in another person's shoes.

In one county in America alone there are over 150 different racial and ethnic groups. And that is a great gift for our country in a global society. It is a gift, one we should cherish and treasure and nourish. But unless we realize that curious blend of human reality that gives something common to human nature across all the racial and ethnic divides and still demands of us to respect each other's honestly held differences, we will not meet the challenges of the future. And our inability to do that and our tendency here in America to use elections as an excuse to divide one another, so that we choose up sides based on the belief that our opponents are aliens—and we learn that they're aliens from 30-second ads that tell us how evil and bad they are—that is a very dangerous tendency in a global society when we need to be pulling together and when we can only solve our problems by pulling together. There is no other way to solve the people problems that human societies everywhere face and that the United States has in abundance except by working together, by reaching across the divides.

And the third thing I tell young people is that they should figure out what they believe, stand up for it, and work for it and not be deterred.

To be perfectly honest, the thing I like best about your cheering tonight is that you were cheering for me. [*Laughter*] The thing I like second best about it was your energy, your belief, your conviction, your passion.

You know, I see all these surveys that say Americans are cynical. My friends, that's a great luxury. If you worried about whether every bus you boarded was loaded with a bomb, you wouldn't have the time to be cynical. If you lived in a tiny village in the Andes where you didn't know where your child's next meal was coming from, you wouldn't have the time to be cynical. If you lived in a country in Africa where you were trying to save your wife's life because she belonged to a different tribe than you do and your tribe had the army and they were going through one little village after another with machetes, you wouldn't have the option of being cynical.

You live in a country with the strongest economy, the greatest potential, the widest diversity, the largest amount of opportunities on Earth. And you are not cynical or you wouldn't be here at this conference and you wouldn't have stood up and you wouldn't have exhibited all that energy. But a lot of the people that you work and live with back in your communities are. And they say, "Aw, it doesn't matter who wins, all the politicians"—you've heard all that stuff. I'm telling you, it's a bunch of bull. [*Laughter*] It's a bunch of bull. It's not true.

You know, before we had to stop them for the election season of the other party—[*laughter*]—they have to hold their elections; I'm not complaining. But before we had to stop them for the election season of the other party, the Vice President and I spent over 50 hours with the leaders of the Republicans and Democrats in Congress. And we spent the time in private. And most of what we said I don't think I should talk about in any great detail; it wasn't all that different from what you've already heard in public. But after you spend 50 hours with other people and you talk through and you express your really—what you think and what you feel, you develop a certain relationship to people even if they're very different from you.

And the point I want to make to you is that the leaders of the majority in Congress and I really do view the world in different ways. But that is not a cynical statement. And it has nothing to do with campaign tactics, about which I spoke earlier. It is a plain fact. And that's why I say to young people, you have to decide what you believe and take sides and stand up. But there's nothing to be cynical about. These differences are real and deep and profound and they matter. And they're honestly held by all the parties.

And I just want to say to you that this is a very great country, but if you want your country—when those of you who are younger are my age, and I'm nearly eligible to join AARP—[*laughter*]—I hate it, but it's true—[*laughter*]—if you want this country when you're 50, when you're 60, when you're 65 to be the beacon of hope for the world, to be Israel's best friend, to stand up for freedom and against terrorism, if that's what you want, if you want every child who grows up in this country to believe that he or she can live out their dreams if they'll work for it, then cynicism and inaction and passivity have no place in your future or the future of your friends and neighbors back home where you live. You have to lead. And that's what I want you to do.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:12 p.m. in the ballroom of the Washington Hilton and Towers Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to David Hermelin, national vice chair, United Jewish Appeal; Gad Yaacobi, Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations; Efrat Rabinovich, wife of Itamar Rabinovich, Israeli Ambassador to the United States; and Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks on the Opening of the Los Angeles Branch of the Museum of Television and Radio

March 17, 1996

Let me say that I'm very sorry I couldn't be with you in person tonight. But I am delighted to be here by satellite to open the Los Angeles branch of the Museum of Television and Radio. Hillary and I send our best wishes to all of you, and we know we have an awful lot of friends among you tonight.

I'm speaking to you from the White House's historic library which actually has something in common with the museum. Even though many of the books that fill this room were written long before we ever heard a voice over the radio or saw a face on the screen, all three mediums serve much the same purpose. They enable us to communicate, to pass along ideas, stories, histories, reports from one person to another, to get a feel for the times. And that's why your museum is so important, for radio and television are truly witnesses to our century.

Among the 75,000 programs available are President Franklin Roosevelt's "fireside chats," which helped to pull our Nation through the Depression and the Second World War. There's footage of the triumph of man's first steps on the Moon, a record of our civil rights struggles. And having just returned from the Middle East, I am especially sensitive to the fact that you have footage of President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin and later of the historic handshake between Chairman Arafat and Prime Minister Rabin. You also have footage of the tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination. But I'm also told there are even a few lighter moments reserved for "I Love Lucy" and "Happy Days" and "Seinfeld."

This museum is a tribute not only to radio and television but especially to the men and women who pioneered them and who made the most of their infinite potential. Some of our country's greatest creative talents have dedicated their lives to writing, directing, and producing radio and TV shows. And some of our greatest talents are still engaged in that important work. This museum honors them too.

The Museum of Television and Radio is doing nothing less than preserving our historical and cultural legacy for the future. Through its screening and listening devices, the seminars,

the classes, the museum plays an important role as it enhances people's understanding of the craft and the creativity of these two media and how they've had an impact on our lives. Using the same satellite technology that allows me to join you this evening, the museum is able to take its education programs to a national audience, particularly through its University Satellite Seminar Series, which reaches college students all across our Nation.

I know many of you in attendance have been instrumental in giving us the gift of radio and television. Let me thank you for that gift which touches millions of Americans every day. And I want to thank you, too, for the gift of the Museum of Television and Radio, first in New York and now in Los Angeles. It's a great gift to the American people. You have created a significant cultural institution.

I congratulate you, I thank you, and I wish you well this evening. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at 10:40 p.m. from the Library at the White House.

Remarks at the Dedication of the Nashville Wharf in New Orleans, Louisiana

March 18, 1996

Thank you. I'll tell you what, it's been a cold winter in Washington. It's good to be down here in more ways than one.

I want to thank Irwin Joseph for his fine introduction and for his years of distinguished leadership. I thank Ron Brinson for welcoming me back to the Port of New Orleans. And I thank all of you who work here who make this a success.

I'm delighted to be here with so many of your officials and former officials. I want to thank my good friend Senator John Breaux, who always brings his sense of humor to every endeavor, something we need more of in Washington, DC, I might add.

I want to thank Senator Bennett Johnston and to tell you that I will miss him a great deal. He's always helpful to me if I help Louisiana first. [*Laughter*] I was sitting here thinking as I was coming today, well, Bennett's going to retire, and he'll lose interest in all this stuff. And Mayor Morial was up here speaking and talking about how the crime rate had come down in New Orleans with the help of the community policing efforts which were at the core of the crime bill we passed in 1994, and I'm very proud of that. So I said—[*applause*]—thank you. So I said to Senator Johnston, I said, "I think it's just great that things are going better in New Orleans. The crime rate is coming down. The juvenile crime rate is coming down. The economy is up." He said, "Yes, it is," and he said "I've got just one more little project here I want to talk to you about." [*Laughter*] So you may get him for free after next year for all I know. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank my longtime friend Congressman Bill Jefferson and his colleague Congressman Cleo Fields, who is out here in the audience. I want to also echo the positive things that were said about your fine young Mayor. I love working with him. And let me tell you something, New Orleans is one of the few cities in America today where not only the crime rate is going down but the crime rate among juveniles is going down, not only because you're being tougher on crime but you're giving these kids something to say yes to so they can stay out of trouble in the first place. And that's a real tribute to the Mayor, and I respect him for that.

I want to thank Lieutenant Governor Blanco and Attorney General Ieyoub for being here. They're over there to my left. And I thank the religious leaders for coming, and I want to thank all the former officials who are here. I see two New Orleans natives, your former State treasurer, Mary Landrieu, and my dear friend Congresswoman Lindy Boggs. Thank you, my dear, for being here. Thank you.

I'd like to thank the people who provided the music today, the James River Movement and the St. Augustine High School band. Let's give them a big hand over there. [*Applause*]

You know, I feel sort of like a preacher who gets up to give a sermon, and I'm preaching

to the saved, and besides that, it's already been given by everybody who's spoken before. I wanted to come here to help you dedicate this new Nashville wharf because it is the symbol of the decision that you have made to reach out to the rest of the world, to compete and win.

When I became your President I had a very straightforward vision of what I thought our country had to do to deal with the challenges of the new information age and the new global economy. I wanted to see this country go into the next century, which is now only 4 years away, with the American dream alive and well for every American who was willing to work for it, without regard to their race or their region or where they started out in life. I wanted to see our country remain the world's strongest force for peace and for freedom, for security and prosperity around the world, because that makes us safer and stronger. And I wanted to see us come together more as a people around our basic values of responsibility and opportunity and work and family and, most importantly, as a community. In my State of the Union Address I tried to address all these things and to say what is to me the most important lesson I have learned as your President, which is that whenever we are divided we defeat ourselves, but whenever we are united America always wins.

I want to thank the Members of Congress who are present here for helping us to change the economic direction of this country; to implement a strategy that will permit the American dream to be more available to all Americans as we move into this new world; for helping us to reduce the deficit, to increase our investment in people and research and technology; and to expand trade on fairer terms.

Four years ago this country was drifting with high unemployment and stagnant incomes. In the last 3 years and 2 months our economy has produced 8.4 million jobs. And I am proud of that, and you should be, too. The combined rates of unemployment and inflation and home mortgages are the lowest they have been in 27 years.

We now see the United States leading the world again in key industries, from autos to telecommunication. Today, just today, for the 3d year in a row, the distinguished World Economic Forum in Europe has said that the United States is the world's most productive, strongest economy. That is what the American people have produced, and they should be very proud.

Here in Louisiana, over 160,000 new jobs have been created in the last 3 years. Bank lending has increased. New homes are increasing by 15 percent a year. Homeownership in our country is now at an all-time high. And in each of the last 3 years there has been a record number of new businesses.

I know that we are all concerned, and I want to say more in a moment about the impact of large businesses having large layoffs. But you should know that entrepreneurs in America, small-business people in each of the last 3 years have created far more jobs than have been laid off by large companies, so that we are, net, 8.4 million ahead. No other country in the world has a record even remotely approximating that in the last 3 years. And it's a great tribute to the people who are out there in the private sector working hard, not only the business owners and the management but the workers who have done so much to become more productive and competitive in this global economy.

I'm also proud of the fact that our country is getting its act together at home. All across America the crime rate, the poverty rate, the welfare rolls, the food stamp rolls, the teen pregnancy rates are down in America. That is good news for the United States.

And I'm proud of the fact that our country has remained the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and security and prosperity. As your CEO has said, we have led the world toward broader trade agreements. We've also led the world back from the brink of nuclear disaster. There's not a single nuclear missile pointed at an American citizen today, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, and I am proud of that.

When I leave you I'll have the honor of going up to review our troops in Fort Polk. The brave men and women who have just returned from Haiti will be especially honored because there they helped to restore democracy, to stop the flow of desperate refugees to our own shores. When I sent them to Haiti, I promised that they would finish the job and come home soon. And I will be saluting them for a mission accomplished.

Even as our——

[*At this point, there was a disturbance in the audience.*]

You know—wait, wait, wait a minute, wait a minute. We can't both—wait, wait, wait. We

can't both talk at the same time. I'll tell you what—wait a minute. I'll tell you what I'll do. If you'll let me finish, then I'll ask people who want to hear you go outside that door right there and hear you after I finish.

But let me say that even though what I just said to you is true and accurate, and this country is clearly in better shape than it was 3 years ago, we know that this is a record for the American people to build on, not to sit on, because we know that a lot of important challenges still remain out there for our people. We know that even as our economy has created more jobs, too many people still work without a raise, too many people fear this downsizing or layoffs that could take their own lives away from the stability they now enjoy in the flash of an eye.

We know that even though the crime rate is dropping dramatically, a lot of people are still afraid when they walk down the street, and the rate of violence in our country is still entirely too high, and we're losing too many of our young people still to drugs and gangs and crime. We know that even as people all across the world take strides for peace, none of us are immune from the things that we have seen in the bombs in London or in Israel or the poison gas in Japan or even in Oklahoma City.

So this is a time of great opportunity but also a time of great challenge. This is, as I said in the State of the Union, the age of greatest possibility the American people have ever known; the greatest period of change in 100 years, since the time when millions of us moved from the farm to the factory, from the country to the city and the towns. I am proud of the work that we are doing to take advantage of this change, but I know we have more to do.

How will we as a nation do for all Americans what you have done here, to turn the challenge of the new economy into opportunity? Well, we're going to do it the way we have always done the right things, by working together. I say again, this country has been hurt more by permitting itself to be divided by forces for short-term gain when what we really needed to do was to work together for the long run. And we dare not let that happen today.

You heard others before me talk about trade. I want to put it in a larger context. I said in the State of the Union and I say again to you here, there are at least seven major challenges we have to face if we're going to fulfill our mission of opening the American dream to all Americans who will work for it and pulling the American family together and maintaining America's leadership.

First, we have to strengthen America's families and give all our children a decent childhood. Yes, we have to invest in their education, their health care, and nutrition. But we also have to give their parents the capacity to shape their lives. That's why I fought so hard for the V-chip in these new television stations. If you're going to have 500 television stations, give parents back the right to control what their young children see. I think it's important.

We have to renew our schools and open the doors of college education to everyone. If you look at the differences in wages today in America, you see that the single most significant thing is the level of skills that workers have, which means that we not only have to open the doors of college education to all Americans, we have to make available continuing education and training throughout the lifetime of every single solitary American worker. And that's why I say to you the best thing we could do to cut taxes if we pass the balanced budget plan this year, which I still hope we will, the politics notwithstanding, the best tax cut we could give American families is a tax deduction for the cost of education after high school for up to $10,000 a year. That would make a difference to America's families.

For people who have to change jobs we have to provide a greater measure of economic security in a way that doesn't undermine our ability to create jobs. What does that mean? If you lose a job, you should immediately be able to get a voucher to take to the local community colleges or wherever you need it to get a new education to start a new job in life. If you change jobs, you ought to at least be able to take your health insurance with you, and you ought to be able to take a pension with you when you go. That's what we need to do.

I say again, I laud what the Mayor has done here, but we cannot stop in our fight against crime and violence until every child has a chance to grow up safe and until when you turn on the television news at night and you see the reports of a crime, you are surprised. We have to make it the exception, not the rule again in America.

As you and Louisiana know, we have got to find a way to grow our economy and improve our environment. And we have proved time and

again in the last 3 years that is not a choice you have to make. We do not have to choose between a clean environment and a growing economy. If we do it right, we can have both. And that ought to be the priority of every American citizen.

And finally, we have to restore America's faith in Government. We have to restore your faith that you're getting your money's worth, that we're doing our job, and that we're not doing things we shouldn't do that you should be doing for yourselves. In the last 3 years we have taken significant strides. The Government is smaller. By the end of this year the Government will be as small in Washington as it was when President Kennedy gave his speech here 34 years ago. That is something all Americans need to know. The Government is less bureaucratic. We're getting rid of 16,000 pages of Federal regulations. The Government is getting more effective. The Small Business Administration has cut its budget and doubled its loan volume. The Government is trying to be more responsive to you. Almost three-quarters of all the people on welfare in the United States today are in welfare reform experiments that the Federal Government has told the States to have at it and try to move people from welfare to work.

These are important changes. But there is more to do. We ought to pass the right kind of balanced budget that gets interest rates down, grows the economy, balances the budget but doesn't wreck Medicare and Medicaid and doesn't walk away from education and the environment. We ought to pass the line item veto that my friends in the other party have said they're for for 100 years, to give the President the ability to X-out unnecessary spending. And we ought to pass campaign finance reform. We ought to do things that will increase your confidence that Washington is doing your business, because that is exactly what we need to do.

And finally, let me say, if you ask me to say in a sentence, "Well, Mr. President, what is the role of Government in Washington in the 21st century?" I would say that our primary job is first, to protect your security and second, to give you the ability as citizens, as families, as communities, to meet your own challenges and make the most of your own lives. The Government cannot do certain things for you, but we can create an environment in which you are empowered to make the most of your own lives. That is our responsibility.

Now, it is against that background that you have to understand why I thought this was so important today for me to come down here and be a part of this dedication. This is a picture of America's future, because of the work that is being done, because of the way it's being done, and because of the people who are doing it and because you are doing it together.

Thirty-two years ago when President Kennedy stood here, or 34 years ago, he told our Nation that we had a choice: to trade or to fade. Not a bad line for 34 years ago, is it? [*Laughter*] And you know that we chose to compete. I come here to reaffirm that choice today. A fifth of all America's trade is conducted through the ports of the State of Louisiana. So much cargo is crammed into these wharfs that the current port can't keep up with the demand. The terminal where we're standing was operating at full capacity just a week after it opened. Wharf C, which opens in several months, is expected to be at capacity within a day after it opens.

That's what happens when Americans work together. This port was expanded and rebuilt by the State and the city. The business opportunities have been seized by the employers and the workers. Our National Government has done its part by getting the deficit and interest rates down and growing the economy and expanding the barriers to trade so that we have more opportunities to sell to more people.

Through this port passes steel from Gary, Indiana, bound for Japan; trains designed and made in Minneapolis steaming for South America; thousands of crates of pharmaceuticals made right here in Louisiana bound for Europe and beyond. Ninety thousand men and women across Louisiana already earn their living because of this port. The future is going to bring more trade, more opportunity, and more jobs because you embraced the challenge of change and looked to the future with confidence.

One thing has remained constant throughout our history: Our people have always had a restless energy and a determination to conquer new frontiers, to make real the promise of the American dream in each new generation. Today that spirit and that legacy demands that we compete and win in a world marketplace that can be punishing and uncertain but also deeply, deeply rewarding.

All change is unsettling. Every change requires pain as well as bringing gain. But if we remember our mission, that we're trying to

make the American dream available to everybody who will work for it, we're trying to keep our country the world's strongest force for peace and freedom, and we're trying to bring the American people together—if we remember that mission, we can make the right decisions.

Take the trade issue that has been so much debated again in recent months. If you hear the debate, you would think there are only two choices, that in the face of competition, some of which is unfair and much of which comes from countries that pay people wages we couldn't live on, we should just try to build walls around our country again. The problem is, walls don't permit this port to operate. Then others would say there is one other opportunity, and that is simply to have pure open trade in which our markets are open to others, and we hope that they'll open their markets to us.

But in a world of stiff competition what you need is fair rules. What you need is a genuine market. What we need is trade that is both free and fair, truly open, two-way open trade. The Port of New Orleans proves that if you have two-way open trade, Americans will do very well, and we'll be just fine in the future.

And let me emphasize just one of the benefits that comes from two-way open trade. We know that jobs tied to international trade, on balance, pay higher than average wages. Now, in 1992, the year before I took office, only 20 percent of the new jobs created in the United States paid above average wages. Since that time, we have conducted 200 new trade agreements, 20 with Japan alone. Trade in America is at an all-time high, up one-third in 3 years, trade with Japan up more than a third. In the areas of agreement, the 20 areas of agreement, trade is up 80 percent with Japan.

What is the result? One big result is that in 1995, instead of 20 percent, over 55 percent of the new jobs created in this economy paid above average wages. We have to do more of that. We have to keep going in that direction.

And so I say to you, my fellow Americans, you are pointing the way to the future. Every step in the future is fraught with uncertainty. In a dynamic and open world there aren't the guarantees that used to exist. But we can do very well, and we can achieve our mission. But we must not be afraid.

I'm reminded, you know, that whenever I come home I remember all my old stories, whenever I come back to the South. I'm reminded of the old story of the minister who had been a fairly bland minister, and he determined that he had to step up his preaching style. And so he worked and worked and worked for months to develop a sermon that he felt was the finest, most barn-burning, most emotion-generating sermon he had ever delivered. And he filled the church one day and boy, he gave a stem-winder. Nobody could believe it. It was magnificent. And the punchline was, "I want everybody who wants to go to heaven to stand up right now." And the whole congregation leapt to their feet, except one lady in the front row who sat stone still. And she hadn't missed a Sunday in 40 years; the most faithful member of the church wouldn't get up. He was crestfallen. He said, "Sister Jones, don't you want to go to heaven when you die?" And she jumped right up. She said, "Oh, I'm sorry, Preacher, I thought you were trying to get up a load to go right now." [*Laughter*]

Well, folks, we have to go right now. We have to go right now into this future. And you have to send a message that America can win in this new future. If we work together and we do the right things and we stay true to our values, we can win in the future. We need not be afraid of the world toward which we are moving if we keep our mission in mind, if we stay true to our values, and above all, if we remember when we are divided we defeat ourselves; when we are together, America always wins.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. at the Nashville Avenue B Wharf. In his remarks, he referred to Irwin Joseph, president, Port of New Orleans International Longshoremen's Association; Ron Brinson, president and chief executive officer, Port of New Orleans; Mayor Marc H. Morial of New Orleans; Lt. Gov. Kathleen Blanco and Attorney General Richard P. Ieyoub of Louisiana; and former Representative Corrinne Claiborne (Lindy) Boggs.

Remarks to the Community at Fort Polk, Louisiana
March 18, 1996

Thank you. General Shalikashvili, Deputy Secretary White, General Sheehan, General Tilelli, General Shelton, Admiral Miller, General Sherfield, Command Sergeant Major Austin, Command Sergeant Major Laye; to the Members of Congress who are here, Senators Johnston and Breaux and Congressmen Jefferson, Fields, Hayes, and McCrery; to the members of the Joint Readiness Training Center, the members of the Fort Polk community, to the Department of Defense civilians, and to all the men and women of America's Armed Forces.

Let me say I was very impressed by that recent maneuver where you rushed the ropes—[*laughter*]—and I was very impressed when all the people behind you rushed up behind you, and I know you're a lot warmer now and that's the main reason you did it. [*Laughter*] I wish you were about 5 feet taller; you could be a windbreaker for us up here. [*Laughter*]

I am delighted to be the first sitting President ever to visit Fort Polk. I know well the Joint Readiness Training Center. As some of you may know, before it came here it was located in my home State when I was Governor, in Little Rock at the air base there and at Fort Chaffee. I must say when I was Governor and it was announced that we were losing the JRT Center to Fort Polk, I had some qualms about it. But from the looks of things today, it's been a good move. It's stronger than ever before, and the JRTC is serving the United States well. Thank you very much.

As all of you know, I come here today primarily to stand with the veterans of Operation Uphold Democracy, the men and women who restored freedom to Haiti. We have been true to our word and true to our mission because of your skill and professionalism. The vast majority of our forces have returned from Haiti on time, just as we said they would. The last 500 American peacekeepers are now packing up, and in less than 30 days they too will be home.

You made history by showing once again that when America acts on behalf of its values and its interests, it gets the job done. You undertook a difficult task, and every single one of you who served in Haiti can say with great pride, "Mission accomplished." You made a difference for our Nation's security and for a neighbor in need. We and other nations will now have to help Haiti in the hard road ahead of it, but the military job was done, done by you and other allies who came to work with you. And for that, every single one of you should be very proud.

Eighteen months ago our Nation faced a serious challenge. Just a few hundred miles from our shores a brutal regime was torturing and murdering the citizens of Haiti. More than 3,000 of them had been killed in a reign of terror. The democracy that they had voted for in overwhelming numbers was stolen from the people. Tens of thousands were fleeing to America and to other nations in unsafe boats and rafts, and many died along the way. There was a clear threat to our borders and to the civility of our region. Because it was the right thing to do and because it was in our interest, we decided to intervene. We gave our word that democracy would be restored. And because the military dictators came to the United States and broke their word when they promised to leave, you, the men and women of Uphold Democracy, kept America's word.

From beginning to end, this mission was a testament to the skill and professionalism of America's Armed Forces. The coup leaders knew from the outset they were facing the best trained, the best equipped, the best prepared fighting force on Earth. When they learned that the 82d Airborne and other units were on the way, they gave way. That enabled our troops to land on the ground without bloodshed and prove once again that our military might is the indispensable muscle behind our diplomacy. You are trained to fight. Time and again, you have stood down aggression and triumphed in battle.

In Haiti you came to a different kind of mission and showed the world another side of America's magnificent military. You and our troops who are now in Bosnia have demonstrated a dedication to fighting for peace as great as your ability to prevail in war. You've paved the way for the return of Haiti's democratic government. You took guns off the street. You helped to develop a local police. You gave the people there a new sense of security. You

fixed the roads and bridges and brought the food and medicine and cleared the way for a return to normal civilized life. You gave the people of Haiti the breathing space they need to reclaim their democracy, to get their economy started, to undertake the hard work that only they can do of building a free nation. Now Haiti has enjoyed its first democratic transfer of power in 200 years as a nation, thanks to you.

While the country remains poor, while its institutions remain fragile, this country now has better prospects for the future than at any time in the past. You did the job. When I sent America's troops to Haiti in September of 1994, joined by 27 other countries' troops, I said that the United States forces would remain through the inauguration of a new president. That took place on the 7th of February.

I want to now thank and ask you to join me in thanking the extraordinary men who led the U.S. and the U.N. efforts in Haiti, General Hugh Shelton, General Dave Meade, General George Fisher, and General Joe Kinzer. Let's give them a big hand for their service and leadership. [*Applause*]

There was a lot of extraordinary service from others in uniform as well, people like Army Special Forces Sergeant First Class Gregory Cardot, who gave the ultimate sacrifice. Today we remember his loss. We honor his devotion to duty. And we honor that of all those of Uphold Democracy. Like American service men and women everywhere, those of you who served in Haiti went above and beyond the call of duty.

I would like to mention just a few of those in closing who went the extra distance and made the extra difference. Sergeant First Class Joseph Register, Jr., saw a mob beating a Haitian man. Ignoring his own safety, Sergeant Register plunged into the crowd, shielded the badly wounded man, and gave him first aid. He protected the man despite great personal risk until other soldiers arrived to help. And he probably saved that man's life. For his brave actions, Sergeant Register received the Soldier's Medal, the Army's highest peacetime award for heroism.

Airman First Class Patricia Hasboun, who we just saw receive the Joint Service Commendation Medal, used her own Creole language skills to help teach a Haitian town's police chief to drive as she distributed food and toys and clothes to orphanages throughout Haiti.

While on patrol in Port-au-Prince, Staff Sergeant Mark Maxwell and Sergeant Bill Fitzpatrick, now stationed here at Fort Polk, pushed through a crowd to find a woman lying on the ground in labor and in great pain. Sergeant Fitzpatrick secured the area. Staff Sergeant Maxwell, using his skills from the combat lifesaver course, delivered that woman's healthy baby boy.

Special Forces Staff Sergeant Jorge Ramos took it upon himself to restore the sanitation system and public washing facilities in the town of Leogane. He organized local volunteers and gave a community that had been badly neglected one of the essentials of a decent existence. And out of gratitude to the sergeant and his troops, the townspeople painted a 4-foot-high replica of his Special Forces patch on a nearby wall.

These are only a few of the stories of Uphold Democracy. We know that our success in Haiti would never have been possible without the strong support of the military families of Operation Uphold Democracy. And I would like to now say a special word of thanks to all of them. We Americans know that the burden of our leadership in the world weighs heavily on the families of men and women in uniform, here and around the world. We ask our troops to travel a long way from home, to be apart from their loved ones for long periods of time, to take on difficult and dangerous missions. So I thank them.

And let me also say here publicly what I will have a chance in a few moments to say personally to the families of the troops in Bosnia who are here today, we also honor your strength and your sacrifice. You are giving the people of Bosnia an opportunity for peace. You are helping to prevent the recurrence of the most vicious bloodshed Europe has known since the end of World War II and to prevent a widened war which could have drawn in American forces in the fighting. We know it's tough for one parent to be left to carry all the family responsibilities, to bear the extra burden of running a household and raising the family. We ask a great deal. But time and again, America's military families deliver too.

All of you have shown what is best about our country: the determination to stand up for freedom and to stand against oppression, the readiness to give a helping hand, to do all of that together as one America. I thank you for that. Your example explains why people all over

the world look to America for hope and for inspiration. We can't be everywhere, and we can't do everything. But where we can make a difference and where our values and interests are at stake, we must act. That was the case in Haiti. You acted and acted well, above and beyond the call of duty.

I congratulate you on your tremendous achievement. I thank you for a job well done. Your Nation is grateful and proud.

God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:45 p.m. on the parade ground. In his remarks, he referred to Deputy Secretary of Defense John P. White; Gen. John J. Sheehan, USMC, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Command; Gen. John H. Tilelli, Jr., USA, Army Vice Chief of Staff; Gen. Henry H. Shelton, USAF, Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command; Adm. Paul D. Miller, USN (Ret.); Brig. Gen. Michael B. Sherfield, USA, Commander, Joint Readiness Training Center; Command Sgt. Maj. Johnny Austin, Joint Readiness Training Center; and Command Sgt. Maj. Jesse Laye, U.S. Atlantic Command.

Remarks to the Community in Alexandria, Louisiana
March 18, 1996

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for waiting in the cold and the wind. I am so glad to be here. I want to thank the Tioga High School band for playing. Didn't they do a great job? [*Applause*] Mayor Randolph, Mayor Baden, Senator Johnston, Senator Breaux, Congressman Fields, Congressman Jefferson, Chairman Meyer, I am delighted to be here, and I thank you for waiting for me.

I want to talk just a minute, very briefly, about what you have done here with England Air Force Base and why that's a model of what I hope we'll see more of all across America. You know, when the cold war ended and we were moving into this global economy, the first thing that happened that scared a lot of Americans was the need to downsize the military and the plain need that the country had to reduce the size of our bases. A lot of people were afraid, but you people were not afraid. You worked together, and you were determined to make some good things happen here. And I have to tell you that I have been all over this country looking at military bases. I have worked with communities all over America, personally, to help them start their communities up and to use these bases as economic assets. There is no place in the entire United States that has done a better job than Alexandria has.

Now, what I want to say, even in all this wind, is that there are other challenges facing us. You read in the press, I'm sure, that some big companies, for example, are restructuring and laying off a lot of people. All the time in this economy there are jobs being created, jobs being abolished, jobs being created, jobs being abolished. But what I want to say to you is that this country is moving in the right direction. We have 8.4 million more jobs today than we had 3 years ago because the American people, when they work together, can find ways to solve problems, meet challenges, and move forward. And if we will commit ourselves to a few simple things, educating all of our children and providing education for adults whenever they lose jobs, the moment they lose jobs; making the most of our resources; selling America's products around the world; and taking the things we have in this country, like these military bases, and turning them into opportunities; and if we will commit to say if a person loses a job they at least ought to be able to carry their health insurance and their pension with them so they can take care of their families when they start anew; if we will commit ourselves to making it possible for people to start small businesses and for every community in America to participate in the economic recovery, then this country is going to do just fine.

I want you to know, when I became President, because I had been through a base closing in my home State, I started a whole new program to get the Pentagon to move more quickly, to move properties out and give them to the communities so that they could be used to generate jobs. And that is what we have done now

all across America, and we're using you as a model.

Now let me say that there's one official reason we're all out here on this windy day, and that is that I am here to take the next step in the official transition of this Air Force base to the central Louisiana community by formally presenting the deed for 165 acres of the base to Jim Meyer. So I'd like to ask him to come up here and let me present the deed. Mr. Meyer?

Here it is. It is now yours.

Mr. Meyer. Thank you.

The President. Thank you again. God bless you. It's great to see you. I've had a great day. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:55 p.m. at the England Air Park. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Ned Randolph of Alexandria; Mayor Fred Baden of Pineville; and Jim Meyer, chairman, England Economic and Industrial Development District.

Remarks on the 1997 Budget and an Exchange With Reporters
March 19, 1996

The President. I need a lot of help today. [*Laughter*] Please be seated.

Good afternoon. Today I am presenting to Congress and the American people my budget for fiscal year 1997. This detailed budget plan invests in our people and balances the budget in 7 years.

The budget continues the economic strategy that I put in place when I took office of President. Three years ago our economy was drifting and our deficit was exploding. In the 12 years before I became President the deficit had skyrocketed and the national debt had quadrupled. I was determined that our Nation must change course and once again provide growth and opportunity for the American people. So we cut the deficit. We invested in education and training. We opened foreign markets to our goods and services through tough trade agreements. We shrank and reformed our Government so that it now has the smallest work force in 30 years but is still capable of performing essential functions necessary to the well-being and the growth of the American people.

The American economy has turned around. It is now poised for sustained growth. Thanks to the ingenuity and hard work of the American people, our Nation has created 8.4 million jobs. We have the lowest combined rate of unemployment, inflation, and home mortgage rates in 27 years. Exports are up dramatically, to an all-time high. Key industries from autos to semiconductors once again lead the world. And just yesterday the World Economic Forum said that for the third year in a row the American economy was the world's most productive. In addition to that, it's worth noting that in the last couple of years wages have started rising for the first time in a decade. And as compared with 4 years ago, when only 20 percent of the new jobs paid above average wages, in 1995 over 55 percent of the new jobs paid above average wages.

But there is more to do. We must press on. The most important thing we can do to keep our economy growing is to finish the job of balancing the budget in a way that reflects our values. In 1992 I pledged to cut the deficit in half and to continue cutting it after that. We are cutting the deficit in half. I'm proud to say that my 1997 budget is the first budget presented by a President of either party in nearly two decades to come to balance using the numbers of both Congress and the executive branch.

It cuts unnecessary spending in hundreds of Government programs. It reforms welfare, putting in place a system that ends welfare as we know it and moves more people from welfare to work. It honors our values by protecting Medicare and Medicaid and investing in our future through education and the environment. It closes corporate loopholes and cuts taxes for working families and small businesses. Most important, this is the second year of the plan I presented to the American people to balance the budget in 7 years. This budget underscores my personal determination; we will balance the

budget. The best way for that to happen is for Congress and I to work together.

In the coming weeks, we must seize the opportunity we now have to give the American people a moment of real bipartisan achievement. Over the last several months I have worked closely with the bipartisan congressional leadership. We have spent hours and hours together in serious and productive discussions. The congressional leaders and I have identified $700 billion in savings common to both our plans. That is more than enough to balance the budget in 7 years and to provide a tax cut.

I am ready to work with the leaders of Congress to finish the job. Toward that end, I have invited the bipartisan congressional leadership to meet with me tomorrow at the White House. I will urge them to address our pressing national concerns: balancing the budget, welfare reform, the Kennedy-Kassebaum health care bill, the antiterrorism legislation. And we'll also discuss the prospects for progress on all these areas in the weeks ahead. We have to meet our common obligation to act on our urgent national priorities. We should enact a balanced budget and we should do it now, not after the November election, not after the political season, not later, but now. The American people deserve nothing less. It is the right thing to do.

Now I'd like to call on the Vice President to discuss some of the priorities in the budget that we are pursuing consistent with our strategy. And then others will come forward to brief you on other aspects of the budget.

Mr. Vice President.

[*At this point, the Vice President made remarks.*]

Q. Mr. President, have you heard from the congressional leaders?

The President. We're going to meet tomorrow.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:07 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.

Remarks to the National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids

March 20, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you, Alan. And I want to thank the Lung Association, the Heart Association, the Cancer Society, all the physicians who are here today with the various medical groups. Dr. Bristow, it's good to see you. And I thank all of you for being here.

I thank Secretary Shalala and Commissioner Kessler and CDC Director David Satcher for their leadership. I want to thank someone who is not here but who had a lot to do with this effort—I thank the Vice President, who lost his own beloved sister to lung cancer, for his strength and leadership in this endeavor.

Normally, I don't think the people of America should give the President an award for anything, because the President's job is award enough. It is an uncommon gift with a great responsibility. But to tell you the truth, I'm kind of tickled about this today, because I admired, indeed I loved, Mike Synar very much. He was a good man and a brave man who gave the rest of us a great deal of energy and hope and direction. And our country could do with a few more like him, people that just rear back and stand up and do the right thing. And if it doesn't work out, they just laugh and go on and don't expect any kind of a blue ribbon or award at the end of the day.

When I gave the State of the Union Address and spoke about the challenges facing our country as we move into the next century, I said, and I repeat, that our first challenge—not the Government, the people's first challenge—is to strengthen our families and cherish all our children and give every single one of our young people the childhood that he or she deserves. One of the most important things we can do in meeting that challenge is to protect our children from what is rapidly becoming the single greatest threat to their health: cigarette smoking and tobacco addition.

This is, like other challenges, as Secretary Shalala so eloquently said, a challenge we have to meet together. To be sure, Government has a role to play. I want to acknowledge the presence of two other Members of Congress here today who stood shoulder to shoulder with Mike Synar, our good friend Congressman Dick Dur-

bin from Illinois, who won his primary for the United States Senate last night. Congratulations, Dick. It is a measure of his commitment to the issue that I talked to him after midnight his time last night, but he suited up and showed up here today anyway. We thank you. And Congressman Marty Meehan from Massachusetts, thank you, sir, for being here and for your good work here as well.

I thank the parents of America who have become increasingly sensitive to this issue and are working hard to teach their children. I thank the young people here who are working hard to reach out to their peers and who often can have more influence on their peers than their parents or the President. I thank the athletes and the entertainers who are committed to being role models, the businesses who control access to tobacco products, the teachers, the coaching, the advertising executives. I thank the health care professionals and the volunteers.

Because of this great sea of people in America, what was once the work of a few lonely activists has grown into a national movement to protect the health and the future of our children. Three thousand young people start to smoke every day, and a thousand of them will have their lives shortened as a result. It seems to me that as President, if I say that what I really want is for every American child who is willing to work for it to have his or her shot at the American dream, that cannot be done unless we first of all try to guarantee them the existence and the health necessary to pursue their dreams. And that is also what the rest of us must do.

We have, as all of you know, proposed ways to crack down on advertising that tells young people smoking is cool. We've proposed ways to make it harder for children and teenagers to buy cigarettes by reducing their access to vending machines and free samples. We issued the Synar regulation in January to demand that States, in return for the Federal money they received, do more to enforce their own laws against the sale of tobacco to minors. It's worth noting here that it is illegal in every single State of the Union to sell any form of tobacco to minors. We're working closely with State governments to ensure that the Synar regulations are implemented quickly and decisively. And I have to say that so far the results on that front have been quite encouraging to me.

All of you I want to thank for supporting these efforts. All of you who have been fighting for a long time are now working to bring your experience in new ways to bear on this effort through the National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids. And I want to welcome especially some of the people in this room who are new to the struggle in this effort but who can make all the difference.

First, let me say I am very glad to announce that two groups of America's athletes, heroes to so many young people, have come forward to help. Young women in particular are bombarded with billboards which suggest that smoking is cool and glamorous and a good way to stay thin. The women of the U.S. National Soccer Team know better. This spring and this summer, they are going to make America proud when they compete in the Olympics. And just when thousands of young girls around the country are looking up to them, they are going to make it clear that smoking is not cool. Working with the Federal Government, they have launched a major promotional advertisement effort called Smoke-Free Kids and Soccer. The effort, including television advertising, will be centered around the team's matches all across our country leading up to the Olympics in Atlanta this summer. It will make a real difference in people's lives, and two members of that team are here today. I would like for them to stand and be recognized. Thank you very much. [*Applause*]

Former major league baseball players Joe Garagiola and Bill Tuttle, along with Mrs. Tuttle, have stepped up to the plate to help get spit tobacco out of baseball. As leaders of the National Spit Tobacco Education Campaign, they are working to educate players about the dangers and to help protect the health of young fans who look up to them. In fact, they've just come back from a trip down to spring training in Florida where they met with team owners and the players' union, and they are making some very impressive progress as well. I want to ask Joe and Bill and Mrs. Tuttle to stand and I want to thank them. Thank you so much, and God bless you. [*Applause*]

I also want to thank some businesses who are doing their part. Businesses, of course, have a right to sell cigarettes to adults, but they also have a responsibility, a legal one and a moral one, to prevent cigarette sales to minors. I'm very proud and happy to announce that major

United States supermarket chains are taking decisive steps to curtail the sale of cigarettes and tobacco to young people. A&P company, Giant Food, and Pratts Supermarkets are instituting mandatory training of all their cashiers to ensure that they know the law and understand their obligations to enforce it. That means requiring identification from all young people who seek to buy cigarettes. In July, A&P Chairman James Wood will recommend to the board of directors that A&P discontinue the use of all vending machines by the end of the year. Giant is going to eliminate vending machines in all stores except for their 24-hour stores. Pratts doesn't allow any cigarette vending machines at all. And in the meantime, A&P and Giant are converting their vending machines so they only operate with tokens that must be purchased from a cashier.

I urge every supermarket chain and every individual grocery store in America to follow the lead of these three companies and shut down tobacco sales to minors. I'd like to ask the people here from those companies to stand to be recognized today. Thank you very much. [*Applause*]

Let me just say one other thing about them. You know, I spend a great deal of my time as your President trying to find ways to both generate more jobs for America and to help American businesses make more money, because both those things are very good for our country. And I'm proud of the fact that our country has produced in the last 3 years 8.4 million new jobs. And unlike the past 15 years, almost all of these jobs have been created in the private sector as we have downsized the Government. Therefore, any President and any citizen must think seriously before we ask a business to do something that will cost it money. This decision costs these people money. And they did it because it was the right thing to do for America. And I thank you for that very much.

I want to thank all the activists who are here in the room who have been recognized and those of you who have not. And especially I'd like to say a word of thanks to the former employees of tobacco companies who have stood up to tell the world the truth. And I want to recognize one in particular, the late Victor Crawford, whose wife, Linda, is here today. He was a great champion for our children. We miss him today. We wish he were here, and we know he's smiling down on us. Thank you, Linda, for being here, and God bless you.

My friends, we have come a long way in this endeavor, indeed, a long way since our administration made the first announcement about our efforts to reduce tobacco advertising and tobacco sales to young people. Now we have supermarket chains, athletes, workers, private citizens who have recognized the threat tobacco poses. And this movement is producing results. Just last week there was a major breakthrough when Liggett agreed to settle its lawsuits. It became the very first tobacco company to acknowledge that tobacco can be deadly. This is the first crack in the stone wall of denial. My message to other tobacco companies is, therefore, simple and direct: Take responsibility. Sell to adults, but draw the line on children.

I'm happy that Liggett has also agreed to begin changing their own advertising practices so that they have less influence over young people. That's a good start. And now I want them and the other tobacco companies to go the distance. If selling cigarettes to minors is illegal, no good corporate citizen should be aiming advertising at those minors.

My fellow Americans, we can win this fight. We can save countless lives of our young people. We can give them the future that we imagine when we look into the bright faces of these children who are here. But we have to do it together. It is folly to pretend that any one of us, including the President, can do it alone.

When he graduated from high school in 1968, Mike Synar called on his classmates to, quote, "Stand and be counted when the occasion arises." Well, he always did. This occasion requires us to do it for him, and I am honored that we can do it in his name.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:50 p.m. in the East Room at the White House upon receiving the Mike Synar National Public Service Award from the Coalition on Smoking OR Health. In his remarks, he referred to Alan Synar, brother of the late Representative Mike Synar; Lonnie Bristow, president, American Medical Association; Julie Foudy and Carla Overbeck, cocaptains, U.S. Women's National Soccer Team; and Bill Tuttle's wife, Gloria.

Statement on Signing Tax Benefit Legislation for Military Personnel Serving in Operation Joint Endeavor

March 20, 1996

Today, in recognition of the sacrifices members of the U.S. Armed Forces are making in and around Bosnia, I signed a bill extending special tax benefits to military personnel serving in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Macedonia.

During Vietnam and the Gulf war, tax relief was granted to individuals serving in "combat zones." By extending similar tax benefits to those supporting peace efforts in the former Yugoslavia, this legislation recognizes the unique hardships and risks members of the U.S. Armed Forces face in non-combat missions like the one in Bosnia.

I wish to thank Congress for their overwhelming support and timely passage of this legislation and also for their recognition of the hardships encountered by American troops serving in Operation Joint Endeavor.

NOTE: H.R. 2778, approved March 20, was assigned Public Law No. 104–117.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report on Science, Technology and American Diplomacy

March 20, 1996

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

I am pleased to transmit this annual report on Science, Technology and American Diplomacy for fiscal year 1995, in accordance with Title V of the Foreign Relations Act of Fiscal Year 1979, as amended (Public Law 95–426; 22 U.S.C. 2656c(b)).

Science and technology (S&T) are central to the goals of economic security, military strength, and diplomatic engagement—the vital elements of national security. The wisdom of our investments in S&T will significantly affect our ability to meet our national security challenges as we move into the next century. International cooperation in S&T serves to prevent and mitigate threats to society, increase exports of U.S. technologies, and promote sustainable development.

The Title V report provides the context for international science and technology cooperation in the implementation of our foreign policy. This year's streamlined report presents an overview of current U.S. S&T policy, S&T cooperation in the post-Cold War era, and its relation to foreign policy goals, such as building democracy, promoting and maintaining peace, and furthering economic growth and sustainable development. Following the thematic chapters are narratives on science and technology cooperation with key countries.

We face the challenge of seeking greater world stability at a critical time in our history. Finding effective solutions to global problems that impact Americans can be accomplished, in part, through interactions with scientists around the globe. We must continue to ensure that our country maintains world leadership in science and technology, and that international cooperation continues to advance our broad policy interests.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

Remarks to the Independent Insurance Agents of America Legislative Conference and an Exchange With Reporters

March 21, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. First let me welcome the Independent Insurance Agents of America to the White House and thank President George Shaffer for the fine statement that he made.

I want to say to the press here assembled that this is a big announcement out in America. Where Americans live, there are 300,000 agents and their employees in independent insurance agencies all across this country, people who know and serve their friends and neighbors and are active in their community and are trusted for their judgment on many issues, not the least of which is health care. The fact that they have decided to come in here today and express their support for the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill is a remarkable act of statesmanship and good citizenship, and it will reverberate in every Main Street in the United States of America.

It is a true bipartisan, almost a nonpartisan effort to make an honest endeavor to bring health care to millions of Americans who've been shut out of the market. These people know the folks who lose their jobs and can't get health insurance. These people see across a small desk in a modest room the people who can't get health insurance because someone in their family has a crippling condition or has once had a serious illness, even if they have overcome it. The Independent Insurance Agents are therefore, in some ways, about the most valuable partner America could have in shaping health care reform.

I want to say again how grateful I am to President Shaffer and all the other members here; the incoming president, Ron Smith; my longtime friend from Arkansas George Frazier; and the people who work for the organization here in Washington. They've all done a wonderful job, and I want to thank them for this.

As the Vice President said, this bill could help as many as 24 million Americans. That's a lot of folks out there, working people, people that are working hard to make this country go, to keep our economy strong, and to keep our communities strong, and most important of all to raise their children and keep their families strong. In this new, more dynamic economy where we're creating more jobs than we have in a very long time but where people are also feeling the sting of change, it is more important than ever before to pass this legislation.

From the beginning this proposal has had enormous bipartisan support. Besides the strong bipartisan support in the Senate, which includes 30 Democratic and 23 Republican cosponsors, this bill has been endorsed by groups representing doctors, consumer groups, businesses, manufacturing groups, and citizens. To have the support of the Independent Insurance Agents of America, and the fact that the bill has passed the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources unanimously, seems to me to virtually guarantee that before long, if Congress will proceed in good faith, this bill will be the law of the land, and millions and millions of American families will be better off and our whole country will be stronger because of it. I am very pleased that the Senate leadership has committed to move this bill expeditiously when the lawmakers return from recess. And I urge the Congress to pass it.

Now, let me also say that I hope this will become a model for what we can do on other legislation. I am far from giving up on passing a balanced budget plan, on passing welfare reform, on passing strong antiterrorism legislation. If we can do this, we can do those other things as well. These are important national priorities, and we ought to be dealing with them this year. We shouldn't be deterred by the fact that it's an election year.

Let me just make one other comment about an issue that has come up in the last couple of days that I think I need to make a statement about, and that is the proposal to repeal the assault weapons ban. That assault weapons ban was adopted after a very heated debate and a lot of controversy and a lot of pain in 1994. There were, clearly, Members of Congress who lost their seats because they voted to ban assault weapons and because they voted for the Brady bill.

The ban covers 19 deadly kinds of assault weapons and their copies. It didn't take any guns away from anybody; it expressly protected

hundreds of hunting and sporting weapons for the first time in Federal law. It was passed because America's law enforcement officials asked for it, every single law enforcement organization in the country.

It was passed to try to help save the lives of law enforcement officials who have to go out on the streets and sometimes face gangs that are better armed than they are. It was passed to save the lives of innocent people who often get caught in crossfires. And I believe it would be deeply wrong for Congress to repeal this assault weapons ban and in essence to take the side of the Washington gun lobby over the interests of the law enforcement people of this country and the law-abiding citizens of this country. And I very much hope that it will not pass. It will endanger law enforcement officials if it does pass. It will cost more citizens their lives if it does pass. The only people that will be benefited are people who engage in illegal activity.

I believe Congress should reject this extreme step. We ought to keep the assault weapons ban. And I would like to call upon the Republican leadership in the Congress to reconsider their decision to bring this to a vote. It doesn't need to be voted on in the House or the Senate, and if it is passed, I will veto it. They know I intend to do that. There is no point in distracting the American people or the Congress from the important work before us.

Let me close by saying that this is what we ought to be doing more of, what we're doing here and what the Senate has done with the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill. Again, I say that it's—I rarely make announcements in this room or in this White House with people that are so reflective of Main Street America on an issue that would have such a profound impact on ordinary Americans as this Kassebaum-Kennedy bill.

President Shaffer, and to all the rest of you, I thank you. You have done a good thing for your country today. Thank you very much.

Legislative Agenda

Q. Mr. President, how much do you think Presidential politics is going to enter into all these votes?

The President. I hope not very much at all. It's a long time till the election; we don't need a work stoppage here. We need to just keep on working. We'll have several months for elections.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:38 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to George Frazier, past president, Independent Insurance Agents of America.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Rene Preval of Haiti and an Exchange With Reporters

March 21, 1996

The President. Let me begin by just saying how very pleased I am to welcome President Preval to the White House. This is our first chance to have a face-to-face meeting, but we've been in regular contact, and I am anxious to have this chance to discuss the future of Haiti.

I'm very pleased by the events of the last year and a half. Haiti has had the first peaceful transfer of power in 200 years, from one democratically elected President to another. They've had parliamentary elections. The institutions and people who caused so much of the problems of the past have been changed, and there is, I think, a new atmosphere of hope in the country.

We know that they have significant challenges, economically and otherwise, and we are committed to continuing our efforts to work with our friends around the world, Canada and other places, to try to support Haiti and to make sure that the great democratic effort they're making succeeds.

Economic Reforms in Haiti

Q. What kinds of economic reforms, Mr. President, would you like to see them pursue at this point?

The President. Well, I think that we want to see them work out an achievable plan of reform to gain the support of the international

financial institutions so we can get the investment necessary into Haiti to generate private sector jobs and grow the economy. We want to see investors going back in there again and giving jobs to the people. We have to do what we can to see that the benefits of freedom flow to ordinary citizens through an advance in their economic standing.

Q. Does that effort have to be picked up, in your opinion? Are they moving fast enough?

The President. Well, I want them to do whatever is necessary to secure the support of the international financial institutions as soon as possible, because I think that is what is necessary to grow the economy. And I want the President and the country to succeed, and I think bringing some economic benefits down there is going to be critical to that. But we want to support them in other ways as well.

Product Liability Legislation

Q. Mr. President, do you think that the product liability bill is beyond redemption or is there some chance after a veto that it could be salvaged?

The President. I've said all along that there is legislation in this area that I would sign. I think that some change is appropriate, and I think Senator Rockefeller made a very strong effort there. There were some things put in the conference, as you know, which I feel very strongly made it worse. But there are some changes that I think are relatively modest that could be made that would permit me to sign it. So I still have some hope that we'll get a good products liability bill out of this Congress.

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

Haiti

The President. Welcome. It is a great pleasure for me to welcome President Preval here to the White House. We are all excited about his visit to the United States and anxious to have a good conversation. I'm very proud of the progress that Haiti has made in preserving its freedom and liberty and very pleased that when he was inaugurated it marked the first peaceful transfer of power from one democratically elected President to another in 200 years.

Now I want to do what I can to be as supportive in Haiti's efforts to preserve freedom and democracy and also to advance economically. I want to see the people of Haiti reap the benefits of freedom and democracy in terms of new jobs and new opportunities. So we will be discussing what we can do to advance that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:13 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the Tentative Agreement To End the General Motors Strike
March 21, 1996

I am pleased that the United Auto Workers and General Motors have reached a tentative agreement. GM and the UAW have a long and proud history of working together to solve their disputes. Both sides have worked hard to settle this dispute and I congratulate them for spending long hours at the bargaining table and arriving at a tentative agreement which will hopefully send more than 150,000 workers back to their jobs.

When American corporations work together with their workers, we can meet our challenge to grow the economy and provide families higher wages and increased economic security.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Deployment of United States Armed Forces to Haiti

March 21, 1996

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

I am providing you my fourth report on the continuing deployment of U.S. Armed Forces to Haiti, most of whom have served as part of the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH). I am providing this update of events in Haiti, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed regarding U.S. support for the successful efforts of UNMIH to assist the Government of Haiti in sustaining a secure and stable environment, protecting international personnel and key installations, establishing the conditions for holding elections, and professionalizing its security forces.

As you know, pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolution 975, UNMIH was authorized to assume responsibility for the U.S.-led Multinational Force for peacekeeping operations in Haiti. Through the presence of UNMIH and its support to the United Nations-Organization of American States International Civilian Mission, a tremendous improvement in the observance of basic human rights in Haiti has been achieved. Over 5,000 Haitian police have received professional training and continued to be observed by and receive guidance from UNMIH international civilian police monitors. Haiti's Presidential election on December 17, 1995, led to the first-ever transition from one democratically elected President to another on February 7, 1996.

In Resolution 1048 of February 29, 1996, the U.N. Security Council extended UNMIH's mandate for a period of 4 months and authorized a decrease in the troop level of UNMIH to no more than 1,200. Beginning in January of this year, there has been a phased reduction in the number of U.S. military personnel assigned to UNMIH. At present, 309 U.S. personnel remain a part of UNMIH, primarily providing logistical, aviation, psychological operations, engineering, staff, and medical support. These forces are equipped for combat. By April 15 we expect to withdraw all U.S. military personnel from UNMIH.

In addition to U.S. personnel assigned to UNMIH, U.S. military personnel are assigned to the U.S. Support Group Haiti as part of the FAIRWINDS exercise. Over the past 6 months, the Support Group has demonstrated the capabilities of U.S. military engineers to deploy overseas in an austere environment and has also provided training opportunities for military engineering, support, medical, and civic affairs personnel. Through this exercise, substantial humanitarian and civic assistance has been provided to the Haitian people. This assistance has included the repair and restoration of nine schools and one hospital and the drilling of wells in order to provide potable water to two remote communities. Currently, the Support Group consists of 184 military personnel, who are under U.S. command and follow U.S. rules of engagement.

There have been no serious security incidents or civil disturbances involving attacks on or gunfire by U.S. forces since my last report.

I have taken the measures described above in order to further important U.S. foreign policy goals and interests, including the restoration of democracy and respect for human rights in Haiti. I have ordered the continued deployment of U.S. forces in Haiti pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, and in accordance with various statutory authorities.

I remain committed to consulting closely with the Congress on our foreign policy, and I will continue to keep the Congress fully informed about significant deployments of our Armed Forces.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 22.

Statement on the Farm Bill
March 22, 1996

I have reviewed the work of the conferees on the farm bill. While I strongly favor some aspects of the final bill, I have very serious reservations about it.

However, farmers need to know the conditions under which they are operating as they head out into their fields in the coming weeks, and the hour is growing late. For that reason, I will, with some reluctance, sign this bill when Congress presents it to me. Let me be clear: I am firmly committed to working with Congress next year to strengthen the farm safety net, and I plan to propose legislation to do so.

I am especially disappointed that the bill does not provide as strong a safety net for family farmers as it should. It provides fixed payments without regard to whether farmers are receiving adequate income from the market, yet leaves farmers without protection in the event of natural disasters or other circumstances that sharply reduce their income.

I am pleased that the bill provides significant funds for conservation and environmental enhancement programs and that it will channel additional needed funds to rural development and agricultural research programs through the Fund for Rural America. The bill also reauthorizes nutrition programs for another 2 years and gives farmers the planting flexibility they need to plant for the market, not for Government programs.

I look forward to working with Congress next year in a process that involves all interested groups to make this a truly farmer-friendly farm bill.

Statement on Signing the Eleventh Continuing Resolution
March 22, 1996

Today I have signed into law H.J. Res. 165, the eleventh continuing resolution for fiscal 1996.

House Joint Resolution 165 provides for a temporary extension of appropriations—March 23 through March 29—for activities funded in four of the five appropriations bills that have not been enacted into law. For AFDC/Foster Care, funding is provided through April 3 to avoid disruption of payments to States, which are normally made on the first of each month. The District of Columbia receives no new Federal funds, but retains authority to use local funds.

The reason that I must sign yet another continuing resolution is that the Congress still has not passed five of this year's appropriations bills in acceptable form. If I do not sign this measure the Government will shut down for a third time.

Six months through the fiscal year, almost three-quarters of the nondefense budget of the Federal Government is being provided through this continuing resolution rather than through enactment of freestanding appropriations bills. For the sake of school districts and others who depend on these funds, this cannot continue. As we work to balance the budget and control discretionary spending, we must protect our Nation's investments in education, the environment, law enforcement, and technology.

Therefore, I urge the Congress to send me legislation for the remaining fiscal 1996 appropriations bills in acceptable form, and to do so before it adjourns for the Easter recess. We must work to resolve our differences over this legislation. I am committed to doing so.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

March 22, 1996.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 165, approved March 22, was assigned Public Law No. 104–118.

Joint Statement by France, the United Kingdom, and the United States on the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty

March 22, 1996

The governments of the French Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America will sign on Monday, March 25, 1996 the three additional protocols to the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty, which is also known as the Treaty of Rarotonga.

Last year's NPT Review and Extension Conference agreed that internationally recognized nuclear weapon free zones, based on arrangements freely arrived at among the states of the region concerned, enhance international peace and security. The Conference also agreed that the cooperation of all the nuclear weapon states and their respect and support for the relevant protocols is necessary for the maximum effectiveness of such zones and the relevant protocols.

Our decision to sign the protocols to the Treaty of Rarotonga demonstrates our clear support for a nuclear weapon free zone in the South Pacific.

It is also an important further milestone in demonstrating our commitment to nuclear nonproliferation.

It underlines our wish to see a permanent end to nuclear testing throughout the world. It will give a further boost to the negotiations for a comprehensive test ban treaty, which we believe should be completed in the first half of 1996.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

The President's Radio Address

March 23, 1996

Good morning. Today I want to talk to you about upholding our values, expanding our economy, and moving our country forward together; about giving every American family the opportunity to succeed in the new global economy; and about what some American businesses are doing and what more American businesses can do to increase economic opportunity and security for their employees and their families in a way that is good for business and grows our economy.

In the last 3 years I have worked hard to give the American people a Government that is more responsible, that promotes economic opportunity, brings Americans together, and challenges all Americans to take responsibility for themselves, their families, their communities, and their country. I've challenged parents to get more involved in their children's education. I've challenged welfare recipients to move from welfare to work. I've challenged the entertainment industry to put our children first and voluntarily rate the programs they put on television so parents can protect their children from excessive violence or other inappropriate material.

That same ethic of responsibility must guide all of us in our work lives as well. And I believe American business, the engine of our prosperity and the envy of the world, clearly has a role to play.

We've made much progress already. Three years ago our economy was drifting. The deficit was twice as high as it is today. Unemployment was high and job growth was very low. I took office determined to change our economic course. Since then we've cut the deficit in half, invested in the education and training of our people, expanded exports through tough trade agreements, and reduced the size of Government by over 200,000 while cutting regulations, giving more responsibilities to State and local governments, limiting the abuse of lobbying, without cutting essential services.

And the American people have responded. In 3 years and a month, our economy has created 8.4 million new jobs, and every year more and

more of them are good, higher paying jobs. The combined unemployment, inflation, and home mortgage rates are at their lowest levels in 27 years. We've halted the decade-long slide in real average hourly wages. Every year entrepreneurs have started a record number of new small businesses, and in key industries like autos and semiconductors, America now leads the world again.

We are moving in the right direction, but we must do more to grow the economy and to support America's working families. Too many Americans are still working harder and harder just to keep up, and they worry that they'll be left behind by the new economy. We have to make sure all Americans who are willing to work for it can be winners of economic change and that all of our people share in the benefits of our growing economy.

Of course, Government must play a role. We must finish the job of balancing the budget in 7 years to bring interest rates down even further. We should increase the minimum wage. We should ensure access to health care, to education, to training, to pensions for our people. We should reform welfare to move people from welfare to work.

But we know that business has a role to play, too, if we want people to have better lives, provide for their families, and face the future with confidence. Let me be clear: The most fundamental responsibility for any business is to make a profit, to create jobs and incomes by competing and growing. After all, in the last 3 years, nearly all the new jobs created in the world's advanced economies, nearly all of them, were made in America by American business. We recognize, too, that not every business can afford to do more than worry about the bottom line, especially a lot of small businesses. But many of America's most successful businesses have shown that you can do well by doing right by employees and their families. Let me mention five ways businesses can show good citizenship toward their employees.

First, they can be friendly to families. We know that most people play more than one role; we're employees and parents, too. And people have to be able to succeed at home and at work for America to succeed. So, many companies call for employees' flexible work schedules, help with child care, or good leave policies. And every business should let their employees know what is already their right under the Family and Medical Leave Act I signed into law: to take some time off without losing your job in case of a family emergency.

Second, businesses can give their employees health care and pension benefits. We're trying hard here in Washington to pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill so that workers don't lose their insurance when they change jobs or when someone in the family gets sick. We passed pension reform legislation to protect the pensions of 40 million workers, and we're working to get money that is owed to pension funds paid in. We're also proposing to simplify rules so that small businesses can provide pensions for their workers and the owners of the businesses more easily. But business has to do more, too.

Third, businesses can invest in their most important asset, their employees. The most successful companies do give workers broad opportunity for improved education and training, both within the firm and outside it. Every worker should know that whatever the new economy brings, he or she will be ready. When workers lose their jobs, I want Government to be there with a "GI bill" for America's workers, a voucher worth up to $2,500 a year so that people can immediately be retrained. When people need further education, I want Government to provide up to $10,000 a year in tax deduction for the cost of education after high school. But companies should do their part, too, with education and training. Upgrading the skills of our existing work force is the single best way to raise the incomes of America's workers and the productivity of our businesses and the growth of our economy.

Fourth, businesses can work in partnership with their employees. That can mean giving employees a greater voice in the production process. It can mean collective bargaining. It can mean sharing the benefits of good times through stock bonuses, employee ownerships, and other means of gains sharing. And when layoffs are necessary for the long-term health of the company, the best companies provide adequate notice and good severance so employees have a chance at a new job with a good income.

Fifth, every company in America has a duty to provide a safe workplace. No one should have to put themselves at risk just to put food on the table at home. Government has a part to play, too, with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. But the safest workplaces are those that work in partnership, where the value at work is a safe and healthy workplace.

These acts of good corporate citizenship are good for employees, but many, many thousands of American businesses have proved they're good for business, too. Our changing economy puts a real premium on skill, ingenuity, creativity, and loyalty of the work force. The quality and productivity of America's workers are our greatest source of economic strength.

Family flexible workplaces, health care and pensions, training, partnership, safe workplaces: five challenges many of America's best businesses are now meeting. We want others to follow their lead. Government should support them in doing so. That's the way to create strong, lasting growth for our economy, and that's the way to make sure that every American, every American, has the chance to reap the rewards of economic change and economic growth.

We can meet these economic challenges the way we best meet all our challenges, by working together as partners, all of us doing our part. Remember, the greatest lesson of our democracy is this: When we are divided, we defeat ourselves, but when we are united, America never loses.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:54 p.m. on March 22 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on March 23.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on Corporate Mentoring in Cincinnati, Ohio

March 23, 1996

[*Moderator John E. Pepper, chief executive officer, Procter & Gamble, and cochair, Cincinnati Youth Collaborative (CYC), welcomed the President and noted that the city of Cincinnati recently had achieved victories in referendums for schools and construction of sports stadiums, along with the University of Cincinnati's entry into the NCAA basketball regional tournament.*]

The President. Actually, I watched the game. They did very well.

Mr. Pepper. Looked really good. But we're pleased to be here and look forward to the dialog we can have and to answer your questions on these programs.

The President. Thank you.

[*Mr. Pepper said that the mentor program was driven by Cincinnati's commitment to children and education and that community involvement was widespread, through the sponsoring CYC and other organizations such as the United Way.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

Well, I don't want to spend a lot of time talking; I came here to listen to you. But let me just make a couple of comments. First of all, to reiterate what John said, it is perfectly clear that no matter how many jobs we can generate in the private sector in America—and our country has done a very good job in the last 3 years. We've generated 8.4 million new jobs, by far more than any advanced country in the world. The other six big economies together have netted out about zero. Three of them have created a few thousand jobs; three of them have lost a few thousand jobs. America is producing jobs.

But if we want all Americans to do well, to be able to get a job, keep a job, and have a growing income, we've got to raise the education levels of the country and we have to do a better job of connecting school to work.

Now there are some things the Government can do. We've worked hard to increase our investment in Head Start, for example, to give schools more funds to try to meet strong national standards, to improve access to college through a better college loan program and the national service program. I hope that Congress will adopt a balanced budget plan that will include a deduction of up to $10,000 a year for the cost of education after high school. I think these things will all help.

But the main role of Government, I think, today is to work with the private sector in trying to keep the market successful in generating new jobs but also to create the conditions in which at each community level in America, in every community in the country, the business and education and ordinary citizens can work to-

gether to try to develop the capacity of every person. I mean, basically, that's what I am trying to achieve by the time I finish my service as President. I want a framework out there where the Government's role is to help create the conditions in which communities can solve their own problems and get the most out of their own people.

And the school-to-work initiative that we started back in 1993 gives funds to projects like this one, not to tell you what to do but just to empower you to work together to move young people through education and then into the work force. And so I heard a lot of great things about it, and I heard that John Pepper and Procter & Gamble were particularly active and that there were 1,500 other volunteers in this program. So I just wanted us to get a little more personal exposure to it.

And so, having said that, I'd like to turn it back to you.

[*Mr. Pepper introduced Catherine Ingram, Cincinnati school board president, who addressed the need for linkage between the community, businesses, schools, and parents in mentor programs. She said that the 70 percent approval rate in the school referendum was a sign that people were starting to realize a connection between education and their economic concerns. Mr. Pepper then noted the importance of including the president and vice president of the school board as CYC members.*]

The President. I agree with that.

[*Mr. Pepper then introduced John Bryant, CYC executive director, who said the program had 1,000 mentors drawn from all walks of life, working with students in elementary school through high school. He explained that at higher grade levels, students gained exposure to the world of work and then were eligible to receive college scholarships raised by corporations and to use a college information center sponsored by a manufacturing company.*]

The President. Thank you.

[*Mr. Pepper introduced Schroeder Junior High School student Nathaniel Walker, saying it was his 13th birthday. Mr. Walker then described activities with his mentor in and out of school.*]

The President. You say you spend about an hour a week with her?

Mr. Walker. Yes.

The President. Do you look forward to that hour every week?

Mr. Walker. Yes. When she's on travel, she sends me a postcard and tells me when she's coming back. It tells me why she wasn't there or something like that.

The President. You like that because it tells you that it's important to her, right?

Mr. Walker. Yes.

The President. Do you know a lot of other students that have mentors?

Mr. Walker. Yes, I know one of them. It's a girl that went to my school. She said—we got in the same magnet school, and she's got a tutor.

The President. And does she like hers?

Mr. Walker. I don't talk to her about that. [*Laughter*]

The President. Thank you for coming.

Mr. Walker. You're welcome.

The President. Happy birthday.

Mr. Walker. Thank you.

The President. Hope you have a good day.

[*Mr. Pepper then introduced Miriam Mazuka, director of the CYC mentoring program in which Mr. Walker participated. She commented on the positive outcome seen in students who had mentors, including fewer school dropouts and fewer teen pregnancies.*]

The President. And you say you have about 1,000?

Ms. Mazuka. We have 1,007 serving as mentors in a one-to-one relationship, and we have about 200 people that are just tutoring youngsters. And we have this long, long waiting list of students who want to be matched.

The President. How many do you have who want to have mentors that don't?

Ms. Mazuka. Well, you know, we stopped keeping track of that, because the list goes on and on and on. It's a matter of supply and demand now. It's over 1,000.

The President. So it's virtually unlimited. So if you had a thousand more adults in the community who would do it——

Ms. Mazuka. We have a thousand youngsters——

The President. ——just your students.

Ms. Mazuka. Absolutely.

The President. Well, maybe my coming here will help you get some more mentors.

Ms. Mazuka. I certainly hope so.

The President. We are formally sending out an appeal to the Cincinnati community.

Mr. Pepper. I'll just add to that by——

The President. What's that?

Mr. Pepper. ——holding up that telephone number. [*Laughter*]

The President. That's right.

Mr. Pepper. You know, this is just relentless promotion if we go all around. That number is 475–4959, if you can't read it. And we literally have 700 youngsters right now who have held up their hand and asked for a mentor, and we don't have it. And this does work. This changes lives.

The President. That's terrific. Thank you.

[*Mr. Pepper introduced Taft High School student Verneilya Britten, who related her experience in the Taft Career and Academic Program, training to be an administrative assistant at W.R. Grace.*]

The President. Do you know other students that are in this program?

Ms. Britten. Yes.

The President. Do they all like it?

[*Ms. Britten replied in the affirmative, saying the program was giving her a head start on a career. Mr. Pepper next called upon Paul Laws of W.R. Grace, Ms. Britten's supervisor, who said that the program benefited students by giving them work experience and helping them make career decisions and it benefited employers by providing a pool of already trained workers. Mr. Pepper then said 79 companies were participating.*]

The President. And does each company essentially take one student?

Mr. Laws. We have two. We've taught enough volunteers—we have two mentors on site, actually formed two little teams, one for administrative and one for operations, where Verneilya will learn various duties in the administrative area and another mentee will learn the duties of operations and plant, lab, along those lines—engineering.

Mr. Pepper. It's typically one or two, but we do up to as high as six.

Mr. Bryant. We can go up to six, but at the present time, we don't have any more than four at the present time. But in terms of the original planning, anywhere from one to six.

The President. You know, I think this is so important because we as a nation, we for many years made a strict sort of division between a world of school and a world of work, and even within school between academic courses and vocational courses. And now all those lines are blurring, and that's a very good thing.

You know, for example, some people learn better, learn academic subjects better in practical settings. We know that—we also know that the world of work and the world of learning can no longer be easily divided, because people have to keep learning at work for a lifetime.

And one of the problems that I saw first when I was a Governor, working with both businesses and schools, and then when I became President, is that we have no real system in our country for acquainting young people with the world of work and moving them easily into the world of work. And I think it will strengthen their academic performance. That would be my guess. And I think it will also ultimately, therefore, be in the interest of the business community as well to have these kinds of programs. I thank you very much for your work you're doing.

[*Senator John Glenn asked about training for prospective mentors, and Ms. Mazuka described the mentor training program. Mr. Pepper explained that Federal funds were used for the job training pilot program and said he doubted the program would have been started if that money was not available. He then introduced Jan Leslie, Partners in Education director, who described the program to match companies with public and private schools to provide mentoring, tutoring, and assistance in developing curriculum and restructuring school business operations. She noted that public schools were able to decrease their administrative staffs by 50 percent as a result.*]

The President. Is that right?

[*Ms. Leslie affirmed the positive results and praised the high level of corporate support.*]

The President. Were you on the school board when this happened?

[*Ms. Ingram replied that she joined the school board 2 years after the corporate involvement began in 1991 but that some educators were still skeptical that corporate methods should be applied in schools, even in areas such as inventory and purchasing.*]

The President. I think it's very important. The administrative cost of American public education

has gotten very high. And part of it is because of the school districts get their money from the local district, from the State, from the Federal Government. Part of it is because these programs sort of built up over time that they have to manage. There are a lot of reasons for that.

But in a world in which administrative overhead is going down dramatically everywhere else because of computer technology and new management techniques and where there's a limit to how much money you can raise, it's very important to be able to demonstrate I think, for matters of good education, that you've lowered administrative costs and put it back into direct education.

The Federal Government today has 205,000 fewer people working for it than it did the day I became President. And we have very good severance packages, early retirement packages; we weren't just throwing people out, you know. But with the smallest Government that we've had since 1965, and by the end of the year it will be the smallest it's been since 1962, that helps us to get the deficit down and it also frees up money for real direct services to people. In the education context, that's real education programs, it's more of the things we're talking about today.

I know it's not the subject we came here to talk about, but you caught my attention. [*Laughter*] I have to go meet with—I'm going to meet with the Governors next week. They're having an update on the educational summit we held back in 1989. And it's one of the things that I've been trying to get updated on. So I thank you.

[*Mr. Pepper next introduced Sister Rose Ann Fleming of Xavier University, who welcomed the President to the campus and then described the university's various scholarship and mentoring programs, including those for university student-athletes. She mentioned that in the last 14 years, every Xavier men's basketball player who had played for 4 years had graduated.*]

The President. That's fantastic.

Sister Fleming. And we're looking forward to the same thing continuing. So I think for the underscoring of what has been said here today through the training and mentors and work with young people, like Nate here, a one-to-one relationship is the key to a successful development of the individual, and that's what the university is all about.

The President. Thank you.

Mr. Pepper. That really completes the comments that we wanted to have the group make, and we'd obviously be glad to expand on any of that, or if you have any comments.

The President. I just want to ask one question of either Mr. Bryant or whoever else: How many students do you have in your summer jobs and summer school program?

[*Mr. Bryant replied that there were 460 students in their summer programs combined, in addition to about 1,200 jobs in the Youth Employment Services program. A participant then encouraged the President to ensure that the Federal Government would remain a partner in youth summer job training programs.*]

The President. If I might just offer one or two comments. First of all, I want to thank each and every one of you, not only for being here today but for what you're doing with your lives, because I think it's very important. And secondly, I want to thank a number of you for what you said about these programs, and John, what you said about the pilot project.

Let me say what the problem is. If you come from Washington and you come to Cincinnati and you say to yourself: What is the connection between the National Government and what we're doing? Do they have any responsibility in Washington to help us do what we're doing here, and if so, what is it?

You know, when I took office, the deficit was twice as big as it is now, the national debt quadrupled; we had to get it down. I've tried to take the position that in reducing the deficit, we ought not to be cutting our investments in education, and we ought to be not telling local communities how to deal with things like this but giving them some research fund or some pilot project funds, if you will, to help them explore what works, and then keep funding what plainly works, like the student loan programs and the summer job programs; these things plainly work. And there's not enough to serve everybody, so if we provide the base, then perhaps you can come in and raise money on top of the base.

So I've been quite heartened by what I've seen today because I know that most of this work has to be done at the community level, and that is a good thing. How could anyone in Washington know whether W.R. Grace in Cincinnati could take 2 young students or 5

or 3 or 25 or anybody? So this has to be done at the local level.

What we must do in Washington is to make the National Government relevant and trustworthy and effective for the 21st century. And that means we have to get our own house in order; we can't—we have to balance the budget, but we also have to decide what it is we're going to invest in and what our objective is.

It seems to me our objective ought to be to keep America the world's greatest job generator and then to make sure that our young people are trained to do good jobs and have successful lives so that they can be rewarded in this new world they're living in. And that means that a lot of the actual work and how it's done must be decided by these kinds of community partnerships, but the National Government has to create the conditions in which they can flourish. That's what I'm trying to do.

A lot of the times you hear these great debates in Washington, you know, they sound—they may sound abstract to you. But actually what the debate is, is a debate about everyone knows the economy's changed, that it involves more mind and less muscle and it's more global and less local, and everybody knows, therefore, that—and all businesses are changing and there again, the Government has to change. And we're trying to define—our great challenge is to define what it is our responsibility is to help you do what you're doing.

One of the things a President can do, of course, is to use the bully pulpit—I mean, I just made a plea for more mentors here—[*laughter*]—but also to try to make sure that if we are creating these conditions, that people know what you're doing here in Cincinnati with the Youth Collaborative, because I think this is a good model that could be carried all across America. You know, I wish every community had this level of intense and organized partnership, and I'm very grateful to you. And I also feel that I have learned, and I think Senator Glenn probably feels the same way I do, that at least I think I have a clearer idea about exactly what our responsibilities in Washington are to help you do what you're doing here. And I thank you for that, all of you.

Thank you.

Mr. Pepper. We're glad you're here, and thank you very much for coming. I guarantee it will leave us just more energized.

The President. Great day. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. in Schmidt Hall at Xavier University.

Remarks to the Community in Cincinnati
March 23, 1996

Thank you so much. Thank you for the wonderful welcome. Thank you, Mayor Qualls, for the kind things you said, for making me feel so welcome here, for your outstanding leadership for Cincinnati. And congratulations on the recent success of your education and your stadium referendum. That was a very impressive thing.

Thank you, Father Hoff, for making me feel so welcome here at Xavier. You know, I graduated from Georgetown. I tell everyone I'm the closest Baptist you'll ever get to a Jesuit. [*Laughter*] And I'm delighted to be here. The Jesuits have always been famous for their humility. I hope Father Hoff doesn't get in trouble for saying that now that I had seen the Pope three times I could finally come to Xavier. [*Laughter*] But I'm trying to move up in life, and I enjoyed it. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I want to say a warm word of thanks to my good friend Senator John Glenn. Hillary and I admire John and his wonderful wife, Annie, so much. I want all of you to know that one of the most challenging jobs we've had in Washington in the last 3 years is to figure out how to downsize the Government without undermining the quality of service we're giving to the American people. And we now have the smallest Federal Government in 30 years. It's 205,000 people smaller than it was when I took office; by the end of this year it will be the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President. But if you want to do that in ways that first, are humane to the employees in-

volved—that do the maximum amount through early retirement or give the employees time to find other jobs and generous severance packages—and don't hurt public services, it takes a really careful strategy. And the leadership of John Glenn, from his committee, telling us how to do this and helping us do it, was absolutely essential. And the whole country is in his debt for that and for many other things, and I wanted to say that in front of his constituents today so that you could know he deserves a lion's share of the credit for what we did.

I'd like to thank the young musicians for playing "Hail to the Chief" so well. Thank you very much. I'd also like to say that Felisha Coady can sing for me any time. I thought she was great.

You know, I love coming to Cincinnati today because Cincinnati really disproves something that Mark Twain said about you a long time ago. Remember what Mark Twain said about Cincinnati: "If the world would end, I'd come to Cincinnati, because everything happens here 10 years later." [*Laughter*] That's not true.

Cincinnati is ahead of the times in many ways. I saw it today in looking at the remarkable work that you're doing with the communications between the school systems here and the universities and the business community, trying to help every young person succeed. I saw it in the votes that were cast in the referendum. I see it in the growth of the phenomenal businesses you have here. I see it in your successful obsession with basketball. I see it in many ways. So I am honored to be here today. And what I want to talk to you about today is something that will affect the lives of every person in this audience, but especially the young people. And let me begin with a little background.

I ran for President in 1992, having been Governor of my State for 12 years, because I was literally obsessed with trying to deal with all the sweeping changes going on in our Nation and world in a way that would allow us as a people to achieve three critical objectives. One is, I wanted then and I want now for this country to go into the 21st century in a way that every American who is willing to work for it will have a shot at the American dream.

Secondly, I wanted to maintain the leadership of the United States at the end of the cold war as the world's strongest force for peace and freedom, for security and prosperity.

And thirdly, I wanted to see this country come together around its basic values, not be divided as it too often is, especially in election season. If you were to ask me 3 years later what the most important lesson as President I have learned, it is this, simply: When we are divided, we defeat ourselves; when we work together, America always wins.

And so I began to work on these objectives. I believed that we needed a new economic policy. I believed we needed a new social policy that emphasized personal responsibility as well as giving people the opportunity to escape the problems before them. I believed that we needed a new, aggressive, sharply focused policy in the world that got America more fair trade agreements and reduced the threats of not only nuclear war but terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. And I thought we had to dramatically change the role of Government, to make it smaller and less bureaucratic and less burdensome but still very strong and effective in working with the private sector to create an environment in which individual citizens and families and businesses and schools and community groups could make the most of their own lives by working together.

Now, 3 years later, you see the incredibly impressive dimensions of the time in which we are living, including some things that seem to be paradoxical. And so let me describe this time as I see it, to explain why I've come here to talk about this issue of not only our responsibility in Government but business' responsibility to make a better future for the United States and for the working people of America.

Consider just the last 3 years. Three years ago we had much higher unemployment. The jobs we were creating were overwhelmingly lower paying jobs. The deficit was more than twice as big as it is now. Well, after 3 years the good news is that the deficit is half of what it was 3 years ago; that our economy has produced over 8.4 million jobs; that in 1995, most of those jobs actually paid above average wages, not below, those new jobs; we've had 3 years in a row of record new formations of small businesses; our trade is at an all-time high with other countries; interest rates have been low for home mortgages, so homeownership's at a 15-year high.

That is the good news, and that is good news. America has recovered our lost lead. We now lead again the world in the sales of automobiles

and semiconductors. Every year there is a World Economic Forum in Europe that votes on the most productive economies in the world. After we had slipped to fifth 4 years ago, for the last 3 years we've been voted first by a panel of international economists again. America is number one. That's good news.

If you look at where we are with our social problems, the crime rate is lower, the welfare rolls are lower, the food stamp rolls are lower, the poverty rate is lower, the teen pregnancy rate has dropped; what has gone up is child support collections in the last 3 years. I think that's very hopeful for all of us.

Now, we'll never come together again until we acknowledge some truths, though, the other side of this time of change. First, on the social side, all of those things are lower, but they're all still too high. They're all still too high. And I'm not going to talk at great length about that today, but I will say this: If we know what brings the crime rate down, which is more police officers on the street and community policing, effective partnerships in the community, and giving our young people something to say yes to as well as something to say no to, we ought to do more of it, not less of it. We shouldn't turn away from that.

If we know now, because I have given the States and localities more freedom to experiment in the area of welfare in 3 years than occurred in the past 12 years combined, even though the Congress has still not passed welfare reform legislation that is both tough on work and good for children, almost three-quarters of the people on welfare in America today are under welfare reform experiments because our executive branch has just told the States to have at it. And if we know what works, which is investing in children, providing work alternatives, being tough and requiring people to go to work, but making sure there is a job there and making sure the kids aren't punished, then we ought to do more of it, not less of it. That's what we ought to do. We need to do that.

But let me come back now to the economy. How do you square all of those good statistics I just gave you with the fact that you constantly read articles about businesses downsizing; you constantly read articles about people who've worked harder and harder without a raise in years and years; you constantly see from your own experience that there are communities that have not been touched by any economic recovery? How can those two things be squared?

I want to focus on that today and what everybody's responsibility is. The truth is that the good news is true and so is the bad news. So are the problems. They're both true. Why? Because we are entering a new economy that is so different that we're going through the period of most profound change that we've been through in 100 years.

It was 100 years ago when most Americans stopped living on the farm and started living in towns, cities; 100 years ago when most people stopped working on the farm and started working in factories or in businesses that supported factories or depended upon them. And when that happened, there was a great uprooting of the patterns of life in America. And a lot of people had untold new opportunities and a lot of people had a lot of money that they never had before. And a lot of people were left out in the cold and sort of felt like they were twisting in the wind.

And America developed what was called then a new progressive movement—and its first embodiment was a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt—which began to ask the question: What are we going to have to do together to reap the benefits of the industrial era when most of us are now living in towns and cities, not living in the country anymore, in order that every American will be treated fairly and we can grow stronger together? That's what the big debate was.

That debate went on for 50 years, from the late 1800's arguably until the end of World War II, when with the GI bill and a lot of other things, the United States of America built the greatest middle class the world has ever known and we had 30 years in which all Americans' incomes were growing, whether they were in the poorest part of our income scheme or the wealthiest part. And we had a very strong, growing country that was growing together.

Then along comes the information and technology revolution. And now most economic markets are not national, they're international, the market for money, the market for products, the market for services, more and more global. Now most work is done with the mind, not with muscle, even in factories. Now, because of the information revolution, the nature of the workplace itself is changing.

How could I reduce the Federal Government by 205,000 people and nobody know it in Cincinnati? Why? Because of the digital chip. Because fewer people can do more work that is related to information gathering and dissemination. It is the most sweeping change in 100 years.

Bill Gates, the great computer genius who founded Microsoft, says that the digital chip is the most significant change in communications in 500 years since Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Europe. And that explains how you can have all this basically good news and still hear these gripping stories of people who are caught in the crosswinds of change.

There are basically three groups of Americans who are caught in those crosswinds. Number one, there are people who live in isolated inner-city neighborhoods and isolated rural neighborhoods who have felt no economic recovery because they don't have new jobs there; it's hard to get the investment in.

Number two, there are the people, principally those in the bottom half of the hourly wage earners of America, who work harder and harder and don't seem to ever get a raise because they don't have a special educational skill that a rich country can pay high rewards to in a global economy where people who live for things we can't live on can send products into our markets.

And number three, there are these people who have worked all their lives for big companies that are now being downsized either because they have to, to survive, or because if they do it, they can make more money because they don't need as many people, especially in middle management, anymore. And you've been seeing a lot of their gripping stories. A lot of them are about my age.

You know, when you're 50 years old and you've worked for the same company for 25 years and you've got two kids about to go to college and you get laid off and you think, "My goodness, I'll never get a job paying this again; how am I going to send my kids to college," it's not a very comfortable thing for somebody to say, "Well, relax, the President just signed a telecommunications bill and it's going to create 3 million jobs in the next few years; go to work for Sprint or MCI." And you say, "But I'd have to go 500 miles away, and I've got this home mortgage and I've got these two kids that are just about to get out of high school, and what am I supposed to do?"

So the good news is true, folks, and it's important. The United States has created 8.4 million jobs in the last 3 years and 1 month. And during that time the people in the other big six economies of the world have created a net zero. Three of the countries have created a few thousand jobs, three of the countries have lost a few thousand jobs; they netted out zero. So the big seven economies of the world have created 8.4 million jobs in the last 3 years, all of them in America. I wouldn't give that up for anything in the world. That's nothing to sneeze at. That's something we should want.

So the question is, how do we do today what was done 100 years ago? How do we keep the dynamism of the American economy? How do we go forward into the future with great confidence? How do we do it together in a way that enables us to achieve our objectives? Every American willing to work for it has a shot at the American dream, we have stronger families and better childhoods for all of our people—how are we going to do that? That is what I want to talk about today.

Yes, the Government has certain responsibilities. I've described some of the things we have already done. There are other things that we should do in Government. We ought to finish the work of balancing the budget to get interest rates down even further in a way that will enable us to invest and grow our economy. We ought to do that without cutting our investments in things like education and the environment and research and technology and college loans and college scholarships, the things that will grow the economy. We should do that, and we can do it.

We ought to pass some tax relief for average families, and I think the most important tax benefit we could give America at a time when education is critical to income in the future is to give every American family a deduction of up to $10,000 a year for the cost of college education. I believe that.

Now, there are other things that we ought to do. But let's face it, one of the things that we have done in downsizing the Government is to become even more reliant on the private sector. A far higher percentage of the new jobs created in our administration are private sector jobs, as compared with the jobs created in the previous 12 years. I want it that way. But if that is true, that means that this new era puts even more responsibility on that private sector

not only to grow and do well but to help in dealing with the dislocations, the problems, and the challenges that this new age imposes upon us.

That's what I want to talk about today. And I don't want to ask you if you agree with me on all these things, but at least I want you to think about this, because we have to succeed as citizens, as workers, and as parents in order for America to grow. We all have mutual roles. And let me begin again by saying what I said before: Our business community is the engine of economic growth that's the envy of the entire world. The most fundamental responsibility of any business in a free enterprise system is to make a profit. That's how they hire people and pay them. That's how they serve their consumers. So that's important.

But we recognize that there are other responsibilities as well. Some businesses are in trouble and some businesses are so small they can only worry about the bottom line. But what I want to say to you today is that a lot of businesses in America today never make the headlines because what they're doing is good in trying to help people cope with all these changes. And in trying to help their employees cope with these changes, they're actually making more money.

So as we look ahead we should ask ourselves, what is the role of Government in this new era? It should be smaller, it should be less bureaucratic, but it should be strong enough to help to create a climate which enables people to make the most of their own lives. What is the role of business in this new era? It should first and foremost do well, make money so you can hire people and contribute. But it should, whenever possible, do well in a way that strengthens families and grows the middle class in a way that develops a loyal, productive work force for the business and keeps the middle class alive so we can support all these businesses by buying the goods and services that they produce. That is the balance that we must seek to achieve.

It is also true that none of us exists in a vacuum. Business leaders would be the first to say that they are not motivated solely by economic considerations. I just talked about the work here done in Cincinnati in trying to develop the capacities of our young people here. And John Pepper of Procter & Gamble was there. They've invested a lot of money in this. I don't know if it helps their bottom line in the short run, but in the long run it's the morally right thing to do. I think it will turn out to be good for the company, by building a community that's positive to live in.

The other day I was with three grocery store chains who announced that they were going to give up all their vending machines for cigarettes because they couldn't enforce the law that says it's illegal for young people under the age of 18 to smoke. And they didn't want to be a part of it, so they're just going to give up the income. They're just going to give it up.

So I think it's important to recognize that there are a lot of incredibly good things going on in the private sector today. And that's what I want to talk to you about, because the people of this country are our most important asset. And our ability, first of all, to develop the educational capacity of our people, and secondly, to develop good values and a good sense of partnership in every workplace in America is going to be critical to our future. Because you look at the work—you can move technology anywhere. You can now move information anywhere. You can move money anywhere in the flash of an eye. What we have that is special—what you have that is special in Cincinnati are what's been done here already and the people who live here. That's what's special. That's the key to the future.

So I believe that the Government has a responsibility to create a framework in which the economy can grow. And the Government has a responsibility to help people who fall between the cracks in this new era.

The private sector also has some challenges facing it, and many companies are meeting those challenges. Let me just mention five; one or two were mentioned by Senator Glenn. First and most important, we have to encourage companies to be more family friendly, because most parents work, most parents work. Most of us who are parents believe that that's still our most important job. For all my responsibility to you, I still think it's my most important job. So we have got to work for a country where people can succeed at home and at work.

Let's take Procter & Gamble; I'll talk about their policy. When a P&G employee gives birth to a child, she gets a year of maternity leave; then eligible for up to 5 years of reduced work hours to have more time to care for the child. Now, arguably that costs some money, but argu-

ably you get it back in a fanatically loyal employee who can stay with the company for a longer period of time. Not every company can afford to do that, but those who do wind up doing pretty well. The company offers direct subsidies for child care, so that children can have a more safe and secure environment.

The first major bill I signed into law was the Family and Medical Leave Act, which requires most companies except the very smallest ones to at least give people some time off without losing their job when there's a baby born, a sick parent, or some other kind of family emergency. I think that that is a very important principle. If we want to succeed in a world where most parents have to work, then the workplace has to be more family friendly. And the Government and all the rest of us should do whatever we can to give the incentives and the encouragement to the business sector to make those workplaces family friendly.

Secondly, we need to encourage companies, even the smaller businesses, to find ways to give their employees access, at least, to health care and to retirement. You know, now that more and more people are working for smaller companies, we have a smaller percentage of people in the work force with health insurance tied to their job than we did 10 years ago. And we're the only wealthy country in the world that doesn't provide a system for health insurance for all working families when they're under 65; Medicare takes care of it for everybody over 65. This is a big challenge. The same thing is true with pensions. More and more small businesses are developing what are called defined contribution plans instead of defined benefit plans. And more and more people now are changing jobs before they stay 10 years on the job and before their pension vests.

So what do we have to do? We don't want to stop the dynamism in the economy. If you try to freeze things, unemployment will go up. We want to keep creating jobs. So what do we have to do? We have to develop health care packages that people can carry around with them from job to job. We have to make it easier for small businesses to take out pension plans for the owners and the employees. And we have to develop some portability provisions so that people can carry those pension plans around, including being able to stop contributing in the period when they're unemployed and pick it up again and make up the difference. We've got to do some things like that if we want people to do well over the long run.

I met a young man at the airport when I came in today, wrote me a letter about his mother not being able to get health insurance, and it led to his mother being able to get health insurance. But the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill that Senator Glenn spoke about is the first step along the way. It doesn't solve all the problems, but it's a first step along our journey to developing a system that will enable the economy to continue to grow and provide some economic security for families who need it. It simply says that you can't automatically lose your health insurance when you change jobs or when somebody in the family gets sick. That's what health insurance is for, to cover people when they get sick.

We also need to make it easier for small businesses to buy in the insurance pools that are large so they can buy insurance more cheaply. But we also need to encourage and laud and lift up companies that provide these kinds of benefits. Starbucks Coffee is a big chain now in America; it hasn't always been a big chain. But they provide health insurance for their employees, quite unusual in that kind of business. And why do they do it? Well, they think it's the right thing to do, but they also conducted an analysis of why there was so much turnover in that line of work. And one reason was all these young people who work for them said, "We can't get any health insurance; we would stay a year and go do something else." So they discovered that it cost them $1,500 to train a new employee, which meant if they bought health insurance for their work force—most of whom are young, healthy, and single—and they stay 3 years instead of one year, they would make up all the money and still some. So sometimes it's possible to do right and do well, and we should encourage that.

The other thing we need to do is to do more to encourage companies and to challenge them to invest in their employees. I got a letter the other day from a man who is head of a big high-tech company who said the single most significant challenge facing the American people today in the area of education is reeducating the existing work force; it's the only way to get incomes up. We have got to help people do that.

Now, there are lots of companies that are doing this. The American people need to know about it. We need to lift them up. Others need

to be encouraged to follow their lead. They should get telephone calls and ask how they did it and made money besides. You take one of my favorites, Harley-Davidson, because they brought motorcycles back to America; they set up basic reading, writing, and math skills instruction at an on-site learning center and they made money out of doing it, because their employees became more productive.

Xerox, a lot of other companies, do this. United Technologies will permit a person who is an employee there to go back to school for any degree program, whatever—it doesn't even have to have anything to do with their job—and they'll pay a lot of the tuition and give them half the time off.

We need to look at what the policies of good companies are and lift these companies up and ask ourselves: Is there something the Government can do, something the community can do to make it easier for others to do this? But this is an important thing.

The fourth important point, I believe, is to encourage business to work in greater partnership with their employees. That can mean a lot of things. It can mean a greater voice in the production process. It can mean good faith in collective bargaining. It can mean gain-sharing of all kinds, sharing the benefits when times are good if you have to share the burden when times are bad. It can mean that when there has to be layoffs, it can mean having policies that really work to at least let the employees know that you're doing your best to make sure they can move from this life to another one.

I was at an interesting company in California a couple of weeks ago, Harman International, where they make a lot of electronic speakers for sound systems for automobiles and offices and homes and everything else. There's great fluctuation in their orders. But to try to keep their work force whole and loyal, they set up a whole new business called Ole, Off Line Enterprises, and they used all of their scrap materials to let their employees design products having nothing to do with their main line of work and then sell them. And they were able to keep a couple of hundred employees all the time that otherwise would have gone out on the street, so they can call them back without wrecking their lives. It made the company money, but it also made the company a world reputation among the work force that they cared about them and they were trying to keep them whole in the tough times. We need to encourage things like that and support them.

If you look at what Cinergy here in Cincinnati did, they had to trim their work force by 10 percent, and they did it by the beginning of this year without laying off a single, solitary soul. That's an important thing. They did it through early retirement incentives, through voluntary generous severance packages, and they have now put in a policy of no layoffs between now and 1999.

Now, the Government can't make all companies do this; for one thing, not every company could do it. There are too many differences in the market. But we all ought to be out here knowing that these things are going on and that they're good, and we ought to be able to get this information out all across America, so when other companies are confronted with these challenges, they will ask themselves: Are there things I can do to support the economic security of the families of the people who are working for me? Are there things the Government could do not to make me do this, because you can't freeze the future, but at least to create a climate in which it would be easier for me to do this and still do well?

The last point I want to make is that every company has a duty to provide a safe workplace. Now, a lot of people see this as the Government's duty, and it is to some extent. For 25 years or more the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has had the responsibility of providing a safe workplace, and I've opposed the attempts in the Congress to weaken OSHA and to undermine its budget and to make it turn back on its mission.

Fundamentally, what you want is for the value of every company to be a safe and healthy workplace. You take Motorola. I'm proud that we worked with Motorola to open up the Japanese market to their cellular telephones and help them create jobs in America. But I'm even prouder in some ways that because of their own safety programs, their own safety training—things that Government does not require them to do—injuries are 70 percent below the industry average in those plants. That's the sort of thing we ought to encourage.

OSHA ought to be out doing more of what we're trying to do now, making partnerships with companies and saying, look, if you can figure out how to have a safer, better workplace, we could care less, you can throw the rulebook

away. We're interested in results. We want the employees to feel good when they go to work every day. We want them to participate in making the workplace safer.

These are the elements of corporate citizenship that together with the proper policies from the Government will enable us to move into the 21st century with the American dream alive for everybody. Just think about it, five simple things: family friendly workplaces; health care and pensions; training and education; more partnership; and safe and healthy workplaces—five challenges that the rest of us ought not only to encourage the business community in America to meet but to help them to meet wherever we can.

Soon I will announce—I will invite, excuse me, the chief executive officers of some of our country's best companies to come to Washington for a conference on corporate citizenship before I leave for Japan and Russia next month. And we are going to talk about the good things that are being done and how we can spread them. We're going to talk about not how we can complain about the disruptions that the global economy is bringing to America but how we can do something about it to guarantee more economic security to the American families that are out there doing the best they can and working hard.

Let me say again, there is no running away from this future. We don't have to run away. This country can compete and win and maintain its standard of living and enhance it. And that is the only way we can maintain our standard of living and enhance it. You will not find a country that has run away from the global economy who is doing as well as the United States is. We can't run away. And we cannot do anything that will try to freeze the dynamism of the economy; otherwise we won't be able to create jobs.

But we can lift up those companies that are doing a good job. We can ask ourselves relentlessly, what sort of Government policies in Washington, in Columbus, or in Cincinnati can help companies to do better? And we can continue to work together to create a climate in which every single workplace will want to be identified with these five characteristics.

I say again, we have got to do this together. The thing that works in the world we're living in is working together. And when America works together, we always win.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:28 p.m. in the Schmidt Memorial Field House at Xavier University. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Roxanne Qualls of Cincinnati; Rev. James E. Hoff, president, Xavier University; and John E. Pepper, chief executive officer, Procter & Gamble, and cochair, Cincinnati Youth Collaborative.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Columbus, Ohio
March 23, 1996

Thank you very much. I'll tell you, I've been around John Glenn a lot; that's the best darn speech I ever heard him give. [*Laughter*] Let me see if I can remember that, "You don't make America stronger by taking Big Bird away from 5-year-olds, school lunches away from 10-year-olds, summer jobs away from 15-year-olds, or student loans away from 20-year-olds." That's a pretty good line. That's a good line.

I want to thank our national chairman, Don Fowler, for his tireless work and for being here, and your remarkable State party chair, David Leland, for this incredible event. I thank you, sir, and all who worked on it. I thank all the distinguished officials that are up here on the dais with me, and especially my colleagues Congressman Sherrod Brown, Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur, and Congressman Tom Sawyer. Thank you for your fine work.

I have, I understand, two friends out in the audience, former colleagues, your former Attorney General Lee Fisher and your former Governor Dick Celeste; hello to you wherever you are, and thank you for being here. Ladies and gentlemen—Ted Strickland, is he here? Where are you, Ted? Thank you.

I want to thank the remarkable Central State University Marching Band, thank you very much

for playing. I'd like to thank the others who performed before I came out here, America's Pride and Darla's Dancers and Madeline Reberra, thank you all.

I have a very great deal to be thankful to Ohio for, as it has been pointed out. The votes of Ohio on June 2, 1992, made me the nominee of the Democratic Party. The votes of the Ohio delegation in New York City in June of 1992—or July of 1992 officially made me the nominee of the Democratic Party. On election night in 1992 in November, Ohio put the Clinton-Gore ticket over the top, and we thank you for that.

More recently, I want to thank especially the people of Dayton for hosting the Bosnian peace talks and giving the United States a chance to play a role in settling the bloodiest conflict in Europe since World War II, promoting peace, saving lives, and thereby avoiding a war which our young people might be drawn into. I thank you for hosting those peace talks.

Let me say, having been traveling around the country now for the last couple of weeks, if anybody in this room had anything to do with settling the GM strike, there's 150,000 people that want to thank you, too, all across America for the chance to go back to work.

Ladies and gentlemen, most of what needs to be said to the Democrats of Ohio has already been said here tonight. I have a lot of gratitude in my heart. I want to thank all of the people from Ohio who now serve or who have served in our administration and all of you who have helped us to move this country forward.

But I want you to understand clearly, without any reservation, that this election represents a turning point in American history. In 1992, the real question was whether we would just sort of continue to drift along or whether we would change the course of America. In 1996, the decision will be between two very different paths of change. There is no status quo option.

And when I ran for President in 1992, I told you that my vision for America was a country in which every person, without regard to their region, their income, their race could have a chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities, to share in the American dream if they were willing to work for it; an America that led the world for peace and freedom and prosperity and security; and an America where we valued and respected each other so that we came together around our basic values of work and family and community, instead of being divided by the cheap, short-term, divisive tactics that many have used in the other party to divide the American people at every election season. That's the America I want, an America coming together and moving forward and meeting the challenges of the future.

And my message to you is that the record that Senator Glenn talked about is not a record to sit on, it's a record to build on, because what has happened is—for all the progress we have made, you know America still has many challenges. And I think every American understands at some level, maybe just instinctively, that this is not a normal time, that we are going through a period of very profound economic and social change. I believe and I said all over America that our Nation today is changing economically more than it has at any time in a century, since people moved in Ohio from the farm to small towns and cities, since they moved from making a living primarily in agriculture to making a living primarily out of manufacturing.

Today the American people and people all over the world are moving from an economy that is based on their national markets to one based on world markets. They're moving, whether they work in the factory, on the farm, or in offices, from an economy where mind is more and more important and muscle is less and less important. They're moving into economy where work forces are being radically restructured because the little digital chip means that you can communicate more information more quickly with fewer people than anyone would have imagined even 10 years ago.

It has been at least 100 years since we have dealt with changes of this scope. And as with every period of great change, there are vast new opportunities created for people, but there is also uprooting and uncertainty. And our great challenge today is to take the positive things that have happened, that Senator Glenn talked about, and build on them to achieve our mission to provide security to every working family in this country that is willing to work for it, so that everyone will be rewarded for what they do, and to help our people in the great struggles of daily life, to strengthen our families and give all of our kids a childhood, to make all of our streets safe and our environment clean. That is our struggle. And to do it we have to be willing to change the way the Government works, to earn the trust and the confidence of

the American people and to make it work again for all. That is what I have been working on.

And for all those who would argue against your political preferences and these people in Congress, let me just remind you, think back to where we were 4 or 5 years ago when the deficit was more than twice as high as it is; when your unemployment rate was 2 points higher; when it seemed like the only new jobs that were coming into the economy were low-wage jobs. No, I don't pretend that we solved all the problems, but we do have over 8 million new jobs, just like I said; we have cut the deficit, just like I said; and wages are going up again in America for the first time in a decade. And that's something to run on.

The first argument, obviously, is the argument Senator Glenn made. The other side, they said if our economic plan passed it would bring a disaster to America. They were wrong. We don't need to go back to their strategies. They gave us the disaster for America the last time they had the economy. On the other hand, we don't need to stand pat, either, as they tried to do in 1992. This is a record to build on, not to stand on.

We have to meet the challenges of all those Americans out there who do not feel strong and certain about the future. They are basically three groups of Americans: They're the people that live in those inner-city neighborhoods and those isolated rural areas where nobody has invested money yet. We need to give people incentives, tax incentives to put their money there to create private sector jobs to grow the economy there. We need to put in banks to loan money to people there. If we can provide incentives to invest in foreign countries, we ought to provide incentives to invest in the heartland of America's neighborhood.

The second group of Americans are the Americans who are working harder and harder and harder at hourly wages and never seem to get a raise. And there are a lot of them. And what do we have to do with them? For one thing, we should do no harm; we should reject the other side's budget proposal that would actually reduce the family tax credit that is now providing tax relief to families with incomes under $28,000.

The second thing we ought to do is raise the minimum wage. You know, both political parties in America and most politicians talk about family values. Well, that's a good thing to talk about; it's a good thing to be for. There's nothing more important. But there are millions of people out there, my fellow Americans, who are trying to raise children on $4.25 an hour. You can't do that; that's not a family value. We ought to raise it instead of letting it go to a 40-year low.

We ought to give these people the certainty that we are fighting for a growing economy and we're trying to open new markets. You know, we have concluded 200 trade agreements since I have been President, 20 with Japan. And in the areas where we've made new trade agreements, our exports have gone up by 80 percent with Japan. We've got to give these people a fair break and not let them be worked over in the global economy.

We ought to give these families a real tax break. And one of the things we ought to give them is a tax deduction for the cost of all education after high school—a college—[*inaudible*]—tax break.

We ought to say—and then there's a third group of people. You've been reading a lot about them lately. They're the people that work for these big corporations that are downsizing. What about them? Some of them are average income working people, some of them look like me—they're 50-year-old, white, gray-headed men who worked for these big companies for 25 or 30 years, and all of a sudden—says, "We don't need you anymore. I know you've got two kids about ready to go to college, I know you've got problems, but we're sorry, you have to go." What about them?

Well, you know what? There are several things that we can do. For one thing, we ought to say there are a lot of companies that don't do that to their employees; let's look at them and find out how they do it and give other companies incentives to treat their folks in a good, positive way.

Then we ought to say if a person loses their job in America, they ought to immediately get a voucher from the Federal Government worth about $2,500 a year that they can take to the nearest community college to immediately go back and learn a new skill and start a new life. And if you lose your job or if someone in your family gets sick, we ought to change the law—we ought to do it now—so that you don't lose your health insurance anymore and you can keep it when you lose your job. And if you go to work for a small company, you

still ought to be able to take out a pension plan that you don't lose even if you lose your job; people ought to be able to carry those pensions with them and keep them for a lifetime and protect themselves in their retirement.

My fellow Americans, we have to face the challenges of the future because everybody has to know that they can benefit from the new global economy. I am grateful for the 8.4 million jobs. I am grateful that we have set a new record in business formation every year I've been President. I'm glad we're number one in selling automobiles and semiconductors again. I'm glad that the World Economic Forum in Europe says that we've gone from fifth place, before I became President, to having the most productive economy in the world for the last 3 years; I'm glad about that. But I won't be satisfied until working together we have created the opportunity for every American who will work for it to make the most of his or her own life and to give all the kids in this country a better future, and you shouldn't be, either.

Let me say that a big part of that is also getting back to our basic values, to having our communities and our families stronger. We have to help people raise their kids. That's why I was for the family tax credit. This year, 17 million families with incomes of under $28,000 a year will have lower taxes because of that '93 economic plan. That's why I was for the V-chip in the telecommunications bill so that parents would have more control over what their children see on television. I think that's important.

That's why our administration was the first in history to say we have to do something about the biggest health problem our young people face today, which is that 3,000 of them illegally start smoking every day and 1,000 of them will die sooner because of it, and we ought to stop it if we can. We've got to do something about it.

And we have to do something to make our streets safer. I'm glad that the crime rate is down and the welfare rolls are down and the food stamp rolls are down and the poverty rolls are down and the teen pregnancy rate is down. I'm glad about that, but they're all too high, and you know it. And we cannot be satisfied until you turn on the evening news at night and if you see on the evening news that a terrible crime has been committed, you are surprised instead of numb to it. That's when we know we will have whipped the crime problem.

And so I say to you, we need a combination of things. First, let's do what we know works. The FOP, the Fraternal Order of Police, which has one of the biggest chapters in the country here in Ohio, and all of the other law enforcement officers in this country helped us write that crime bill that Congress tried to undo a couple of days ago. And we got with them and with people that work on crime in the community and they said, "What works? Community policing works; put more police on the streets, put them in the neighborhoods, put them in the schoolyards, let people know their neighbors. They can lower the crime rate." And folks, all over America, in city after city where people had given up on crime, the murder rate is down and violence is down. We can do better. We have to do more of that.

We also said that we ought to have tougher laws for punishment for people who commit serious crimes. We ought to have a "three strikes and you're out" law. But for kids that get in trouble the first time, we need to try to give them a chance to recover their lives by giving them something to say yes to.

And let me tell you, again, it is a sign of the times: The crime rate is down, but the rate of violence among children under 18 is up. There are too many kids out there raising themselves, and we need to support each other in giving them their childhood back. We have to do it.

There's been a lot of talk in Ohio about welfare reform. The welfare rolls are down since this administration came in. And even though Congress has not yet passed a welfare reform bill that I can sign that is tough on work but good to children, we have on our own given 37 States permission to get rid of Federal rules and find ways to move people from welfare to work. Three out of four people on welfare today are under welfare reform experiments approved by this administration. That is more than the last two administrations of the other party put together. We are moving people from welfare to work.

We are also doing something we should do more of. This administration has taken the lead in giving America record amounts of child support collections. We can move people off welfare if parents pay what they owe to raise their own kids, and we should insist upon it.

If we want America to be what it ought to be, we also have to give our children clean air, clean water, safe food, and a decent environment for the future. For years there was a serious debate about that. There is no longer a serious debate; we now know we can grow the economy by protecting the environment, and that is what I mean to do.

And let me say to you, it is not necessary, to balance the budget, to shut down the cleanup of toxic waste sites. There are millions of children that live within 3 or 4 miles of toxic waste dumps. We don't need to shut down our efforts to clean them up. It is not necessary, to balance the budget, to weaken the laws on safe food and clean air and clean water. It is not necessary to undermine the enforcement of the environmental standards of America to balance the budget, and I will not do it. I will not tolerate it; it is wrong. It is wrong.

Now, my fellow Americans, we also have to realize that, much as we'd like to, just because the cold war is over we can't walk away from the rest of the world. I know a lot of people even in this room have disagreed with some of the decisions I have made in foreign policy. But let me tell you, we are the world's only superpower now. I try not to meddle. There are some things we can't do. I don't want to be the world's policeman, but we can't walk away. We have to try to be the world's peacemaker. And every time we make peace, every time we make peace for people in other parts of the world, we ensure that we will be a little safer.

Let me tell you, you know, if you just take terrorism, no great nation can hide from terrorism. We saw it at the World Trade Center in New York here. We saw it in Oklahoma City. And when you see bombs blow up innocent civilians in Israel or in London, just remember this: In the world we're living in, with computer technology, with open borders, one of our biggest challenges is seeing the people who are terrorists, the people who are drug runners, the people who are organized criminals, and the people who smuggle weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and biological weapons, coming together and working together. I am determined that that will not happen, and I intend to keep us involved with every freedom-loving country in the world that will stand up to the terrorists and the thugs that would rob innocent people of their future.

Now, it is in that context that you must see this choice. I don't want to sit on this record. I want to build on it. I want more change, not less. I want a Government that is smaller and less bureaucratic. We have given you the smallest Government, not the other party that always cursed the Federal Government. The Democrats have given you the smallest National Government in 30 years and the biggest reduction in regulations.

But I do believe—we need a doctor? Is there a doctor here? We have somebody who passed out in the heat here. Can we get a doctor? Okay? She's okay, just wanted more jokes. [*Laughter*] Let me say—we got another one over here. We need a doctor over there.

Now, let me say, you have to see this election in these terms. They can say, "Oh, old 'Veto' Bill"—you bet, and I'm proud of it. And I'd do it again. You look—I want you to look at where the budget negotiations were when they left them to go finish their campaign. They had acknowledged that we didn't need those big Medicare cuts, those big Medicaid cuts; that we didn't have to gut education or environmental protection; that we didn't have to raise taxes on working people, we don't have to raid pension funds, we don't have to do those things.

Now, remember this, there is no longer a choice between the status quo and change. There are two real different views of change here. They say the Government is the problem, just get out of the way and let things take their course. I say, you remember what happened 100 years ago? The progressive movement that culminated in Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, that progressive movement started under a Republican, Teddy Roosevelt. They abandoned him and his tradition, and we shouldn't make the same mistake. We have to stand up for that.

I believe that the Government of the United States has to, first of all, make us secure; secondly, give us the conditions of a growing economy; and third, work in partnership with the American people so that individuals and families and communities can make the most of their own lives and meet the challenges of this uncertain world. That is the difference between our campaign and theirs. It is clear, unambiguous, and true.

So I want you to think about it. Yes, I vetoed that budget, and I'd do it again. But I don't like it. I'd rather sign the right kind of balanced

budget that will lower interest rates, balance the budget, grow the economy, and give your kids a future. That's what I did. And that's the way I feel about welfare reform and health care reform and all these other things.

I want to work with the Congress. But the main thing I want is to give you the kind of future you need and deserve. So if you are willing to stand up and fight one more time, we can have an American dream for all Americans in the 21st century. That's what we can have. We can have family values. We can have a free and safe America. We can have a better future.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:23 p.m. in the Lausche Building at the Ohio State Fairgrounds. In his remarks, he referred to former Representative Ted Strickland.

Remarks to the National Association of Attorneys General and an Exchange With Reporters

March 25, 1996

The President. Please sit down, everybody. The Attorney General and I are delighted to be here. I understand that the Vice President has already been in this morning. Mr. Udall and Mr. Harshbarger and to all the attorneys general here, you're very welcome in the White House, and I'm very glad to see you.

I want to, if I might—I know we're going to have some time later for questions—but I wanted to just speak about two things this morning, especially while our friends in the media are here, that directly affect the work that you do. First of all, I want to applaud those of you who have been in the forefront of dealing with the consequences of tobacco to young people in your States.

As you know, this administration has worked on that very hard. We promulgated the Synar regulation to try to help you do what you are trying to do in your States. And we will do everything we can to help you implement those Synar rules as easily and effectively as possible.

No matter how hard we work on that, I'm convinced that it won't be enough. Young people are barraged constantly by messages that glamour and grit can be found in a package of cigarettes. And we believe that we must act much more strongly to make cigarettes less accessible and to make children less subject to the lures of the advertising. And in that connection, I know that 27 of you wrote to the FDA in support of those objectives. I want to thank you for that. It seems to me that all the evidence clearly indicates that we have to continue to move on this front. It is the most serious public health problem that our young people face; 3,000 of them a day begin to smoke illegally, and 1,000 will have their lives shortened as a result.

The second thing I want to mention is to thank you for the partnership we've enjoyed in the fight to reduce crime and violence. The police program is continuing apace. We're actually slightly ahead of schedule in the goal of putting 100,000 more police officers on the street. There is now broad recognition in the country that the community policing strategy is central to the successful efforts that many, many communities have enjoyed in bringing down the crime rate. It's one of the good news stories of the United States in the last few years. And we will continue to do that.

We also have worked hard with you on a number of other areas in the crime bill. I want to mention, if I might, one other thing that's especially important, and that is the issue of gun violence. The Brady bill, which became the Brady law, has now directly resulted in over 60,000 people with criminal records being denied access to guns. And it is working well, and I think it has proved, beyond even some of us who supported it—even beyond our expectations, that it can make a difference.

As you know, we've had a recent controversy here in Washington with the attempt in the House of Representatives, which was successful in the House, to repeal the assault weapons ban. It is not presently scheduled for a vote in the Senate yet, but the people who got it voted on in the House certainly haven't given

up, and there are a lot of people on record in support of repealing it in the Senate. So I ask you for your support on that. It would be a mistake. This country needs a lot of things, but it does not need more assault weapons. And we now have been through one good set of hunting seasons in every State in America, and so every hunter who was told that that assault weapon ban represented some threat to his or her ability to go out and hunt deer in the deer seasons, or ducks in my home State, now knows that was not true.

And if it does get to my desk, of course I will veto it, and I'm confident the veto will be sustained. But this should not be brought back up. This should not even be a subject of debate in the United States. But it is still very much alive and well, and so I ask you for your help and your support in that regard.

We have got to continue to work on this crime problem until—everybody knows we will never totally eliminate crime in America; we can't transform human nature. But I do believe if we work at it we can get back to the time when people turn on the evening news and they see a horrible crime story, they're surprised instead of numb to it. And that is, I think, the goal we ought to set for ourselves, that it should become the exception rather than the rule.

And again—I know that I speak for the Attorney General—we have enjoyed working with all of you, and we're glad to be here, and we want to answer some of your questions. I think we'll have a chance to visit after we conclude the public portion of this meeting, but I thank you very much.

I asked the Attorney General if she wanted to give a speech. She said, no, you're coming to see her this afternoon. [*Laughter*]

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

China and Taiwan

Q. Mr. President, do you think that China and Taiwan are at a turning point now?

The President. Do you mean, do I think the tensions are going down?

Q. Right, where do you think this is going?

The President. Well, I hope they are. I was encouraged by some statements that came out of both sides in the aftermath of the election. And so I hope that is what is going on.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:36 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Tom Udall, New Mexico attorney general, and Scott Harshbarger, Massachusetts attorney general, association president and president-elect, respectively.

Statement on the Death of Edmund Muskie

March 26, 1996

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of former Senator Edmund Muskie. A dedicated legislator and caring public servant, Senator Muskie was a leader in the best sense. He spoke from his heart and acted with conviction. Generations to come will benefit from his steadfast commitment to protecting the land. Our thoughts and prayers go out to his family, his friends, and the people of Maine at this difficult time.

NOTE: The related proclamation of March 27 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Angola (UNITA)

March 25, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since September 26, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order No. 12865 of September 26, 1993. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to Angola, invoking the authority, *inter alia,* of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibited the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibited such sale or supply to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"). United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance, of the stated prohibitions. The order authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against Angola (UNITA). There have been no amendments to the Regulations since my report of September 18, 1995.

The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, relating to transportation to Angola or UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has designated the following points of entry as points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: *Airports:* Luanda and Katumbela, Benguela Province; *Ports:* Luanda and Lobito, Benguela Province; and Namibe, Namibe Province; and *Entry Points:* Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

2. The FAC has worked closely with the U.S. financial community to assure a heightened awareness of the sanctions against UNITA—through the dissemination of publications, seminars, and notices to electronic bulletin boards. This educational effort has resulted in frequent calls from banks to assure that they are not routing funds in violation of these prohibitions. United States exporters have also been notified of the sanctions through a variety of media, including special fliers and computer bulletin board information initiated by FAC and posted through the U.S. Department of Commerce and

the U.S. Government Printing Office. There have been no license applications under the program.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from September 18, 1995, through March 25, 1996, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Angola (UNITA) are reported to be about $226,000, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel) and the Department of State (particularly the Office of Southern African Affairs).

I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 25, 1996.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 27.

Statement on Signing the Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996
March 26, 1996

Today I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 2036, the "Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996," which brings needed reforms to the Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA).

This Act would eliminate a statutory mandate that requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to promulgate stringent and costly treatment requirements for certain low-risk wastes that already are regulated under the Clean Water Act or Safe Drinking Water Act. The EPA considers these wastes to present little or no risk, due to existing regulation under State and Federal law.

The Act requires EPA to conduct a study to determine whether, following elimination of this mandate, there will be any risks that might not be addressed by State or other Federal laws. It also preserves EPA's authority to impose any additional controls that are needed to protect public health and the environment. In addition, H.R. 2036 reforms certain municipal landfill ground water monitoring requirements under current law, thereby easing burdens on local governments.

The Administration's support for H.R. 2036 originated in its initiative for Reinventing Environmental Regulation, as announced on March 16, 1995. As part of that initiative, I made a commitment to support commonsense reforms to the SWDA—if those reforms could be developed through a bipartisan process. This Act addresses one of the most important issues that the Administration identified in our initiative. Once implemented by EPA, it will eliminate an unnecessary and duplicative layer of costly regulation, yielding tens of millions of dollars in savings to private industry.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 26, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 2036, approved March 26, was assigned Public Law No. 104–119. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 27.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association Education Summit in Palisades, New York

March 27, 1996

Thank you very much, Governor Miller, Governor Thompson; Lou Gerstner. Thank you for hosting this terribly important event. To all of the Governors and distinguished guests, education leaders, and business leaders who are here, let me say that I am also delighted to be here with the Secretary of Education, Governor Dick Riley. I believe that he and Governor Hunt and Governor Branstad and I were actually there when the "Nation At Risk" report was issued, as well as when the education summit was held by President Bush. I want to thank Secretary Riley for the work that he has done with the States and with educators all across the country. And I know that every one of you has worked with him, but I'm glad to have him here, and he's been a wonderful partner for me and I think for you.

This is an extraordinary meeting of America's business leaders and America's Governors. I know some have raised some questions about it, but let me just say on the front end I think it is a very appropriate and a good thing to do, and I applaud those who organized it and those who have attended. The Governors, after all, have primary, indeed constitutional responsibility for the conditions of our public schools. And the business leaders know well, perhaps better than any other single group in America, what the consequences of our failing to get the most out of our students and achieve real educational excellence will be for our Nation.

So I am very pleased to see you here doing this, and I want to thank each and every one of you. I also think you have a better chance than perhaps anyone else, even in this season, to keep the question of education beyond partisanship and to deal with it as an American challenge that all the American people must meet and must meet together.

All of you know very well that this is a time of a dramatic transformation in the United States. I'm not sure if any of us fully understands the true implications of the changes through which we are all living and the responsibilities that those changes impose upon us. It is clear to most people that the dimensions of economic change now are the greatest that they have been since we moved from farm to factory and from rural areas to cities and towns 100 years ago.

In his book "The Road From Here," Bill Gates says that the digital chip is leading us to the greatest transformation in communications in 500 years, since Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Europe. If that is true, it is obvious beyond anyone's ability to argue that the educational enterprise, which has always been central to the development of good citizens in America as well as to a strong economy, is now more important than ever before.

That means that we need a candid assessment of what is right and what is wrong with our educational system and what we need to do. Your focus on standards, your focus on assessment, your focus on technology is all to the good. We know that many of our schools do a very good job, but some of them don't. We know that many of our teachers are great, but some don't measure up. We know many of our communities are seizing the opportunities of the present and the future, but too many aren't.

And most important, we know that—after the emphasis on education which goes back at least until 1983 in the whole country and to my native region, to the South, to the late seventies when we began to try to catch up economically with the rest of the country—we know that while the schools and the students of this country are doing better than they were in 1984 and better than they were in 1983 when the "Nation At Risk" was issued and in 1989 when the education summit was held at Charlottesville, most of them still are not meeting the standards that are necessary and adequate to the challenges of today. So that is really what we have to begin with.

Now America has some interesting challenges that I think are somewhat unique to our country in this global environment in which education is important, and we might as well just sort of put them out there on the front end, not that we can resolve them today.

The first is that we have a far more diverse group of students in terms of income and race and ethnicity and background and, indeed, living

conditions than almost any other great country in the world.

Second, we have a system in which both authority and financing is more fractured than in other countries is typically the case.

Third, we know that our schools are burdened by social problems not of their making, which make the jobs of principals and teachers more difficult.

And fourth, and I think most important of all, our country still has an attitude problem about education that I think we should resolve, even prior to the standards and the assessment issue, and that is that too many people in the United States think that the primary determinant of success in learning is either IQ or family circumstances instead of effort. And I don't. And I don't think any of the research supports that.

So one of the things that I hope you will say is, in a positive way, that you believe all kids can learn and, in a stronger way, that you believe that effort is more important than IQ or income, given the right kind of educational opportunities, the right kind of expectations. It's often been said that Americans from time to time suffer from a revolution of rising expectations. This is one area where we need a revolution of rising expectations. We ought to all simply and forthrightly say that we believe that school is children's work and play, that it can be great joy, but that effort matters.

I see one of our business leaders here, this former State senator from Arkansas, Senator Joe Ford, whose father was the head of our educational program in Arkansas for a long time. We had a lot of people in one-room schoolhouses 40 and 50 and 60 years ago, reading simple readers, who believed that effort was more important than IQ or income; they didn't know what IQ was. And we have got to change that. And Governors, every Governor and every business leader in this country can make a difference.

I'm no Einstein, and not everybody can do everything, but if you stack this up from one to the other, all the Americans together in order by IQ, you couldn't stick a straw between one person and the next. And you know it as well as I do. Most people can learn everything they need to know to be good citizens and successful participants in the American economy and in the global economy. And I believe that unless you can convince your constituents that that is the truth, that all of your efforts to raise standards and all of your efforts to have accountability through tests and other assessments will not be as successful as they ought to be. And I think frankly, a lot of people, even in education, need to be reminded of that from time to time.

Now let's get back to the good news. Thirty or 40 years ago, maybe even 20 years ago, no one could ever have conceived of a meeting like this taking place. Governors played little role in education until just a couple of decades ago, and business didn't regard it as their responsibility. In the late seventies and the early eighties, this whole wave began to sweep America. And one important, positive thing that ought never to be overlooked is that the business leadership of America and the Governors of this country have been literally obsessed with education for a long time now. And that's a very good thing, because one of the problems with America is that we tend to be in the grip of serial enthusiasms. It's the hula hoop today and something else tomorrow. Boy, that dates me, doesn't it? [*Laughter*]

In this country the Governors have displayed a remarkable consistency of commitment to education, and at least since 1983, the business community has displayed that commitment. And I think it's fair to say that all of us have learned some things as we have gone along, which is what has brought you to this point, that there is a—you understand now, and I've heard Lou Gerstner talk about it in his, almost his mantra about standards—that we understand that the next big step has to be to have some meaningful and appropriately high standards and then hold people accountable for them.

I think it's worth noting that the 1983 "Nation At Risk" report did do some good things. Almost every State in the country went back and revised its curriculum requirement. Many revised their class size requirements. Many did other things to upgrade teacher training or to increase college scholarships or to do a lot of other things.

In 1989 I was privileged to be in Charlottesville working with Governor Branstad and with Governor Campbell, primarily, as we were trying to get all the Governors together to develop the statement at the education summit with President Bush. And that was the first time there had ever been a bipartisan national consensus on educational goals.

The realization was in 1989 was that 6 years after a "Nation At Risk," all these extra require-

ments were being put into education, but nobody had focused on what the end game was. What did we want America to look like? It's worth saying that we wanted every child to show up for school ready to learn, that we wanted to be proficient in certain core courses and were willing to assess our students to see if we were, that we wanted to prepare our people for the world of work, that we wanted to be extra good in math and science and to overcome our past deficiencies. All the things that were in those educational goals were worth saying.

Another thing that the Charlottesville summit did that I think is really worth emphasizing is that it defined for the first time, from the Governors up, what the Federal role in education ought to be and what it should not be. I went back this morning, just on the way up, and I read the Charlottesville statement about what the Governors then unanimously voted that the Federal role should be and what it should not be.

When I became President and I asked Dick Riley to become Secretary of Education, I said that our legislative agenda ought to be consistent, completely consistent, with what the Governors had said at Charlottesville. So, for example, the Governors said at Charlottesville, the Federal Government has a bigger responsibility to help people show up for school prepared to learn, so we emphasized things like more funds for Head Start and more investment in trying to improve the immunization rates of kids and other health indicators; and more responsibility for access to higher education, so we tried to reform the student loan program and invest more money in Pell grants and national service and things like that; and then, more responsibility to give greater flexibility to the States in K through 12 and to try to promote reform without defining how any of this should be done. And so that's what Goals 2000 was about; we tried to have a system in which States and mostly local school districts could pursue world-class standards based on their own plans for grassroots reform.

And we overhauled the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and we redid title I to do one thing that I think is very important: We took out of what was then in the law for chapter 1, which was lower educational expectations for poor children. It was an outrage, and we took it out of the law. I don't believe that poor children should be expected to perform at lower levels than other children.

And Dick Riley, since he has been Secretary of Education, has cut Federal regulations over States and local school districts by more than 50 percent. It seems to me that that is consistent with exactly what the Governors said at Charlottesville they wanted done.

Now, the effort to have national standards, I think it's fair to say, has been less than successful. The history standards and the English standards effort did not succeed for reasons that have been well analyzed, although I'm not sure the debate was entirely worthless; I think the debate itself did some good. But there are recommended standards that have been widely embraced coming out of the math teachers, that most people think are quite good. And the preliminary indications for science are encouraging.

And I want to say again, it would be wrong to say that there's been no progress since 1983. The number of young people taking core courses has jumped from 13 percent in '82 to 52 percent in '94. The national math and science scores are up a grade since 1983. Half of all the 4-year-olds now attend preschool. Eighty-six percent of all our young people are completing high school; we're almost up to the 90 percent that was in the national education goals. That is progress.

But what we have learned since Charlottesville and what you are here to hammer home to America is that the overall levels of learning are not enough and that there are still significant barriers in various schools to meeting higher standards.

I accept your premise: We can only do better with tougher standards and better assessment, and you should set the standards. I believe that is absolutely right, and that will be the lasting legacy of this conference. I also believe, along with Mr. Gerstner and the others who are here, that it's very important not only for businesses to speak out for reform but for business leaders to be knowledgeable enough to know what reform to speak out for and what to emphasize and how to hammer home the case for higher standards, as well as how to help local school districts change some of the things that they are now doing so that they have a reasonable chance at meeting these standards.

Let me just go through now what I think we should do in challenging the country on standards for students, as well as for teachers

and schools. I suppose that I have spent more time in classrooms than any previous President, partly because I was a Governor for 12 years and partly because I still do it with some frequency. I believe the most important thing you can do is to have high expectations for students—to make them believe they can learn; to tell them they're going to have to learn really difficult, challenging things; to assess whether they're learning or not; and to hold them accountable, as well as to reward them. Most children are very eager to learn. Those that aren't have probably been convinced they can't. We can do better with that. I believe that once you have high standards and high expectations, there is an unlimited number of things that can be done.

But I also believe that there have to be consequences. I watched your panel last night, and I thought it was—the moment of levity on the panel was when Al Shanker was asked, "When I was teaching school and I would give students homework, they said, 'Does it count?'" That's the thing I remember about the panel last night. All of you remember, too. You laughed, right? [*Laughter*] "Does it count?" And the truth is that in the world we're living in today, "does it count" has to mean something, particularly in places where there haven't been any standards for a long time.

So if the States are going to go back and raise standards so that you're not only trying to increase the enrollment in core courses, you're trying to make the core courses themselves mean more—and I heard Governor Hunt last night say he'd be willing to settle for reading and writing and math and science, I think were the ones you said—if you're going to go back and define what's in those core courses and you're going to lift it up, you have to be willing, then, to hold the students accountable for whether they have achieved that or not. And again, another thing that Mr. Shanker said that I've always believed, we have always downgraded teaching to the test, but if you're going to know whether people learn what you expect them to know, then you have to test them on what you expect them to know.

So I believe that if you want the standards movement to work, first you have to do the hard work in deciding what it is you expect children to learn. But then you have to have an assessment system, however you design it, in your own best judgment at the State level, that says, no more social promotions, no more free passes. If you want people to learn, learning has to mean something. That's what I believe. I don't believe you can succeed unless you are prepared to have an assessment system with consequences.

In Arkansas in 1983 when we redid the educational standards, we had a very controversial requirement that young people pass the 8th grade tests to go on to high school. And not everybody passed it. And we let people take it more than once. I think it's fine to do that.

But even today, after 13 years, I think there are only five States in the country today which require promotion for either grade to grade or school to school for its young people—to require tests for that. I believe that if you have meaningful standards that you have confidence in, that you believe if they're met your children will know what they need to know, you shouldn't be afraid to find out if they're learning it, and you shouldn't be deterred by people saying this is cruel, this is unfair, or whatever they say.

The worst thing you can do is send people all the way through school with a diploma they can't read. And you're not being unfair to people if you give them more than one chance and if at the same time you improve the teaching and the operation of the schools in which they are. If you believe these kids can learn, you have to give them a chance to demonstrate it. This is only a cruel, short-sighted thing to do if you are convinced that there are limitations on what the American children can do. And I just don't believe that.

So that, I think, is the most important thing. I believe every State, if you're going to have meaningful standards, must require a test for children to move, let's say, from elementary to middle school or from middle school to high school or to have a full-meaning high school diploma. And I don't think they should measure just minimum competency. You should measure what you expect these standards to measure.

You know, when we instituted any kind of test at home, I was always criticized by the fact that the test wasn't hard enough. But I think it takes time to transform a system, and you may decide it takes time to transform a system. But you will never know whether your standards are being met unless you have some sort of measurement and have some sort of accountability. And while I believe they should be set by the States and the testing mechanism

should be approved by the States, we shouldn't kid ourselves. Being promoted ought to mean more or less the same thing in Pasadena, California, that it does in Palisades, New York. In a global society, it ought to mean more or less the same thing.

I was always offended by the suggestion that the kids who grew up in the Mississippi Delta in Arkansas, which is the poorest place in America, shouldn't have access to the same learning opportunities that other people should and couldn't learn. I don't believe that.

So I think the idea—I heard the way Governor Engler characterized it last night, I thought, was pretty good. You want a non-Federal national mechanism to sort of share this information so that you'll at least know how you're doing compared to one another. That's a good start. That's a good way to begin this. I also believe that we shouldn't ignore the progress that's been made by the goals panel since Governor Romer was first leader of that, going through Governor Engler, and by the National Assessment on Educational Progress. I know a lot of you talked about that last night. They've done a lot of good things, and we can learn a lot from them. We don't have to reinvent the wheel here.

I also would like to go back and emphasize something I heard Governor Hunt say last night. I think we should begin with a concrete standard for reading and writing because the most troubling thing to me is that we've been through a decade in which math and science scores have risen and reading scores have stayed flat. Intel recently had to turn away hundreds of applicants because they lacked basic reading and writing skills.

Now, that will present you with an immediate problem because if you want to measure reading and writing, you will not be able just to have a multiple choice test which can be graded by a machine. You'll have to recognize that teachers do real work with kids when they teach them how to write, and you have to give them the time and support to do that. And then there has to be some way of evaluating that. I know that's harder and more expensive, but it really matters whether a child can read and write.

And for all the excitement about the computers in the schools—and I am a big proponent of it—I would note that when we started with a computer program in our school, and I believe when Governor Caperton started in West Virginia, he started in the early grades for the precise purpose that technology should be used first to give children the proper grounding in basic skills. So I think that's quite important.

Secretary Riley says that every child should be able to read independently by the end of the third grade. And parenthetically, that if that were the standard, I think we would be more successful in getting parents to read to their children every night, which would revolutionize the whole system of education anyway.

The second thing I think we have to do is to face the fact that if we want to have these standards for children, standards and tests, we have to have a system that rewards and inspires and demands higher standards of teachers. They, after all, do this work. The rest of us talk about it, and they do it.

So that means that, first of all, you've got to get the most talented people in there. There's been a lot of talk about this for a decade now, but most States and school districts still need work on their certification rules. We should not bar qualified, even brilliant young people from becoming teachers. The Teach For America group in my home State did a wonderful job, and a lot of those young kids wind up staying and teaching, even though they can make 2 and 3 times as much money doing something else. Every State should, in my view, review that.

I also believe any time you're trying to hold teachers to higher standards, they should be rewarded when they perform. I know that in South Carolina and Kentucky, if schools markedly improve their performance, they get bonuses and the teachers get the benefit. That's not a bad thing; that's a good thing, and we should have more of that.

I want to thank Governor Hunt for the work he's done on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. We had the first group of teachers who are board certified in the White House not very long ago. Every State should have a system, in my opinion, for encouraging these teachers to become board certified; the Federal Government doesn't have anything to do with that. Encourage these teachers to become board certified because they have to demonstrate not only knowledge but teaching skills. And when they achieve that level, they should be rewarded. There should be extra rewards when they do that.

We also need a system that doesn't look the other way if a teacher is burned out or not

performing up to standard. There ought to be a fair process for removing teachers who aren't competent, but the process also has to be much faster and far less costly than it is. I read the other day that in New York it can cost as much as $200,000 to dismiss a teacher who is incompetent. In Glen Ellyn, Illinois, a school district spent $70,000 to dismiss a high school math teacher who couldn't do basic algebra and let the students sleep in class. That is wrong. We should do more to reward good teachers; we should have a system that is fair to teachers but moves much more expeditiously and much more cheaply in holding teachers accountable.

So States and school systems and teachers unions need to be working together to make it tougher to get licensed and recertified, easier and less costly to get teachers who can't teach out of the classrooms, and clearly set rewards for teachers who are performing, especially if they become board certified or in some State-defined way prove themselves excellent.

The third thing I think we have to do is to hold schools accountable for results. We have known now for a long time—we have no excuses for not doing—we have known for a long time that the most important player in this drama besides the teachers and the students are the school principals, the building principals. And yet, still, not every State has a system for holding the school districts accountable for having good principals in all these schools and then giving the principals the authority they need to do the job, getting out of their way, and holding them accountable both on the up side and the down side. To me, that is still the most important thing. Every school I go into, I can stay there about 30 minutes and tell you pretty much what the principal has done to establish a school culture, an atmosphere of learning, a system of accountability, a spirit of adventure. You can just feel it, and it's still the most important thing.

Secondly, the business community can do a lot of work with the Governors to help these school districts reinvent their budgets, I think. There are still too many school districts spending way too much money on administration and too little money on education and instruction. And there needs to be some real effort put into that, that goes beyond rhetoric. I mean, I was given these statistics, which I assume are true because I had it vetted four different times—I hate to use numbers that I haven't—if it is true that New York City spends $8,000 a student on education, but only $44 goes to books and other classroom materials, that's a disgrace. That's wrong. And that's true in a lot of other school districts.

We cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we've got now. That's an area where I think the business community can make a major, major contribution. A lot of you have had to restructure your own operations; a lot of you have had to achieve far higher levels of productivity. If we can reduce the Federal Government by 200,000 people without undermining our essential mission, we can do a much better job in the school districts of the country.

Let me also say I think that we ought to encourage every State to do what most States are now doing, which is to provide more options for parents, you know, in terms of the public school choice legislation and the charter schools—a lot of you have done a very good job with the charter schools. But I'm excited about the idea that educators and parents get to actually start schools—create and manage them and stay open only if they do a good job—within the public school system. Every charter school I visited was an exciting place. Today, 21 of you allow charter schools—there are over 250 schools which are open; 100 more are going to open next year—freed up from regulation and top-down bureaucracy, focusing on meeting higher standards. The schools have to be able to meet these standards if you impose them.

Secretary Riley has helped 11 States to start new schools, and in the balanced budget plan I submitted to Congress last week, there is $40 million in seed money to help start 3,000 more charter schools over the next 5 years, which would be a tenfold increase. That may become the order of the day. So I believe we need standards and accountability for students, for teachers, and for schools.

Let me just mention two other things briefly. I don't believe you can possibly minimize—and a lot of the Governors I know have been in these schools—you cannot minimize how irrelevant this discussion would seem to a teacher who doesn't feel safe walking the halls of his or her school or how utterly hopeless it seems to students who have to look over their shoulders when they're walking to and from school. So I believe that we have to work together to

continue to make our schools safe and our students held to a reasonable standard of conduct, as well.

You know, we had a teacher in Washington last week who was mugged in a hallway by a gang of intruders, not students, a gang of intruders who were doing drugs and didn't even belong on the school grounds. We have got to keep working on that. All the Federal Government can do is give resources and pass laws. That's another thing the business community can help with, district after district. This entire discussion we have had is completely academic unless there is a safe and a disciplined and a drug-free environment in these schools.

We passed the safe and drug-free schools act, the Gun-Free Schools Act. We supported random drug testing in schools. We have supported the character education movement. We've almost ended lawsuits over religious issues by the guidelines that Secretary Riley and the Attorney General issued, showing that our schools don't have to be religion-free zones. We have worked very hard to help our schools do their job here.

The next thing I hope we can do, all of us, in this regard is to work to help our schools stay open longer. Our budget contains $14 million for helping people set up these community schools to stay open longer hours. But remember that 3 in the afternoon to 6 in the evening are the peak hours for juvenile crime, and all that comes back into the schools. So I think that's another thing we really need to look at. A lot of these schools do not have the resources today to stay open longer hours, but they would if they could.

And one of the primary targets I would have if I were a local leader trying to redo my district school budget is to reduce the amount spent on administration so that I could invest more money in keeping it open longer hours, especially for the latch-key kids and the other kids that are in trouble that don't have any other place to go. So that's something that I think is very important.

Finally, let me just echo what Governor Miller said about the technology. We did have a barnraising in California, and we hooked up actually more than 20 percent of the classrooms to the Internet on a single day. But we need every classroom and every library in every school in America hooked up to the Internet as quickly as possible. We set a goal as the year 2000; we could actually get there more quickly. I propose that in the budget, a $2 billion fund to help the communities who don't have the money to meet the challenge, but every community, every State in America, at least, has a high-tech community that could help get this done. The Congress passed a very fine Telecommunications Act that I signed not very long ago which gives preferential treatment to people in isolated rural areas or inner-city areas for access to schools and hospitals. So the infrastructure, the framework is there.

Anything you can do to help do that, I think, is good if the educators use the technology in the proper way. And I'll just close with this example. I was in the Union City School District in New Jersey not very long ago. That school district was about to be closed under the State of New Jersey's school bankruptcy law, which I think, by the way, is very good, holding school districts accountable, and they can actually lose their ability to operate as an independent district in New Jersey and the State takes them over if they keep failing.

There are a lot of first-generation immigrant children in that school. It was basically a poor school. Bell Atlantic went in and worked with others. They put computers in all the classrooms. They also put computer outlets in the homes of a lot of these parents. And you had—I talked to a man who came here from El Salvador 10 years ago who is now E-mailing his child's principal and teacher to figure out how the kid's doing.

But the bottom line is the dropout rate is now below the State average, and the test scores are above the State average in an immigrant district of poor children, partly because of the technology and partly because the business community said, "Hey, you kids are important," and partly because the place has a good principal and good teachers.

But I do think that the business community—if you look at the technology as an instrument to achieve your higher standards and to infuse high expectations into the community and to give the kids the confidence they need that they can learn, then this technology issue is a very important one.

Well, that's what I hope we'll do. I think we ought to have the standards. You should set them. We'll support you however you want. But they won't work unless you're going to really see whether the standards are being met and unless there are consequences to those who

meet and to those who do not. I think you have to reward the good teachers and get more good people in teaching, and that we have to facilitate the removal of those who aren't performing.

I think the schools need more authority and should be held more accountable. We've got to redo these central school budgets until we have squeezed down the overhead costs and put it back into education. And unless we have an environment in which there is safety and discipline, we won't succeed. And if we do have an environment in which the business community brings in more technology, we will succeed more quickly.

I believe that this meeting will prove historic. And again, let me say, I thank the Governors and the business leaders who brought it about. In 1983 we said, "We've got a problem in our schools. We need to take tougher courses. We need to have other reforms." In 1989 we said, "We need to know where we're going. We need goals." Here in 1996, you're saying you can have all of the goals in the world, but unless somebody really has meaningful standards and a system of measuring whether you meet those standards, you won't achieve your goals. That is the enduring gift you have given to America's schoolchildren and to America's future.

The Governors have to lead the way. The business community has to stay involved. Don't let anybody deter you and say you shouldn't be doing it. You can go back home and reach out to all the other people in the community because, in the end, what the teachers and the principals and more importantly even what the parents and the children do is what really counts. But we can get there together. We have to start now with what you're trying to do. We have to have high standards and high accountability. If you can achieve that, you have given a great gift to the future of this country.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:25 p.m. in the Watson Room at the IBM Conference Center. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Bob Miller of Nevada, NGA vice chairman; Gov. Tommy G. Thompson of Wisconsin, NGA chairman; Louis Gerstner, chief executive officer, IBM; Gov. James B. Hunt, Jr., of North Carolina; Gov. Terry E. Branstad of Iowa; Carroll W. Campbell, former South Carolina Governor; Albert Shanker, president, American Federation of Teachers; Gov. John Engler of Michigan; Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado; and Gov. Gaston Caperton of West Virginia.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Radiation Control for Health and Safety

March 27, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 540 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360qq) (previously section 360D of the Public Health Service Act), I am submitting the report of the Department of Health and Human Services regarding the administration of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 during calendar year 1994.

The report recommends the repeal of section 540 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act that requires the completion of this annual report. All the information found in this report is available to the Congress on a more immediate basis through the Center for Devices and Radiological Health technical reports, the Radiological Health Bulletin, and other publicly available sources. The Agency resources devoted to the preparation of this report could be put to other, better uses.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 27, 1996.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report on the Trade Agreements Program
March 27, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2213), I transmit herewith the 1996 Trade Policy Agenda and 1995 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 27, 1996.

Remarks Announcing the "One Strike and You're Out" Initiative in Public Housing
March 28, 1996

Thank you. You know, when we were walking over here, Leora said she was nervous. I don't think she told the truth. [*Laughter*] I'm just glad she's not on the ballot this year. [*Laughter*] Didn't she do a great? I want to thank Leora Robinson and Lieutenant Ramirez. They both spoke so well and so passionately, and they spoke the truth. They spoke on behalf of the mayors, the police chiefs, the housing administrators, and the residents who are here and people all across America. And I thank them.

I thank the Members of Congress who are here; and Mr. McGaw, the head of the ATF; and my friends the mayors who are here, and especially—I know the mayor of Toledo is a proud mayor today, hearing these two fine people speak. I thank the Vice President for the work that he has done in our whole community empowerment initiative, trying to give people all over America control of their lives again. And I want to echo what the Vice President said; it is literally an inspiration for me to have the opportunity to work with Henry Cisneros, a man who believes that all problems can be solved and goes about proving it day-in and day-out. I thank you, sir, for what you have done.

In my State of the Union Address I challenged local housing authorities and tenant associations to adopt this "one strike and you're out" policy to restore the rule of law to public housing, to simply say, "If you mess up your community, you have to turn in your key. If you insist on abusing or intimidating or hurting other people, you'll have to live somewhere else."

It seems so simple, it's hard to imagine how we ever went so wrong. Public housing was created with a simple purpose in mind, to provide good, inexpensive homes for good, hard-working people, so they could care for their children, hold down their jobs, and eventually save enough, if they chose, to move into homes of their own. Public housing has never been a right; it has always been a privilege. And it is amazing how far some people in some places have strayed from that original mission.

I think it is worth saying today again, even though you have just seen evidence of it, most people who live in public housing work. Most people who live in public housing are doing their very best to be good parents. Most people who live in public housing deserve a better deal than they have gotten in the past from the kinds of things that have gone on. And we are determined to help the people all across this country change that so that everybody will be able to tell the story that Leora and Lieutenant Ramirez told today.

The only people who deserve to live in public housing are those who live responsibly there and those who honor the rule of law. We've worked hard to protect public housing residents with Operation Safe Home and public housing drug elimination programs. We've made 6,800 arrests, seized hundreds of weapons, confiscated $3 million worth of illegal drugs. And coupled with our other anticrime initiatives, we're help-

ing to restore order in our cities, to our one-stoplight towns, and in our public housing. But we know we have to do more.

This policy today is a clear signal to drug dealers and to gangs: If you break the law, you no longer have a home in public housing, "one strike and you're out." That should be the law everywhere in America.

To implement this rule, we are taking two steps. First, I will direct Secretary Cisneros to issue guidelines to public housing and law enforcement officials to spell out with unmistakable clarity how to enforce "one strike and you're out." These guidelines are essential.

Believe it or not, the Federal law has actually authorized "one strike" eviction since 1988. But many public housing authorities have not fully understood the scope of their legal authority. Others have problems working with residents or local police or the courts. And for a small number, enforcement has frankly not been a priority. For whatever reason, the sad fact is that in most places in this country, "one strike" has not been carried out. You see the consequences when it is in what these fine people have said today.

Now there will be no more excuses, for these national guidelines tell public housing authorities the steps they must take to evict drug dealers and other criminals. They explain how housing authorities must work with tenants, with the police, with the courts, with our Government to get the job done. They also tell housing authorities how to screen tenants for criminal records. With effective screening, many of the bad people we're trying hard to remove today won't get into public housing in the first place.

The second thing we're going to do is to make sure these guidelines don't sit around and gather dust. Under the new rules HUD will propose, for the first time there will actually be penalties for housing projects that do not fight crime and enforce "one strike and you're out." Superior housing authorities that live up to their responsibilities will improve their chances for increased funding and for greater flexibility in how the housing authority is run by the local people. Those that don't will face increased supervision and might lose out on extra financial help.

I know that for some, "one strike and you're out" sounds like hardball. Well, it is. It is because it's morally wrong for criminals to use up homes that could make a big difference in the lives of decent families. And as Leora said better than I could have, if people aren't going to do anything wrong in public housing, they have nothing to fear from "one strike and you're out."

After all, it's not as if nobody wants to live there. There are three people in line for every one person who has a slot in public housing. In many places, the waiting list today is up to 4 years. This is a privilege, not a right. The people who are living there deserve to be protected, and the good people who want to live in public housing deserve to have a chance. The people who are in the middle, doing the wrong thing, must be removed.

There is no reason in the world to put the rights of a criminal before those of a child who wants to grow up safe or a parent who wants to raise that child in an environment where the child is safe, in no danger of being shot down in a gang war, and can't be stolen away by drug addiction.

We know this policy works. Beyond Toledo, we know that in North Carolina at the Greensboro Housing Authority, where this policy has been implemented, crime is down 55 percent. We know that in Georgia at the Macon Housing Authority, drug-related arrests have fallen 91 percent since the policy was implemented in 1989. In both of those cities and in other cities all across the country where "one strike" has been implemented, one statistic is rising, the number of residents who feel safe.

We also know why "one strike" works, because for it to work, people have to join together in common cause. The Leora Robinsons have to support the Lieutenant Ramirezes. People have to work together to believe that they can recreate a community. When we tell you how to evict a drug dealer, therefore, you have to take the action. The guidelines only point the way. We'll make sure that our police have the tools they need to get crime out of public housing. But the residents, the administrators, the neighbors, the people that know that they can recreate a sense of community and security and a decent environment for children, they have to support the police in taking that action.

We can work for better housing in Washington, but only you, those of you who are here and your counterparts all across America, can make better housing and safer housing a reality where you live.

For too many years, the chaos in some of our public housing units has been a national blind spot and a national disgrace. Most Americans probably think it has to be that way. Many of them who had had no personal experience with tenants may even believe most people who live in public housing are lawless, are not working, are not concerned parents. All of that is wrong.

Now we are going to give the good, decent, law-abiding citizens in public housing the life they deserve, and we're going to give the kids the future they deserve by doing what we should have been doing all along, and doing it together.

I want every American to believe that if he or she works hard and plays by the rules, they can share in the American dream. I want every parent to believe that if he or she works hard, they can do a better job raising their kids in a country that's supporting them, not undermining them. I want this country to come together across the lines of income and race, not be divided. Surely, our dreams of opportunity and decent childhoods and strong families and unity in this country can be furthered by what we're doing here today. And surely, others will see this and say that they have to do the same.

I want to now sign this Executive order, and I'd like to invite the people who are here from Greensboro and from Macon to come up as well: Deborah Shaw and Deputy Chief David Williams from the Greensboro Housing Authority, and Joann Fowler and Sergeant Richard Kory of the Macon Housing Authority. And I'd like to ask Lieutenant Ramirez and Leora to come up here and also be here when we sign.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:32 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Leora Robinson, resident of Ravine Park Village, Toledo, OH; and Lt. Frank Ramirez of the Toledo Police Department. Following his remarks, the President signed a memorandum for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on the "One Strike and You're Out" guidelines.

Memorandum on the "One Strike and You're Out" Guidelines
March 28, 1996

Memorandum for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

Subject: One Strike and You're Out Guidelines

Since 1993, my Administration has undertaken comprehensive efforts to improve the safety and quality of life in our Nation's public housing. Operation Safe Home, the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program, and steps to keep out weapons have been important parts of this overall safety effort. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has enabled cities to demolish dozens of blighted, high-rise projects and replace them with safer developments. The Department is also changing the social dynamic in public housing by instilling positive incentives for personal responsibility and family self-sufficiency. In all of these initiatives, HUD has worked closely with the Congress and with public housing managers and residents, elected officials, and Federal and local law enforcement agencies.

Today, the majority of the Nation's approximately 3,400 public housing authorities provide safe, attractive, quality homes. But there remains too much public housing in this country that is ravaged by drugs, crime, and violence.

It is imperative that we protect the ability of all individuals to live in safety and free from fear, intimidation, and abuse. It is also imperative that our precious public housing resources be made available only to responsible, law-abiding individuals. We must have zero tolerance for those who threaten the safety and well-being of decent families and innocent children who live in public housing.

That is why, in my State of the Union Address, I expressed my strong support for a clear and straightforward rule for those who endanger public housing communities by dealing drugs or engaging in other criminal activity: One Strike and You're Out of public housing.

At my request, HUD has now developed, in consultation with the Department of Justice, new national Guidelines on One Strike and

You're Out. These new Guidelines set forth how each public housing authority should use applicant screening and tenant eviction procedures to keep out drug dealers and other criminals who threaten the safety and the well-being of residents. These Guidelines are meant to ensure that One Strike and You're Out is effective and that it is fair.

You have advised me that HUD intends to amend its public housing performance evaluation regulations so that the overall "grade" HUD gives annually to each local housing authority will be based, in part, on how effectively it has implemented the type of applicant screening and tenant eviction policies set forth in the new Guidelines. I understand that this "grade" can affect both the amount of Federal funding a public housing authority receives and the degree of Federal oversight to which a public housing authority will be subject.

I hereby direct you to disseminate these important new Guidelines on One Strike and You're Out to each of this Nation's public housing authorities. I also direct you to ensure that these Guidelines are made available to public housing residents, Federal and local law enforcement agencies, community leaders, and appropriate elected officials.

One Strike and You're Out is one component of comprehensive initiatives already underway to improve safety and quality of life in public housing. We will continue to work with the Congress, and with public housing authorities, residents, local officials, and law enforcement agencies, to rid our public housing of drugs, violence, and crime.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Statement on Senate Action on the Line Item Veto
March 28, 1996

I want to commend the Senate for passing legislation to give the President line item veto authority. While not a perfect bill, the conference report as passed by the Senate will give Presidents the ability to cut wasteful Government spending and special interest tax provisions.

I have advocated the line item veto for a very long time. I had the line item veto when I was Governor of Arkansas; I advocated the line item veto when I ran for President; and I have pursued it since becoming President.

The President, no matter what party, needs the line item veto to ensure that our public resources are put to the best possible uses during these times of tight budgets. While I note that this authority does not become effective until the next Congress, I urge the House to follow the Senate's lead and pass the conference report now.

Statement on Congressional Inaction on Minimum Wage Legislation
March 28, 1996

I am disappointed that the Republican leadership has again prevented the Congress from even voting on whether to raise the minimum wage and give 10 million Americans an immediate pay increase. With every day that the Republican leadership continues to stall, the value of the minimum wage continues to fall closer and closer to a 40-year low. Some of America's greatest working heroes are the parents who are trying to raise their kids, working full time at the minimum wage. If we value work and we value families, we ought to raise the value of the minimum wage. With the 5-year anniversary of the last minimum wage increase next Monday, now is the time to put politics aside, raise the minimum wage, and help lift the lives of millions of America's workers.

Remarks on Signing the Cancer Control Month Proclamation
March 29, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, we're going to have a ceremony over in the East Room in just a few moments, so I don't want to make my remarks twice. Let me just say that there is hardly a family in America who has not been touched by cancer. We have come a very, very long way in the fight against cancer. More people are survivors than ever before; more people are living longer than ever before. But we have a great deal more to do before we can be confident that we have actually done everything possible to give our children and our grandchildren the kind of future they deserve.

And that's what this day is about. And that's what this proclamation declaring April Cancer Control Month is all about. And I'm glad to sign it, especially with these children behind me because they are the embodiment of our common endeavors.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:34 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. The proclamation is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks on the Anticancer Initiative
March 29, 1996

Mr. Vice President, Secretary Shalala, Dr. Kessler, Congressman Richardson, welcome. To all of you who are here, I welcome you, and I thank you, each in your own way, for the power of your example.

I thank Stacy, too, especially for being here and telling us her story and doing it in the way that she did. We know we can thank modern medicine, but you saw a little bit of her steel and grit when she was talking, and it's a great testimony to her faith and to her inner strength. I think that we ought to ask her parents to stand since she mentioned them.

Would you stand up, please, Mr. and Mrs. Oller? Thank you. [*Applause*] Thank you very much.

Perhaps more than any other health statistic in America, cancer touches virtually every family. My mother and my stepfather succumbed to cancer; the Vice President lost his sister. Just before coming here today I proclaimed April Cancer Control Month over in the Oval Office, and I was there with several cancer patients and their families. They're all over here, and I want to thank all of them for coming to visit with me, the children and the adults alike, the parents, the brothers, the sisters. As families, they are fighting for a way to win this battle, and the rest of us owe it to them to give them every chance they can to win. That's why we're here today; we want to have more people like Stacy.

More than ever before, we know from the sheer statistics that cancer is treatable and beatable. We know that early detection and prevention are critical. We have, therefore, put more resources in to mammograms for women over 50, and we have taken a very strong stand against the use of tobacco by young people and against any attempt to induce them to use it.

When cancer does strike, we have an ever-growing arsenal of new drugs and cutting-edge therapies to fight it. But before any treatment can get to patients, we need to make sure it is safe and effective. The development and approval process can take years. When a member of a family get cancer, the whole family bears the pain and years are sometimes far, far too long. These families should not also suffer from the stress of knowing that there may be better remedies already out there, but they're somehow not quite available.

So I'm happy today to say to those patients and to their families, the waiting is over. Today, we announce a major new initiative to speed new cancer therapies to our people. These changes will affect at least 100 drugs now being studied. Dozens of them will get to the market sooner, and that means they can help Americans suffering from cancers of the breast, lung, ovary,

prostate, and colon, among others. For these Americans, we cannot guarantee miracles, but at least now new hope is on the way.

With our reforms, cancer patients won't have to leave the country to look for promising treatments. If a drug does demonstrate effectiveness, patients will have access to it here even while the drug continues to undergo tests for approval. Let me emphasize, these steps will speed cancer drugs to patients who need them when they need them. They will help to save lives. They will give cancer patients a better chance. They will do all this by cutting redtape, but they will not—they will not—cut corners on safety. We are doing this the right way, and it is the right thing to do.

This initiative is part of our National Performance Review, popularly known as REGO, reinventing Government. This remarkable effort has been chaired brilliantly by the Vice President, and it will, among other things, now cut the development time for drugs by as much as several years. At the same time, the FDA will cut its review time for these drugs from 12 months to 6 months.

The initiative contains four major proposals:

First, we propose to accelerate approval for cancer drugs by allowing companies to apply to market a treatment that is still being tested. In other words, if a drug shows promise by shrinking tumors, for example, it can be considered for approval. That could cut several years off the time needed to get a drug to market.

Second, we propose to expand access to drugs that are already approved in other countries. The FDA will encourage the sponsors of these experimental drugs to apply for permission to distribute the drug to eligible cancer patients before final drug approval is granted here in the United States.

Third, we propose that cancer patients be better represented in FDA advisory meetings. These committees play a major role in policy and product decisions. And cancer patients who have valuable insights and the most at stake should be at the table when these decisions are made.

Fourth, we propose fewer applications for additional uses of approved cancer drugs. Often, these applications are for uses the drug maker does not even intend to market. By cutting out these unnecessary applications, we will free investigators from paperwork and allow them to devote more time to cancer research.

These four steps are the results of listening to patients, to their families, to their advocates, to the pharmaceutical industry, the doctors, and the researchers. This initiative shows what we can do when we work together.

Since 1938, our Nation has looked to the FDA to protect and improve the public health by making sure that medicines we take help us, not harm us. Our commitment to safety must never waver. Under Commissioner David Kessler, the FDA has reinforced that commitment while working to speed drug approval in the right way. In 1987 it took an average of 33 months to approve new drug applications. In 1994 96 percent of new drug applications were acted on within 12 months.

On AIDS drugs the United States was the first to approve five of the six antiviral treatments for the disease. The most recent of these drugs was approved in 42 days, a record. And the FDA has been the first to approve new drugs for ovarian cancer, for lymphocytic leukemia, for cystic fibrosis, for multiple sclerosis, for Lou Gehrig's disease and Alzheimer's. Under Dr. Kessler, more than ever, the FDA is a place where advance science and common sense work together for the American people.

Now using the principles of the National Performance Review, we have an opportunity to help more Americans conquer cancer. These four steps will make a big difference, and we are glad to give them to the American people today.

Now I'd like to ask the Vice President to come up here and talk just a few moments about the reinventing of these regulations, how we did it, what we hope will happen. And let me say, again, how grateful I am to Secretary Shalala, to Dr. David Kessler, and to the Vice President, and to all the other good people at FDA. We can keep our people safe and save more lives, and that's exactly what we're determined to do.

Thank you, God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:06 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to cancer survivor Stacy Oller, who introduced the President. The Cancer Control Month proclamation is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Statement on Signing the Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996

March 29, 1996

Today I have signed into law H.R. 3136, a bill providing for an increase in the public debt limit, an increase of the Social Security earnings limit, and increased flexibility for small businesses to comply with regulations.

I applaud yesterday's bipartisan congressional vote to maintain the Nation's creditworthiness and financial integrity. With the signing of this bill, millions of Americans will, once again, be secure that this great Nation will stand behind its obligations to pay not only beneficiaries of Federal programs but bondholders as well.

Over 8 months ago, Secretary of the Treasury Rubin wrote to the leaders of the Congress, urging them to pass an increase in the debt limit sufficient to extend through the current political season. Secretary Rubin pointed out that attempting to use the prospect of a Federal Government default to achieve leverage in a budget debate was not in the best interests of the American people. Now that we no longer need to focus our efforts on avoiding a default, we can turn our full attention to continuing to bring down the budget deficit as we have successfully done for the last 3 years.

When I took office, the deficit was $290 billion—and rising. By the end of fiscal 1995, the deficit was $164 billion. As a share of the economy, we have cut the deficit by more than half. And just yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office announced its estimate that the deficit for the current fiscal year will fall to $140 billion—thus cutting the deficit that I inherited in half and fulfilling my commitment to do so in my first term.

We should now continue this progress—and limit future increases in the public debt—by reaching an agreement to balance the budget by 2002. Over the last several months, I have worked closely with congressional leaders to reach agreement on balancing the budget. In fact, we have about $700 billion in common savings, enough to balance the budget and provide a modest, targeted tax cut. Let me reiterate: I am committed to reaching an agreement with the Congress to balance the budget—and to reaching that agreement this year.

I also am pleased that this legislation increases the Social Security earnings limit. Currently, retired workers ages 65 through 69 who earn wages above a certain amount have their Social Security benefits reduced by $1 for every $3 in earnings. Over 900,000 Social Security beneficiaries lose some or all of their benefits. This reduction in benefits discourages work by senior citizens who are able and willing to do so. Raising the earnings test will increase the standard of living of the elderly and help the Nation's economy.

This legislation also responds to the legitimate concerns of small businesses regarding regulatory burdens. The bill includes several recommendations of the White House Conference on Small Business that I have supported. In addition, it codifies a number of my reinvention initiatives that will help small businesses comply with Federal regulations and, just as important, enable them to become meaningful partners in the regulatory process.

Finally, this legislation increases congressional accountability for regulations, providing expedited procedures for the Congress to review those regulations. I have long supported this concept, and my Administration endorsed the Senate's efforts of last year in this regard. I am, however, concerned about changes that the House made to this bill, which will unduly complicate and extend this congressional review process. We will work with the Congress to resolve these concerns.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 29, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 3136, approved March 29, was assigned Public Law No. 104–121.

Statement on Signing the Twelfth Continuing Resolution
March 29, 1996

Today I have signed into law H.J. Res. 170, the Twelfth Continuing Resolution for fiscal year 1996.

House Joint Resolution 170 provides for a temporary extension of appropriations, through April 24, for activities funded in the five appropriations bills that have not been enacted into law. Thus, it prevents a third government shutdown.

Full-year funding is provided for the Federal payment to the District of Columbia and the Federal contribution to the District's retirement funds. Language is included to permit the seven unions of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to continue to represent FAA employees and to bargain collectively on their behalf.

I commend the Congress for providing $198 million to cover the costs of civilian implementation of the Dayton Peace accords in Bosnia. Subject to certain conditions, these funds will be available to finance civilian programs identified for the rest of fiscal year 1996. The commanders of the United States military units that are part of the NATO-led Bosnia Peace Implementation Force (IFOR) have strongly urged that the Congress make these funds available expeditiously in order to support their military mission. This bill provides an appropriately prompt response to their request.

In addition, the provision of this $198 million will enable the United States, as provided for in this bill, to mobilize broad international support for economic revitalization at an aid donor's conference on Bosnia, scheduled for mid-April. In sum, the bill demonstrates bipartisan support for the kind of American leadership abroad that serves our country well.

Despite this accomplishment, we are now halfway through the fiscal year, and the Congress still has not completed the work it should have done six months ago. That is a disservice to the American people.

While this is taking place, school districts around the country are facing the possibility of teacher layoffs, environmental clean-ups are being delayed, and States, local governments, and government contractors must contend with continuing uncertainty as they seek to provide critical services to the public.

My Administration has been working with the Congress in an effort to resolve our differences on funding levels for education, the environment, and other key priorities, as well as on numerous special interest legislative riders. We have made some progress in our discussions, but many difficult issues remain to be resolved.

It is time for the Congress to do its job. I call on the Congress to meet its responsibilities by sending me legislation for the remaining fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills in an acceptable form.

I hope that this will prove to be the final continuing resolution for fiscal 1996, and I intend to continue working with the Congress to ensure that it is.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

March 29, 1996.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 170, approved March 29, was assigned Public Law No. 104–122.

The President's Radio Address
March 30, 1996

Good morning. Today I want to talk to you about what we can do to make sure that working Americans have the chance to make the most of their own lives, to raise their children in security, and to become winners in economic change. I want to talk about something very simple we can do to help our hardest pressed working families: Raise the minimum wage.

Our Nation is living through a time of great change, our greatest economic transformation

since 100 years ago when so many Americans moved from farm to factory. Now we're all moving into an age of information and technology and global trade. Four years ago our economy was drifting, with high unemployment, a deficit twice as high as it is now, and few new jobs. I took office determined to change our course, to cut the deficit in half in 4 years, invest in education and training, expand exports through tough trade agreements like the ones that opened Japan to our autos and auto parts, and to shrink and reform the Government so that it works better and costs less. It's now the smallest it's been since 1965, but still strong enough to protect workplace safety, pure food, clean air and water, to help Americans get the education they need, to grow the economy, and to protect our seniors through Medicare.

In 1992, I told the American people that if we implemented our economic plan, two things would happen: we'd get 8 million jobs, and the deficit would be cut in half. Well, last month we learned that our economy has already created 8.4 million jobs, nearly all of them in the private sector since 1993. And now, in 1995 and 1996, over half of the jobs coming into the economy are in high-wage industries. And just yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office certified that by the end of this year the deficit will be less than half of what it was when I took office. Over 8 million jobs, the deficit cut in half: two important commitments kept to the American people.

We've also got the lowest rates of unemployment and inflation combined in 27 years, record numbers of new small businesses. Our auto and telecommunications industries now lead the world. We've got a 15-year high in homeownership. And finally we have halted the decade-long slide in real hourly earnings. But this is a record to build on, not to sit on.

As I said in my State of the Union, one of the main challenges we face is to make sure that this new economy with all of its opportunity doesn't leave people behind who are willing to work for their opportunities. We've got to make sure that every American has the education and training, the health care, the pensions to be secure in this time of change, and that if they change jobs, they can take their health care and their pensions with them.

And we have to get wages rising again in this country for working people. We've got to make sure that our lowest paid workers keep up. That's why in 1993 I cut taxes for working people on modest incomes through the earned-income tax credit, giving tax benefits to 15 million working Americans, a downpayment on a strong commitment that no one who works full time and has children in the home should live in poverty. And that is why we must make sure the minimum wage is a living wage.

Today the minimum wage is $4.25 an hour. Over many years, both political parties have worked together to make sure it keeps up with the cost of living. In 1989, the current leaders of both the House and the Senate joined together with Democrats and Republicans to raise the minimum wage. It went fully into effect exactly 5 years ago this Monday.

But since then, the minimum wage has stayed unchanged while the cost of living goes up. This year if Congress doesn't raise the minimum wage, it will drop in value to a 40-year low. That's why I proposed last year that the Congress increase the minimum wage from $4.25 an hour to $5.15 an hour. For a parent working full time, this 90-cent-an-hour increase would help pay for groceries for 7 months, or 4 months of rent, or months of child care. Tens of millions of Americans would benefit, 70 percent of them adults. These are among our hardest working people—6 out of 10 of them are working women, many trying to raise children and hold their families together; others are just getting started in the work force, trying to get a hold on the first rung in the ladder—all of them trying hard to do the right thing, to work. Raising the minimum wage would honor both work and family. We should not leave behind anyone who is willing to work hard as our country moves forward.

Now, a majority of the Senators support an increase in the minimum wage. But the Republican leadership of the Senate has refused to allow the minimum wage even to come up for a vote. In fact, you need to know that a Member of Congress who refuses to allow the minimum wage to come up for a vote made more money during last year's one-month Government shutdown than a minimum wage worker makes in an entire year. Over the past 5 years, while the minimum wage has been stuck at $4.25 an hour, a Senator's salary has gone up by a third. That is wrong.

I challenge the Republican leadership to stop blocking a vote and let the majority rule. Pass an increase in the minimum wage. And Con-

gress should vow that the next time they want to raise their own pay, they ought to raise the minimum wage, too. We hear a lot of talk in Washington these days about old-fashioned family values. Well, it's hard to raise a family on $4.25 an hour, but millions of Americans are out there struggling to do it.

Now, we can do the right thing and create jobs and grow our economy. This is really an age of remarkable possibility for our Nation. More of our people will have the chance to live out their dreams than ever before. But we need to make sure that every American can become a winner in this time of economic change. If we don't want to grow apart as a people, we have to do the things that will enable us to grow together. Think about it. Support raising the minimum wage.

Thank you.

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

Remarks Welcoming President Oscar Luigi Scalfaro of Italy

April 2, 1996

President Scalfaro, Mariana Scalfaro, members of the Italian delegation, distinguished guests: On behalf of the American people, I am delighted to welcome President Scalfaro to the United States. It is an honor to return the gracious hospitality the people of Italy showed to Hillary and me in Rome and Naples in 1994.

America and Italy are joined by friendship, family, and values. Our Founding Fathers drew inspiration from the thinkers of ancient Rome to build a new republic based on laws and rooted in liberty and justice. Thomas Jefferson was moved by the ideas of his friend Filippo Mazzei to write the immortal phrase, "All men are created equal." Constantino Brumidi, an artist from Rome, labored for 25 years on the frescoes that adorn our Nation's Capital. Generations of Italian-Americans have contributed beyond measure to America's greatness, enriching our Nation's character with their spirit and the strength of their heritage.

America and Italy stood together for half a century to safeguard Europe's freedom and advance our common ideals. Now with the end of the cold war, the United States looks to Italy as a valued partner more than ever, from keeping the peace in troubled regions to building an undivided Europe.

Earlier this year I visited Aviano Air Base, where the United States and Italy work together to contain the conflict in Bosnia and provide a lifeline to the Bosnian people. Now we are joined in a common support of the peace that is taking hold in Bosnia. I know I speak for all Americans when I thank the people of Italy, its leaders, its troops, and its citizens for the enormous effort they have made to bring peace to the people of Bosnia.

I also thank Italy for its support for our common efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East and for its role in the recent conference at Sharm al-Sheikh in Egypt.

Italy and the United States stand together as well in the fight against the forces of hatred and violence—the organized criminals, the drug traffickers, the terrorists who have brought pain and destruction to Italians and Americans alike.

Mr. President, the bonds between our people stretch across the centuries. They extend from the hearts of our neighborhoods to the distant reaches of the heavens where America and Italy now are cooperating on the international space station. As I said in Rome, and I say again, we, Italians and Americans, are now and forever *alleati, amici, una famiglia*—allies, friends, a family.

Welcome to the White House. Welcome to America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:15 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

The President's News Conference With President Oscar Luigi Scalfaro of Italy

April 2, 1996

President Clinton. Good afternoon. Let me say again, it's a great pleasure to have President Scalfaro at the White House. For 50 years, Italy has been one of America's closest allies, a pillar of the Atlantic Alliance throughout the cold war, a strong advocate for freedom and democracy in the years since.

Over these many years of partnership, our Nation has had no better friend in Italy than President Scalfaro. The President began his public career with the founding of the post-war Italian state. He has served his country in a range of high positions, and he has always, always worked to strengthen the close cooperation between our nations. As President, he has stood firm for the values that we share, and America is grateful to President Scalfaro for his leadership and his wise counsel.

This is our third meeting. Today we focused in large measure on our shared interests and effort in building a free, stable, and undivided Europe. Nowhere is this common commitment more evident than in our work in the former Yugoslavia. I salute the Italian soldiers who are participating in the mission in Bosnia. America's soldiers are proud to serve with them in what is truly a joint endeavor. They and the other members of IFOR are doing invaluable work. They're giving the people of Bosnia a chance for peace. They are carrying on Italy's tradition of shouldering responsibility in the region that began with Operation Deny Flight and Operation Provide Promise. Italy is helping to build bridges to Central and Eastern Europe, bridges that can extend security and prosperity and democracy across the entire Continent.

As a member of NATO and the European Union, Italy is a force for cooperation and integration in Europe and around the world. I had the opportunity today to thank President Scalfaro for Italy's work in overcoming the old divisions in Europe and for his nation's global efforts to promote peace and security, from its support for the peace process in the Middle East to its vital help in the effort to halt proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to its commitment that we strongly share to win the struggle against terrorism.

President Scalfaro told me about Italy's ambitious goals for its E.U. Presidency. The new transatlantic agenda, which I was proud to sign at Madrid at the U.S.–E.U. summit last December, promises to make our citizens on both sides of the Atlantic more secure and more prosperous. I am pleased with the cooperation we have enjoyed with Italy on problems such as international crime, narcotics, and refugees.

Finally, let me say we had a brief discussion of political change in Italy and throughout the world. Every nation in the West, including America, has been undergoing a period of adjustment in the wake of the end of the cold war. We in the United States are convinced that Italy's democracy is strong, its economy healthy, its people committed to playing a vital and constructive role on the world stage in the future as they have for so many decades. We are very pleased about that and, again, very glad to welcome you, Mr. President, to Washington.

President Scalfaro. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Thank you for the invitation and for the welcome during the state visit. But above all, I would like to express my great satisfaction for the words that you have repeated during this meeting and that you have repeated to me when I finished my speech at the arrival ceremony.

I have written down the sentences that have struck me the most and which are the reason for which I am so pleased with this meeting with you. As you said just earlier, Italy is a guiding force in the world. You added that in the meeting that we just had that we believe that Italy is a first-class ally in the international field, in all fields. And again, the American people—is very attached to the alliance between our two countries.

This visit, which is a visit based on friendship, is a visit in which a head of state, such as myself, has lived through these 50 years following the end of the war, following the War of Liberation, and these were very difficult years after the war, difficult recovery years. And based on de Gasperi's policy, which has always been based first of all on the agreement among free people, de Gasperi always taught us that the

fundamental approach of a state must be based, first of all, on foreign policy. And from this, in the logic of things, follows domestic policy. And therefore, this agreement among free people has as its pillar the United States of America, with the sacrifice made by their men and through the various stages that I have mentioned earlier, the initial agreements that we struck in Italy among the political forces. And it was because of this that we recognized in human rights and the values of mankind the values of peace.

Based on this approach, we have begun our fight against terrorism. I had the opportunity for 4 years when I was Minister of the Interior when, at the time, I was able to subscribe the first agreement with the United States on this issue. The danger of this violence, in other words, the violence against man and the attack against man's values, continues, persists today.

I have said earlier and I repeat today, when faced with terrorism, negating human rights, there is no such thing as neutrality. There is no such thing as abstention. He who says he is neutral before the aggression against human rights, he who says that he has abstained from this, must undoubtedly be considered as someone as being against the values of mankind and man's dignity. This is what our meeting was based on, and this is why I'm so pleased with our meeting.

Thank you, Mr. President.

President Clinton. Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Russian Elections

Q. Mr. President, from the IMF to your own administration, the West appears to be bending over backwards to support or bolster Boris Yeltsin as the Russian elections approach. How important is it for the West to impede a comeback of the Communist Party in Russia, and what would be the repercussions if the Communists succeed?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I think that none of us should take any position on the elections in another country, but the United States has been clearly on the side of reform in Russia, on both political and economic reform. And what would be the repercussions of an election, of a change in government in Russia would depend entirely on how the new government proceeded: what would be their policy on political reform, on democracy and freedom; what would be their policy on relating to their neighbors; what would be their policy on economic reform in relating to the rest of the world?

So we have to judge—first of all, leave all free countries and free elections to their own devices, and then, secondly, we evaluate other countries based on what they do. But we have to say clearly that we are on the side of reform, political reform, democracy, respecting the rights of other countries, and economic reform.

Could we have a question from an Italian journalist? Mr. President, would you like to call on——

Italian Elections

Q. We are now in the largest democracy in the world. Can you confirm your doubts about the presidentialism? Do you see any reason for authoritary——

President Clinton. Do I see any reason for what? Are you asking him or me? [*Laughter*]

President Scalfaro. You're asking me a question? Okay. All right, just so we understand each other, because if—first, I'm going to ask—all right, let's do it one thing at a time. I'd like to hear the question first. Your question is based on the assumption—and lucky you who has this assumption—that I am concerned about—if there is a Presidential solution. I don't have these concerns. And since this debate grew from a speech that I gave to the Parliament in Mexico last week, I said precisely that I do not have any objections to a state based on a Presidential system. Now, if this sentence means that I'm against it, then you can explain it to me. I also added that what I believe to be crucial is that the Parliament must have full powers. And I said that wisdom would have it that there must be able to have a synthesis between these two principles.

Now, if somebody says that I said that the Presidential system is dangerous, then that means that you think something, and you attribute it to me. I think—I have thoughts, but I don't sublet my thoughts. This is as clear as I can be. Now if you want to debate it, then you can go ahead, but you can't forget the fact that in Italy a few weeks ago, just a few weeks ago, I asked the government to—I asked Senator Maccanico to create the government.

This did not come from me, because according to our constitutional laws, the head of state must gather all of the proposals from all the parties—from the right wing of Mr. Fini, which

had the support of Forza Italia, and these proposals were supported by the left wing of D'Alema. D'Alema said that—he said he could not—not be in favor of Maccanico, and that's how this whole thing started.

Excuse me, one minute—in this whole exercise, the lady has a little bit more energy than the man, but you have to wait. In this attempt, there was a broad understanding on a semi-Presidential system, and a sentence that Fini expressed, and I think I'm going to repeat it verbatim here, is, "without mortifying the Parliament in its exercise of its powers." And I won't add anything more, because the political forces don't want to add anything to it, and that's it.

President Clinton. I feel as if we just got to sit in on a little family feud here. [*Laughter*]

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

1996 Presidential Election

Q. Mr. President, now that you know who your opponent will be in the November elections, what do you think of him? Also, this election is being called, rightly or wrongly, the center against the middle. What do you think are the real issues that will divide the two candidates?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I think we should put off the politics for a little longer. I mean, for many people this election has gone on for—since the second I took my hand off the Bible in 1993. And I think that's not always good for the United States. And we have work to do.

Just last week, we at least extended the debt limit, passed the line item veto, something I have advocated for 3 years. We still have a balanced budget before us. I hope we can pass the right kind of balanced budget. We've got the welfare reform issue before us. We have a lot of other—we've got the antiterrorism legislation, which I still hope can be rescued.

So I think we should work on this. And I think I should do my job, and Senator Dole should do his. And we should not have a work stoppage between now and November just because we've got an election. Then at some point in the future, we'll have our conventions, and there will be plenty of time to have the political campaigns.

But I think the American people will sort out the differences pretty clearly. They laid their markers down last year. They passed their budget, and they said, "If we have the White House and the Congress, this is what we intend to do for America." That's their message. Read their budget. And I have different views, which I made clear last year. And we will be able to amplify those as we go forward. There are other differences as well.

But the main point is that we are not yet in an election—at least we shouldn't be—and we all are getting checks from the American people, both of us are and those who support us, to go to work and show up here every day. We shouldn't have a work stoppage between now and November. We ought to keep working until we pass a balanced budget, pass welfare reform, pass antiterrorism legislation, and keep going forward.

Q. That's not going to happen.

President Clinton. I don't think that you know that. I think that we might—I think we might do that. A lot of people thought that we wouldn't have the line item veto. I had to agree to wait until next year to exercise it, but I wanted it bad enough on the books that I was glad to do that. And we've done some other things that I think are worth doing. We lifted the earnings limits on Social Security, something I have long favored and I think will really benefit this country as the demographics of our work force change. So I think we can get things done here. We need to keep doing it.

An Italian journalist.

Italian Elections

Q. A State Department report foresees a key role for the ex-Communist Party after the Italian political polls on April 21st. How would that affect the U.S.-Italian relationship?

President Clinton. After the—how would what affect it? If we had a Communist-dominated government?

Q. Yes.

President Clinton. I'll answer the question the way I answered the question on Russia. First of all, we support freedom and democracy in democratic countries. So, if any government emerges as a result of the free choice of the people, under the rules of the constitution and laws of any country, that is that nation's business. We then evaluate those governments based on what their position is in relation to us: What is their economic position; what is their foreign policy position; what is their position on human

rights and freedom? And that's what we would do with any government.

And if you look at the whole history of the way the Italian governments have emerged and conducted themselves in the last 50 years, I don't know that we have any cause for concern, so I wouldn't express any here. I think that's up to the people of your country to decide what kind of government you have, and then you have to decide what the policies are.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

1996 Presidential Election

Q. Mr. President, to follow up on your last answer, Senator Dole and his advisers have indicated that the Senator will try during the course of this legislative session to pass as much of the Republican agenda as he can, to send it to you for your signature or, just as good for him politically, perhaps, your veto. Senator Daschle has indicated that he will do everything he can to block Senator Dole from doing that. So the very thing that you describe, the kind of political deadlock, election-year deadlock, seems in prospect. I wonder if you might have some advice for both sides in that.

President Clinton. That's what they say now, but you know, Senator Dole's just been through all these primaries, and you know, since the whole purpose of the primaries was to nominate someone that hopefully will defeat me in November, they had to—they ginned up a lot of red meat, and they got their juices flowing, and that's what they were doing out there.

But I would just say that the right thing for the country is for us to pass a balanced budget plan. We have now both identified more than enough savings to get there. They know what I cannot accept. We have 95 percent agreement, I think, on welfare reform, and we are very close on some other things; I just think it would be a mistake not to do this.

So there will be still plenty of things we disagree on. I mean, after all, they put their marker down last year. You can see it in their budget. I mean, there's plenty of differences between us that won't be evaporated by anything we do that's good for America between now and November, but we both have jobs to do and we ought to do them.

It may be that they will try to pass bills that they know that I will have to veto, but I'd far rather sign them. And I just hope we can avoid this sort of gridlock. There's no need for it, particularly if you look on the budget, if you look at how we've identified—the American people must have a difficult time understanding how both sides could identify more than $700 billion worth of savings, which is more than enough to balance the budget and give a middle-class tax cut to support childrearing, and not do it. I think that'll be very hard to explain. But I don't have a vote in Congress; I can only urge them to do it.

Is there an Italian question?

Extraterritorial Impact of Sanctions

Q. Mr. President, the U.S. has always been pro-free-trade as a country. But recently, Congress has passed a couple of bills, the D'Amato bill and the Helms-Burton bill, that are introducing secondary boycott and the concept of extraterritoriality of U.S. law. This will create a problem for many international companies, European companies and Italian companies who want to do business with the U.S. Don't you think that, by signing those laws, you will send the wrong message of the outside wall?

And just a question for President Scalfaro. Mr. President, did you talk about Ustica and the fact that NATO may have important documents that would help to resolve this issue?

President Clinton. Let me answer your first question. With regard to the Helms-Burton legislation, the United States believes that we need to take a very firm position in our dealings with Cuba, which is the only nondemocratic country left in our hemisphere and which recently shot down two American civilian airplanes over international airspace, in plain violation of international law.

The Helms-Burton bill provides the President with a waiver authority which I believe makes it possible for me to implement that bill in a way that does not violate the commercial rules and regulations governing nations and that will not undermine our strong, broad-based, and consistent commitment to open trade among nations, and I will do my best to do that.

Perhaps the President would like to answer the question you asked him.

1980 Ustica Island Airline Tragedy

President Scalfaro. Yes, I did speak about this issue with President Clinton. Obviously, I didn't ask him the questions because this is a NATO issue, but I did ask him for his support for the Italian request, and I told him that this

request did not come from political circles but came from a judge, the judge who has been responsible for this long trial.

I also added that there is a right—the right for Italy, which is part of NATO, to know the facts. Second place, there's a right, and it's even stronger a right that cannot disappear, which is the families' natural right to know how their loved ones died.

I also added that, in my opinion, that if we were to be denied this request, it could cause speculation which could not help anyone. President Clinton very kindly replied to me that he had never discussed this issue before in NATO, but that he would gladly examine the case and that he would give his support to the request made by the Italian judges.

President Clinton. Ann [Ann Devroy, Washington Post].

Judge Harold Baer

Q. Mr. President, is it proper for the White House to criticize a sitting Federal judge, and do you now regret appointing Judge Baer in New York?

President Clinton. Let me answer—you have two questions: Number one, I don't regret appointing him; number two, I think it is proper for the White House to say, or for the President personally to say if he disagrees with a judge's opinion.

After all, I think there's been a little overreaction to this. The judge has lifetime tenure. So that to insulate the judge in our system from pressure, that does not mean that any judge should be entitled or any court should be entitled not only to lifetime tenure but a gag rule on everyone else.

So I supported the position taken by our United States Attorney in New York. On the other hand, I think that it's important not to get into the business of characterizing judges based on one decision they make. Judge Baer had a rehearing on it, made a decision, and I have nothing to add to what our United States Attorney said. But I think that it's very important that we say—at least for me to say—I support the system we have, I support the independence of the Federal judiciary. I do not believe that means that those of us who disagree with particular decisions should refrain from saying we disagree with them. It doesn't mean we won't obey them; we'll all obey them. But if we don't agree and we have reasons for not agreeing, we should be free to say that. And that's what I think should be done.

Now beyond that, however, I don't think it's fair to just characterize a judge or judges in some sort of sweeping way, as apparently members of the other party are now beginning to do. And I'm a little perplexed by that since I think only three of my judges had any—any of the ones I've appointed—had any Republicans voting against them. I believe all the rest of them went through without Republican opposition.

And there have been many articles talking about how, number one, the judges I have appointed had the highest ratings from the American Bar Association of any President since the appointments have been made; number two, they were more diverse in terms of gender and race; but number three, I have been criticized from all sides because they are less ideological. I didn't—I have tried to appoint good, sensible people to the bench.

So I hope that we won't have a big attempt to turn this into a political campaign issue. I think that it's obvious what is going on here. The people on the other side are sort of embarrassed about their crime record. They fought the crime bill. They fought the 100,000 police. They fought the Brady bill. They fought the assault weapons ban. They fought things that they used to say they were for, so now they think they can sort of get well by making some outrageous claims about the judges I have appointed.

But that does not mean that every American shouldn't feel free to express his or her opinion on a particular decision. That's why you give these judges the insulation, but you still permit the free debate.

Visiting Heads of State

Q. You talked about European heads of state who come to the United States to promote themselves. Were you referring to a specific case?

President Scalfaro. No, if I were referring to someone in particular, I would have said so. You know me better than that. I said that there is a tradition. It's not a new tradition, and you know it very well. This is the tradition that, following the Second World War, that heads of state come here because it's a huge publicity stunt that they used in their own countries, or they do it to promote themselves. I wanted to

say that this is not my case, and I would be offended, and it would be a lack of respect for the United States and for the President of the United States, but also for Italy and for myself. And that's all I have to say.

President Clinton. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 117th news conference began at 12:36 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. President Scalfaro spoke in Italian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Interview With Jon Miller and Fred Manfra of WBAL Radio in Baltimore, Maryland

April 2, 1996

Q. Here's the pitch to Bobby Bonilla, and Bonilla takes ball one outside. So I guess that ends some of the conversations about how Cone's arm is.

Hey, and look who just stopped in. Mr. President.

The President. How are you?

Q. How are you, Mr. President? Bill Clinton is here with us. The pitch to Bonilla——

The President. I'm the good luck charm when I'm on this radio——

Q. Oh, yeah, definitely. In fact, when you were with us last year, Bobby Bonilla came up and promptly hit one over the center field wall. And he drives this one deep into right center field——

The President. No, no. Yes.

Q. This one is bouncing over the wall.

The President. Ground rule double. That's good.

Q. And right after Bonilla hit that home run, then Ripken came up, and he did the same thing. In fact, President Clinton, you broadcast that Ripken home run which was an historic night. You were part of it. So let's go back now and take a listen here. This is how it happened.

[*At this point, WBAL played an audiotape of the President's remarks in 1995.*]

The President. That was a great day.

Q. We've played that 500 times since then, and everybody loves that. Here's Cal the following season as we pick up again, and President Clinton is here with us. And again, everybody with such indelible memories of that great night, Mr. President. What do you think now? Cal taking ball one from Appier.

The President. Well, he's got the only two RBI's, doesn't he?

Q. Two-run single in the first inning for Cal, and now we're a 2–2 ball game.

I'm glad you were able to come over today. We thought you might be able to be here yesterday, and then we got rained out. But we're very pleased——

The President. Beautiful day today, though, isn't it?

Q. Fantastic.

The President. And the wind's not too bad inside which is good.

Q. Two and 0 to Cal Ripken. Bonilla at second.

The President. Strike.

Q. Down around the knees. Two balls and one strike.

The President. A little too low to hit, though.

Q. Did you get a chance to see Cal before the game?

The President. Yes. He baited me about going out on the pitcher's mound because last year I stood in front of the mound and started—[*laughter*]—so he said, you know, "That's what that mound is there for. You're supposed to step up on top of it." [*Laughter*]

Q. And he fouls it off back out of play.

The President. So I asked him if he were baiting me. He said, "No, no." He said, "If you don't want to go out there and do what you're supposed to do, it's all right with me." [*Laughter*]

Q. Well that's great. You got the Ripken treatment.

The President. So I had to go up there and stand on the mound.

Q. You're like part of the family now if he was talking to you like that. Well, you stood

up there, and you threw a strike in there. Nice going.

The President. It was a slow strike, but I got it over.

Q. Two and two to Cal Ripken, batting with two down and Bonilla at second in the last of the third inning. Kevin Appier.

The President. He hit a hard ball there. That was a hard, good double.

Q. Now the pitch. There's a looping liner. Shallow center——

The President. Get down. Get down.

Q. Base hit. Here comes Bonilla, and Ripken has done it again. Another Presidential base hit for Cal Ripken. We may have to have you on every time he bats.

Well, it looked like he got a little slider that kind of hung up there above the knees, and he blooped it into shallow center. And Bobby Bonilla scored. I have a feeling that Alomar, Palmeiro, Bonilla, Ripken, they're going to combine for a few runs this year.

The President. They'll do well. And this guy, Surhoff, is good, too. He can hit.

Q. He hit .320 last year with Milwaukee. Very fine. Not a power-type hitter, but he gets the ball to all fields. And he takes ball one, down and in, on a breaking ball. One ball and no strikes.

Now last year you had your daughter, Chelsea, here and——

The President. She was here. She's a little jealous that I'm here today, but she had to go to school today. [*Laughter*] You know, she and her mother just took a wonderful trip. They went to see our forces in Bosnia, and then they went to Turkey and Greece. So I told her she got to go to Turkey, Greece, and Bosnia, and I got to go to Baltimore. [*Laughter*]

Q. So you're even.

The President. That's the deal. That's right.

Q. Yeah, you're even. Here's a foul ball back into the upper deck. One ball, one strike, to Surhoff.

Well, we thought maybe she'd get spring break or something. Next time on opening day, declare spring break over here.

One ball, one strike——

The President. They missed so many days this winter; they need to go more, not less.

Q. That's right.

The President. It's good to see springtime out here, isn't it?

Q. It sure is.

The President. We had a tough winter.

Q. Baseball has brought the sunshine back. There's a pitch inside to Surhoff. Two and one, the count.

The President. Look at the flag blowing up there. You'll see how hard the wind is, though, and you don't feel it in here, which is good.

Q. Yeah, I've been downtown on top of one of the buildings. The flag is standing straight out at attention out there, but inside here, very comfortable.

But I was impressed. I mean, you walked out on the mound, and we've seen guys bounce them in there. But you put it right in. Did you warm up ahead of time?

The President. I did. I got to—hurry.

Q. Pop foul over third base side over into the seats, reaching in.

The President. He nearly got there, didn't he?

Q. Yeah. And not getting it was Lockhart. Gave it a good shot. Two and two, the count.

Who warmed you up? You played catch with somebody?

The President. Well, Mr. Angelos threw me a few balls.

Q. Yeah?

The President. Yeah—[*laughter*]—believe it or not. We threw about 20 balls together, and then I threw about 20, 30 more balls down there, just fooling around. And then I came out and put a jacket on and a cap on.

Q. Two and two to Surhoff. And a fast ball tailing outside for a ball. Three and two, the count.

Well, we put out tapes and CD's of the whole Ripken thing last September and raised money for charity.

The President. That's great.

Q. And everywhere we went after they completed that, people commenting about how much fun it was that you were on the air. And when Cal hit that home run, it was—there you were, the First Fan.

The President. Well, we were all so happy, you know. It was a—what?

Q. That's what B.J. Surhoff is saying as they call him out on strikes.

The President. It looked like it was inside, didn't it?

Q. Two feet inside, I thought. And that's what B.J.'s arguing, too. But he's called out on strikes.

The President. I told—I went down to see the umpires before the game, and I said that I really wanted to see them because they were

the only people in the country that got second-guessed more than I did. [*Laughter*] So I like those guys. I'm for them, you know. They are the company misery loves. [*Laughter*]

Q. Well, that's it for the Orioles in the third inning. The President of the United States is here with us, Bill Clinton.

The President. One run on two hits.

Q. And one man left on.

The President. Yes.

Q. And at the end of three, it's the Orioles, 3; Kansas City, 2.

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

Q. Inning number four, now, at Camden Yards. Jon Miller, Fred Manfra, along with the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, as the Royals come to bat. The Orioles are back in front, 3 to 2. Johnny Damon stands in, a left-handed hitter. Takes a strike from Mike Mussina.

President Clinton was just commenting to us between innings about what a beautiful scene it is here at Camden Yards.

The President. It's just magnificent today. I wish everybody could see it. It's so really beautiful.

Q. There's a popup, shallow left. Ripken, the shortstop, out. Near the foul line on the outfield grass. And he makes the catch.

The President. I think everybody here's having a good time. Just the feel of being here, you know, makes you so happy.

Q. You know, it's been said that—I mean, opening day in baseball really, actually for a baseball fan, carries all of the same sentiment that we ascribe to New Year's Eve, you know, a clean slate, a fresh start, high hopes.

The President. You bet.

Q. But it's even more tangible in baseball because we really know that they've got a shot.

Here is Michael Tucker, the cleanup man. Three to two for the Orioles. And the pitch, and it's a ball down and in.

Now, you were telling us between innings that you had a chance to go down to Atlanta and see the layout there.

The President. I looked at the Olympic Stadium, which is magnificent. The American people will love it. And then after the Olympics, a section in the back is going to be taken down like what we now see from here over center field, and it's going to be converted into the Braves' new stadium.

But the unique thing about it is, it's going to be—the base line is going to be even closer—I mean, the foul line is going to be even closer to—the base line—to the stands than here. And home plate's going to be even tucked in tighter than here, so that the average distance from base line to the stands will be about 45 feet. And the major league ballparks average something like 70 feet. So even though the Braves have this magnificent pitching staff, they're going to be tested because they won't get as many easy foul-outs.

Q. Here's a fly ball, shallow left. In comes Hammonds, and he makes the catch for out number two.

Well, that's a good point because, I mean, the current stadium in Atlanta probably has more foul territory than any other ballpark.

The President. Yes. A little more than average, yeah.

Q. Yeah.

The President. But, I mean, the pitchers are fabulous. So they'll do fine. But it just interested me that they are going to have a little extra handicap there. And of course, visiting pitching staff will as well. So they—arguably, it will be a fair fight on everything.

Q. So it sounds like they didn't ask Greg Maddux about how they should build that ballpark. [*Laughter*]

The President. Actually, I asked him about it when they were—when the Braves came to the White House for the World Series, and their starting—you know, their big four were all there, and they didn't seem too worried about it. They were ready to roll.

Q. If you're good, you're good.

The President. Yeah.

Q. Mussina here, I mean, there's less foul territory than average here, and doesn't seem to bother him much.

The President. He's a fine pitcher. Oh, he's so good.

Q. The batter is Keith Lockhart, and it's one ball and one strike.

The President. Mussina's got a great future, too. I mean, he's got a—young, strong.

Q. Young guy. Still lives in his hometown. Goes up and coaches the basketball team in his old high school. You know, instead of going off on some yacht to the south of France, I mean, he's just back home, and he likes to work with the young kids.

Two and one to Lockhart. Where are you headed now? You've got——

The President. I've got to go back to—the President of Italy is here today. And we're having the Italian state dinner tonight.

Q. Now, in fact, I understand that my buddy Keith Berman from ESPN is supposed to be a guest at that state dinner.

The President. I think that's right. I think he's going to be there.

Q. Well, keep him away from the President of Italy. That's all I can say. [*Laughter*]

The President. And we're going to have a lot of distinguished Italian-Americans.

Q. Two-two pitch now to Lockhart. That's a base hit down the left field line. Hammonds hustles over to cut it off. Rounding first and holding is Lockhart with his second straight hit. Three to two, Kansas City trailing the Orioles here in the fourth inning.

Well, that sounds like a great night. And again, we really appreciate your stopping by.

The President. Thanks. Glad to do it.

Q. Any time you feel like a ball game, well, stop by and visit us.

The President. You've got a deal.

Q. All right.

The President. Thank you.

Q. That's the President, Bill Clinton, threw out the first ball—threw a strike, I might add, and he actually warmed up, he said, with Orioles chairman of the board Peter Angelos ahead of time.

The President. I did, and I was on the pitcher's mound because Ripken taunted me up there. [*Laughter*]

Thank you.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. That's a popup.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:21 p.m. in the WBAL broadcast booth at Oriole Park at Camden Yards. In his remarks, he referred to ESPN commentator Chris Berman. A portion of this interview could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Interview With Mel Proctor, Jim Palmer, and Mike Flanagan of Home Team Sports in Baltimore

April 2, 1996

Q. Welcome back to Camden Yards. The Orioles lead the Kansas City Royals 3–2. It is opening day, and President Bill Clinton was here today to throw out the first ball, and he'll be joining us momentarily, as soon as we get him miked up.

Well, we've got two right-handers, myself and Jim Palmer, and two left-handers in the booth now, Flanagan and the President.

Q. We finally have some balance up here.

Q. Can we get a Presidential chair in here? Thank you very much.

How are you, sir?

The President. Great. It's been a good game, don't you think?

Q. I agree.

The President. And a beautiful day.

Q. What was that first pitch you threw? Fastball, slider, curve?

The President. It wasn't fast. It wasn't fast, but I had a good time.

Q. This is a good time of the year for you. I know you're a big college basketball fan, having gone to Arkansas. Unfortunately, the Razorbacks were eliminated, didn't make it to the finals.

The President. But I'm very proud of them. They started 4 freshmen and made it to the Sweet 16, so I think they did well. It was a great tournament this year, I think. Everybody who watched the games must have felt it was a great tournament.

Q. I know you love being here on opening day.

The President. I do. And this has been exciting, you know? It's great to see this new Baltimore team. You know, they've got a chance to go all the way. And yet, if my count's right, all their RBI's go to Mr. Ripken today.

Q. That's right. [*Laughter*]

Q. Yes, he got 30 percent of what he had in all spring training. And of course, they all

want to get to the White House, because I know you had the Atlanta Braves there in early March.

The President. I did.

Q. I know you get out to a game or two during the season. Do you watch at the White House when you're home?

The President. I do quite often, I do. I watch the games when they're on, especially at night. When I come home late at night and I'm kind of keyed up and I don't want to go to sleep, I often watch the games that are on.

Q. A drive to right center field. Johnny Damon makes the catch on the warning track.

The President. Great play. That's a great play.

Q. Johnny Damon taking an extra base hit away from Chris Hoiles.

So you were saying you watch our games late at night. I guess in essence what you're saying is that we put you to sleep.

The President. Or keep me awake. [*Laughter*]

Q. This is the youngster that last year, at Double A, got about 188 at bats, but the reason Bob Boone left him in center field, even though they have a very good center fielder in Tom Goodwin, is because of his ability to make plays like that.

Q. Here's Tony Tarasco, who struck out his first time up.

Q. Did you play baseball yourself in high school?

The President. My school didn't have a team, but we had church league and Boys Club. We had all those. I played in some of those teams when I was a kid. I loved it.

Q. I know you love to golf; did you play any other sports growing up?

The President. Yes, but only—not in school; I played church league basketball, softball, baseball, but you know, everybody that grew up where I did wound up loving sports.

Q. Now, are you allowed to have a favorite team?

The President. I think so. In the basketball years—in the basketball season, excuse me, people understand it when I cheer for my home State team or for my alma mater, Georgetown. And when I was a kid, interestingly enough, in Arkansas, the St. Louis Cardinals were the closest baseball team to us; there were no Texas teams then. And so we used to listen to Cardinals baseball. That's what I studied to when I was a boy.

Q. Is that right?

The President. Yeah.

Q. I know you were out here last year when Cal Ripken broke Lou Gehrig's consecutive game streak.

The President. I was.

Q. What did that mean to you?

The President. I think it meant a lot to me not only as a baseball fan but as a citizen and as the President now, as someone who really wants his country to work well. The idea that a man could show that kind of discipline and devotion to his work and stay with one team for a career in a time and age when a lot of people don't last very long because they don't have the discipline to do it and just go for the big-time bucks in the short run and float around from team to team, or in the case of non-athletes from company to company, I think it really sort of was reassuring, not only to me but to the American people, to see that kind of record set and to see that kind of discipline and loyalty. I liked it a lot.

Q. Are you aware that Ken Griffey, Jr., is a Presidential candidate and has promised, if elected, to let people not pay taxes for 2 months?

The President. Yes, I'm worried about that. I'm worried about him. I figure that—at the very least he's going to take more votes away from me than Senator Dole. [*Laughter*] I'm really worried about it. I think—you know, I've always been a big fan of his. I feel sort of stabbed by it. It's breaking my heart.

Q. You wouldn't consider that, would you?

The President. What?

Q. Not having taxes for 2 months?

The President. What I want to know is how he's going to pay the bills. I'll consider it. I want to hear the rest of the deal. How is he going to not pay the bills?

Q. Base hit for Jeffrey Hammonds, who is two for two—a double his first time up and now a single. So that's a good sign. Hammonds is back healthy and swinging the bat well.

The President. Looking good.

Q. Getting back to Cal Ripken and all of the pressure that he must have been under last year during that streak—and you can certainly identify with pressure in your office—what do you see about the way he handled the pressure?

The President. I think he did what I try to do; he didn't vary his routine. He just focused on the day that was before him. And I think that he must have had the record in mind, but it didn't paralyze his play. Even the night he

was here, the night he broke the record, he hit a home run on a 0–3 pitch. So he still had enough presence of mind not to even just take the walk, you know? He was there, ready. He was playing. He was alive to every moment, and I think that's what you have to do. When you're under a lot of pressure, you have to just take a deep breath and do what you know to do.

Q. Pitch is low to Brady Anderson, who has struck out and grounded out. We're visiting with President Clinton.

The President. I think you've got to give a lot of credit to conditioning, too. And the way he keeps himself in shape in the off-season and during the season must have an incredible amount to do with the fact that he was able to play relatively injury-free all these years. And that requires a lot of discipline.

Q. And you know, a lot of discipline—Mike and I played for the Orioles for a number of years, and a lot of people wonder what it's like to play in the big league. Are you enjoying being President? Is it what you thought it was going to be?

The President. Yes. Oh, yes, I enjoy it very much. I'm honored every day when I go to work. There are some parts of it that are a little rougher than I thought it would be, but I have no complaints. I signed on for the whole show, and I'm just honored to have a chance to do it, to make a difference, to stand up for what I believe in, and to serve. It's an incredible opportunity, and if I had it to do over again, I'd do it in a heartbeat.

Q. There are no off days as President?

The President. No. But I always tell everybody——

Q. Even Cal gets one off in the spring.

The President. ——even the bad days are good, you know? Even the bad days are good. You know, the only frustrating thing is when you come up against a problem that you know cries out for some sort of resolution, and you're not sure you have the power to do anything about it; or when you get a problem where it seems 50–50 on both sides, you just have to kind of feel your way through to the answer, but you're not—neither you nor anyone else can be sure about whether it will come out all right. Those things are frustrating, but in terms of the pressure and the tension of the job, I don't mind that at all. I like it. It's part of the challenge.

Q. Three and 0, the count to Brady Anderson. Jeffrey Hammonds is at first with two outs.

The President. Come on, Brady, you need a hit.

Q. There goes Hammonds, throw to second by MacFarlane. He bounces it.

The President. He made it.

Q. But it gets him anyway.

The President. No.

Q. You don't think so, Mr. President?

The President. I don't think so.

Q. Well, maybe we can get the umpire to change his mind.

Q. Could we appeal?

The President. No, no. I went to see the umpires before the game. Let's look again.

Q. Did they have their glasses on?

The President. Yeah, they got him.

Q. They did.

The President. They got him. He was right.

Q. We'll be back, Mr. President, in a moment. Take a commercial break; we'll be right back.

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

Q. Welcome back to Camden Yards. Mel Proctor with Jim Palmer, Mike Flanagan. We're visiting with the President of the United States, Mr. Bill Clinton, who is enjoying opening day here at the ball park.

Good to have you with us.

The President. Thank you. It's really beautiful here, isn't it? Fabulous park.

Q. We think it's the best.

The President. One nice thing is, look how hard the wind is blowing, and you see the flags up there, and yet it's kind of calm in here, so it doesn't seem to be distracting the game.

Q. Joe Vidiella will lead off the fifth inning for the Royals, with the Orioles ahead 3 to 2. Vidiella was called out on strikes his first time up.

We were talking about your job and the enjoyment you derive from it, but what is the biggest challenge you have faced so far since you have been in office?

The President. The initial challenge was to try to get the economy turned around and get the deficit down, get the interest rates down, get the jobs coming back into the economy. Now the big frustration is how to make—how to get that economic benefit of—we have over 8 million new jobs in the economy. Unemployment is low, lower than the last 25-year average. But there's still a lot of people that feel uncer-

tain, because things are changing so fast. And now the biggest challenge is figuring out how to keep the job machine going and still give the baseball fans in America, the working people, the security that they deserve while they are on the job, some certainty that if they work harder they can get a raise, they can have a retirement, they can provide health care for their kids, that kind of thing.

And no one knows how to do this. It's a new challenge. We have never had a time before when we generated so many new jobs, and the economy was performing well, but we still have people uncertain out there. So that's our biggest challenge today.

Q. One out, Mike MacFarlane up for the Royals. He doubled and scored his first time up.

We were talking about somewhat of a background in sports as a youngster. Did you take any lessons away from competition that you use now in your life and on the job?

The President. Absolutely. Two, particularly. No matter how good you are at what you're doing, most things work out better when teams do it together. People work better together than they do on their own most of the time. And the second lesson is the obvious one: Never give up. It's not over till it's over.

Q. Were you very frustrated as a sports fan during the baseball strike?

The President. Yes, very. Especially that year. It's something that you can identify with as a pitcher. It was the greatest hitting year in 50 years. I mean, for people like me that grew up memorizing the baseball statistics, not just of all of my heroes in the fifties when I was a boy but going back to the twenties and thirties, I knew the hitting records of all the old players. The idea that we were going to have a—literally a 50-year record in hitting. And I know there are all kind of reasons for it, the expansion teams. I know all that. But to see that just thrown away, it just broke my heart. For all of us nuts, it was a bad deal.

Q. Thanks for being with us, sir. It's been a pleasure.

The President. Thanks.

Q. Come back anytime.

The President. Thank you. This, however, is going to be a good year.

Q. Yeah, I imagine, and a busy year.

The President. A good year for baseball.

Q. And also a busy year for you.

The President. But I'll still keep up.

Q. Okay. Good luck. Nice seeing you.

Q. A real pleasure.

The President. Thank you.

Q. We'll be back with more from Camden Yards in a moment. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Give me a golf game some day.

Q. Okay. You got a deal.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 4:30 p.m. in the HTS broadcast booth at Oriole Park at Camden Yards.

Remarks at a Dinner Honoring President Oscar Luigi Scalfaro of Italy
April 2, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. President Scalfaro, Mariana Scalfaro, members of the Italian delegation, distinguished guests: Hillary and I are delighted to welcome President Scalfaro to the White House. We were so warmly received by him in both Rome and Naples in 1994.

President Scalfaro's long public career and his lifelong devotion to the people of Italy mark him as one of the great democrats of our era. He has always been a great friend of the United States. And during the tremendous changes that have affected Italy and all Western democracies since the end of the cold war, he has been a clear voice for civility and decency in public life.

Today we had a serious talk about the issues we are working on together, but tonight it is fitting that we celebrate the extraordinary friendship between Italy and the United States and between the people of Italy and the people of the United States. And tonight, Mr. President, on behalf of all the American people, we thank Italy for the greatest of all its gifts to

us, its people. For America has been enriched beyond measure by Italian-Americans.

In this century we have been treated to supreme grace on our sporting fields by athletes from Joe Dimaggio to Joe Montana. In the fine arts we've been blessed with the exuberance of Italians in music from Toscanini to Sinatra to Jon Bon Jovi. [*Laughter*] We have seen the pathbreaking innovation of Frank Stella in painting, and we have seen Italian after Italian after Italian grace the silver screen, from Frank Capra to this year's best actor, Nicholas Cage.

We have, as everyone knows, benefited enormously from contributions to our public life from the legendary Fiorello LaGuardia to Senator John Pastore, Judge John Sirica, Governor Cuomo, Geraldine Ferraro, the many Italian-American mayors here tonight, the many Italian-Americans now serving in Congress, and to the Italian-Americans who serve on the court, beginning with the Supreme Court Justice, who has also joined us this evening.

Of course, there are millions more. The Italian-Americans who built our businesses and our farms, who are the backbone of our communities, they deserve so much of the credit for America's strength and greatness.

Many believe the remarkable story of Italians in America began with the immigration at the early part of this century. But in fact, the pattern was set long before that by an Italian named Henry de Tonti, born Enrico Tonti in Gaeta. A renowned soldier, sometime diplomat, fearless adventurer, Tonti was the most trusted deputy of the great French explorer La Salle. You could say he was La Salle's Leon Panetta. [*Laughter*]

He had an incredible string of accomplishments. He was the first European to build a ship on our Great Lakes. He and La Salle together explored the Mississippi River. He brought settlers and traders to the great State of Illinois. And historians credit him with being the true father of that State. This remarkable Italian came to my attention because in 1686 he founded a settlement about midway between Illinois and the Gulf of Mexico on the Mississippi River. The town became known as Arkansas Post, the very first settlement in my home State.

La Salle said that Tonti's energy and resolve made him, and I quote, "equal to anything." In their long and rich history, Italian-Americans have proved themselves equal to anything. And so the extraordinary friendship between the United States and Italy has also proved equal to anything.

The extraordinary friendship between the United States and Italy, rooted in our common love of liberty and democracy, our shared energy and resolve, will help us rise to the challenges of the 21st century and will ensure that we will always be the closest of allies, the best of friends.

And so ladies and gentlemen, let us raise a glass to the partnership between our nations, to the Italian-American community, to the President of Italy and his daughter. *Viva l'Italia,* and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:37 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Remarks to Commerce Department Employees on the Aircraft Tragedy in Croatia

April 3, 1996

Thank you, Dr. Good. Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice President and the First Lady and the members of the Cabinet and I wanted to come here to be with the employees of the Commerce Department at this very difficult hour. Hillary and I have just come from Ron Brown's home, visiting with Alma and Michael and their family and friends who are there. And we wanted to come and spend a few moments with you.

As all of you know, the plane carrying Secretary Brown and his delegation, including a number of your colleagues, business leaders, and members of the United States military, went down today near Dubrovnik, Croatia. We do not know for sure what happened there. But

I wanted to come here today, as it is almost Passover for American Jews and I know a lot of you will want to be leaving soon, just to have the chance to say a few words to you.

The first thing I want to say is, before I left I asked Alma, I said, "Alma, what do you want me to say when I go to the Commerce Department?" She said, "Tell them Ron was proud of them, that he liked them, that he believed in them, and that he fought for the Commerce Department, and tell them that you're going to do that now," which I thought was an incredible thing.

I've known Ron Brown a long time. I was always amazed at the way he was continually reaching out trying to bridge the differences between people, always trying to get the best out of people, always believing that we could do more than we have done. In a way, this job was sort of ready-made for him at this moment in history, and he loved it very much.

Most of the time, Ron Brown spent using the power of the Commerce Department to find ways to give opportunity to ordinary Americans, to generate jobs for the American economy and build better futures for American citizens. But when we met earlier this week, right before he left for the Balkans, he was so excited because he thought that, along with these business leaders and the other very able people from the Commerce Department on this mission, that they would be able to use the power of the American economy to help the peace take hold in the Balkans, to help people in that troubled place have the kind of decent, honorable, and wonderfully ordinary lives that we Americans too often take for granted. And he was so excited by it. If you saw any of the clips on the television that have been showing today about his meetings yesterday, you could see that.

I just want to say on a very personal note that I hope all Americans today will be grateful for what all the people who were on that plane did, for the military personnel, for the business leaders, who didn't have to go on that mission, who did it not out of a sense of their own profit but out of a sense of what they could do to help America bring peace.

To all of the wonderful people in the Commerce Department that were on that plane, some of them very young, one of them who came to our campaign in 1992 thinking the most important thing he could do was to ride a bicycle across the country asking people to vote for the Vice President and me, wound up a trusted employee at the Commerce Department; to all of their loved ones and their families, their friends, I want to say I am very grateful for their lives and their service.

I also want to say just one last thing about Ron Brown. He was one of the best advisers and ablest people I ever knew. And he was very, very good at everything he ever did. Whether he was the Commerce Secretary or a civil rights leader or something else, he was always out there just giving it his all. And he always believed that his mission in life was to put people's dreams within their reach if they were willing to work for it and believe in themselves.

When we were over at his home a few moments ago, Alexis Herman, who as many of you know used to work with Ron at the Democratic Committee, and they've been friends a long time, told me that his favorite Scripture verse was that wonderful verse from Isaiah:

> They who wait upon the Lord shall have their strength renewed. They shall mount up with wings as eagles. They will run and not grow weary. They will walk and faint not.

Well, Ron Brown walked and ran and flew through life. And he was a magnificent life force. And those of us who loved him will always be grateful for his friendship and his warmth.

But every American should be grateful that at a very difficult moment in our Nation's history, he made this Commerce Department what it was meant to be, an instrument for realizing the potential of every American. For all of you who played a role in that, I ask for your prayers for Secretary Brown and his family, for your colleagues and their families, for the business leaders and their families, and for our beloved military officers and their families. And I ask you always, always to be fiercely proud for what you have done and very grateful for the opportunity to have done it.

I'd like to ask now that we bow for a moment of silence.

[*At this point, a moment of silence was observed.*]

Amen.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:09 p.m. at the Department of Commerce. In his remarks, he referred to Secretary Brown's widow, Alma Brown, and his son, Michael Brown. The related proclamation of April 4 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message on the Observance of Passover, 1996

April 3, 1996

Warm greetings to all who are celebrating Passover.

This festival chronicles God's deliverance of the Israelites from their bondage in Egypt. With faith and determination, these courageous people sought liberation from slavery and a path to freedom. Although their journey was long and fraught with peril, the children of Israel reached the Promised Land to rebuild their communities in the sweet air of freedom.

More than three millenia later, Jews across America and around the world gather during Passover to commemorate this epic journey. The holiday seder itself is rich with symbols—of the suffering endured by the Israelites in Egypt, the difficulties encountered during their exodus, and their unquenchable hope for the future. And throughout this ritual meal, unifying and sanctifying it, prayers are recited in praise of God and in gratitude for His intervention in the struggle of the Israelites.

This year Passover has fresh meaning for us. The seder's bitter herbs and salt water remind us of our sorrow at the death of Yitzhak Rabin and the loss of so many innocents to the evil of terrorism. But as this harsh winter ends, we remember as well that God still lights our path and that, with courage and hope, the best in human nature will still prevail.

Hillary and I extend warm wishes for a memorable Passover.

BILL CLINTON

Remarks Following a Memorial Service for Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown

April 4, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, we just had a very moving memorial service not only to grieve but to celebrate the life of Secretary Brown and the other employees of the National Government, our military people, and the business leaders who were on that mission. We thanked God for their lives, we prayed for their families, and we came together in our grief and rededication. And we pointed out that it was 28 years ago on this day that Martin Luther King was killed in Memphis, working for what he believed in.

Today I spoke with the parents of one of the young women who died who worked for the Department of Commerce, who said they had spent their careers as schoolteachers, raising their daughter to believe that she could make a difference and that she ought to try. And they were very proud that she died doing what she believed in, trying to aid the peace in Bosnia.

And so that is how we are trying to think about this very difficult thing on this beautiful spring day in Easter Week.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:15 p.m. outside St. John's Church, Lafayette Square.

Message on the Observance of Easter, 1996
April 4, 1996

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Easter.

Across America and around the world, Christians gather on Easter Sunday to commemorate the central event in the history of their salvation: the Resurrection of Jesus. This holy day marks that moment in time when good conquered evil, hope overcame despair, and life triumphed over death. Just as spring brings warmth and beauty to the earth after a harsh winter, Easter brings joy and new life to the spirit, reminding us that no mistake or failing of the past can put us beyond the reach of God's mercy.

In this age of great challenge and even greater possibility, Easter's timeless message strengthens us for the tasks before us. As we celebrate in churches and cathedrals, at sunrise services and in family gatherings, we remember that our lives have great purpose and value. We recognize that the life and words of Jesus call us to works of caring and compassion, to giving more than receiving. His death and resurrection are powerful reminders of how God's grace is still at work in the world in which we live today.

Hillary joins me in extending best wishes to all for a wonderful Easter celebration.

BILL CLINTON

Statement on Signing the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996
April 4, 1996

I am today signing into law H.R. 2854, the "Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996." H.R. 2854 would authorize most agriculture programs for fiscal years 1996–2002, including commodities, credit, conservation, rural development, trade, and nutrition.

I am signing H.R. 2854 with reservation because I believe the bill fails to provide an adequate safety net for family farmers. The fixed payments in the bill do not adjust to changes in market conditions, which would leave farmers, and the rural communities in which they live, vulnerable to reductions in crop prices or yields. I am firmly committed to submitting legislation and working with the Congress next year to strengthen the farm safety net.

I am, however, keenly aware that farm legislation is long overdue and American farmers need to know now the conditions under which they are operating. In addition, the bill includes a considerable number of my Administration's proposals. I believe these authorities will enhance our environmental and economic development goals. They will form a lasting legacy of the 1996 farm bill.

The hallmark of the bill's commodity title is the planting flexibility provisions. At long last, farmers will be free to plant for the market, not for government programs. The expansion of planting flexibility will improve U.S. competitiveness in world markets. In addition, this legislation will reduce the adverse environmental effects of production agriculture and greatly simplify farm programs.

I am very pleased with the rural development title of the bill. The Congress has incorporated the Administration's principle that we must continue our investment in traditional infrastructure while expanding the investment in information infrastructure and in human capital. These investments will ensure that all Americans, regardless of how remote an area they live in, will have the opportunity to better their lives and share in the economic growth spurred by the revolution in information technology.

My Administration is keenly aware that there is no "one size fits all" Washington solution to local economic development needs. That is why we proposed the Rural Performance Partnership Initiative, which provides flexibility to States to tailor Federal program funds to their unique

situation. I salute the Congress for enacting this proposal, as well as providing $300 million in additional resources for rural development and agricultural research through the "Fund for Rural America."

I also wholeheartedly endorse the bill's conservation provisions. The bill will enhance contributions to environmental quality and farm income from the Conservation Reserve Program, a program whose importance I have repeatedly stressed. This bill provides more than $1 billion over 7 years for on-farm conservation measures, including assistance for livestock producers, which will help prevent soil erosion and clear our streams and air. I am also glad to see that farmers will still have the choice to enroll permanent easements in the Wetlands Reserve Program.

In addition, the bill would provide $200 million, with the possibility of an additional $150 million, for restoration of the Everglades. This project is one of the Administration's top environmental priorities, and the funds in this bill are a good downpayment toward our goal. Moreover, I call on the Congress to enact the Administration's comprehensive Everglades restoration plan, including the one-cent per pound marketing assessment on Florida sugar. This assessment would ensure that the benefitting industry pays its fair share.

I am also generally pleased with the trade title, which includes almost all of the Administration's proposed export program enhancements. While the Administration opposed the reduced funding for certain export programs in the bill, it will use these, and newly authorized tools, to expand upon the record levels of agricultural exports we have achieved. This will ensure that America's farmers continue to take advantage of the growing opportunities in the world market.

I am disappointed that the Congress has rolled back an important reform of the crop insurance program, which was enacted just 18 months ago, to ensure that every farmer has crop insurance where it is available. Still, the farm bill embodies a clear commitment to maintain crop insurance as an alternative to costly and unreliable ad hoc crop disaster programs of the past. In this respect, the Administration strongly supports the development of new "revenue insurance" approaches over the coming years so that the crop insurance safety net can play an increasingly large role in the farm economy. This is a key component of our strategy to continue to help farmers manage the risks they face.

While commodity and conservation programs remain the core of any farm bill, much of the future of agriculture and rural America will be determined by many other factors outside the traditional scope of those programs. This bill recognizes the growing importance of those forces and incorporates many of the reforms the Administration sought. While seeking improvements in the farm safety net, I will also charge my Administration with using the bill's new tools to ensure that agriculture sustains the growth it has achieved, that the pace of environmental improvements is accelerated, and that we create new economic opportunities for farmers and rural citizens.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 4, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 2854, approved April 4, was assigned Public Law No. 104–127.

Remarks at a Tree Planting Ceremony Honoring Those Who Died in the Aircraft Tragedy in Croatia

April 5, 1996

Last year, as we prepared to go to Oklahoma City, Hillary and I planted a dogwood tree here in honor of the public servants who lost their lives there. And this year as we prepare to go back, almost a year later, we are planting, sadly, another tree in honor of Secretary Brown and all the public servants of the United States and the citizens who lost their lives in the plane crash. We hope the prayers of the American people will be with them and their families at

this difficult time. We hope everyone will honor the contributions they made to the United States and the welfare of our people.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:15 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks at the Plaque Dedication Ceremony for the New YMCA Day Care Center in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

April 5, 1996

Thank you very much. Governor Keating, Senator Nickles, Mr. Mayor, Lieutenant Governor Fallin, Congressman Brewster, Congressman Istook, to the families that are behind me and the children that just made the walk with us and their parents, I thank them.

I was especially glad to see Brandon and Rebecca Denny, because they came to see Hillary and me in the White House and I thought they would be glad to see us again. But I asked them if they remembered meeting me; they said, "Yes. How's Socks?" [*Laughter*] So I thought to myself, things are maybe beginning to get back to normal in Oklahoma City; at least the children have their priorities in order.

Hillary and I thought a lot about where we were last year when we came down here to be with you and with our friend James Lee Witt, the FEMA Director, who is also here today. And I wondered what I ought to say. Let me begin by noting that this is, after all, Good Friday. It is a day for those of us who are Christians that marks the passage from loss and despair to hope and redemption. And in a way that is the lesson of this little walk we just took with these children and their parents, from a place where we mourn lives cut so brutally short to this place where, thanks to you and all of those who the Lieutenant Governor mentioned, we can truly celebrate new beginnings.

I hope the lesson of the walk and this effort will comfort and inspire all of those here in Oklahoma City and especially those who are, as the Governor said, still hurting, still searching, still working to put their lives back together. I know there's nothing that anyone can do to bring back the children whose lives were taken from us, nothing we can do to sweep away the frightening memories that still linger in the children who survived, except to continue to work until they finally go away.

But what you have done is to show our children that in the wake of evil, goodness can surround them and lift them up. You have done a lot here already to prove that their lives are strong and powerful, like the tree behind me, which has now become famous around the country. Everybody wants to know why this tree stood up when the bomb went off. It lost its leaves and its bark, and it's still kind of ugly—[*laughter*]—but it survived, and it's going to bloom again. Why is it going to bloom again? Because its roots kept it strong and standing.

The survivors and the spirit of this community are blooming again because your roots kept you strong and standing. Now we see it in this child care center that we are here to dedicate today. It's a testament, really, to the resilience of the human spirit and the fierce devotion of the parents of this community and the larger community, what Hillary likes to call "the village of citizens," who are determined to support your children and their future. When something really terrible happens, it's easy to forget how important basic things are. It's pretty important for children to have a safe place to fingerpaint or plead with the teacher to read a book for the fifth time or just play in a secure and safe environment.

These places, like the one you are preparing here for your children, are places where our kids begin to learn how to relate to other children. And they have to learn to live out the essential values that have stood our American family so well for so long. They really have to learn how to build instead of tear down, to work together instead of run away, how to treat other people who are just like them with respect and fairness. By rebuilding a place for children to learn these lessons and to play and to laugh again, all of you, as citizens, have done the most honorable thing a nation could ask for, and I want to thank you for that.

I also want to thank those of you who have already mentioned in public and in private the tragedy our Nation has endured this week with the loss of our Commerce Secretary and my dear friend, Ron Brown, and many other people, many of them quite young, who served our Nation in the Commerce Department and the United States military, and the business executives who were on that trip.

They lost their lives pursuing the very spirit that we are here to celebrate today. They went to the Balkans, a region that has literally been torn apart by war, where hundreds of thousands of people have been stripped of their dignity and lives, and where millions have been turned into refugees and where countless children have been robbed of their future. And they did it just to prove that through faith and commitment, the people of Bosnia could get over their hatred and intolerance and that America wanted to help.

Ron Brown laughed with me last Monday night when we talked about this mission in detail, that I had sent him all over the world with business leaders, primarily to expand the reach of the American economy, to generate more jobs for Americans. But he was going to Bosnia to use the power of the American economy, with the business leaders who were there, just to try to help the peace take hold, to give normal life back to those people. That is a noble and good thing for which they lived and died, and I ask you for your prayers for them and their families who, in these difficult days, are having their problems understanding the whys of all of this.

So as we remember those who perished here almost a year ago and we mourn those who died on that hard mountain so many thousands of miles from here, let us again thank God for the grace that has brought us to this point and enabled us to live with our sorrows and tragedies and to rebuild our lives.

You know, the bagpipers over there were playing "Amazing Grace." I suppose it's the best known American hymn, at least the first verse. But as we remember those people in this community who are still grieving and still struggling, and we think of all of the difficulties life presents for which we have no answer, I would like to close with a reference to the third verse of that magnificent hymn:

> Through many dangers, toils, and snares
> I have already come.
> 'Tis grace has brought me safe thus far,
> And grace will lead me home.

We pray God's grace today on those who lost so much a year ago and on the efforts of those of you who are working hard to build a better future, to make something profoundly good come out of that tragedy.

I'd like now to ask the children who are here, and all of the others in the podium who would like to, to come up here and help me unveil the plaque. I don't have great manual skills. I need all of the help I can get up here. Could you all come up—the families and Governor, Mayor—you all come on over. Let's do this together.

God bless you. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:36 p.m. at the New YMCA Day Care Center. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Frank Keating and Lt. Gov. Mary Fallin of Oklahoma and Mayor Ron Norick of Oklahoma City.

Remarks to the Families of the Victims of the 1995 Bombing in Oklahoma City

April 5, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you so much, Reverend Alexander. Governor Keating, Mrs. Keating, Mr. Mayor, Senator Nickles, Lieutenant Governor Fallin, Congressman Brewster, Congressman Istook; most of all to the families here of those who lost their lives and those who survived the bombing almost a year ago.

I come here today as much as anything else to thank you. On this very difficult and painful day for me, when I have lost a great and good friend and a lot of gifted employees of the Fed-

eral Government, some of them very young, and some wonderful members of our Armed Forces and some of our Nation's most able business leaders, the power of your example is very much with me, and I thank you for that.

A year ago we were here to join in mourning your loss and praying for your healing. Today I ask that we not only remember your loss but celebrate the rebuilding you have already done and the work you will still do.

I have relived the moments of last year many times in my mind since I was here with you. I have wondered how you were doing and prayed for your strength. I was honored to have two of your citizens at the State of the Union Address and to recognize their unique contributions to our country through their service to you.

Just a few moments ago I was honored to lay a wreath, along with the First Lady and some children who survived and their parents, and then to dedicate the child care center that will be built near the site of the bombing, thanks to the remarkable efforts of your public officials and private citizens together. You have shown how strong you are, and you have given us all an example of the power of faith and community, the power of both God's grace and human courage.

On this Good Friday, what you have done has demonstrated to a watching and often weary and cynical world that good can overcome evil, that love can outlast hate, that the light of human life can shine on through the most terrible darkness. And so I thank you for that. And I know that you could not have done it without your faith.

On this Friday I can't help noting that there is a wonderful verse in the Book of Matthew which says that a person who follows the word of God will be likened unto a wise man who built his house on a rock. "And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon the house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." Well, your building was blown down, and many lives were shattered. But today I saw again that the spirit of Oklahoma City fell not, for it is founded upon a rock. And I thank you for showing that to America.

From the early rescue efforts that so many engaged in to the scholarship funds for the children who lost their parents, to the current outpouring of support that will enable families to travel to Denver for the trial, to the dedication ceremony I just attended, I see over and over and over again that you have redeemed the promise of essential human nature and human possibility that we celebrate so profoundly in this season. And what I want you to know is that, in doing that, you have renewed the faith of America. You have drawn our national family closer together.

A year ago I was able to come here and say to you that "You have lost too much, but you have not lost everything. You have not lost America." In the year since, America has stood with you and prayed with you and worked with you as you rebuild. But today I come to you to say you have given America something precious, a greater sense of our shared humanity, our common values, our obligations to one another. You've taken some of the meanness out of our national life and put a little more love and respect into it, in ways that you probably cannot even imagine. And I thank you for that.

I will call on all Americans to express their solidarity with you when you celebrate the first anniversary of your tragedy. Earlier today I signed a proclamation calling for a moment of silence across our land on April the 19th at 9:02 a.m., Central Daylight Time, to ask the American people to gather in silent prayer and quiet reflection with their friends and neighbors, wherever they live, from Maine to Alaska, to southern California, to Florida.

And let me say to all of you again, we will be there with you. But because of what you have felt and what you have endured, let me ask you now if you will bow your heads in silent prayer to remember all that this year has meant to you and to pray for those who lost their loved ones on that plane in Bosnia. Only you can know how they feel.

May we pray.

[*At this point, a moment of silence was observed.*]

Amen.

I would like to say a special word now to some of the people who were involved here a year ago: To the Federal workers who survived the blast and are back on the job, we're glad, and we support you. To those who are not yet back on the job, we will stand with you until the day you are able to work again. To those who lost their lives in the service of their country, trying to help America get through every

day in the best possible way, we thank you, your families, beyond measure.

Before Hillary and I left the White House this morning, we planted a new dogwood tree on the South Lawn to honor the memory of those who died in the crash in Bosnia. It is very near the one we planted a year ago, before we came to be with you for the first time, in honor of the loved ones that you lost. A year ago I noted that the dogwood tree embodies the lesson of the Psalms that the life of a good person is like a tree whose leaf does not wither; that just as a tree takes a long time to grow, sometimes wounds take a long time to heal. Well, your tree has taken root on the South Lawn of the White House. In a few weeks it will flower. The healing power of our faith has also taken root and must bloom again here.

You know, this Easter Sunday all over the world the over 1.5 billion people who are Christians will be able to bear witness to our faith that the miracles of Jesus and the miracles of the human spirit in Oklahoma City only reflect the larger miracle of human nature that there is something eternal within each of us, that we all have to die, and that no bomb can blow away, even from the littlest child, that eternity which is within each of us.

I know a lot of you are still hurting, but I hope as Sunday comes you'll be able to find some comfort in that. Your healing has to go on. A lot of you probably still have your doubts about all of this. I'm sure there's some lingering anger and even some rage and dark and lonely nights for many of the family members. I can only say to you that the older I get the more I know that we have to try harder to make the most of each day and accept the fact that things will happen we can never understand or justify.

We flew over my home State, you know, coming here, and it made me think of the words of an old gospel song that were actually written in Arkansas. And I thought I would leave you with these words, and our love and respect, as we move toward Easter.

The hymn goes:

> Further along we'll know all about it.
> Further along we'll understand why.
> Rise up, my brothers, and walk in the sunshine.
> Further along we'll understand why.

God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:20 p.m. in the Myriad Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. Don Alexander, pastor, First Christian Church; and Cathy Keating, wife of Gov. Frank Keating of Oklahoma. The proclamation is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at the University of Central Oklahoma in Edmond, Oklahoma
April 5, 1996

Thank you very much. Governor Nigh, Mrs. Nigh, Congressman Istook, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Speaker, the other distinguished guests on the platform, and to the students and the other members of the University of Central Oklahoma community and family, Governor David Walters and Mrs. Walters, and to all the people who are here with me today because of the mission we are on.

Let me say it's good to be back here. I heard the students laughing when Governor Nigh announced that I was here 8 years ago, and I was thinking, most of the students were in grade school the last time I was here. [*Laughter*] Later this year I'll be eligible for my AARP card—[*laughter*]—but I'm still glad to be here.

As all of you know, and as the Governor said, I came here today to Oklahoma to pay my respects nearly a year after the tragedy of the bombing, to attend a memorial service for the families of those who were victims, for the survivors and their families, and others who were Federal employees who worked there, and to help your State officials to dedicate the beginning of the child care center which will be rebuilt, which is a remarkable accomplishment, and to meet with this scholarship committee, which informed me of the results which were just announced to you by Governor Nigh.

And it is coming at an especially sad but ironically appropriate time, just a couple of days after we suffered the loss of our Secretary of Commerce and a number of fine Federal employees—some of them very young, barely older than some of the students here—a number of fine U.S. military personnel, and some of our country's most outstanding business leaders in that plane crash in Bosnia.

I would like to make just two points briefly. I know it's cold and you've been waiting a long time, but I ask you to reflect on two things. That plane went down in Bosnia full of people who have worked very hard to help the American people fulfill their potential. Ron Brown was immensely proud of the fact that more than any other Commerce Secretary and Commerce Department in our history, they had been instrumental in opening new avenues for people to buy American products and American services and create jobs for Americans, so that when young people get out of college they can get jobs, good jobs, jobs that pay better than average, jobs with a good future.

But these people went to Bosnia with only the most modest expectation of any personal gain for themselves. They went there to try to use the power of the American economy to help bring opportunity to the Bosnians so that peace wouldn't fall apart and instead would take hold.

But the main thing I want to say is that my friend Ron Brown, who grew up in Harlem, never forgot where he came from and spent his lifetime trying to help other people realize their dreams. When our hearts were breaking over what happened in Oklahoma City—it was this madness that somebody for some perverted political purpose could take everyone else's life away from them who weren't even standing in the way, they just happened to show up in the wrong time in the wrong place. And so I would like to say two things to you today.

First of all, all of us need to ask ourselves a year later, what are our responsibilities not only to help the children who were tragically robbed of their parents in Oklahoma City to fulfill their dreams but to provide that opportunity for all people? I've worked very hard to expand the quality and availability of college loans and the college scholarships for children of modest incomes. I'm still hoping we'll pass a balanced budget amendment in our legislation in this Congress that will include a tax cut that gives families a deduction for the cost of college tuition, because I think it's the best possible tax break we could give America, to do that.

But this is not a political issue. Every American has an interest in seeing every other American be able to live out their dreams. And we have certain positive responsibilities, just like Ron Brown believed that we did, to try to do that, and access to higher education is, perhaps, the most important one.

The second thing I want to ask you about, especially the young people, is to think about where do we go from here. And as horrible and personal as the bombing of the Federal building was to you, I want you to try to step back a minute and put it in a larger context. It was, first and foremost, an act of terror. What is terror? Terror is when someone, allegedly for some philosophical or political reason, believes they have the right to take innocent lives, not people who are fighting them in war, not people who are wearing uniforms, not people who are staring at them across a battle line but just to take an action that will take the lives of people who just happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.

And we are seeing that all over the world, and you see it in two ways. First, you see homegrown terror, people in your own country that are so profoundly alienated they think they have a right to do this. You've been reading about the Unabomber in recent days. That's an example of that. You remember when the religious fanatics in Japan broke open poison gas in the Japanese subway and killed a lot of people and a few days later could have killed hundreds more, but miraculously, the second attempt was thwarted. That's an example of that.

And then you have imported terrorism, where people come in from other countries and they try to wreck your life to pursue their political ambitions. An example of that is the World Trade Center bombing. And it's really tough when they're coming from right next door, which is what is tearing the heart out of the people in the Middle East now. And you remember how recently we saw the people there—innocent—not only innocent Israelis, innocent Palestinians, innocent Moroccans, little children just blown away because some crackpot believes that it is a legitimate way to pursue your political philosophy to kill innocent civilians.

Now what I want to tell you today is—and I want you to think about this, especially the

young people—the world you're living in and the world we're moving toward is going to offer you more opportunities to succeed, if you have a good education, than any generation of Americans has ever known. But the same forces that offer you those opportunities to succeed offer people opportunities to commit terrorist acts. And therefore, we must be more vigilant, more active, more determined than ever before.

Why is that? Well, just think about it. What's the world like now? Computer technology can now interface people all over the world. I'm trying to get every classroom and every library and every school in America connected to the Internet by the end of the decade. I know right now there are public schools in America where young junior high school students can get on the Internet and do research out of libraries in Asia and Australia, all over the world. Well, that also means that terrorist networks can get information about how to build bombs and how to wreak mischief if you just know how to find the right home page.

We've got to have open borders in order to move products and services around the world, in order for people to travel around the world. We have to be able to get around in a hurry. The more open the borders are, the more open the information is, the more vulnerable we are to things like money laundering and terrorists moving out of countries.

Now, that should not frighten you. The good news is we are reducing the traditional threats to your security and your future. Communism has failed. The cold war is over. We have agreed to treaties that will reduce by two-thirds the number of nuclear weapons that existed when the cold war was at its height. And for the first time in the history of nuclear weapons, for the last 2 years there's not a single nuclear weapon pointed at any American citizen. That is the good news.

That's the good news. But in an open world of easy information, quick technology, and rapid movements, we are all more vulnerable than we used to be to terrorism and its interconnected allies, organized crime, drug running, and the spread of weapons of destruction. And so I spend a lot of my time as your President trying to think about what we can do to minimize those dangers.

We've done a lot to try to fight terrorism. We've done a lot to try to fight drug trafficking. We've done a lot to try to fight the money laundering that goes along with all this, to try to help other countries stand up to organized crime, because nobody is immune from this. You see it in all of the places I cited. You see it when those terrible bombs go off in London. I saw it in Latin America where we have honest law enforcement officials in Colombia trying to help us crack the Colombian drug cartels. And the good news is we arrested seven top leaders in the last couple of years. The bad news is, 500 Colombians laid their lives down trying to break their country of the grip of drug cartels.

So what we have to do is to ask ourselves, our generation—the generation that preceded us won World War II and then won the cold war. What we have to do now is to fight back these organized forces of destruction so all the opportunities that await you young people will be there and so you can pursue them without fear; so that if you're willing to work hard and obey the law and make the most of your own lives, you will be able to live out your dreams. That is what this is all about.

The lessons we have to take out of what happened to us at the World Trade Center, what happened to us in Oklahoma City, what we were able to avoid when we stopped terrorist attacks in the last 2 years on our own soil and against our airplanes as they were flying over the oceans, those are the things we have to learn.

Now, what I want to say to you is that, first, you've got to realize all these things work together. On the 19th of this month, when you all are observing the one-year anniversary, the reason I won't be here is I have to go to Russia to a nuclear summit. And part of it is about continuing to reduce nuclear weapons. But part of it is making sure that every place in the world that has the residue of the nuclear age, this nuclear material, make sure it is secure and safe and cannot be stolen, because we don't want our homegrown terrorists or our foreign terrorists to get their hands on nuclear material that, with just the size of a wafer, you could make a bomb 10 times more powerful than the one that destroyed your Federal building in Oklahoma City. So I have to go there. The United States has to be a part of that. And that's an important thing, but we also have to recognize that there are things that we have to do here at home.

Last year I asked people in the other parts of the world to stand with the United States

because we took a tough stand against the countries that support terrorism, against Iran and Iraq and Sudan and Libya. And I get frustrated when they don't help. But when those bombs blew up in Israel, it sobered a lot of countries up, and in 3 days the President of Egypt and I were able to persuade 29 countries to send high-level leaders, including heads of state, to Egypt to meet to stand up against terrorism. We had Arab countries condemning terrorism in Israel for the first time.

So we've got—we're getting in a position now where the people are willing to say we can't let terrorism pay. We can't let terrorism pay. We've got to make sure that terrorists pay for what they're doing. We have to make sure that's true here and around the world.

When I was in Israel—and I suppose they have about as much experience with terrorism as anybody—I talked to leaders of both political parties. And they hardly agree on anything over there; they fight just like we do. [*Laughter*] But you know what? They were both agreed on one thing. They said, "You have got to continue to take the lead in the fight against terrorism, and you need to pass that legislation that you're trying to pass to crack down on the forces of terrorism in the United States and enable us to stand against them when they invade our country."

It's been almost a year since I was pledged that terrorism bill, and it's still not in the shape it needs to be. But let me just tell you three things that I think ought to be in it, and there's a big debate about it.

We know what kind of bomb blew up the Federal building. We propose that we be able to have markers that go into explosives when people buy them. Contractors don't have a thing in the world to fear. People need to buy explosives; you can't do a lot of work without them. But if explosives are used to kill innocent civilians, we ought to be able to find out where they came from and who bought them. That's what I believe, and I hope you do, too.

We ought to have explicit authority that permits the Attorney General of the United States to stop terrorist groups like Hamas from raising money in America. And if we catch people doing it, we ought to be able to throw them out of the country immediately—immediately, not after some long, drawn-out process.

We ought to have the best technology available to our law enforcement officials to keep up with these terrorists that move around in a hurry, and they're very sophisticated and very hard to catch. And we can do that without violating the civil liberties of the American people, without undermining the constitutional rights of criminal defendants. But I'm telling you, folks, these people are smart. They understand computers. They understand information. They understand how to hide. They understand how to doctor bank records. They understand how to launder money.

And when it all comes down to it, just think of what would happen if Oklahoma City had happened five or six or seven times within a month or two. Think what it would have done to the American people. Think what would have happened if 3,000 people had been killed at Oklahoma City and every American had felt like those people were within 50 miles of them. That's what happened in Israel just a few weeks ago. It can paralyze a country. It can take its heart out. It can take its confidence away. It can make young people believe they have no future.

Now, I am very optimistic about America's future, and I am proud of the work that our law enforcement officials have done in catching these people. And I am proud of the fact that we have caught and deported more terrorists in the last 3 years than at any time in our history put together. I am proud of that.

I am not saying these things to frighten any Americans. I am just telling you I have been around the world representing you; I've talked to people all over the world. I do not believe—if we can do our job and if we had just a little bit of luck—I do not believe that you will have to worry about a nuclear weapon wiping out a whole American community or killing lots of Americans in the way that our parents worried about us when I was growing up. But I do not believe you can fulfill your dreams and be totally free until we have taken the strongest possible stand against terrorism, organized crime, drug running, and weapon sales. And they are all related.

So I ask you, I ask you because you will have more weight than most people—this State has suffered, this State has felt it, this State understands the human dimension of people killing innocent people for perverted, allegedly political reasons—to say in simple, clear terms, this is not a political issue; this is not a partisan issue; this is not an ideological issue. This is

a matter of America getting ready for the future and guaranteeing our young people the opportunities that they deserve to live out their God-given dreams and destiny.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:40 p.m. in the courtyard at the School of Education. In his remarks, he referred to George Nigh, president, University of Central Oklahoma, and his wife, Donna; Mayor Bob Rudkin of Edmond; Glen Johnson, speaker, Oklahoma State House of Representatives; and David Walters, former Oklahoma Governor, and his wife, Rhonda.

Memorandum on Designation of the Acting Secretary of Commerce
April 5, 1996

Memorandum for the Honorable Mary Lowe Good, Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology

Pursuant to the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including section 3347 of title 5, United States Code, and Executive Order No. 11880, as amended, you are directed to perform the duties of the office of Secretary of Commerce, until such time as I appoint a Secretary of Commerce.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: The related Executive order of April 5 amending Executive Order No. 11880 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

The President's Radio Address
April 6, 1996

Good morning. For millions of Americans this is an especially joyous time of year. All across our country, families come together to celebrate Easter or Passover; parents reunited with their children, brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles, friends joining in these celebrations of faith and renewal.

Yesterday in Oklahoma City, Hillary and I gathered with a remarkable American community to remember its loss and mark its passage from pain to hope. Nearly a year has passed since evil struck our heartland, killing 168 Americans, injuring many more, touching all of us. Yet from the moments terror's shadow darkened their lives, the people of Oklahoma City began their common effort to work together to rebuild their lives, their community, and their future.

The people of Oklahoma City have proved to the Nation that while the American spirit can be terribly tested, it cannot be defeated. They have shown our children that even in the wake of the most terrible tragedy, goodness can prevail.

The men, women, and children who fell beneath the rubble of the Murrah Federal Building were not cut down in a great battle. They were just ordinary Americans, simple soldiers of the everyday, going to work, going to play, taking on their responsibilities as parents and providers and citizens.

Many of them were Government workers, laboring every day to help millions of their fellow citizens make the most of their own lives: caseworkers seeing to it that senior citizens received their Social Security; law enforcement officers keeping our streets safe, our schools free from drugs; military recruiters helping to keep our country strong. They're the people who make America work. They're what we mean when we speak of Government of, by, and for the people.

The work of Government employees isn't usually very glamorous, and it can be grindingly difficult. And as the tragic loss of Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown and his colleagues just a few days ago reminds us, sometimes it can also be very dangerous. Later today the Vice

President and I will make a sad journey to an Air Force base in Dover, Delaware. There, on the eve of Easter, we will be with the families of Ron Brown and his delegation as their loved ones make a final journey home.

Ron Brown was a dear friend of mine, a friend to American businesses and American workers everywhere, who did more to create good jobs by opening new markets to our products and services than anybody who ever held his position. He was also a friend to millions of people around the world because of his relentless determination to bridge the false divisions that keep us apart here at home and abroad.

When he became Commerce Secretary, I asked him to make that Department a powerhouse for American jobs and opportunity and an instrument for promoting peace and freedom and democracy around the world. Well, that's exactly what he did. Every minute of every day was dedicated to creating jobs for American workers and opportunities for our companies. But he was also in the Balkans to channel the energy of the American economy, once again the strongest in the world, into a powerful force for peace and renewal.

With him were dedicated Government workers from the Commerce Department and other agencies. Some of them were very young. With him were members of our United States military who were serving their country and getting the mission where it was supposed to go. And with him were some of our finest business leaders, all of them trying to help people rebuild their lives and their land so that the hard-won peace in Bosnia would grow strong and take on a life and logic of its own, overcoming the past of ethnic hatred and division. These Americans literally gave their lives bringing to others the blessings of a normal life that too often we take here for granted.

So this weekend, as you enjoy the blessings of family and community and friendship, please say a prayer for the families and friends of Ron Brown and his colleagues and for the family and friends of the good, hard-working Americans who were stolen from us in Oklahoma City one year ago and for those who survive but still have challenges to face.

Sometimes it takes a terrible tragedy to illuminate a basic truth. In a democracy, government is not "them" versus "us." We are all "us." We are all in it together. Government is our neighbors and friends helping others pursue the dreams we all share, to live in peace, provide for ourselves and our loved ones, give our children a chance for an even better life.

So in this season of reflection and rebirth, let us follow their example and rededicate ourselves, each in our own way, to the welfare of our beloved country and our fellow citizens. That's the best way to carry on the legacy of those who give their lives in the service of our country.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:40 p.m. on April 5 at the University of Central Oklahoma for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 6.

Remarks Honoring Those Who Died in the Aircraft Tragedy in Croatia at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware

April 6, 1996

My fellow Americans, today we come to a place that has seen too many sad, silent homecomings. For this is where we in America bring home our own, those who have given their lives in the service of their country.

The 33 fine Americans we meet today, on their last journey home, ended their lives on a hard mountain a long way from home. But in a way, they never left America. On their mission of peace and hope, they carried with them America's spirit, what our greatest martyr, Abraham Lincoln, called "the last, best hope of Earth."

Our loved ones and friends loved their country, and they loved serving their country. They believed that America, through their efforts, could help to restore a broken land, help to heal a people of their hatreds, help to bring a better tomorrow through honest work and shared enterprise. They knew what their country

had given them, and they gave it back with a force, an energy, an optimism that every one of us can be proud of.

They were outstanding business leaders who gave their employees and their customers their very best. They were brave members of our military, dedicated to preserving our freedom and advancing America's cause.

There was a brilliant correspondent, committed to helping Americans better understand this complicated new world we live in. And there were public servants, some of them still in the fresh springtime of their years, who gave nothing less than everything they had, because they believed in the nobility of public service.

And there was a noble Secretary of Commerce who never saw a mountain he couldn't climb or a river he couldn't build a bridge across.

All of them were so full of possibility. Even as we grieve for what their lives might have been, let us celebrate what their lives were, for their public achievements and their private victories of love and kindness and devotion are things that no one—no one—could do anything but treasure.

These 33 lives show us the best of America. They are a stern rebuke to the cynicism that is all too familiar today. For as family after family after family told the Vice President and Hillary and me today, their loved ones were proud of what they were doing; they believed in what they were doing; they believed in this country; they believed we could make a difference. How silly they make cynicism seem. And more important, they were a glowing testimonial to the power of individuals to improve their own lives and elevate the lives of others and make a better future for others. These 33 people loved America enough to use what is best about it in their own lives, to try to help solve a problem a long, long way from home.

At the first of this interminable week, Ron Brown came to the White House to visit with me and the Vice President and a few others. And at the end of the visit he was bubbling with enthusiasm about this mission. And he went through all the people from the Commerce Department who were going. And then he went through every single business leader that was going. And he said, "You know, I've taken so many of these missions to advance America's economic interest and to generate jobs for Americans; these business people are going on this mission because they want to use the power of the American economy to save the peace in the Balkans." That is a noble thing. Nearly 5,000 miles from home, they went to help people build their own homes and roads, to turn on the lights in cities darkened by war, to restore the everyday interchange of people working and living together with something to look forward to and a dream to raise their own children by.

You know, we can say a lot of things, because these people were many things to those who loved them. But I say to all of you, to every American, they were all patriots; whether soldiers or civil servants or committed citizens, they were patriots. In their memory and in their honor, let us rededicate our lives to our country and to our fellow citizens. In their memory and in their honor, let us resolve to continue their mission of peace and healing and progress. We must not let their mission fail. And we will not let their mission fail.

The sun is going down on this day. The next time it rises it will be Easter morning, a day that marks the passage from loss and despair to hope and redemption, a day that more than any other reminds us that life is more than what we know, life is more than what we can understand, life is more than sometimes even we can bear, but life is also eternal. For each of these 33 of our fellow Americans and the two fine Croatians that fell with them, their day on Earth was too short, but for our country men and women we must remember that what they did while the sun was out will last with us forever.

If I may now, I would like to read the names of all of them, in honor of their lives, their service, and their families:

Staff Sergeant Gerald Aldrich
Ronald Brown
Duane Christian
Barry Conrad
Paul Cushman III
Adam Darling
Captain Ashley James Davis
Gail Dobert
Robert Donovan
Claudio Elia
Staff Sergeant Robert Farrington, Jr.
David Ford
Carol Hamilton
Kathryn Hoffman

Lee Jackson
Stephen Kaminski
Katherine Kellogg
Technical Sergeant Shelly Kelly
James Lewek
Frank Maier
Charles Meissner
William Morton
Walter Murphy
Lawrence Payne
Nathaniel Nash
Leonard Pieroni
Captain Timothy Schafer
John Scoville
I. Donald Terner
P. Stuart Tholan
Technical Sergeant Cheryl Ann Turnage
Naomi Warbasse
Robert Al Whittaker

Today we bring their bodies back home to America, but their souls are surely at home with God. We welcome them home. We miss them. We ask God to be with them and their families.

God bless you all, and God bless our beloved Nation. Amen.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:20 p.m. in Hangar 706 at Dover Air Force Base.

Remarks at the Annual Easter Egg Roll

April 8, 1996

Where is Bernie? Is he behind me? Oh, here you go.

Well, let me say I always look forward to this every year. And the forecast today, believe it or not, was for snow. But we knew that the Easter Egg Roll wouldn't be spoiled, and just look what a wonderful day we have.

So let me say I want to join Hillary in thanking all of you who have contributed to make this Egg Roll successful. I want to thank all of you for coming and all of those who will come. This is a wonderful day for all the children who come here, and it really belongs to the children. And I love looking out and seeing all these smiling faces of parents with their children. I sometimes think the parents have more fun than the children do, but it really is for the children, so all of you like me, who like this, try to restrain yourselves so that the kids can stay front and center.

It is a great honor for us to be a part of this. It is one of the things that we are really thankful for, the opportunity to live in the White House, to do, because it gives America's children a chance to come here and be a part of this. I hope you have a wonderful, wonderful day.

And I think it is time to start. So I want Bernie to come up here and blow the whistle to start the Egg Roll. He has been doing this every year for a few years—[*laughter*]—and we are honored to have him again. He is as much an institution of this Egg Roll as anything else we do. So let's give him a big hand and let's begin. Bernie Fairbanks, come on.

All right, we've got one track here and one track here. And I'm going to blow the whistle, and both of you start at the same time, okay? All right, one, two, three.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:50 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks on Signing the Line Item Veto Act and an Exchange With Reporters

April 9, 1996

The President. Good morning. I want to welcome Senator Nickles and Congressmen Cardin, Spratt, Goss, and Solomon here; Governor Romer; Ed Lupberger, the chairman of the

United States Chamber of Commerce; Marne Obernauer, the vice chairman of the American Business Conference; David Keating, the CEO of the National Taxpayers Union; Al From, from the Democratic Leadership Council; and Fred Greenstein, a distinguished Presidential historian from Princeton who has also supported the bill I am signing today.

It gives me great pleasure today to sign into law the line item veto. This is a bipartisan achievement that has been long sought by Presidents, long supported by Members of Congress and by Governors. It will help us to cut waste and to balance the budget.

For years, Presidents of both parties have pounded this very desk in frustration at having to sign necessary legislation that contained special interest boondoggles, tax loopholes, and pure pork. The line item veto will give us a chance to change that, to permit Presidents to better represent the public interest by cutting waste, protecting taxpayers, and balancing the budget.

We all know that this is needed because too often, as vital bills move through Congress, they can become clogged with items that would never pass on their own. Presidents often have no choice but to sign these bills because of their main purpose. This new law will give the President the power to cancel specific spending items and specific tax loopholes that benefit special interests. These proposals can then be debated and subject to an open vote on the floor of Congress. A fresh air of public accountability will blow through the Federal budget.

This law gives the President tools to cut wasteful spending, and even more important, it empowers our citizens, for the exercise of this veto or even the possibility of its exercise will throw a spotlight of public scrutiny onto the darkest corners of the Federal budget.

I have advocated the line item veto for a long time. When I was Governor, I used it, and it helped us to balance 12 budgets in a row. Forty-three of our fifty Governors have the line item veto. Governor Romer is with us because so many of the Nation's Governors have supported this measure for so long. The line item veto will help us to bring common sense to our Nation's Capital, just as it has to State capitals all across America.

Let me say, I am particularly pleased that this measure received support from both parties, working together for the public good. That's the way we should meet all of our challenges in America, and it's the only way we can balance the budget in the right way.

I am very proud that we have cut the deficit in half since I took office. The line item veto will help the President cut the budget deficit even further. But we have to pass a 7-year balanced budget and to do it in a way that reflects our fundamental values. The Congress and the executive branch have now identified over $700 billion of savings common to both plans. That is more than enough to balance the budget and have a modest tax cut.

So I hope that we can do what we did with the line item veto: work together and pass a good balanced budget plan. That will bring these interest rates down; it will reassure the financial markets; and it will keep economic growth going in the United States.

Let me say in closing before I sign the bill that it is customary for a President to give the pens he uses to sign a bill into law to those who did the most for its passage. So I am honored today to send the very first four pens that are used here to the former Presidents who also made the line item veto their cause, President Reagan and President Ford, President Carter, President Bush. I thank them, and our country thanks them. Their successors will be able to use this power that they long sought to eliminate waste from the Federal budget, to advance our values and protect our priorities as we move into the 21st century.

Thank you.

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

Separation of Powers Doctrine

Q. Doesn't this transcend the Founding Fathers' separation of powers and give the President too much power?

The President. I don't think so. We've worked hard to—we anticipate that it will be challenged. We've worked hard to provide for a means for it to be resolved quickly. But this leaves ultimate hands in the authority of the Congress. They can take all these separate issues back and vote on them separately. And I think all of us believe that as long as that is done, that we don't violate the constitutional separation of powers doctrine.

And the constitutions of our various States are modeled pretty closely on the Federal Constitution. They all have separation of powers

doctrines, and the Governors have had this authority in almost all the States and have used it well and without any upsetting of the constitutional framework.

As long as the practical impact of this is to force these matters to be considered separately, I don't think there's any question that it's not a violation of the separation of powers. Now of course, others in authority and the judicial branch will have their opportunity to say differently, but I believe it will be upheld.

Liberia

Q. Mr. President, what's the latest word you have on the situation in Liberia? And will you be forced to order Americans evacuated from Liberia?

The President. Well, let me say, first of all, since the—for the last several days we've been keeping very close watch on it. We have a number of Americans there in Monrovia, and we have put in place the pieces necessary to do everything possible to assure their safety. And we're watching it very closely. We have not made a decision from here. I'm not sure we should make a decision from here on their evacuation. We're working with the Embassy, and we're being guided in significant measure by what they know to be the facts on the ground there. But we have tried to put in place backup measures which would permit us to protect the Americans as quickly as possible, should that become necessary.

Q. Have you received any assurances on their safety?

The President. Well, we've done the best we could. You know, it's hard for anybody to assure their safety in the sense that conflict is going on in the capital. But we believe that we've made the right decision so far with regard to their situation, and we're watching it very closely.

Line Item Veto

Q. Mr. President, the critics of the line item veto have said that it will allow a President to wheel and deal with a Senator or a Congressman or a group of Senators or Congressmen and to threaten them with this power. What could you say—not to question your integrity or whatever—what would you say to the American people that you would not and your successors would not abuse this power?

The President. Well, first of all, every power given to the Congress or to the President or to the courts is, I suppose, susceptible of some abuse, and we have a system of checks and balances there. My argument is, number one, there's obviously some negotiations that go on over legislation all the time now—and almost always, by the way, fully reported by you in the press, whether we like it or not. [*Laughter*]

Number two, keep in mind, the protection—the protection the Members have is that if the President goes overboard and says, "If you don't vote for me on some other bill, or this bill, I'm not going to allow your project in here"—if the President started doing that, and it was unrelated to the real merits of the underlying spending provision, then I believe the Congress would respond by passing these bills separately.

Keep in mind the ultimate protection the Congress has: If the President abuses his authority, the ultimate protection the Congress has is the clear ability to have these bills voted on separately and publicly. And then the President's veto gets singled out. The President could veto that spending bill again, too. Then the President would be ultimately held accountable by the people, through the reporting of the process in the press.

And let me also say that I found—you know, I was a Governor for quite a long time before I came here, and what I found was—and I'm sure Governor Romer could corroborate this—is that once this mechanism is in place and people understand that the Executive is prepared to use it, it becomes necessary to use it less, that its main benefit after a few years is that it exists in reserve, because it changes the whole shape of the budget negotiations and makes these bills less subject to this sort of catch-all spending.

Now, it will take some years, perhaps, for that to happen here, but we are doing this for the long run. None of us who have supported this—and I'm sure the representatives from the business groups, the taxpayers unions, and others would say the same thing—none of us have ever pretended that this was some sort of miraculous cure-all. But we believe it will put discipline into this budget, and it will really help over the long run to give the American people a kind of budgeting process they need, as well as reducing waste and helping to move the budget into balance.

Thank you.

Q. Are you sure you will be using it next year?

The President. Well, that's up to the bosses out there. But I'll tell you this, I was more than happy—the majority in the Congress wanted to wait until January to put it in, for their own reasons, and when I was asked about it, without a moment's hesitation, I said yes. That was a reasonable compromise for me.

I think this is so important that we shouldn't—if they want to take it out of the context of this year's elections and the fall's budget negotiations, I think it is so important to get into the law for the long run it was fine with me. I was very happy to do that. I don't have any problem with it. We did it. It's the right thing to do, and it's been done, and we did it together, and that's the way we ought to do more things.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado. S. 4, approved April 9, was assigned Public Law No. 104–130.

Statement on Signing the Line Item Veto Act

April 9, 1996

Today I am very pleased to sign into law S. 4, the Line Item Veto Act.

This new law shows what we can achieve when we put our partisan differences aside and work together for the Nation. Members of both parties have fought for this legislation because they believed that no matter which party has control of the White House or the Congress, the line item veto would be good for the country.

I have consistently supported a Presidential line item veto as a Governor, as a candidate for President in 1992, and as President the last 3 years.

Starting with Ulysses S. Grant, Presidents of both parties have sought the line item veto so they could eliminate waste in the Federal budget. Most recently, Presidents Reagan and Bush called for its passage, as did many Members of Congress.

With this authority, Presidents will have a valuable new tool to ensure that the Federal Government is spending public resources as wisely as possible. It will permit the President to cancel discretionary spending, new entitlement authority, and tax provisions that benefit special interests at the expense of the public interest.

This carefully defined authority is also a practical and principled means of serving the constitutional balance of powers. The modern congressional practice of presenting the President with omnibus legislation reduces the President's ability to play the role in enacting laws that the Constitution intended. This new authority brings us closer to the Founders' view of an effective executive role in the legislative process. The President will be able to prevent the Congress from enacting special interest provisions under the cloak of a 500- or 1,000-page bill. Special interest provisions that do not serve the national interest will no longer escape proper scrutiny.

No one, of course, believes the line item veto is a cure-all for the budget deficit. Indeed, even without the line item veto, we are already cutting the deficit in half—as I had promised to do when I ran for President. But the line item veto will provide added discipline by ensuring that as tight budgets increasingly squeeze our resources, we will put our public funds to the best possible uses.

I call on the leaders of the Congress, in the spirit of bipartisanship reflected in today's bill signing, to join me in continuing to make progress. We should move ahead by reaching an agreement to balance the budget by 2002.

Over the last several months, I have worked closely with congressional leaders to reach such an agreement. In fact, we have about $700 billion in common savings. We should finish our work this year.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 9, 1996.

NOTE: S. 4, approved April 9, was assigned Public Law No. 104–130.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Konstandinos Simitis of Greece and an Exchange With Reporters

April 9, 1996

President Clinton. Let me say it's a great honor for me to welcome Prime Minister Simitis here, along with his party. Greece has been a long and strong ally of the United States, and I'm looking forward to discussing a number of issues, including how we can be helpful in resolving some of the difficulties in the Aegean.

Let me say, first of all, that I think all these issues should be resolved without the use of force or the threat of force, with both parties agreeing to abide by international agreements and with a mutual respect for territorial integrity. With regard to the Imia question, the United States has already said we believe it should be submitted to the International Court of Justice or some other international arbitration forum.

I also want to thank Greece for its leadership in trying to resolve the problems in the future of the Balkans in a positive way. Greece is participating in IFOR and is working with the challenges presented in Albania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, in a number of other ways.

And finally, I hope we have a chance to talk about Cyprus a little bit. This has been an area of intense interest for me since I became President, and I hope that we can do more in that area to help that situation to be resolved.

Iranian Arms Shipments to Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned about the investigation of Iranian arms shipments to Bosnia during the war?

President Clinton. No.

Q. Did you allow it to happen?

President Clinton. Our record on that is clear. Mr. Lake has talked about it. There was absolutely nothing improper done.

Q. You know, Bob Dole supported lifting the arms embargo, and now he is talking about possible investigation of the flow of arms. What do you think is going on there, Mr. President?

President Clinton. He also took the position that we had the right to unilaterally lift it.

Q. What do you think his motives are though?

President Clinton. You all can comment on what is going on. I'm just going to try to do my job.

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

Discussions With Prime Minister Simitis

President Clinton. Hello. Is everyone in? Let me say, first of all, it's a great honor for me, on behalf of the United States, to welcome Prime Minister Simitis here. I have already had the opportunity to thank him for the wonderful welcome that my wife and daughter received from the government and from the people of Greece recently. We have a number of things to discuss. I hope the United States can be helpful in resolving some of the problems in the Aegean.

At the outset, let me say, we believe that all these issues should be solved without the use of force, without the threat of force, with everyone agreeing to abide by international agreements and to respect the territorial integrity of other countries. With regard to the Imia situation, the United States has long said that we favor the resolution by referring the matter to the International Court of Justice or some other international arbitration panel, and we feel very strongly that these things have to be resolved.

I want to have an opportunity to thank the Prime Minister for the leadership that Greece has shown in resolving problems in the Balkans, involving Albania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and participating in IFOR in Bosnia. And I think that the future of the Balkans as a secure and peaceful and hopefully more democratic place requires the leadership of Greece. And so I'm looking forward to that.

And finally, I hope we have a chance to talk a little bit about Cyprus. Cyprus has been an area of special interest to me since I became President. I spent an awful lot of personal time on it, and we intend to explore this year whether there is something else we can do to help resolve that matter, because I believe that if that could be resolved, then that would open the way for a whole new future for the region and great new possibilities for all of its people.

Greece-Turkey Relations

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us what role the U.S. would play in Greek-Turkish relations, and what is the U.S. position on the sovereignty issue of the Imia islet?

President Clinton. Well, I just said I think it ought to be decided by the International Court of Justice. I think the United States—since we have been—this is a delicate thing. We hardly have had a longer and stronger ally than Greece in the United States, and we have had—we obviously have worked with the Turks and have had good relationships with them. And the differences between Greece and Turkey are a source of great concern to us.

But we believe they can be worked out if there is adherence to international agreements, nobody uses force or threatens to use force, and there is a genuine respect for territorial integrity and an understanding that if you look—if you try to imagine what the future will look like 10, 15, 20 years from now, and what the probable challenges to the freedom and the prosperity of the people of Greece are, and the people of the United States, from around the world, obviously, that future would be much more secure if the differences between Greece and Turkey could be resolved.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—and what did he say?

President Clinton. I said the same thing to him I'm saying to you. I find in this world, you know, since we have a global press, you have to say the same thing to everyone. [*Laughter*] So I said exactly the same thing to him I said to you.

Q. Do you see a specific role of Greece in the Balkans?

Prime Minister Simitis. Can I say a few words?

President Clinton. Sure, it's your press.

Prime Minister Simitis. It's very important for us to be here and to discuss matters of common interest with President Clinton. Greece aims on the one hand to improve the bilateral relations with the United States; on the other hand, we want to promote stability, peace, and prosperity in our part of the world, the European Union, the Balkans, and the Eastern Mediterranean. In order to achieve these targets, we want to discuss matters as European integration, cooperation with Balkan countries, our relations with our neighbors in Turkey, and the Cyprus issue.

As far as the relations with our neighbors are concerned, we think that certain principles must be applied. The first principle is that no one can use force or use the threat of force. The international treaties and international law must be applied. And finally, the resolution of disputes must be realized with the help of the International Court of Justice.

I hope that with these discussions, and I'm sure—there will be progress in these matters, and we will have in this part of the world a new development that is positive for stability and peace.

Q. Sir, is there a specific initiative that you will undertake to de-escalate tension?

President Clinton. I have already told you what my position is. I want to have a chance to meet with the Prime Minister, and we will be talking more later.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:12 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Signing Legislation Waiving Certain Enrollment Requirements
April 9, 1996

Today I have signed into law H.J. Res. 168, which waives the printing requirements of sections 106 and 107 of title 1 of the United States Code with respect to H.R. 3019 and H.R. 3136. I do so to avoid any confusion as to my ability to act on any form of that legislation presented to me after certification by the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives that the form is a true enrollment. In signing the resolution, I express no view as to whether it is necessary to waive the provisions of title 1 before I exercise my prerogatives under Article I, section 7, of the Constitution where the Congress has presented to me any form of bill it considers to be a true enrollment.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 9, 1996.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 168, approved April 9, was assigned Public Law No. 104–129.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report on the Intelligence Community Budget
April 9, 1996

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with section 311(b) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, I transmit herewith the Report on Executive Branch Oversight of the Intelligence Community Budget. This report describes actions taken: (1) to improve budget formulation and execution for national intelligence agencies, (2) to establish more effective financial management throughout the intelligence community, with particular emphasis on the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), and (3) to reduce the forward funding balances of the NRO.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Larry Combest, chairman, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and Arlen Specter, chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Remarks at the Funeral of Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown
April 10, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans, citizens of the world who have come here; to Alma and Tracey and Michael and Tammy; to Chip and to Ron's mother and to the other members of the family who are here: This has been a long week for all of us who loved Ron Brown, cared for his work, cherished the brilliant young people who worked with him, honored the business executives who took the mission of peace to Bosnia, and the members of our United States military who were taking them on that mission.

But this has been the longest week for the Brown family. You have grieved and wept. You have comforted others whose loved ones were lost. You have remembered and smiled, and last evening you got to celebrate and laugh at the life that you shared, each in your own way, with Ron.

I begin by saying to all of you, on behalf of all of us, we thank you for the strength you

have given to others even as you have borne your own grief, for we can see Ron in your eyes and hear him in your voices and feel his strength in yours. Indeed, I was confident, as I heard Michael speak, that from heaven Ron had written the words. So today and in all of our tomorrows, as we remember and love him, we will remember and love you. We hope on this day amidst all the grief you will also feel gratitude for his magnificent life, determination to carry on his legacy and keep it alive, and the peace of God which takes us to a place beyond all our understanding.

The Bible tells us, "though we weep through the night, joy will come in the morning." Ron Brown's incredible life force brought us all joy in the morning. No dark night could ever defeat him. And as we remember him, may we always be able to recover his joy. For this man loved life and all the things in it. He loved the big things: his family, his friends, his country, his work, his African-American heritage. He loved the difference he was making in the world, this new and exciting world after the cold war.

And he loved life's little things: the Redskins and basketball and golf, even when it was bad, and McDonald's and clothes. And I'm telling you, folks, he would have loved this deal today. I mean, here we are for Ron Brown in the National Cathedral with full military honors, filled with the distinguished citizenry of this country and leaders from around the world in a tribute to him. And as I look around, I see that all of us are dressed almost as well as he would be today. [*Laughter*]

But let us remember also that he loved success, but not so much he wanted to succeed at the wrong things or in the wrong way. And he always remembered that worldly success doesn't take us too very far from all the rest of our fellow human beings who don't enjoy as much of it. That accounts for why he was always so kind to people without regard to their station in life.

Ron Brown enjoyed a lot of success. He proved you could do well and do good. He also proved you could do good and have a good time. And he also proved that you could do all that and, at the same time, still take time to help other people.

With his passion and determination, his loves and his joys, his going beyond the stereotypes of his time, he lived a truly American life. He lived his life for America, and when the time came, he was found laying down his life for America.

What a life it was, with his remarkable enthusiasm that infected everything he did. As long as I live I will remember the time Ron Brown and I were walking the streets of the neighborhood in Los Angeles, and we went to this sporting goods store that had been owned by some people who were trying to help young folks stay out of gangs. And in the back of the sporting goods store, there was a basketball court. And all these little kids had gathered around, and they asked Ron and they asked me if we would like to play basketball. So we divided up sides. He took a few kids. I took a few kids. All of a sudden he forgot who was President and how he got his day job. [*Laughter*] He was totally caught up in the drama of the game. This was an important trip we took, but afterward, whenever anyone asked him about that trip, all he could remember to say was, "The President was in my face from 20 feet out, but when I shot, nothing but net." [*Laughter*]

Ron Brown was very clever. Even as a young boy at the Hotel Teresa, "Little Brown," as Joe Louis called him, was always trying to think of what else could be done. He met all kinds of celebrities, as has been widely chronicled, men like Louis Armstrong and Sugar Ray Robinson and women like Lena Horne and Dinah Washington. And he did what most kids do, even today, he got their autographs. But unlike most kids, he sold them to his friends. [*Laughter*] According to Michael, he sold two to a page, five bucks a pop, until Joe Louis found out and shut down his act. [*Laughter*] But it was too late. He was well on his way to becoming the Secretary of Commerce. [*Laughter*]

He was daring. We all know that. He was daring when he announced he wanted to be the chairman of the Democratic Party, after we had lost three Presidential elections. And no one thought he had a chance to win. Then when he won, he announced that in 1992 the world's oldest political party would win the White House again. And nobody thought he was right, including the Governor of a small Southern State. [*Laughter*] But as with so many other things, he was right, and the rest of us were wrong.

On a personal note, I want to say to my friend just one last time: Thank you; if it weren't for you, I wouldn't be here.

Ron Brown was a true leader, and he knew that in his mind that meant you could never show doubt, even if you had to kind of make it up as you went along. I later learned this story about his acceptance of the job I offered him. I sent for Ron. He came to see me, and I said, "You know, this is a big, new world out there, and you ought to be Secretary of Commerce. You could change the future of America and millions of other people around the world. You could make a real difference." And he said, "That sounds good. I want to think about it." I later learned that he walked out and went to see our mutual friend Harold Ickes and said, "Harold, what does the Secretary of Commerce do?" [*Laughter*]

By the time he arrived, he knew. He knew better than anyone else. He came on like a force of nature. Yesterday I received a letter from one of the many business executives that Ron Brown helped to open new markets around the world. He's on our Export Council, and he said in this letter, "You know, Mr. President, Ron Brown really is the finest Secretary of Commerce the United States ever had."

He also remembered what it was he was leaning toward. Ron Brown made his staff memorize a one-sentence mission statement about their job at Commerce. Here it is: The mission of the Department of Commerce is to ensure economic opportunity for every American.

That was Ron. He wanted to give other people a chance to live a good life and live the American dream. He wanted to do it in a way that helped people around the world to lift their aspirations. He went after it with everything he had. He used to say to me, "If what we have to do means getting the government out of the way, let's lead the charge. And if what we have to do means working together to find some new solution, let's lead the charge. But let's get it done. Let's fulfill the mission."

He also never forgot that there are always some people who are left behind. I want to tell you this story because to me it captures so much the essence of what made him very special. When we first came into office we only had about a month to put our first budget together. And we knew we had to do some pretty tough things to get the deficit way down. Day after day, the Cabinet would gather in the Roosevelt Room; Ron was always there. And on one of those days, we talked about the need not only to cut the budget but to do some really symbolic things that would show the American people we were different and we stood for the right things. And we were all, frankly, being just a little sanctimonious in looking for symbolic gestures.

And so we were talking about the need to cut the perks that had previously been provided to top officials, things like chefs in the Secretary's dining room and chauffeurs for a lot of higher ranking officials. And we talked about them, frankly, all of us, nonchalantly and fairly sanctimoniously until Ron turned to me and said, "You know, these cuts are the right thing to do, Mr. President. It is the right thing to do. But I'd just like to remind people that there are real human beings in those jobs as chefs and chauffeurs. A lot of those folks are my age. Many are black men. Most of them never had the opportunities you and I did. So let's go on and do the right things and make the cuts. But let's not forget about those people, and let's try to help them go on with their lives in dignity."

No one else said that but Ron Brown. He could see where we had to go. He knew it was the right thing to do. But he had enough peripheral vision to know how other people were being affected.

That last thing I'd like to say about his remarkable public life is that while he was often determined to be first, he was equally determined that he would never be the last. And so he exerted more extraordinary effort than virtually anybody I've ever known to develop the talents of other people, to reach out to the young, to give them a chance to serve. How much of the weeping we have done this last week because there were so many brilliant young people on that plane with him from different backgrounds and different racial groups. Why? Because Ron Brown could see in them the promise of a new tomorrow, and he knew they needed someone to reach down and give them the opportunity to serve.

And I hope that is something that none of us will ever forget. For his legacy burns brightly not only in the lives of his wife and children and other family members but also all of those brilliant young men and women, many of whom are with us today, who walked through the doors that he opened and crossed over the bridges that he built.

I received a lot of letters and calls, like many of you have, since Ron died. I got this letter

from Michael Armstrong, the chairman of Hughes Electronics, who was one of the people Ron worked with. And I wanted to read this to you, because so often we think Government operates in a vacuum. Listen to this:

"While the demands of business, the pressures of the Commerce Department, and the politics of Washington can often mask the spirit and character of the dedicated people who try so hard to make a difference for America, the business at hand, the pressures on the Department, and the politics of the moment never dimmed the smile, the energy, the commitment, and the leadership of the man who made such a big difference in the direction and destiny of our country. He led his party to the Presidency. He led the Commerce Department with imagination and distinction. He led American business to new global opportunity. He led his race as an unassuming but forceful role model. He led us all in being what he believed in. He was truly a leader."

Ron Brown: a trailblazer, a builder, a patriot; a husband, a father, a wonderful friend, and a great American.

Let us remember these things about Ron. Let us always have our joy in the morning. Let us be determined to carry on his legacy. Let us always be vigilant, as he was, in fighting against any shred of racism and prejudice. Let us always be vigilant, as he was, in remembering that we cannot lift ourselves up by tearing other people down, that we have to go forward together. Let us always remember, as he did, that Alexis de Tocqueville was right when he said so many years ago, America is great because America is good. He knew we had to keep working and striving to be better.

In his last sermon from the pulpit, Martin Luther King asked God to grant us all a chance to be participants in the newness and magnificent development of America. That is the cause for which Ron Brown gave his life and the cause for which he gave up his life.

In his letter to the Galatians, St. Paul said, "Let us not grow weary in doing good. For in due season we shall reap if we do not lose heart." Our friend never grew weary; he never lost heart. He did so much good, and he is now reaping his reward. He left us sooner than we wanted him to leave, but what a legacy of love and life he left behind.

Now he's in a place where he doesn't even have to worry about how good he looks. He always will look good. He's in a place where there's always joy in the morning. He's in a place where every good quality he ever had has been rendered perfect. He's in a place he deserves to be because of the way he lived and what he left to those of us who loved him.

Let there always be joy in the morning for Ron Brown. Amen.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:43 p.m. in the sanctuary at the National Cathedral.

Remarks on Vetoing Partial Birth Abortion Legislation

April 10, 1996

The President. Good afternoon, I have just met with five courageous women and their families, and I want to thank the Lines, the Stellas, the Watts, the Costellos, and the Ades all for meeting with me. They had to make a potentially life-saving, certainly health-saving, but still tragic decision to have the kind of abortion procedure that would be banned by H.R. 1833.

They represent a small but extremely vulnerable group of women and families in this country, just a few hundred a year. Believe it or not, they represent different religious faiths, different political parties, different views on the question of abortion. They just have one thing in common: They all desperately wanted their children. They didn't want abortions. They made agonizing decisions only when it became clear that their babies would not survive, their own lives, their health, and in some cases their capacity to have children in the future were in danger.

No one can tell the story better than them, and I want to call on one of them. But before I do, I want to say that this country is deeply indebted to them for being willing to speak out and to talk about the real facts, not the emo-

tional arguments that, unfortunately, carried the day on this case.

So I'd like to ask Mary-Dorothy Line to come up here and introduce herself and say whatever she'd like to say about why we're all here today.

[*Mary-Dorothy Line described the circumstances and complications of her pregnancy which made the procedure medically necessary, saying that while she hoped that the same thing would not happen to anyone else, a safe medical option was needed. She thanked the President for understanding that the issue was women's health, not abortion, and for vetoing the legislation.*]

The President. Thank you.

I'd like to ask Coreen Costello to come up and speak a little bit about her experience.

[*Coreen Costello described the circumstances and complications of her pregnancy which made the procedure medically necessary. She stressed that it was not about choice but was a medical issue, and said that she was grateful that the President had listened to her family's story.*]

The President. Thank you.

I would also like to thank Jim and their children, and William.

Would you tell them what you told me in the office? Can you do it? This is Tammy Watts.

[*Tammy Watts said that she had the same tragic story and that while there was nothing that could have cured her daughter, she was grateful that her doctors were able to perform the safe medical procedure to preserve her own health.*]

The President. Thank you, Mitchell—and those are the prints of your baby, right?

[*Ms. Watts showed the President her daughter's handprints and footprints.*]

The President. Vikki, do you want to say anything?

[*Vikki Stella described the circumstances and complications of her pregnancy which made the procedure medically necessary, concluding that it was God who had made the decision for her child to die.*]

The President. Thank you. And you have a baby here.

Mrs. Stella. Yes, I have a little boy here.

The President. You have a 3-month-old little boy here.

Mrs. Stella. Nicholas.

The President. Claudia, would you like to talk?

[*Claudia Ades described the circumstances and complications of her pregnancy which made the procedure medically necessary. She said that all women deserved the finest medical care and thanked the President for taking that responsibility.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

Thank you. Thank you, Richard. Thank you, Mitchell.

Ladies and gentlemen, I asked these families to come here today to make a point that I think every American needs to understand about this bill. This is not about the pro-choice/pro-life debate. This is not a bill that ever should have been injected into that.

This terrible problem affects a few hundred Americans every year who desperately want their children, are trying to build families, and are trying to strengthen their families. And they should not become pawns in a larger debate, even though it is a serious and legitimate debate of profound significance.

I hope that we can continue to reduce the number of abortions in America. When I was Governor I signed a bill to restrict late-term abortions, consistent with the Supreme Court decision of *Roe* v. *Wade,* only cases where the life or health of the mother is at risk. When I asked the supporters of the bill here to try to take account of this, they said, "Well, if we have a health exception you know you could—the doctor and the mother could say anything—they can't fit in their prom dress, that's a health exception—some terrible things like that."

And I said, "No, no, no, I will accept language that says serious adverse health consequences to the mother—those three words. Everyone in the world will know what we're talking about. We're talking about these families." I implored them. I said, "If you want to pass something on this procedure, let's make an exception for life and serious adverse health consequences so that we don't put these women in a position and these families in a position where they will lose all possibility of future childbearing, or where the doctor can't say that they might die, but they could clearly be substantially injured forever."

And my pleas fell on deaf ears. The emotional power of the description of the procedure—which I might add did not cover the procedure these women had and did not cover all the procedures banned by the law—but the emo-

tional power was so great that my plea just to take a decent account of these hundreds of families every year that are in this position fell on deaf ears. And therefore, I had no choice but to veto the bill. I vetoed it just a few minutes ago before I met with these families.

I will say again, if the Congress really wants to act out of a sincere concern that some of these things are done, which are wrong, in casual ways, then if they will meet my standards to protect these families, they could pass a bill that I would sign tomorrow.

But these people have no business being made into political pawns. As I said, and as they said, they never had a choice. This affects staunchly pro-life families as well as people that are pro-choice. They never had a choice. And I cannot in good conscience see their lives damaged and their potential to build good, strong families damaged.

We need more families in America like these folks. We need more parents in America like these folks. They are what America needs more of. And just because they happen to be in a tiny minority to bear a unique burden that God imposes on just a few people every year, we can't forget our obligation to protect their lives, their children, and their families' future.

That is what this veto is all about. And let me say again how profoundly grateful I am to them for coming here today and having the courage to tell their stories to the American people.

Thank you. Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:22 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Message to the House of Representatives Returning Without Approval Partial Birth Abortion Legislation

April 10, 1996

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1833, which would prohibit doctors from performing a certain kind of abortion. I do so because the bill does not allow women to protect themselves from serious threats to their health. By refusing to permit women, in reliance on their doctors' best medical judgment, to use this procedure when their lives are threatened *or* when their health is put in serious jeopardy, the Congress has fashioned a bill that is consistent neither with the Constitution nor with sound public policy.

I have always believed that the decision to have an abortion generally should be between a woman, her doctor, her conscience, and her God. I support the decision in *Roe* v. *Wade* protecting a woman's right to choose, and I believe that the abortions protected by that decision should be safe and rare. Consistent with that decision, I have long opposed late-term abortions except where necessary to protect the life or health of the mother. In fact, as Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health.

The procedure described in H.R. 1833 has troubled me deeply, as it has many people. I cannot support use of that procedure on an elective basis, where the abortion is being performed for non-health related reasons and there are equally safe medical procedures available.

There are, however, rare and tragic situations that can occur in a woman's pregnancy in which, in a doctor's medical judgment, the use of this procedure may be necessary to save a woman's life or to protect her against serious injury to her health. In these situations, in which a woman and her family must make an awful choice, the Constitution requires, as it should, that the ability to choose this procedure be protected.

In the past several months, I have heard from women who desperately wanted to have their babies, who were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions and would not live, who wanted anything other than an abortion, but who were advised by their doctors that this procedure was their best chance to avert the risk of death or grave harm which, in some cases, would have included an inability to ever bear children again. For these women, this was

not about choice—not about deciding against having a child. These babies were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth, and the only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

I cannot sign H.R. 1833, as passed, because it fails to protect women in such dire circumstances—because by treating doctors who perform the procedure in these tragic cases as criminals, the bill poses a danger of serious harm to women. This bill, in curtailing the ability of women and their doctors to choose the procedure for sound medical reasons, violates the constitutional command that any law regulating abortion protect both the life and the health of the woman. The bill's overbroad criminal prohibition risks that women will suffer serious injury.

That is why I implored Congress to add an exemption for the small number of compelling cases where selection of the procedure, in the medical judgment of the attending physician, was necessary to preserve the life of the woman or avert serious adverse consequences to her health. The life exception in the current bill only covers cases where the doctor believes that the woman will die. It fails to cover cases where, absent the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I told Congress that I would sign H.R. 1833 if it were amended to add an exception for serious health consequences. A bill amended in this way would strike a proper balance, remedying the constitutional and human defect of H.R. 1833. If such a bill were presented to me, I would sign it now.

I understand the desire to eliminate the use of a procedure that appears inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be even more inhumane.

The Congress chose not to adopt the sensible and constitutionally appropriate proposal I made, instead leaving women unprotected against serious health risks. As a result of this Congressional indifference to women's health, I cannot, in good conscience and consistent with my responsibility to uphold the law, sign this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 10, 1996.

Letter to Joseph Cardinal Bernardin on Partial Birth Abortion Legislation
April 10, 1996

Dear Cardinal Bernardin:

I want to thank you for your letter on H.R. 1833. I appreciate and considered the strong moral convictions you expressed.

This is a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I have studied and prayed about for many months. I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except where necessary to protect the life or health of the mother. As Governor of Arkansas, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health, and I would sign such a bill now if it were presented to me.

Indeed, when I first heard the procedure referred to in H.R. 1833 described, I thought I would support the bill. But as I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to understand that this is a rarely used procedure, justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious health consequences to her.

In the past months, I have learned of several cases of women who desperately wanted to have their babies, who were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions and would not live, who wanted anything other than an abortion, but who were advised by their doctors that this procedure was their best chance to avert the risk of death or grave harm which, in some cases, would have included an inability to ever bear children again. For these women, this was not about choice. This was not about having a headache or fitting into a prom dress, as some have regrettably suggested. This was not about choosing against having a child. These babies

were certain to perish before, during or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage was going to be done to the woman.

In short, I do not support the use of this procedure on an elective basis where it is not necessary to save the life of the woman or prevent serious risks to her health.

That is why I implored Congress to add a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of the procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. The life exception in the current bill fails to cover cases where the doctor believes not that the mother's death is probable, but rather that, without the procedure, serious physical harm, often including losing the ability to have more children, is very likely to occur. I want to say again that if Congress will amend the bill as I have suggested, remedying its constitutional and human defect, I will sign the bill.

Again, I thank you for your concern. These are painful and sobering issues. I understand your desire to eliminate the use of a procedure you see as inhumane. But to eliminate it without taking into consideration the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary would be, in my judgment, even more inhumane.

Although I know you disagree with me on this matter, I hope we can continue our dialogue and continue to work together on the broad array of issues on which we do agree. I need your help and your insight.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: The letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 10, but was not issued as a White House press release.

Remarks Announcing Proposed Retirement Savings and Security Legislation

April 11, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you, Shawn and Secretary Rubin. Secretary Bentsen, it's nice to have you back in the Rose Garden; to all the business people here; the representatives of working people who are here; and to all the members of the administration who are here who worked on this project—I thank not only those who are here on the platform with me but those who are in the audience, especially Marty Slate at the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

This is a very important day today. There are an awful lot of small-business owners, like Shawn, who are trying to do well not only for their companies but by their employees. We want to help them to give retirement opportunity and security to their workers. There are an awful lot of working people out there today who are afraid that if anything happens to the job they're in now, that they'll also lose the opportunity for a secure retirement. And we want them and their families to have the opportunity of that security when they're out there working hard and doing the best they can.

I have said many times that we are living in an age of remarkable possibility where more Americans than ever before will have the opportunity to live out their dreams. But we also have significant challenges, and one of those great challenges is to help in this incredibly dynamic economy, so dominated by rapid changes of information and technology, so subject to global markets, which is basically a positive thing—I was so happy to hear Shawn say that the product that his company makes might be used to install on mass transportation to protect people from terrorist attacks; that alone would be one of the most significant advances we've seen in this country in many years. But we have to find a way to keep the dynamism of this global economy going and still allow people who are working in it in good faith to achieve a measure of security for themselves, their families, and their children.

This problem is similar to the problems that people faced a century ago when our grandparents moved from the farm to the factory and from the country to the city. There were

vast new opportunities, but also so much disruption there was a lot of insecurity. And over time, our country found ways to build mechanisms of security and stability into the lives of working families, which enabled our economy to continue to grow into the world's strongest but enabled all Americans who are working to benefit from it and to stabilize their lives, their family's lives, and in the process, their communities' lives.

That is the challenge we face today. When I took office, the economy was drifting; unemployment was high; the few new jobs we were getting were in lower wage industries overwhelmingly; the deficit was skyrocketing. Our economic team that is here with me today determined that we would do something about that. We had two central commitments: first, that we had to cut the deficit in half over 4 years, and second, that if we did it right and we got interest rates down, we continued to invest in education and technology and to aggressively open markets for American products, we could also see 8 million new jobs coming into our economy.

Well, those promises have been kept. That deficit will be cut by more than 50 percent by the end of this fiscal year, and we already have 8.5 million new jobs in this economy. And I am proud of that. To give you some idea of the dimensions of that achievement, of the Big Seven economies in the G–7, America's 8.5 million new jobs are more than 8 million more than the combined new job totals of the other six countries in this very competitive global economy.

Nonetheless, we see the paradox of the moment because, day after day after day, we read about how people feel uncertain and insecure in a new world in which America's unemployment rate today is a full point lower than the average unemployment rate of the last 25 years. And that is because of all the dynamism and the new rules of the economy.

So the challenge now is: How do we keep the dynamism going? How do we keep the new jobs coming in? How do we keep the deficit coming down until we balance the budget, and still provide those mechanisms which will allow our people in this new age to do what we had to figure out how to do 100 years ago: to take advantage of all these new opportunities but to still be able to compose a good life for themselves and their families, their children, and their communities.

It is clear that there are at least three things we have to do. Working families have to have lifetime access to education and training, lifetime access to affordable health care, and they have to have the ability to build a pension throughout a lifetime no matter where they work or whether they change jobs.

So we have proposed a "GI bill" for America's workers so that if whenever people lose their jobs, they can immediately get a voucher that will cover their training costs for up to 2 years. We have proposed to make the cost of college tuition tax deductible. I have called on the Congress to pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, which is an important first step in guaranteeing access to affordable health care. The bill says you can't lose your health insurance when you change jobs or if someone in your family gets sick, and I hope and pray that that bill will be coming to my desk in the fairly near future.

Today I am urging Congress to pass this legislation we are proposing on retirement security so that people can build retirement throughout their careers.

As Secretary Bentsen said, in the last 3 years we have done a lot to protect American pensions and to expand opportunities to save for retirement. But there is so much more we have to do. Millions of Americans are not saving enough for their retirement. Often they have no choice. They either have a job where there's no retirement plan, or they have to change jobs. They aren't eligible for savings plans. Their employer doesn't offer the pension plan, or sometimes, even if they had one, the employer goes out of business before a plan can vest.

All these people may work as hard as they can. They may be doing all the right things. But they still have to worry about what will happen when their work is done, and they don't have the options that Secretary Rubin talked about, to put their savings into a retirement account that could be withdrawn from, tax-free, if there's a family emergency, if it's necessary for the health of a parent or the health of a child, or if they want to buy a first home or finance a child's education.

So all these things are, I think, a part of why we can have good economic news and still have good Americans working hard, feeling uncertain about their future. That is what we're

here to do today, to try to respond to that challenge.

I have proposed legislation to help these hard-working Americans. We call it the "Retirement Savings and Security Act." It expands coverage to help 51 million working Americans who are not now covered by an employer-provided retirement plan. Very importantly, it increases portability, so workers can take their retirement savings with them and keep saving if they change jobs or lose their job and have to wait a time to find a new job. This also enhances security so that retirement savings will be there when a worker retires.

With the "Retirement Savings and Security Act," we can help to make retirement something Americans can look forward to, not dread. Where their hard-working retirement earnings are concerned, we can give Americans peace of mind. First, we ought to make it easier for small businesses like Shawn's—I might say, his is growing rather rapidly; Secretary Bentsen said he had 11 employees, Shawn said, "No, 13"—[*laughter*]—and next month there will be a couple more. We ought to make it easier for them and, indeed, for all employers to provide pensions or other retirement plans.

Right now, three-quarters of the workers in large businesses have employer-provided pensions, compared to only one-quarter of workers in small businesses. So we would establish a new kind of 401(k) plan for employees of small businesses. They could expand coverage with this provision alone by up to 10 million working Americans.

Second, we should expand IRA's. We want to double income eligibility so that 20 million more Americans earning up to $100,000 a year can take this tax deduction. This would, first, raise the savings rate in America and, second, make it possible for other family emergencies or needs to be met, for our plan would allow IRA withdrawals for education and training, first-time home purchases, major medical expenses, or during long-term unemployment.

Third, we have to make these pensions portable. This could help more than 5 million workers every single year. It means workers in new jobs will not have to wait to start saving in an employer pension plan. And we can start at home. We will start by allowing Federal workers to save from the first day on the job. People would be able to keep saving through a 401(k) plan even as they move from job to job. We will further ensure that veterans who serve their country will not risk an interruption in their pension coverage. And it will guarantee coverage and benefits for more union workers who change jobs often, like those in the construction industries.

Fourth, we must continue to enhance pension security. We build on what we have done to help secure pensions through tighter enforcement. Most employers do play by the rules, but we must ensure that no employer can easily skim from their employees' contributions. Our plan cracks down on fraud, requires broader audits, and protects workers like those whose pensions were threatened in the Orange County bankruptcy.

Finally, we should not go backward. As Secretary Rubin said, in the budget plan that I vetoed, Congress permitted $20 billion to be taken out of pension plans affecting—excuse me—in the 1980's, companies took $20 billion out of pension plans that affected something like 2½ million American workers. And in 1994 when I signed the legislation that Secretary Rubin and Secretary Bentsen referred to, we were at that time looking at the possibility that 8½ million more American workers could lose their pensions. So the '94 legislation clearly saved the pensions of 8½ million American workers and stabilized those of 40 million others.

Now, when the budget passed, part of it was giving a green light to corporations to take $15 billion more out of pension plans. One of the reasons I vetoed that budget—one of several—was that I do not believe, after all the horrible experience of the eighties and after what we went so far to do in a bipartisan fashion in 1994 to stabilize the pension funds of the country, that we ought to turn around and repeat the mistakes of the past. Our first rule ought to be to do no harm in an age of opportunity and uncertainty.

Now I want to call on the Congress to help us move forward. In many of the things that I have proposed today, there is very broad bipartisan support—broad bipartisan support for making the 401(k) plans more readily available, broad bipartisan support for an expanded IRA. We have to do the portability piece of this; we have to do it. We have to create an environment where ordinary working Americans can look forward to a future with excitement. They'll say, "Hey, well, maybe I'll have to do more

jobs than my parents and grandparents did, but I'll always be able to get education and training. I'll always be able to afford health care and have access to it. I'll always be able to have a retirement plan for my later years. My family is going to be all right in this new world."

That is what this legislation is all about. That's what retirement savings and security means. I hope the Congress will join with us. I hope we can pass all the elements of this plan, and we ought to be able to do it fairly quickly because I do not believe there is a partisan issue here. This is something we can and should do for America, and we ought to do it now.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:23 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Shawn Marcell, president and chief executive officer, Prima Facie, Inc., Conshohocken, PA.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Civil War in Liberia
April 11, 1996

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

On April 4, 1996, small arms and mortar fire broke out in Monrovia, Liberia, apparently as the result of renewed fighting between factions led by Charles Taylor and Roosevelt Johnson involved in the civil war in that country. On April 5, groups of angry civilians set up makeshift checkpoints near the international airport and within the city to protest the destruction of their property by the warring factions. On April 6, the American Embassy began receiving calls from American citizens reporting weapons fire and the movement of large groups of armed individuals in the city. Further violence, including reported hostage-taking, has continued.

On April 9, due to the deterioration of the security situation and the resulting threat to American citizens, I ordered U.S. military forces to conduct the evacuation from Liberia of private U.S. citizens and certain third-country nationals who have taken refuge in the U.S. Embassy compound wishing to leave. U.S. military security assessment and enhancement teams deployed to Monrovia the same day in order to reinforce and assist the American Embassy. Evacuation operations commenced shortly thereafter. The evacuation, designated Operation Assured Response, is being carried out using MH–53 helicopters staged from Freetown, Sierra Leone. A small number of U.S. military aircraft are supporting this operation from Dakar, Senegal. Approximately 140 military personnel from the U.S. European Command's Special Operations Command are involved in this operation and are backed up by forces from the Southern European Task Force, U.S. Army, Europe. I have also ordered the deployment of U.S. Navy amphibious forces to the region to transport evacuees, if required.

Although U.S. military forces participating in the evacuation are equipped for combat, the evacuation is being undertaken for the purpose of protecting American citizens and is not intended to alter or preserve the existing political status quo in Liberia. I therefore expect that this operation will be of limited duration. A number of our helicopters have been fired upon, but have not been hit.

I have taken this action pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. I appreciate the support of the Congress in this action to protect American citizens.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 12.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Labour Party Leader Tony Blair of the United Kingdom

April 12, 1996

Q. Good morning, Mr. President—[*inaudible*].

The President. No, not yet. I may have something to say later today, but I think it's not appropriate for me to comment yet. We're trying to find out all of the facts.

Okinawa

Q. Mr. President, on Okinawa, could you tell us some of the reasoning that went into that decision——

The President. Excuse me? I'm sorry.

Q. On the base in Okinawa——

The President. Yes. Well, Secretary Perry has been working very hard on that issue to try to deal with what we think are some very legitimate concerns the people of Okinawa have about the noise levels, access to land. And Japan has been a wonderful security partner for us for a long time, and they still are. They pay the highest percentage of support for American forces of any of our foreign host countries. And we thought we ought to try to work through these issues. And the Secretary has worked very hard at it, and so has the Japanese Government. And so I hope we've got a good resolution here that will permit us to defend our own security interests and pursue our interests in the Northern Pacific and fulfill our commitments to our Japanese allies.

Thank you.

President's Taxes

Q. [*Inaudible*]—your taxes. Do you have any advice for the American people?

The President. I always try to pay them. [*Laughter*] I've got an accountant, and I tell him to resolve all doubt in favor of the Government and go on. [*Laughter*] That's what I've been saying for 20 years now.

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

Discussions With Mr. Blair

Q. Mr. President, do you think you'll—[*inaudible*]—the next British Prime Minister?

Mr. Blair. Well, that is not a diplomatic question. [*Laughter*]

The President. If I were in his position that's the question I'd ask. Look, it's all I can do to keep up with American politics. I only hope he's talking to the next American President. [*Laughter*]

Q. Will you be sharing ideas, Mr. President?

The President. Yes, I'm looking forward to discussing a number of things including, obviously, the Irish peace process and the process in Northern Ireland, which is very important to the United States. And I want to compliment Mr. Blair and his party. I think that the way they have proceeded in this has been very statesmanlike and very much in the interest of his nation and the cause of peace.

Q. And similarities between your two parties as well?

The President. I'll leave that to you.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Mr. Blair. I was saying to the President how immensely helpful people have found his visit to Northern Ireland a few months ago and what a boost it gave to the peace process. And I think that is still there, and it's still helping. I hope we can get it back on track very much.

Q. Mr. Blair, you'll be talking to the President about your own development of——

Mr. Blair. I think we will be talking about many things, Jeremy.

The President. If you give us a chance. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Blair. Quite so. And on that point——

The President. This is a great omen for the peace process. You've got the Americans' greatest Irish reporter here. [*Laughter*] How are you?

Mr. Blair. You're in very good company, Mary.

Q. Is there anything that Mr. Blair can practically do to bring about a revival of the peace talks in Ireland, a truce?

The President. He might have better ideas about that than I do. But the first thing, of course, is that there has to be an election law ratified in the Parliament. But I want to talk to him about it. We'll see what his ideas are.

Q. Do you want all of the parties to participate in the elections and to attend——

The President. Of course. We've always been for all-party talks and all-party participation, that is, all of the parties that are committed to a peaceful democratic future in Northern Ireland.

Q. And do you think Sinn Fein—[*inaudible*]—peaceful democratic future in Northern Ireland?

The President. We have to get back to the conversation here. I've already answered more questions than I meant to. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 10:45 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on the Progress Report on Auto Trade With Japan and on the Administration's Economic Team

April 12, 1996

Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President, Ambassador Kantor, Senator Levin, and Congressman Levin; all the distinguished leaders from the auto industry and Mr. J.C. Phillips from the UAW and to Jim Hill; all the people here from the agencies that are part of our Nation's economic team that really worked so hard to achieve these results. I welcome all of you here.

I want to thank you for what you said, Jim. I am a car guy. I was 6 years old the first time I crawled underneath a 1952 Buick in my father's tiny dealership in Hope, Arkansas, population 6,000, and I never quite got over it. And one of the things that I promised myself I would do if I ever got a chance to have an impact on it was to give the American automobile industry the chance to be rewarded for its willingness to compete. And that is what we have worked hard to do in this administration.

I just saw something—Mickey Kantor and I walked outside, along with the Vice President, Mr. Panetta, and I saw something I never thought I would live to see—and just 4 years ago, if you had told me that I would see it, I'm not sure I would have believed it—right-hand drive American models made by American workers in American plants bound for Japan, a Ford Taurus, a GM-built Cavalier, a Chrysler Neon, built for the Japanese market where consumers are now freely buying tens of thousands more American cars than ever before. These new exports, as others have said, are the results of efforts by our car makers and our economic team. We have worked to expand our trade on fair terms not only with Japan but with others throughout the world. These exports show what we can do when we truly work together and when others work with us in a spirit of cooperation and mutual benefit.

The boost in sales is tremendous news for American workers, for our auto and auto parts manufacturers, for our strong relationship with Japan. I also want to say it is good news for the people of Japan. When I first went to Japan in 1993, I said to the Japanese people what I will have the opportunity to reiterate in just a couple of days: We have no more important bilateral relationship. We are bound together in our support for democracy and freedom and for the security of freedom-loving peoples in Asia and now elsewhere, as Japan has shouldered bigger and bigger burdens to help us all pursue the goals that we share. We also know that if we have a free and open trading relationship with them, it will help their economy, it will give their consumers more choices, and it will help both nations to be more competitive as we hurtle our way forward into the 21st century.

Just 3 years ago our ties were strained by a trading relationship not beneficial to our Nation. The trade wasn't working, but the ties weren't working either. Today our relationship is working better for both of us. There's a lot to be done. In a big and complex relationship like ours there will always be a lot to be done. But we are strengthening and deepening our relationship. It is now a powerful force for creating opportunity, for advancing democracy, and for improving the quality of life in both our countries.

I also want to say that, as Ambassador Kantor said earlier, I believe that the right kind of trade

is critical for our Nation's future. I believe the position of the United States must always be that we favor open trade. We are not afraid to compete. We believe we can win. But if we're going to live in a world where we want others to raise their standard of living to our level, and we no longer control anything like the percentage of the gross national product we did at the end of World War II, then, fine, we'll compete and we'll help others to advance, but we expect the same access to foreign markets that we give foreign producers to ours. It is a simple rule and one we have followed. It is a critical part of our economic strategy.

When I became President, job growth was slow; the deficit was exploding, more than twice as high as it is now. We did two things. We put in place an economic strategy: lower the deficit, cut it in half in 4 years, get interest rates down, increase investments in education and training, in research and technology, reform and shrink and make more effective the National Government, and expand trade on terms both free and fair. That strategy has been implemented by a national economic team, the first time we ever had a fully functioning National Economic Council to parallel our National Security Council, to integrate, plan, and implement the economic strategies of this country and to work in full partnership with the private sector.

We now have 8½ million more jobs than we had just 3 years ago. And I might say, of the G–7 countries, that's more than 8 million more than the other six nations combined. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. And trade has been critical to that; as Ambassador Kantor said, 200 separate agreements—20 with Japan alone, now 21. Our exports are at an all-time high, our auto producers now leading the world.

Even more important, we have a framework agreement in our relationship with Japan which establishes a comprehensive system for dealing with problems that inevitably arise between two great nations. As a result, our exports there are up over 30 percent; in the areas covered by the agreements, up 85 percent. Today, exports to Japan support more than 800,000 good-paying American jobs, including 150,000 new ones since 1992. Most of these are good, high-wage jobs because jobs tied to exports on average pay 15 percent above the national average wage.

We are, therefore, in expanding our trade to an all-time high—a full third in the last 3 years—slowly helping to change the wage picture that has bedeviled so many American workers who think that they'll work harder and harder and never get a raise. In 1992, 6 percent of our new jobs were in high-wage industries. In 1995, almost 60 percent of our new jobs were in high-wage industries. This strategy will work. It is not a miracle; it will not work overnight; it plainly depends for its success primarily on the willingness of American workers and American business leaders to work together, to be competitive, to be productive. But it will work. This report shows the difference this approach will make.

Last year we reached a landmark agreement that increased our access to the Japanese market for autos and for auto parts. One of the many legacies of our friend Secretary Ron Brown was the establishment with Ambassador Kantor of a team to monitor and enforce the agreement. This report shows that since the agreement was signed, sales of American-made autos have increased by more than a third. Sales of American-made cars, trucks, and vans rose more than 225 percent between 1992 and 1995, including over 58,000 Big Three cars exported from the U.S. just last year. In the first 2 months of this year, our people sold one-third more autos to Japan than in the same period last year. So the movement is all in the right direction.

In auto parts, exports over the last 3 years up 60 percent, to $1.6 billion last year. Now, to give you one example of the evidence that this agreement and its faithful implementation and your work has made, Tenneco Automotive of Houston spent 25 years attempting to break into the Japanese market. Now their Monroe shock absorbers will be sold in almost 7,500 Japanese shops.

These developments are part of the rebirth of our auto industry, an industry that lost 49,000 jobs in the 4 years before I took office and has gained about 80,000 in the 3 years since. Because of the partnership between labor and management, for the first time in 15 years, last year the United States auto industry again was number one in the world. So again, let me thank the representatives of the Big Three, the many auto parts producers, and all the workers who have worked so hard to make our belief in this economic strategy a reality.

The Big Three will be introducing 17 new right-hand models for the Japanese market in the next 2 years. To those of us who have any

memory of this, it seems almost inconceivable. But you always believed you could compete with anybody, anywhere, as long as you had a level playing field. I still believe that. I know we're right. And I know all Americans will be very proud of these results.

Let me just say one other thing about the trade issue. I'm happy about the debate in America on trade today, but I sometimes think it falls into two camps which don't reflect the real world. There are people who say, well, America has got a lot of folks who haven't gotten a raise in a long time, and we may be creating a lot of jobs but there are people who are losing jobs. Well, that's true. But it is also true everywhere in the world. It is not true that the answer is to put a wall up around America and walk away from our obligations and our opportunities to compete and win. If we did that, we would pay a terrible price.

Then there are others who say, well, we ought to be for free trade, but we shouldn't worry so much about all these specific agreements and all these details. We shouldn't have governments negotiating this, we ought to just sort of get out of the way and see what happens and hope for the best. We tried it that way and it didn't work out very well.

Both of those arguments are wrong. Neither reflects an understanding of how the real world works. The right policy is to be for free and fair trade. The right governmental action is to support a genuinely competitive marketplace, help to create it, and then get out of the way. That is the proper policy. If we put up walls, what would happen to the jobs of the people who make cars in plants like the Chrysler plant in Belvidere, Illinois, or Fords in Atlanta or Chevrolets in Lorain, Ohio, that produce those right-hand drive vehicles we just saw? On the other hand, if we didn't want to hold others to the same standards we expect to meet in world competition, what would happen to all the jobs of the people who would not be able to stand against the kind of unfair practices we have seen practiced in the past?

We made a good start in the auto industry. The Japanese have proceeded in good faith. I think it's been good for them as well as us. I hope that we will see the day when these policies will be the law of the world, when the World Trade Organization, because of GATT, really will have an integrated world trading system. I hope we will see the day when we will see these kinds of benefits in dealing with all of Asia, all of Latin America, all of Europe, all of Africa, all of the countries that were formerly part of the Communist bloc.

But I know this: These people in the auto industry have proved that our policy works. I thank you, Senator Levin and Congressman Levin, for your work. I want to thank all the people in our administration, the economic team and, most of all, I want to thank the workers and the managers in the auto industry for proving that we're doing the right thing.

Now, before I close let me just make one more announcement. We could not have done what we did here if we hadn't had a vision not only of the economic policy we wanted to pursue but also of how we wanted to pursue it. We put together an economic team for the first time in the history of this Government that really functions. I can't imagine why it had never been done before, but it hadn't. There were a lot of different power centers in the Federal Government allegedly making economic policy. We decided to change that. We had a good strategy, good teamwork, and good players.

We didn't have a better player than the late Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown. Nobody was more determined that American workers and companies would get a fair shake around the world, and his extraordinary efforts are a model for us all. He memorized—as I said at his memorial service the other day, he made every Department of Commerce employee memorize a one-sentence mission statement that ought to be the mission of everybody in our Government: Our mission is to ensure economic opportunity for every American.

Well, we still have to do that, and I don't want to miss a beat. And I am determined that we will continue on the work that Ron Brown was engaged in the last day of his life. So today I am proud to announce that I intend to appoint Ambassador Mickey Kantor to be the next Secretary of Commerce. And I will send his nomination to the Senate promptly.

This is not an easy time for the people at the Commerce Department, but they will do fine. And I think that we need to send a clear signal to the rest of America and to the world that we don't intend to miss a beat. We have got a strategy, we have got a team, it's working, and we're going forward with it.

No Trade Representative has ever amassed a record of achievement that surpasses Mickey

Kantor's in the last 3½ years: GATT, NAFTA, 200 separate agreements, enforcement, the consequences that flowed from it. But frankly, it hasn't been easy. If you think that you have been to something tough, you ought to sit in those trade negotiations day-in and day-out, and then when you finish one, be told to get on an airplane to fly halfway around the world and get in the middle of another one.

I have heard Mickey say a thousand times he was 6 foot 4 and blond-headed when he came to work here. [*Laughter*] He and Ron Brown used to joke, you know, that they were the Alphonse and Gaston of our economic team. Mickey was the bad cop; Ron was the good cop. I thought we ought to give him the chance to be a good cop for a change. [*Laughter*] And I want to thank him for his service.

I also want to announce that I will ask his principal deputy, Charlene Barshefsky, who has been a brilliant negotiator for our country, to serve as acting U.S. Trade Representative. She has been a deputy there since I took office. She has been our chief trade negotiator in Latin America and in Asia. She is not here today because she is on her way back from a trade mission. And I have gone to many places and had world leaders ask me who she was because they virtually got tears in their eyes after 4 or 5 hours of trying to outmaneuver her. [*Laughter*] So I want to thank her in her absence.

Finally, I want to make one more announcement. In just a few days we will have another very important vacancy in our economic team, one that has been critical to the success of our plans to being able to cut the deficit in half and continue to invest in America's priorities, and that is the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. I have been very blessed to have two outstanding Directors, and I gave them both other jobs.

Leon Panetta is now serving with great distinction as the White House Chief of Staff and longs for the days when he used to have that other job. [*Laughter*] Alice Rivlin will soon be moving on to become the Vice Chair of the Federal Reserve Board and therefore the object of our complaints whenever the economy is not growing as we think it should. [*Laughter*] And so there is, or soon will be, a vacancy at the Office of Management and Budget. And I am pleased to announce today that I intend to nominate as the next director Franklin D. Raines.

Frank Raines has had extensive experience in Government and in the private sector. He worked at OMB and on the domestic policy staff under President Carter. Since 1991, he has served in the very important position of vice chair of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Fannie Mae. He knows the world of finance; he respects the bottom line. He also understands, I know from our work in the transition and from a conversation we had just yesterday, the very real, human impact the work of the budget has on the American people and the opportunities they will or will not have to make the most of their own lives. So I am very proud to ask him to join our team.

I, frankly, was a little surprised that he was willing to leave that incredibly lucrative position—how shall I say it. [*Laughter*] So I told Frank when he came here that he was about to join the ranks of Bob Rubin and Mickey Kantor and a number of other successful people who came into this administration to help save the middle class, and when they leave they'll be part of it. [*Laughter*]

As you might imagine, this has been a profoundly moving and difficult week for all of us in our political family. Mickey Kantor and I were particularly close to Ron Brown; we loved him very much. I am doing what I think is the right thing to do today for the economic interests of America's business and for the future of all those workers who deserve the opportunity that is set out in the Commerce Department's mission statement. I've known Mickey Kantor a very long time. Except for the color of their skins, the careers that he and Ron Brown had are remarkably parallel over a long period of time. And if he does as well at Commerce as he did at the trade office, we are in very good hands indeed.

I also want to thank Frank Raines for proving once again that this country is full of patriotic Americans who love their country, who are willing to serve, and who are willing to make real, tangible sacrifices to serve, because the work of democracy, the work of citizenship is what makes the rest of this country move and go.

I thank them both, and I'd like to ask if, each in their turn, they'd like to come up and just make a few remarks. First, Mickey Kantor.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:40 p.m. in the

East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to J.C. Phillips, chairman, United Auto Workers Local 882, and Jim Hill, Atlanta plant manager, Ford Motor Co.

Message to the House of Representatives Returning Without Approval Foreign Relations Legislation

April 12, 1996

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1561, the "Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997."

This legislation contains many unacceptable provisions that would undercut U.S. leadership abroad and damage our ability to assure the future security and prosperity of the American people. It would unacceptably restrict the President's ability to address the complex international challenges and opportunities of the post-Cold War era. It would also restrict Presidential authority needed to conduct foreign affairs and to control state secrets, thereby raising serious constitutional concerns.

First, the bill contains foreign policy provisions, particularly those involving East Asia, that are of serious concern. It would amend the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) to state that the TRA supersedes the provisions of the 1982 Joint Communique between the United States and China. The 1982 Communique has been one of the cornerstones of our bi-partisan policy toward China for over 13 years. The ongoing management of our relations with China is one of the central challenges of United States foreign policy, but this bill would complicate, not facilitate that task. The bill would also sharply restrict the use of funds to further normalize relations with Vietnam, hampering the President's ability to pursue our national interests there and potentially jeopardizing further progress on POW/MIA issues. If read literally, this restriction would also raise constitutional concerns.

Second, the bill would seriously impede the President's authority to organize and administer foreign affairs agencies to best serve the Nation's interests and the Administration's foreign policy priorities. I am a strong supporter of appropriate reform and, building on bipartisan support, my Administration has already implemented significant steps to reinvent our international operations in a way that has allowed us to reduce funding significantly, eliminate positions, and close embassies, consulates, and other posts overseas. But this bill proceeds in an improvident fashion, mandating the abolition of at least one of three important foreign affairs agencies, even though each agency has a distinct and important mission that warrants a separate existence. Moreover, the inflexible, detailed mandates and artificial deadlines included in this section of the bill should not be imposed on any President.

Third, the appropriations authorizations included in the bill, for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, fall unacceptably below the levels necessary to conduct the Nation's foreign policy and to protect U.S. interests abroad. These inadequate levels would adversely affect the operation of overseas posts of the foreign affairs agencies and weaken critical U.S. efforts to promote arms control and nonproliferation, reform international organizations and peacekeeping, streamline public diplomacy, and implement sustainable development activities. These levels would cause undue reductions in force of highly skilled personnel at several foreign affairs agencies at a time when they face increasingly complex challenges.

Fourth, this bill contains a series of objectionable provisions that limit U.S. participation in international organizations, particularly the United Nations (U.N.). For example, a provision on intelligence sharing with the U.N. would unconstitutionally infringe on the President's power to conduct diplomatic relations and limit Presidential control over the use of state secrets. Other provisions contain problematic notification, withholding, and certification requirements.

These limits on participation in international organizations, particularly when combined with the low appropriation authorization levels, would undermine current U.S. diplomatic efforts—which enjoy bipartisan support—to reform the U.N. and to reduce the assessed U.S. share of

the U.N. budget. The provisions included in the bill are also at odds with ongoing discussions between the Administration and the Congress aimed at achieving consensus on these issues.

Fifth, the bill fails to remedy the severe limitations placed on U.S. population assistance programs by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–107). That law imposes unacceptable spending restrictions pending authorization for U.S. bilateral and multilateral population assistance programs. But H.R. 1561 does not authorize these programs. Consequently, these restrictions will remain in place and will have a significant, adverse impact on women and families in the developing world. It is estimated that nearly 7 million couples in developing countries will have no access to safe, voluntary family planning services. The result will be millions of unwanted pregnancies and an increase in the number of abortions.

Finally, the bill contains a number of other objectionable provisions. Some of the most problematic would: (1) abruptly terminate the Agency for International Development's housing guaranty (HG) program, as well as abrogate existing HG agreements, except for South Africa, and prohibit foreign assistance to any country that fails to make timely payments or reimbursements on HG loans; (2) hinder negotiations aimed at resolving the plight of Vietnamese boat people; (3) unduly restrict the ability of the United States to participate in the United Nations Human Rights Committee; and (4) extend provisions of the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act that I have objected to in the past. I am also concerned that the bill, by restricting the time period during which economic assistance funds can be expended for longer-term development projects, would diminish the effectiveness of U.S. assistance programs.

In returning H.R. 1561, I recognize that the bill contains a number of important authorities for the Department of State and the United States Information Agency. In its current form, however, the bill is inconsistent with the decades-long tradition of bipartisanship in U.S. foreign policy. It unduly interferes with the constitutional prerogatives of the President and would seriously impair the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs.

For all these reasons, I am compelled to return H.R. 1561 without my approval.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 12, 1996.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting Proposed Budget Rescissions
April 12, 1996

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

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report 10 proposed rescissions of budgetary resources, totaling $400.4 million. These rescission proposals affect the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The report detailing the proposed rescissions was published in the *Federal Register* on April 23.

The President's Radio Address
April 13, 1996

Good morning. This week, on April the 19th, we mark one of America's saddest anniversaries, the first anniversary of the bombing of the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City. It is when

the American spirit is at its best that we find renewal in even the most desolate of our tragedies. And that is what the people of Oklahoma City have managed somehow to do.

They have shown us that while we cannot guarantee our children a world free of madmen, we can promise them that we will always build and rebuild safe places to sustain and nurture their new lives. They have reminded us that while we can never call back the souls that were torn from us, we can prove that the forces of hatred and division are no match for the goodness in the human spirit.

Oklahoma City reminds us of something else, that we must give nothing less than everything we have in the fight against terrorism in our country and around the world, for the forces that are sparking so much of the progress we see today—lightning-fast technology, easier travel, open borders—these forces also make it easier for people with a grudge or a cause to launch a terrorist attack against innocent people.

In this new era, fighting terrorism must be a top law enforcement and national security priority for the United States. On our own and with our allies, we have put in place strong sanctions against states that sponsor terrorism. We have improved our cooperation with other nations to deter terrorists before they act, to capture them when they do, and to see to it that they are brought to justice. We've increased funding, personnel, and training for our own law enforcement agencies to deal with terrorists.

But we must do even more. That is why, more than a year ago, I sent to Congress legislation that would strengthen our ability to investigate, prosecute, and punish terrorist activity. After Oklahoma City, I made it even stronger. My efforts were guided by three firm goals: first, to protect American lives without infringing on American rights; second, to give the FBI and other law enforcement officials the tools they have asked for to do the job; and third, to make sure terrorists are barred from this country.

In the wake of Oklahoma City, Congress promised to send me the bill 6 weeks after the tragic bombing. And yet, unbelievably, almost an entire year has passed, and Congress still has not managed to send me strong antiterrorism legislation. There is simply no excuse for this foot-dragging. This bill should have been law a long time ago.

So I urge Congress: Make it happen. Pass antiterrorism legislation now. In the name of the children and all the people of Oklahoma City, I say to Congress, do not let another day go by in which America does not have the tools it needs to fight terrorism. It's essential that Congress send me the right antiterrorism legislation, legislation that finally will give law enforcement the upper hand.

When I met with leaders of the congressional majority shortly after the bombing, they assured me that Congress would give the American people strong antiterrorism legislation. They haven't. While the Senate passed a solid bill, the House absolutely gutted it. Under pressure from the Washington gun lobby, House Republicans took that bill apart piece by piece. Well, now it's time they put it back together. America cannot afford to settle for a fake antiterrorism bill. We need the real thing. And on my watch, I'm determined to get it.

This is what real antiterrorism should have: First, we need explicit authority to prevent terrorist groups like Hamas from raising money in the United States for their dirty deeds. Second, we need authority to deport quickly foreigners who abuse our hospitality by supporting terrorist activities away from or within our shores. Second, we need to give law enforcement officials the ability to use high-tech surveillance and other investigative tools to keep up with stealthy, fast-moving terrorists.

And we need a provision to mark chemically the explosive materials terrorists use to build their deadly bombs. If we know where the explosives come from, we have an edge in tracking down the criminals who use them. These taggants work. In fact, when they were being tested just a few years ago, they helped us to catch a man who had killed someone with a car bomb. Law enforcement officials believe that of the more than 13,000 bombing crimes in the last 5 years, as many as 30 percent could have been solved faster with taggants.

Yet the Republicans in Congress continue to oppose this commonsense initiative. Why? Because the Washington gun lobby told them to. One Republican Congressman had another reason, an unbelievable one. He actually told his own committee chairman, "I trust Hamas more than my own Government." Well, I don't. And I don't think most Americans or most Members of Congress in either party do.

I urge Congress to change course. Put the national interest before the special interests. Give law enforcement the ability to trace these explosives-using bombs that kill Americans.

We know acts of terror are no match for the human spirit. In the last year, the people of Oklahoma City have proved this. We know we can heal from terrorism. But now we must do even more to stop it before it happens. A strong antiterrorism bill will help us to do just that. And that's why it must be the law of the land.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:05 p.m. on April 12 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 13.

Exchange With Reporters in Anchorage, Alaska
April 15, 1996

[*The exchange is joined in progress.*]

President's Itinerary

Q. ——your stop in Korea?

The President. Have a talk with President Kim, and we'll have some things to say there about the Korean situation. It's much better than it was 3 years ago when I took office in terms of trying to minimize the North Korean nuclear problem, which was a big security problem for the United States.

And then I'm going on to Japan to reaffirm the security partnership we have with the Japanese and Asia, and then on to Russia to deal with the problems of nuclear safety. We've made a lot of progress in the last 3 years; we've got a lot to do. We have a big job to get a comprehensive test ban treaty passed, and then to deal with the aftermath of the cold war, to deal with all of those nuclear materials that are out there. We want to make sure that they don't fall into the wrong hands and someday get put to the wrong uses.

And I'm glad to be back in Alaska, even at 2 a.m. in the morning, and I thank you for coming out. I'm sorry that you all had to stay up so late.

Arctic National Wildlife Refuge

Q. Mr. President, one of the big questions concerning a lot of Alaskans is the issue of oil drilling in ANWR. Do you think there is, in the near future, any possibility of doing that environmentally sensitive development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge?

The President. I don't know. I received your congressional delegation, and I listened to what they had to say. And we have continued to work not only in Alaska but all across America on the whole issue of reconciling development and the environment, and we continue to look for ways to do it. But you know, right now the more imminent issue as Congress comes back is whether we can pass a budget for the Interior Department that deals with the question of the Tongass, and that is the one I think that concerns Alaska that will be up on the plate in the next couple of weeks. And we've worked very hard out here to try to deal with the legitimate interests of the small loggers in trying to do some work there while preserving the old-growth trees that are virtually irreplaceable. So I'm hoping that that can be worked out. We've worked very, very hard on it, and we'll just take these issues as they come and see what happens.

President's Visit to South Korea

Q. President Clinton, looking at your stop in Korea, what do you hope to accomplish there with President Kim?

The President. Well, we're doing a lot of work on that. I want to wait until I see President Kim and make a definitive announcement of any kind. But we are essentially continuing on the path of a charter back in 1993. We're working on ways to not only keep the nuclear problem under control and eventually eliminate it, but also to try to do what we can to promote an ultimate reconciliation, an end to the conflict. If that could happen, then the world would be a much safer place—the whole world, and certainly the people in Northern Asia.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 2 a.m. at Elmendorf Air Force Base. In his remarks,

the President referred to President Kim Yong-sam of South Korea. The press release issued by the Office of the Press Secretary did not include the complete opening question. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Kim Yong-sam of South Korea in Cheju
April 16, 1996

Q. Good morning, sir.

The President. Good morning. Did you get some sleep?

Q. A little bit. Mr. President, do you think the start of these four-way talks could really bring peace to this peninsula? Are you encouraged that these four-way talks could lead to peace? What about the situation along the border between Israel and Lebanon; anything the United States can do to stop that fighting?

The President. We're going to answer questions, you know, after our meeting; but we're working very hard on that and we've been at it for a couple of days now, and we're doing the best we can.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:04 a.m. in the garden at the Shilla Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters During Discussions With President Kim Yong-sam of South Korea in Cheju
April 16, 1996

Q. President Kim, are you excited about the opportunity for a breakthrough with the dialog between North and South Korea?

President Kim. Yes. I think that there is a possibility.

Q. And do you welcome the fact that China might participate as well?

President Kim. Well, we'll have a chance to talk about it later at the press conference.

Q. Mr. President, was it as pretty down on the beach as it looked from up above?

President Clinton. Yes. I felt like a honeymooner again.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:20 a.m. in the garden at the Shilla Hotel. President Kim spoke in Korean, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With President Kim Yong-sam of South Korea in Cheju
April 16, 1996

President Kim. Ladies and gentlemen of the press, on behalf of the people of the Republic of Korea, I would again like to extend a heartfelt welcome to President and Mrs. Bill Clinton who are visiting our country today.

President Clinton and I have held five summit meetings since I became President of the Republic of Korea in 1993 and have worked together steadily to develop Korea-U.S. relations into a mature partnership. President Clinton's

visit to Korea today will further strengthen the solid alliance between our two countries. It also offers an opportunity to reaffirm the strategic importance of our bilateral relations for the Asia-Pacific era in the 21st century.

President Clinton and I held indepth discussions for about an hour on the overall situation on the Korean Peninsula, including the recent North Korean provocations in the truce village of Panmunjom. President Clinton and I shared serious concern over the fact that North Korean authorities have recently tried to unilaterally undermine the armistice agreement and violated the agreement through military maneuvering in the joint security area. We agreed on the great importance of maintaining vigilance and strong joint Korea-U.S. defense posture in order to cope with any possible provocations swiftly and firmly. We have also agreed that the armistice agreement should be maintained and observed until a new system for peace is established. We share the view that the problem of building a permanent regime of peace should be resolved through the efforts initiated by the parties directly involved in the Korean problems themselves.

Based upon such considerations, President Clinton and I have decided to make an important proposal in order to defuse the recently created tensions around the Korean Peninsula and to establish a permanent regime of peace in Korea. Today we have agreed to convene without any preconditions and as soon as possible, and to make a joint announcement of a four-party meeting in which the two Koreas, the direct parties concerned to the Korean questions, and the United States and China, the relevant parties to the Korean armistice agreement, would participate.

We hope that through the four-party meeting we can facilitate dialog and exchanges between the two Koreas, reduce tensions between the two sides, and discuss various ways to establish a permanent regime of peace in the Korean Peninsula. It is the sincere expectation of our two leaders that both North Korea and China can show us a positive reaction to our proposal today. At a working luncheon with President Clinton shortly after, we will discuss recent developments in Northeast Asia and ways to promote bilateral relations in various areas.

Finally, I firmly believe that President Clinton's visit to Korea this time is an opportunity for both our countries to bring to a higher level the enduring and comprehensive partnership which has been established on the basis of our shared value of democracy.

Thank you.

President Clinton. Let me begin by thanking President Kim for inviting me to this magnificent island.

When President Kim was in Washington last summer, I pledged to him that America would always stand by the unshakable alliance between our two countries, an alliance based on a history of shared sacrifice and a future of common purpose. The United States is fully committed to the defense of South Korea, and we are determined to do everything we can to help to secure a stable and permanent peace on the Korean Peninsula. That is why I am here today. The United States and South Korea are proposing a new four-party peace process that can lead to permanent peace. It would begin as soon as possible, and there are no preconditions.

North Korea has said it wants peace. This is our proposal to achieve it. And we hope and expect Pyongyang will take it seriously. The dream of peace lies deep in the heart of all the Korean people, North and South. Realizing that dream will take hard work, patience, and a real willingness to focus on the future. But the benefits to all the Korean people are more than worth the effort. We ask the Government and the people of North Korea to join us in this quest. We would also welcome China's participation as the other signatory of the Korean armistice.

It has been 43 years since the armistice was signed. There have been tensions ever since. North Korea's recent incursions into the joint security area reminds us again that peace on the peninsula is fragile. Any violation of the armistice increases the danger of an accident, a mistake, or a miscalculation that could have grave consequences. That is why the United States maintains a high level of vigilance and readiness on the Korean Peninsula. That is why our troops stand shoulder to shoulder with our South Korean allies. We must maintain the existing armistice agreement until a new peace accord is reached.

We are also ready to do whatever we can to help to reach such an agreement. But let me be very clear: Establishing that peace is the responsibility of the Korean people, North and South. The United States will support and facilitate the peace process. But we will not negotiate

a separate peace treaty with North Korea. The future of the Korean Peninsula lies in the hands of its people.

The partnership between the United States and South Korea is grounded in our shared security concerns, but it extends well beyond them to our many other shared interests. Together we are cooperating in economic efforts that will benefit all our people, in peacekeeping efforts, and in diplomacy around the world. Ours is an alliance for all times, good and bad, and it is stronger than ever.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Paul [Paul Basken, United Press International].

Korean Peace Process

Q. Given North Korea's actions over the last few days, which you noticed, and its rigid adherence to an authoritarian style of leadership for many years, do you have any basis for really believing North Korea is ready to change its outlook and its way of doing business?

President Clinton. Well, I think there are two reasons, and perhaps President Kim would like to comment on this as well. But first of all, the North has said for some time that it does want peace. And secondly, just a few days ago, the North—a minister of the North Korean Government acknowledged the importance of maintaining the armistice until a new peace agreement can be put in place.

I would caution that we should not expect an immediate positive response. I would be happy if it came. But I think it's important that we put this offer out there, let it stand, and be patient.

Q. A question to President Kim Yong-sam. It has been understood that the proposal of the four-party meeting has been conveyed to North Korea and China already, and if there are any response coming from North Korea about this. And secondly, how President Kim looks at the prospects of the success of this four-party meeting. And in case North Korea does not respond positively, and instead continues to demand a direct talk with the United States, what will be the measures to be taken against it?

President Kim. Yes, we have indeed conveyed our proposal of four-party meeting to China, courteously and with a lot of substance in there. And I've already sent my long letter to President Jiang Zemin of China explaining the ideas.

With regard to North Korea, we sent a message to the North on Sunday. About your question of what we can do in case North Korea does not accept the proposal, of course, we do not expect that North Korea can respond to our proposal positively tomorrow. But it is very clear from my meeting with President Clinton today that the United States would not engage in dialog with North Korea separately and will not discuss anything outside these issues. So there is no possibility at all that that kind of exclusive U.S.-North Korea bilateral talks can occur.

So we will be very patient. Time is on our side, and I think that this is perhaps the last choice that North Korea can make to resolve the Korean question. And I believe that eventually North Korea will accept our proposal.

President Clinton. If I might, I'd just like to make one brief comment in response to the question to support what President Kim has said. We are strong, prepared, and united with our South Korean ally in our commitment to the defense of South Korea, first. And second, we have made it abundantly clear that there will be no separate agreement between North Korea and the United States on matters covered by the armistice. So I would hope that the people of South Korea would see this move on President Kim's part as a real example of leadership and strength, because we are united, we are firm, our position is clear, and we are simply trying to respond to the need for peace and North Korea's expression that they would like to have peace.

Q. It is my understanding so far that the deal will be parallel approaches to North Korea, that is, U.S.-North Korea talks on one hand and North-South dialog on the other. And our concern is whether North Koreans might make some miscalculations regarding the recent situations and therefore—and especially in view of the recent developments that North Koreans have taken. And we are wondering whether the four-party proposal is sort of a weak approach to North Koreans who have been so adamant to any accommodation of our proposals in the past.

President Clinton. Well, I would like to make two points in response. First of all, we have for some time had contacts with the North Koreans relating to the remains of our soldiers and the question of missiles and the desire of the United States to lead the world in minimiz-

ing the danger that missile technology proliferation poses to the world. But secondly, we have made it absolutely clear that we will not have any talks nor will we negotiate any agreement on any matter covered by the armistice agreement. We will not do that.

The four-party talks are simply a way of providing a framework within which the South and the North can ultimately agree on the terms of peace in the same way that the armistice talks provided that framework 43 years ago. And if the United States can play a positive role in that, we want to. We would like it if the Chinese would do the same. But in the end, the Korean people are going to have to make peace for themselves and their future.

North Korea

Q. I would like to ask President Kim, as well as President Clinton, about your assessment of the situation, what is going on in North Korea. We hear reports about severe food shortages and fuel shortages. How dire is the situation, and do you think that this might be a catalyst or an inducement to bring North Korea to these talks that you are talking about this morning?

President Kim. With regard to your question, my answer is that, yes, it is true that within North Korea there is a serious shortage of food and energy sources, and things are getting worse. And in fact, they are running short of so many things. And politically we don't think that the situation is stable, and economically it is a very uncertain regime.

If I can make an analogy to the attitudes of North Korea in comparison with the weather forecasting, in fact, today we are going to have another very sunshiny day, because the weather forecast said that it was going to rain today. So we could have done our press conference inside. I think the same can be applied to the attitude of North Korea.

President Clinton. Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press], with regard to the question you asked, I don't have a lot to add to what President Kim said, except to say that sometimes when countries are in difficult straits—just like people when they're in difficult straits—it is more difficult, not easier, to make agreements. So I don't know that the present difficulties in North Korea will change the negotiating posture of the North Koreans in favor of peace. What I would say to them is President Kim and I are making a good-faith effort here. I was impressed that he took this initiative; I was glad to join him with it. And it is clearly in the long-term interest of the people of North Korea to make peace. And so I would implore them to do this and to accept this offer not just because of the present difficulties but because it is the right thing to do for all the people of the Korean Peninsula over the long run.

NOTE: The President's 118th news conference began at 12:37 p.m. in the garden at the Shilla Hotel. President Kim spoke in Korean, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan in Tokyo

April 17, 1996

Prime Minister Hashimoto. Right in front of you, I and President Clinton signed two documents. One is the message to the peoples of Japan and the United States that lays down the direction in which the two countries should, together, proceed towards the 21st century. And the second is the Japan-U.S. Declaration on Security.

The message to the peoples of Japan and the United States summarizes how important the Japan-U.S. bilateral relationships are for our peoples and how our two countries will cooperate on a future agenda by referring to the preciousness of democracy and freedom, bilateral cooperation on regional issues, cooperation for U.N. reform, and on disarmament and on our economic relations and how we shall cooperate with each other in these respects.

The Japan-U.S. Declaration on Security reaffirms that the Japan-U.S. security setup will continue to play an important role, as in the past, in preserving security, peace, and stability in

the Asia-Pacific, and notes that it will be the starting point for our bilateral cooperation into the future.

Our meeting covered a wide ground: security, economic, and other bilateral issues, as well as various problems of the international community and the consolidation, realignment, and reduction of military facilities in Okinawa. Both Governments are making sincere efforts to reduce the burden on the Okinawa people by paying our utmost consideration to the feelings of the Okinawa people.

We once again expressed our appreciation for the contents of the interim report of the Special Action Committee on Okinawa announced the day before yesterday and mutually confirmed that it will be important to ensure proper and expeditious implementation of the measures spelled out in that report, that both of us will continue to do our utmost to arrive at a final agreement in November of this year.

On the Japan-U.S. economic relations, I explained that Japan current account surplus is on a declining trend and that the Government of Japan is working on economic structural reform, including deregulation. And I suggested that we engage in discussions on individual economic issues whenever necessary by building on our past track record.

We'll also discuss the importance of Japan and the United States cooperating with each other to stand up against the threats to humankind and to the global community. We confirmed that, to that end, six new areas will be added to our cooperation on so-called Common Agenda, such as on antiterrorism initiative and on emerging and reemerging diseases, et cetera, and that we shall further foster such cooperation with the participation of the private sector and other countries.

We also decided to study together a 21st century-type development that will be in harmony with nature. Within the little time we had, we also exchanged views on the situation in different parts of the world—China, the Korean Peninsula, Russia, the Former Yugoslavia, the Middle East—and discussed our respective policy there, too.

My candid impressions of the meeting today are that today's summit meeting was supported by very firm and large pillars and by a big roof, the large pillars being mutual understanding between the peoples of our two countries. And I put to the President my determination to create opportunities for many, many more American youths to visit Japan in the future so that these pillars will grow even larger.

The big roof is the values that our two countries have shared together to date. Japan and the United States, both built on universal values of democracy, human rights, an open economy, among others, have mutually built a relationship that is indispensable for the future of the world.

I will end on the note that the essence of the meeting today was the reaffirmation of this extremely important relationship. And I would like to yield to President now.

President Clinton. Thank you, Prime Minister.

Let me begin by thanking the Imperial Family and the Prime Minister for their hospitality to me and the First Lady and to all of our American delegation, and thanking the Japanese people for a wonderful welcome in this beautiful springtime.

I'm here primarily to celebrate the extraordinary partnership between our two nations over the last 50 years and to strengthen our alliance to meet the demands of this time of exceptional change. The Prime Minister and I strongly agree that as two of the world's strongest democracies and leading economies, Japan and the United States have a special responsibility to lead.

This is a moment of remarkable possibility for our people to make the most of their own lives, but it is also a moment of stern challenge. More and more, problems that start beyond our border can become problems within our borders. No one is immune to the threats posed by rogue states, by the spread of weapons of mass destruction, by terrorism, crime, and drug trafficking, by environmental decay and economic dislocation. But together we can turn these collective challenges into common solutions.

For the past 3 years our two nations have been doing just that. Now when you look at the great diversity of our ties in security, in trade, in our Common Agenda partnership, the conclusion is clear: The relationship between the United States and Japan is better and stronger than ever.

Our security alliance is key to maintaining a Pacific at peace, especially at this time of profound regional change. The security delegation—excuse me—the Security Declaration that the Prime Minister and I just signed is a result of more than one year's hard work and careful

study. It strengthens our alliance for the 21st century.

The United States will maintain our troop presence in Japan at about current levels. We will deepen our cooperation with Japan's self-defense forces, and we will reduce the burden of our bases on the Japanese people, and especially on the people of Okinawa, without diminishing our defense capability.

Our trade relationship is also on the right track. That's good for all of our people. When I took office, there was real frustration in the United States about the difficulty we had selling our goods and services in the Japanese market. Since then, our two nations have signed 21 separate trade agreements, covering everything from auto parts to medical supplies to computers. Our exports in those sectors are up dramatically, about 85 percent. That means in America more jobs and better pay and in Japan lower prices and greater choice.

Free and fair trade is a win-win proposition. Now there is more work to be done, of course, in areas like insurance and semiconductors and film. None of it will be easy. But for the first time, I want everyone to be clear, we have established a process to resolve problems that do arise in a patient and pragmatic manner.

The partnership between our countries is also making a real difference around the world. In Bosnia we have joined forces to help people rebuild their lives and their land. I want to thank Japan for the extraordinarily generous $500 million relief and reconstruction package that Japan has just announced. This is evidence of a powerful commitment to lead the world toward peace and freedom.

The Prime Minister and I reviewed many other initiatives we are taking under our Common Agenda. We're working to wipe out polio by the year 2000. We're working to reduce the devastation of natural disasters through our earthquake disaster reduction effort, to protect the world's forests and oceans, to lift people's lives through advanced technology, to complete and sign a comprehensive test ban treaty this year, to bring the blessings of peace and freedom to more people than ever before.

I also thank the Japanese Government for reaching out for greater educational and cultural exchanges with the American people, and I particularly appreciate the efforts the Prime Minister has made in this regard.

In this time of challenge and change, the partnership between our two nations is more important to our people and to the world than ever. If we realize its full potential, that partnership can be a powerful force for progress and peace for our own people and all around the world.

Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Hashimoto. Questions and answers. Those of you who have questions, please raise your hand.

Yes, over there.

Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements

Q. President Clinton and Prime Minister, we appreciate your work. The question for Prime Minister Hashimoto: You stated your candid impressions with regard to the meeting you just had. On individual issues, amidst the end of cold war, in this new relationship, situation here in the world, I believe one of your important themes was to reaffirm the importance of Japan-U.S. relationship, and I wonder—I think you reaffirmed that the guidelines for Japan-U.S. defense cooperation will be reviewed as well. But in this connection, I believe there will be a need for coordination of views between Japan and the United States with regard to the exercise of collective self-defense, which is a matter that could impinge on the Japanese Constitution. And I wonder how are you going to address that problem now, Mr. Prime Minister?

Prime Minister Hashimoto. Last year we modified the national defense outline and came up with a new outline of national defense program in order to organize Japanese defense capabilities in accordance with the new prevailing international circumstances. And it goes without saying that since there have been changes that we have to engage in various studies in response to those changes.

I truly believe that it is because of Japan-U.S. Security Treaty that for 51 years since our defeat in the Second World War, we have been able to lead peaceful lives, and we did not think much about a contingency situation. And in case that emergency arises—there might be a need to rescue Japanese in certain areas of emergency; we might also have to receive refugees—now, we were very fortunate; we didn't have to think about those contingencies. Today, however, we have to consider those possibilities and study what can be done, what cannot be done. We have to study these very clearly. I think

there is a true need to engage in that sort of study.

Now, there's a tendency for people to say that this is a matter of interpretation of the Constitution or a matter of emergency legislation and so on. People are bogged down in conceptual discussions. But I think there are certain things that we can do under the present Constitution, and I think it is our responsibility to make clear what can be done and what cannot be done.

So I would like to appeal to people, taking advantage of this occasion, and in case a crisis really emerges, we have to make sure that the Japan-U.S. security setup will function properly and will be operated efficiently. And to that end, we also have to engage in studies as to what can be done and what cannot be done by Japan. That is how I really see it.

Next question, please.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Terry Hunt, with the Associated Press. The Prime Minister said that you spoke about the Middle East. Mr. President, what can you tell us about U.S. efforts to broker a truce between Israel and the Hezbollah guerrillas? Are you making any progress? And who do you hold primarily responsible for this violence?

President Clinton. Let's begin at the beginning. I think that clearly the truce was violated by Hezbollah violating the agreement that had previously been brokered in raining the Katyusha rockets into northern Israel. That was obviously what provoked this.

Now having said that, I think it is important that we do everything we can to bring an end to the violence. And even though we're here in Japan and we are working on a very important issue here, we've been quite active in the Middle East. The Secretary of State has spent an enormous amount of time on this issue in the last several days, and we will do what we can to bring an end to the violence and to try to reestablish a workable agreement. But I have no progress to report on that at this time.

Taiwan

Q. President Clinton, in the bilateral talks held earlier, have you touched any issues regarding the recent tension in the Taiwan Strait? Because in the declaration, we couldn't find anything like that had been mentioned. Since you emphasized that the security treaty is not only to protect Japan but also to protect the Asian-Pacific region, does it mean clearly that Taiwan is under such a protection? Thank you.

President Clinton. Well, the Prime Minister might want to comment on this as well. But yes, we discussed Taiwan and China extensively, as well as the recent tension in the strait. It is obvious that our partnership is designed to try to preserve the peace for all peoples in this region. And I believe that I can say we both agree that, while the United States clearly observes the so-called one China policy, we also observe the other aspects of the agreement we made many years ago, which include a commitment on the part of both parties to resolve all their differences in a peaceable manner. And we have encouraged them to pursue that. Therefore, we were concerned about those actions in the Taiwan Strait.

I do see some hope in the last few days that there is a return to a more orderly and peaceful relationship, and that is certainly what we are urging both the Chinese and the Taiwanese to do.

Mr. Prime Minister, do you want to say anything?

Prime Minister Hashimoto. When the situation across the Taiwan Straits became very tense, we asked both parties to exercise self-restraint. And also, since the Japan-China declaration, we have supported the Chinese position that there is only one China. Having said that, we also believe that the two parties should resolve this problem in a peaceful manner.

Korean Peace Process and U.S. Troops in Japan

Q. I would like to ask a question of both of you. Before coming here, Mr. President, you visited Korea and suggested that four countries, U.S., China, Republic of Korea, and North Korea, engage in quadrilateral discussions for peace on the peninsula. In that quadrilateral discussions, I wonder how Japanese will participate in discussions. How would you see Japanese role in that process? And what sort of roles would Japan suggest to U.S., China, Korea, and North Korea?

One other thing: In this joint declaration, you said clearly that the 100,000 troop level would be maintained in East Asia. But I believe you did not specifically refer to 47,000 in Japan. Of course, I believe looking at future peace

in East Asia—would you believe that the 47,000 troop level in Japan is something that is fixed or something that you can be flexible on?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, let me answer the second question first. We are committed to maintaining a constant level of troops in East Asia. How many troops we have on any given day and any given week in Japan or in Korea will vary from time to time, depending on what other things are going on in the world and in the area.

But we believe we should maintain our participation at more or less the same levels here in Japan, and we believe we can honor our commitments that Secretary Perry and the Prime Minister have just announced, that the Prime Minister took such a leading role in trying to—in bringing about, with regard to Okinawa and on the other issues, and still keep about 47,000 people here.

Now on the Korea issue, I want to make it clear that the proposal that we made was that these four nations would enter into the peace negotiations because the United States and China were parties to the armistice agreement in Korea 43 years ago. But it is obvious to everyone, I think, that there will never be a peace between the Korean people until they agree to the peace. Ultimately, I think that means that it will have to be supported by all the friends and neighbors of Korea that will have a large say in what kind of future any peaceful resolution would bring about.

So I was very gratified when the Prime Minister expressed his support for the proposal that President Kim and I made yesterday. And I hope that others in the region will do so as well, and then I hope they will be a part of encouraging North and South Korea to make peace and discussing what might come about after it's over if they do make peace.

Prime Minister Hashimoto. When I heard the announcement of that proposal, I was truly happy to learn the contents of that and the substance of that proposal against the background of the situation in the Korean Peninsula. For the four countries, including U.S. and China, to come to dialog without any preconditions I hope would lead to a true solution.

And in that process, if Japan is asked, I believe Japan should play any role it can. Having said that, today there exist the two countries, North Korea and the Republic of Korea; there is a borderline between them. And the United States and China that participated at the time of the armistice agreement would participate in that discussions, but it is not for Japan to go out and say we want to do this, we want to do that. That is my view. But we should earnestly play the role that we are asked to play. Certainly, that is what we ought to do to help each other.

Terrorism

Q. I'd like to ask a question with regard to the Common Agenda you have agreed to. You agreed to add new areas for bilateral cooperation, and I would like to invite comments by President Clinton and Prime Minister Hashimoto. Amongst the new areas, there is a counterterrorism initiative, and it calls for strengthened cooperation between Japan and the United States. As you know, in Japan last year there was an unprecedented large-scale terrorist incident, the Aum Shinrikyo incident, the nerve gas attack. Now, faced with these terrorist attacks, how would Japan and the United States actually try to, shall we say, cooperate and fall in step in countering these activities? Would FBI, CIA, and Japanese police authorities consider regular meetings, regular exchanges?

President Clinton. Well of course, the details would have to be worked out, but let me just, if I could, sketch a framework that I would be thinking about.

Nations like ours, as borders become more open, money and information are transferred in a millisecond all across the world, and we become more integrated, we become vulnerable to two kinds of terrorism: first of all, what you might call homegrown terrorism, what you experienced in the Japanese subway, what we experienced at Oklahoma City; secondly, terrorism that is generated or at least involves interests from beyond your borders, such as what we experienced at the World Trade Center in New York and a number of the proposed attacks that we were able to thwart.

It is obvious to me that these kinds of attacks present a genuine threat not only to the lives of the innocent civilians who may be killed in them but to the whole idea of an open, civilized society in a global economy. Therefore, I think we ought to cooperate in two ways. First of all, there's a lot of information we ought to be sharing with regard to international terrorism, and there's a lot of work we can be doing together.

Secondly, we can learn a lot from each other about how to deal with homegrown terrorism, and even that may have an international aspect. Are people learning, for example, from the Internet how to make the same sort of trouble in the United States that was made in Japan with sarin gas? Isn't it a concern that anybody anywhere in the world can pull down off the Internet the information about how to build a bomb like the bomb that blew up the Federal building in Oklahoma City? How can we work together to learn from each other about how to prevent these things before they occur, when they're purely domestically driven, as well as sharing information and technology and law enforcement about the international terrorist networks that are out there?

I predict to you that every great nation will have to face this for the next 20 years at least, and we just want to be on the cutting edge of showing that we can work together to save lives and to preserve freedom.

Prime Minister Hashimoto. Well, if I could add a word to what the President has already said, we already have cooperation on the money-laundering problems and narcotics trading. We already have cooperation in law enforcing. But how we publish these activities, please don't ask us to do that. But as in the case of law enforcement against money laundering, there are areas where cooperation is already underway. And of course, in terms of counterterrorism, I'm sure there are various ways we can engage in cooperation.

U.S. Troops in Japan

Q. Paul Basken, with United Press International. Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, for both of you: The joint declaration you have just signed describes the U.S. military role in Japan as essential to protecting the security of Asia. How have you concluded the U.S. military is essential here, and what circumstances need to change either in Japan or elsewhere in Asia before U.S. troops can safely go home?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I believe that our presence is needed here as long as people have any fear at all that some countries might seek to dominate others or that Asia might become a battleground for any sort of security problem that would affect the freedom and independence and the safety of the people of Japan or our other allies in the area. When that time comes to an end I think will largely be for the people here to determine, although obviously we would want our views heard as well.

One of the most gratifying things to me as President is that where we are involved in security partnerships, as we are in Asia, I believe that we are seen as a force of stability by our very presence there because of the capacity of our military and the fact that everyone knows we have no ulterior motive. That is, we seek no advantage; we seek to dominate no country; we seek to control no country; we seek to do nothing in any improper way with our military power. We are only here with our allies in Korea and Japan, obviously, and to serve as a source of security and stability to others throughout this region.

And as long as there is any concern about that, I think we should be here, if the people here want us here. When that time is over, we will probably all know it, but I think that definition should flow primarily from the people who have been our allies over the decades and whose security we care so deeply about.

Prime Minister Hashimoto. Let me pick up the thread where the President left it off and give my answer. The presence of the U.S. forces in this part of the world is welcome. We welcome their presence, and we believe that is serving the stability of Asia and the Pacific. And that is of the foremost importance.

The cold war is over. The days of confrontation between East and West is over. And with the end of the cold war, true, large sources of confrontation has disappeared, but regional conflicts have increased for various reasons. We see numerous areas of instability around the globe, and in this part of the world there still remain large amount of weapons of mass destruction.

Against that background, would it be possible for Japan alone to defend itself? To do that, a major effort will be required and also probably will not be able to lay to rest international concerns vis-a-vis such Japanese endeavors. The United States is putting its presence in this area in the form of the American youth, and I believe it can be understood clearly how precious a presence they are for the security of this part of the world.

Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements

Q. A question for the President. I believe the agreement law on security this time will

mean a very major turning point for Japan-U.S. security, and I wonder if you have any comments to share with us.

President Clinton. My view is that it will reinforce our community—excuse me—our security relationship, not represent a turning point but a maturing of it. For example, when the Prime Minister asked us to consider the concerns of the people of Okinawa and I became acquainted with them as a result of some of the unfortunate incidents that you know well about, it bothered me that these matters had not been resolved before now, before this time. And again, I want to publicly say what I said to the Prime Minister last night: I want to thank him for giving the United States the opportunity to respond in an appropriate manner to try to resolve these matters. But we did it in a way that did not in any way undermine our own security or defense capabilities and, therefore, permits us to cooperate with Japan in whatever way may be necessary as challenges come along in the future and as Japan defines its own security agenda.

So I don't see this as a dramatic departure. I see this as the relationship between two old friends maturing, dealing with things that needed to be dealt with, and adjusting to the challenges of the world that we now face.

Ebola Virus

Q. Brian Williams, with NBC News. Mr. President, are you up to date on the apparent discovery of the Ebola virus in Texas? And what can the Federal Government do, I guess, via the CDC to make sure that no kind of scare develops from this?

President Clinton. Yes, I have been briefed on it this morning. The CDC is on top of it. We are working with the Texas health officials. We believe, based on what we now know, that there is no substantial threat to the general population of the people there or the people of the United States generally.

So I can say that I would urge people not to overreact to this. It's a serious matter; we are on top of it. If the facts change and we think there is something more to be concerned about, you may be sure we will inform the American people as soon as we can. But for now, I am confident that the Federal Government is taking appropriate action, and that we're on top of it, and there's nothing for the people to overreact to at this moment.

Prime Minister Hashimoto. President Clinton, thank you very much. And with this, we conclude the press conference. Thank you very much for coming.

NOTE: The President's 119th news conference began at 1:45 p.m. at the Akasaka Palace. Prime Minister Hashimoto spoke in Japanese, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks to the 7th Fleet Aboard the U.S.S. *Independence* in Yokosuka, Japan

April 17, 1996

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Audience member. We love you, Mr. President!

The President. Thank you. Thank you, Admiral Ellis, General Myers, Admiral Clemins, General Freeman, Admiral Tobin. Captain Polatty, I'm delighted to be here with you. Master Chief Dwiggins; to the members of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces; and to the sailors and families of the U.S.S. *Independence* and the 7th Fleet; to the children from the Sullivan School back there and their proud parents over here, I gather, and the other schools that are here, I want to thank you for this wonderful welcome.

The First Lady and I are delighted to be here, along with the Secretary of State, Ambassador and Mrs. Mondale, my Chief of Staff, Mr. Panetta, and Mr. Lake, the National Security Adviser. I should tell you that this is a particularly emotional moment for the Secretary of State because 51 years ago this September he came here to this very harbor as a 19-year-old ensign. So think what you might have ahead of you, all of you in the Navy. You may be Secretary of State some day.

I'm glad to be here on the U.S.S. *Independence* and with the 7th Fleet. I know there are others represented here, I hope, from the *Mobile Bay* and the *Bunker Hill,* from the *Blue Ridge* and the *McCluskey,* the *O'Brien* and the *Hewitt,* the *Asheville* and the *Curtz*—one enthusiastic sailor here—[*laughter*]—the I–5 Team.

You know, for almost as long as there has been a United States there has been a ship called *Independence*. To you, the latest in the line of America's finest sailors, to all the United States Armed Forces in Japan, I bring a heartfelt message from every American back home: Thank you for your skill, your sacrifice, and your service. Thank you, and God bless you all.

Way back in 1959 when the *Indy* slipped down the ways, President Eisenhower was in office, the cold war was at its peak, and most of you weren't even born yet. But because the *Indy* was there, along with millions of brave men and women, we won that long cold war struggle.

Time after time, the sailors of the *Independence* stood up for freedom and stood down freedom's enemies. In the Cuban missile crisis, *Indy* was there. In Vietnam and Lebanon and Grenada, *Indy* was there. When Iraq invaded Kuwait, you were the first carrier on the scene. You delivered our answer up close and personal. In peacetime and war, this great ship and its battle group have been there as America's shield and America's sword.

Your last deployment off Taiwan helped to calm a rising storm. Without firing a single shot, you reassured nations all around the Pacific. With the quiet power of your example, you gave the world another example of America's power and America's character. And I thank you especially for that.

Through you, the United States is in the Western Pacific. We fought three wars in Asia in this century and sacrificed some of our finest Americans in every single one. With your strong presence here, we are preventing war's return and preserving stability for a remarkable region that is growing so fast it buys enough American products and services to support the jobs of 3 million of your countrymen and women back home in the United States.

Make no mistake, there is still a threat that war could return. Without you, the stability and prosperity of Asia could be in danger, and, therefore, so could America's. Old rivalries could break out again. A rogue state could get the wrong idea. A changing region could become unstable. But with you here, Asia is more secure, and so is America. Halfway around the world, your loved ones are safer because you are here at your stations, keeping the peace in a time of change and challenge.

I applaud the job you have done in building an alliance with the Japanese Self-Defense Forces. And I salute the officers and crew of the *Myoko* who honor us with their presence here today.

Fifty years ago no one would have believed that an American carrier and a Japanese cruiser could be berthed side by side, that our forces would work shoulder to shoulder day-in and day-out. But today Prime Minister Hashimoto and I have signed a Joint Security Declaration to strengthen our alliance and prepare it for the challenges of the 21st century together. We can do this because you are here, backing our commitments with your power.

America won the cold war, but now we are about the business of securing the peace, thanks to your dedication and your excellence. Let me say that I am well aware that we see that excellence every day in so many ways, here, from the pilots and everyone on the flight deck to the boiler technicians, from the mess cooks to the storekeepers, to the officers on the bridge. It takes every single one of you, working together as a team, to keep this ship on the flight line, to land some of the best aircraft in the world on what looks to their pilots like a postage stamp in the sea. Your teamwork has notched record after record, including the mark among active ships for arrested landings, 343,000 of them. Congratulations. As someone said to me as the helicopter was setting down, that's a lot of nonskid. [*Laughter*]

As the oldest ship in the Navy, you do fly this remarkable ensign behind me that says, "Don't Tread On Me." And as was said earlier in the introduction by the admiral, this week, this very week is the 221st anniversary of the Revolutionary War battles of Lexington and Concord, the first in America's long struggle for independence. I hope you will think about that, each and every one of you, this week. I hope you will imagine what it might have been like so many years ago, over 200 years ago, for those young people embarking on their struggle, risking their lives for what was then nothing more than a dream.

Now, more than 200 years later, you represent in your uniforms the oldest democracy in human history. Thanks to you and those who came before you, your skill and professionalism, not only does the oldest fighting ship in the fleet inspire the same respect as we have for our early patriots but thanks to you and the people who came before you, we are still here.

As you keep it that way, on freedom's flagship, remember that 221 years of people like you have made America what it is today and make possible this remarkable partnership we celebrate with the Japanese and make possible the guarantee of freedom for your children and your grandchildren and people throughout the world. I thank you for that.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to the families of the 7th Fleet for their support. Our military families bear such a heavy burden of America's leadership, especially those stationed at Yokosuka and other bases so far from home; those who have to cope with the extra strain of long periods when ships are at sea, when one parent has to carry the full load to run a household and raise the children. We ask so much of our families, but again and again they deliver. Our Nation is grateful to you as well, for our security depends upon you as well.

To the men and women of the 7th Fleet, you must know that you represent the very best of America. Over and over again, you have proved your excellence. Thanks to you, the world knows now that the United States will stand firm in Asia. Thanks to you, we can make this new Security Declaration with Japan, and everybody knows that we mean it and that we can mean it. We can stand firm for peace and security, for democracy and freedom, for a good and decent future for the children of this region and the children of the United States, thanks to you.

Our Nation is in your debt now and forever. God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:35 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Rear Adm. James Ellis, USN, Commander, Carrier Group 5; Lt. Gen. Richard Myers, USAF, Commander, U.S. Forces Japan; Vice Adm. Archie Clemins, USN, Commander, U.S. 7th Fleet; Maj. Gen. Waldo Freeman, USA, Commanding General, U.S. Army Japan; Rear Adm. Byron Tobin, USN, Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Japan; Capt. David Polatty, Commanding Officer, and MMCM Ashley Dwiggins, Command Master Chief, U.S.S. *Independence*; and Joan Mondale, wife of Ambassador Walter Mondale.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities

April 17, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to present to you the 1995 Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). For 30 years, this Federal agency has given Americans great opportunities to explore and share with each other our country's vibrant and diverse cultural heritage. Its work supports an impressive array of humanities projects.

These projects have mined every corner of our tradition, unearthing all the distinct and different voices, emotions, and ideas that together make up what is a uniquely American culture. In 1995, they ranged from an award-winning television documentary on President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the radio production *Wade in the Water*, to preservation projects that will rescue 750,000 important books from obscurity and archive small community newspapers from every State in the Union. *Pandora's Box*, a traveling museum exhibit of women and myth in classical Greece, drew thousands of people.

The humanities have long helped Americans bridge differences, learn to appreciate one another, shore up the foundations of our democracy, and build strong and vital institutions across our country. At a time when our society faces new and profound challenges, when so many Americans feel insecure in the face of change, the presence and accessibility of the humanities in all our lives can be a powerful

source of our renewal and our unity as we move forward into the 21st century.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 17, 1996.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Alaska's Mineral Resources
April 17, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1995 Annual Report on Alaska's Mineral Resources, as required by section 1011 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96–487; 16 U.S.C. 3151). This report contains pertinent public information relating to minerals in Alaska gathered by the U.S. Geological Survey, and the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and other Federal agencies.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 17, 1996.

Remarks at a Dinner Hosted by Emperor Akihito in Tokyo, Japan
April 17, 1996

Your Imperial Majesties, Prime Minister and Mrs. Hashimoto, distinguished guests. I want to thank you for your extraordinary hospitality to Hillary and to me and to all of our delegation.

Your Majesties, when we met 2 years ago, you visited our Nation and charmed all of America. As you crossed the United States you reminded all Americans of the character and dignity that distinguished the Japanese people and their rich culture. Tonight you have honored us again with your hospitality, much as you honored our Nation with your presence. You have received us with the exceptional grace and elegance for which Japan is renowned throughout the world.

More than 1,200 years ago, one of your great poets, Ootomo No Yakamochi, wrote of an "imperial setting wonderful, in its spaciousness so superb, so vast. Seeing it, I know why the rulers have dwelt here since the age of the gods." We, too, have been greeted in a setting that is so superb and that speaks of a tradition of graciousness toward friends that reaches back to antiquity.

Let me also thank the Japanese people. The welcome we have received in Tokyo, for the second time in my Presidency, speaks eloquently about the friendship between our peoples. You have made us all feel very much at home.

In a relationship as vast and complex as ours, one that has been analyzed by so many in so many different ways, no number or statistic can begin to capture the value of this friendship to both our nations. History is filled with changing alliances between states. But history offers very few examples of two peoples who have forged such a powerful relationship in the short period of half a century. We have indeed traveled far together. We have been able to cover such distance because we are joined by universal values and seek the same ends: freedom for all our citizens, the blessings of peace and prosperity that enables Japanese and Americans to make the most of their own lives.

Working side by side, we have created in modern times a great democratic tradition, one of unity and cooperation in the service of our people's highest aspirations. In only these five decades, we have reaped enormous benefits, building the two largest economies in the world and creating a tremendous force for security and stability during an era of constant change and frequent upheaval. Today we carried forward that tradition. We revitalized the alliance

that has provided such crucial stability in Asia. We continue the hard work on economic issues that will open opportunities for the future, and we've moved ahead with our common efforts to address the new problems we face around the world.

We have achieved much. For the new century that lies before us, if we maintain our resolve, we can accomplish much more.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us raise a glass to the health of the Majesties and the friendship between the peoples of the United States and Japan, which has become such an extraordinary force for progress and hope at the dawn of this new age of possibility.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 p.m. in the Imperial Palace. In his remarks, he referred to Empress Michiko and Kumiko Hashimoto, wife of Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the Diet in Tokyo
April 18, 1996

Madam Speaker, Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, ladies and gentlemen: Here in this great hall of democracy, on behalf of all of our American delegation, including my wife, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and all other Americans here, let me begin by thanking the people of Japan, the Government of Japan, and of course, the Emperor and Empress for the remarkable hospitality we have been accorded in our visit here. And let me thank you for giving me a chance to address the representatives of the people of Japan and, through you, all the Japanese people, perhaps especially your young people.

I'd also like to thank Madam Speaker for mentioning the distinguished Americans who were also born in my home State, General MacArthur and Senator Fulbright. I thank you for applauding the mention of Senator Fulbright's name. He not only helped many Japanese to get an education, but he also gave me a job so that I could complete my university education. So therefore, in a very real sense, I would not be here today if it were not for him.

One hundred and thirty-six years ago, Japan sent its very first diplomatic delegation to the United States of America. It was a remarkable year for our country. Abraham Lincoln was nominated by his party to become President, and he subsequently became the first President of his party and, many of us believe, the greatest American President.

It was a long time ago, 8 years before the beginning of your Meiji Restoration. But some things don't change very much. In his diary of that experience, one of your envoys to the United States described his visit to our Congress, and here's what he said: "We were shown to a large hall where affairs of state were being discussed. One of the Members was on his feet, screaming at the top of his voice and gesticulating wildly like a madman. When he sat down, his example was followed by another and yet another. Upon our inquiring what this was all about, we were informed that all the affairs of state were publicly discussed in this way." Well, today I hope I can show you at least that we Americans have made some improvement in the way we discuss affairs of state. [*Laughter*]

It seems impossible to believe that it was just 50 years ago that the United States and Japan began to forge what is perhaps the modern world's most remarkable partnership for peace, prosperity, and progress. Today, we celebrate the results. Japan has built one of the greatest success stories the world has ever known. You turned a closed society into an open, thriving democracy. You transformed economic devastation into powerful growth and opportunity for your people. You enriched the lives of millions by harnessing technology for positive change. You have set an example for all of Asia and, indeed, for all the world.

After World War II, a wise generation of Americans reached out a hand of reconciliation to support your extraordinary evolution, first with a security guarantee that allowed you to focus on rebuilding and with aid that helped to lay the foundation of economic growth. Now Japan and the United States are full partners,

bound together by shared values and a shared vision. All around the world, the spread of democracy and the greater prospects for peace and prosperity owe much to the work that our two nations are doing together.

Today I ask you to look with me ahead to the next 50 years of our partnership. What will it bring and how shall we build it? As the world's two largest economies and two of its strongest democracies, Japan and the United States must forge an alliance for the 21st century. Working together and leading together, I am confident that we can seize the possibilities and meet the challenges of today and tomorrow to bring even greater security and prosperity to our own people and to bring the blessings of peace and progress to other people all around the world.

Forging such an alliance will not be easy or automatic. I am well aware that there are people in both the United States and Japan who believe that because the cold war is over and won and because the United States and Japan face challenges at home, we should pull back from the world, and we should pull back from each other. But with all respect, I believe those views are wrong.

Think about the world we live in, the revolution in information and technology, from laptops to lasers, from microsurgery to megabytes. This revolution has lit the landscape of human knowledge and brought all of us closer together. Now information and ideas flash across our planet in the stroke of a computer key, bringing with them extraordinary opportunities to create wealth, to protect the environment, to prevent and conquer disease, to foster greater understanding among people of diverse cultures.

But we know, too, that this greater openness and faster change also mean that problems that start beyond our borders can quickly penetrate our borders: the spread of weapons of mass destruction, the threats of organized crime and drug trafficking and terrorism, environmental decay, severe economic dislocation. And in open and flexible societies like ours, homegrown forces of destruction can take advantage of the freedoms that we all cherish. After the sarin gas attack in the Tokyo subway and the bombing of Oklahoma City, the people of Japan and the people of the United States know this all too well.

No nation can isolate itself from these problems, and no nation can solve these problems alone. To meet and seize the opportunities and challenges of the 21st century, Japan and the United States must continue to be partners. We must join forces, and we must join with those who believe as we do.

Over the next few years we will have ample opportunities to do that. Over the past few years, we have made a good beginning. Of course, we have had some differences. What two great, complex nations would not have differences? The important point is that we have worked through them respectfully, patiently, pragmatically. And we have done so much together that today we can say with absolute confidence that the foundation for cooperation between the United States and Japan is stronger than it has ever been.

The security alliance between our two nations is the cornerstone of stability throughout Asia. We have just completed a security review, the product of more than a year's hard work and study. The Joint Security Declaration that Prime Minister Hashimoto and I signed yesterday reaffirms our commitment to keep this alliance strong and to adapt it to the challenges of a new era.

In our declaration, Japan reaffirmed its fundamental commitment to the United States-Japan security framework and to supporting modern self-defense forces. To guarantee its security and the stability of the region, the United States will maintain 100,000 troops in East Asia, including a strong presence in Japan at about current levels, with the help of your host nation support. And we will more closely coordinate our efforts to meet new security challenges, from stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction to strengthening regional and international security cooperation, from countering terrorism to promoting peace.

Recently, the hospitality the Japanese people extend to our troops was put to a terrible test in Okinawa. The American people profoundly regret the horrible violence done to a young schoolgirl there. Our hearts go out to her, to her family and her loved ones, and to the entire Okinawan community. We are gratified that justice has been done.

In the months since this incident, we have worked with the Government of Japan to minimize the burden of our military presence on the Japanese people. The joint action plan we announced this week calls for the consolidation of our bases in Okinawa and a major reduction

in inconveniences to the people who live there, like noise and training and exercises. These steps will reduce the burden of our bases without diminishing our mutual defense capability or our commitment to safeguard a Pacific at peace.

I want to say again how much I appreciate the leadership of the Prime Minister and his government and the opportunity the United States has been given to do something we probably should have done some time ago. I thank you for that.

Both our nations recognize that peace has its price. But the price is much less than the cost of putting peace at risk. Consider what might happen if the United States were to withdraw entirely from this region. It could spark a costly arms race that could destabilize Northeast Asia. It could hinder our ability to work with you to maintain security in a part of the world that has suffered enough in the 20th century through world war and regional conflicts and that is now in the midst of profound change. It could weaken our power to deter states like North Korea that may still threaten the peace and to take on urgent problems like terrorism, organized crime, and drug trafficking.

Let me say especially to the young people here in Japan and back home in America who will inherit the stewardship of our nations: Some people in my country believe our security alliance is basically a favor to Japan, and some people in Japan doubtless believe that our security alliance is basically a favor to the United States. The truth is, our security alliance benefits both our countries, the entire region, and the world. So to the young people I say, this alliance is our commitment to your freedom and to your future.

And what an extraordinary future it can be. The economies of the Asia-Pacific region are the most dynamic on Earth, already accounting for one-quarter of the world's output and growing every day, improving the lives of your own people and creating ever-expanding markets for others who produce competitive products and services.

Many of these products and services, of course, are American. Already more than 50 percent of America's trade is with the nations of the Pacific, sustaining 3 million good American jobs. Business and tourism are growing rapidly, and they will continue to do so. And to cite just one example of this region's extraordinary potential, in the next decade alone, East Asia plans to spend 1 trillion United States dollars on infrastructure projects alone.

My country, with 7 million citizens who trace their roots to Asia and five States which border the Pacific Ocean, wants to share in and add to this promise. That's why we convened a summit of the leaders of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation nations in Seattle 3 years ago. There, aided by the leadership of Japan, we began to give an extraordinarily diverse region a common identity and purpose, that of a community of nations committed to free trade and investment, to taking down barriers that block commerce and building stronger bridges of cooperation among our people.

As the world's economic leaders, Japan and the United States must set a good example. And we are, from our common commitment to bring free trade to the Asia-Pacific nations to our efforts to improve our own economic relationship.

Three years ago, our nations entered into a framework agreement to better structure our economic dialog and open markets here in Japan. Since then, we have completed 21 separate trade agreements that are making a difference to people on both sides of the Pacific. The sectors covered by these agreements, from auto parts to medical supplies, have seen their sales to Japan grow by some 85 percent, more than twice as fast as exports in other sectors.

Of course, for the American people, these exports mean more jobs at better pay. For the people of Japan, allowing these American goods and services to compete for the favor of the Japanese consumer means greater choice at lower prices. Your own Keidanren projects that deregulation will cut consumer prices to Japanese citizens by 20 percent by the year 2000. Already, to cite one example, because cellular telephone companies can now compete here, there has been a one-third cut in the cost of startup and service fees in the Tokyo region.

Of course, our trading relationship is not entirely free of friction. More work will have to be done to fully implement the agreements we have reached and to deal with other issues. But the important part is that after years of frustration on both sides, for the first time we have actually established a way to work through our differences and to resolve them.

Beyond sustaining our security and building a future of open markets, there are other responsibilities that Japan and the United States have decided to assume because of our position

in the world today, responsibilities we have committed to a Common Agenda: bringing the blessings of peace, democracy, and rights to others; protecting our shared environment; harnessing the power of science and technology for the benefit of all. Together, our nations have a unique opportunity to help people the world over to learn, to change the way they work, indeed, to transform how they live. We must seize this opportunity because it is also our responsibility.

The United States is very grateful that, more and more, Japan is taking on the responsibility of leadership that flows from its place as a great nation. From peacekeepers in Cambodia to minesweepers in the Arabian Gulf, Japan is there. From financial and political support for the Middle East peace process to the $500 million reconstruction package you have just announced for Bosnia, Japan is there. The people of Bosnia and the entire international community are grateful for this extraordinary effort on your part. From seeking an end to polio by the year 2000 to finding better ways to respond to natural disasters like earthquakes, Japan is also there leading the way. From cleaning up the environment here on Earth to exploring the heavens above, Japan is there. We are all better off for your commitment to this kind of leadership.

Today, to the Japanese people, whose pride in the past is now matched by your focus on the future, I say, stay true to that commitment to lead. Make it even stronger. We have come so far in the last 50 years. Think about it: from the waste of war to the wealth of peace; from conflict to cooperation and competition; from mistrust to partnership.

Now, I submit to you that our generation has a sacred duty to make the next 50 years even better for all of our people. In this time of remarkable possibility, I am absolutely confident that we will succeed if we continue to lead and work together as allies, as partners, and as friends.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:52 a.m. in the Chamber of the House of Representatives. In his remarks, he referred to Takako Doi, Speaker, House of Representatives, and Juro Saito, President, House of Councillors.

Remarks at a Luncheon Hosted by Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan in Tokyo

April 18, 1996

Prime Minister and Mrs. Hashimoto, the distinguished Japanese citizens here present, and my fellow Americans: Let me begin, Mr. Prime Minister, for thanking you for hosting this luncheon, and thanking the Emperor and Empress for the magnificent state visit, and all the people of Japan for making Hillary and me and the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and our entire delegation feel so very welcome here.

Over the last 50 years the United States and Japan have built a remarkable partnership for peace and security, for prosperity, and for freedom. We devoted ourselves at this meeting to planning for the next 50 years of that partnership, reaffirming our security ties, talking about a Common Agenda to lead the world to a period of greater peace and prosperity.

But I want to say at this luncheon that I fully realize that the work that each of you has done to bring our people closer together, day-in and day-out, over years and decades, has made possible the progress that we have achieved these last 2 days.

As the Prime Minister noted, the friendship between our peoples began well over a century ago. The first known Japanese citizen to live in the United States was a young sailor named Nakahama Manjiro. He was shipwrecked in 1841, rescued by an American whaleboat, sent to school in Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Prime Minister, some of our delegation think it's a pretty good thing to be sent to school in Massachusetts. [*Laughter*]

Ten years later, he returned to Japan and became one of the few Japanese-English interpreters in this country. Then he was chosen

to accompany the first Japanese diplomatic delegation to the United States in the spring of 1860. President Buchanan hosted these Japanese envoys with a state banquet. Tens of thousands of Americans turned out to see them in Baltimore and Philadelphia, hundreds of thousands of Americans filled the streets of New York City as their parade went by, and our great poet Walt Whitman immemorialized this event in a poem called "A Broadway Pageant."

Today, our contacts are more common so they don't attract so much notice, but they are very important. We see them in the Japanese students who attend our universities, in the American schoolchildren the Emperor and Empress met when they came to the United States who spend half of each day learning Japanese. We see it in your great gift to American baseball, Hideo Nomo, and in Americans like Terry Bross who come to Japan to play baseball. We see it in the Fulbright program that celebrates its 50th anniversary this year and more than four decades here in Japan.

We see it in the business leaders who come from America to Japan to work and in the fine Japanese business leaders who come to the United States and establish plants and put our people to work. We see it in the friendships which have developed over time. One such friendship was celebrated last night when a delegation of Americans headed by our former United Nations Ambassador Andrew Young and Mrs. Coretta Scott King, the widow of Dr. Martin Luther King, came here and met with Japanese friends to honor the life and the service of the late Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, and other Americans who perished in that terrible crash in Bosnia just a few days ago. And I thank you on their behalf for that friendship.

As I said to the Diet a few moments ago, because of the power of our economies and the depth of our devotion to freedom and democracy, Japan and the United States must forge a partnership for leadership in the 21st century. But we should all remember that if we are to succeed as partners and as allies, we must first be friends. It is that friendship which I honor today and which I dedicate myself to strengthening.

I ask now that we join in a toast to the Prime Minister and Mrs. Hashimoto and to the people of Japan.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:20 p.m. at the Hotel New Otani.

Remarks on Arrival in St. Petersburg, Russia
April 18, 1996

Tragedy in Lebanon

Mayor Sobchak, Governor Belyakov, Commander Seleznev, representatives of the Russian Federation, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for this welcome to St. Petersburg. I am very pleased to begin my visit to Russia here, a city so alive with promise and possibility. I have looked forward to this day for a long time, and I very much look forward to my opportunity to see the city tomorrow.

Let me begin, however, by saying I arrive at a somber moment. On behalf of the American people, I want to express my deepest condolences to the Government of Lebanon and to the families of those who were killed and wounded this morning in south Lebanon. I also offer my condolences to the Government of Fiji over the casualties among its U.N. peacekeeping personnel.

Today's events make painfully clear the importance of bringing an end to the current violence in Lebanon. To achieve that goal I call upon all parties to agree to an immediate cease-fire. An end to the fighting is essential to allow our diplomatic efforts to go forward.

Before leaving Tokyo, I directed Secretary of State Christopher to travel to the Middle East to work out a set of understandings that would lead to an enduring end to this crisis. Special Middle East Coordinator Dennis Ross will travel to the region in advance of Secretary Christopher to begin this process.

Resolving the current situation will not only stop human suffering, it will help us all to make further progress toward our goal of a com-

prehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. But let me say again, we should begin with an immediate cease-fire.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 p.m. at Pulkova Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak of St. Petersburg; Gov. Aleksandr Belyakov of Leningrad Oblast; and Comdr. Sergei Seleznev, Leningrad Military District.

Remarks at a Wreath-Laying Ceremony in St. Petersburg
April 19, 1996

Mayor Sobchak, Commander Seleznev, Director Shoshmin, ladies and gentlemen. We gather in this place as friends to remember the sacrifice of those who made our shared victory over fascism in World War II possible. In this cemetery lie the victims of the siege of Leningrad. For 900 days and 900 nights, the citizens here wrote with their blood and defiance one of the greatest chapters in all the history of human heroism. This place is testimony to all the Russian people gave and all they lost in the great struggle of World War II. It calls out to all of us, Russians and Americans alike, to work together in peace for the common good for all our people and for the world.

Mr. Mayor, here in this brave and beautiful city of St. Petersburg, we Americans are thousands of miles from home. But on this day, April 19th, 1996, our hearts must be very close to home and to the sadness and sacrifice of our own citizens. For it was exactly one year ago today that a bomb destroyed the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City and struck at the very heart of America.

The people who fell under the rubble of that building were ordinary Americans, men and women going about their jobs, working hard to provide for their families. They were Government workers dedicating their lives to helping people make the most of their own lives. They were daycare providers, looking out for and teaching our young children, and they were our children, full of promise and wonder, the pride and joy of their parents, the lifeblood of our future.

Today, in the somber spirit of this magnificent memorial to Russia's unforgotten and unforgettable sacrifice, I ask every American to join in a national moment of silence for the victims of Oklahoma City.

The loss we suffered in Oklahoma City reminds us all that when peace is broken, life itself becomes fragile. And so today, as we remember the staggering losses of the Russian people in World War II and the Americans who died in Oklahoma City, we pray, too, for an end to violence and the restoration of peace in the Middle East and everywhere where neighbors still fight over their ethnic and religious differences.

Let us pause to give thanks for the freedoms, old and new, that now bless our lives. And let us pause to pray for those who lost their lives to freedom's enemies, and for those whose tomorrows can still be saved, if we are wise enough and strong enough to find peace.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:50 a.m. at the Piskaryevskoye Cemetery. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak of St. Petersburg; Comdr. Sergei Seleznev, Leningrad Military District; and Alexander Shoshmin, director, Piskaryevskoye Cemetery.

Remarks at Kazan Cathedral and an Exchange With Reporters in St. Petersburg
April 19, 1996

The President. This morning, I have had three very moving experiences: first at the cemetery, the most powerful reminder imaginable about the heroism of the Russian soldiers and the devotion of Russian citizens to the freedom of this country, and then at the Russian Museum, a wonderful picture of the magnificent history of Russian art, and of course here at this cathedral with its remarkable story, a reminder of the power of belief in the spirit in Russian history and the Russian character.

These experiences remind us of Russia's past and its achievements of the present and the remarkable changes that are going on. They also give me great confidence in the future of this country and what we can accomplish together in the spirit of peace and mutual respect and genuine partnership. And so, I feel a great deal of gratitude to the people of St. Petersburg today for these experiences that I have shared with them, and I thank them for giving me the opportunity that I have enjoyed, especially this remarkable moment at the cathedral, learning of its past, its present, and what we all hope will be its future.

Thank you.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, at a place of peace like this church, what thoughts might be coming—Mr. President, coming to a place of peace like this great cathedral, I wonder if it might bring to mind any thoughts for your peace effort in the Middle East?

The President. Well, I think that the parties have got to agree to a cease-fire. It's obvious that they're neighbors, and as we have seen in the terrible events of the last few days, once someone starts the spiral of violence, it's hard to stop. And because the rockets are fired from the areas they're fired from, it's almost impossible for innocent civilians not to be hurt and killed.

We had the situation there in hand, as you know, for more than 2 years because of the peace agreement that was brokered in '93 by the Secretary of State. He is going back there. Mr. Ross is there. We are doing our very best.

Q. Do you have any information that would lead you to believe that both sides will agree to the cease-fire, and what's the status right now of the negotiations?

The President. Well, I'm getting regular updates. Mr. Ross is—I think he is actually there now, and the Secretary of State will go as quickly as he finishes his talks with the Chinese Foreign Minister. And obviously, we have direct contacts with all the parties involved. I think they are looking for a way to stop the fighting, and so I am somewhat hopeful.

I do believe they are looking for a way to stop it. I think that it's obvious now that there's almost no way to contain it or prevent the loss of innocent life once the rockets start firing and the retaliation begins. So I think we have a chance, and we are going to work very hard today and tomorrow and see if we can do it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:05 p.m. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters in St. Petersburg
April 19, 1996

Q. Mr. President, can I ask you—anything you wanted to see in particular?

The President. I saw the Impressionists' paintings; I wanted to see them. And I wanted to see the living quarters of Catherine the Great. [*Laughter*]

Q. How did it compare to yours?

The President. I like mine just fine. [*Laughter*]

Q. [*Inaudible*]—house, Mr. President?

The President. Well, she didn't have to run for election. [*Laughter*]

Q. Are you going to see the Rembrandts here?

The President. Perhaps, yes. I love the desks. The thing that strikes me is the woodwork. I hadn't counted on seeing all that. You ought to go back and see all the secret chambers in the desk back there. He put everything he had in there.

Q. Mr. President, you've seen some religious symbols today that have been opened in the last few years to the Russian people. What are your thoughts on seeing things that didn't used to be open during the Soviet era?

The President. That's a very good thing, not only making it available to the people but also making religious expression legitimate again and making it—encouraging and nourishing it. I think it's a real sign of the health of the Russian democracy that religion is respected and people are free to pursue it and express their honest convictions.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 2:30 p.m. in the White Hall Room at the Hermitage Museum. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom in Moscow, Russia

April 20, 1996

Chechnya

Q. Mr. President, did you and the Prime Minister discuss Chechnya and the ongoing crisis with President Yeltsin?

The President. No, we just got here. We're just starting a discussion.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—together, was Chechnya brought up?

The President Chechnya was not brought up. We discussed the Middle East and we discussed Bosnia, because we have common efforts there. But the rest of our time was devoted to the nuclear summit.

And I'm looking forward, I might say, to this meeting because of all the good work the Prime Minister has done for peace in Northern Ireland with the Irish Prime Minister. And I think that the proposal for all-party talks and the elections as a way to get into it is a very good thing. And I think the cease-fire should be reestablished by the IRA immediately.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. What about the Middle East, sir? Have you heard anything from Secretary Christopher or other people involved, any updates?

The President I'm in regular contact with him, but I have nothing to add right now. We're working at it hard and we may have something to say in the next few hours, but I just don't know.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 10 a.m. at the Kremlin. In his remarks, he referred to President Boris Yeltsin of Russia and Prime Minister John Bruton of Ireland.

The President's Radio Address

April 20, 1996

Good morning. Today I speak to you from Russia, the final stop in a journey that has focused on my first priority as President: increasing the security and safety of the American people. Today, though the cold war is over, serious challenges to our security remain. In fact, the very forces that have unlocked so much potential for progress—new technologies, borders more open to ideas and services and goods and money and travelers, instant global communications,

and instant access to unlimited amounts of important information all across the world—these very forces have also made it easier for the forces of destruction to endanger innocent lives in all countries.

Because so many threats to America's security are global in scope and because no nation is immune to them, we simply must work with other nations more closely than ever to fight them. Whether the threat is the aggression of rogue states or the spread of weapons of mass destruction or organized crime or drug trafficking or terrorism, no nation can defeat it alone. But together we can deal with these problems and we can make America more secure. That's what I have worked hard to do this week.

In Korea, President Kim and I proposed a new initiative to promote peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula, where 37,000 American troops stand watch on the last cold war frontier. In the last 3 years we have dramatically reduced North Korea's nuclear threat. Now the four-party peace process we call for among North and South Korea, China, and the United States can lead to a permanent peace. We hope and we expect that North Korea will take it seriously.

In Japan, Prime Minister Hashimoto and I signed a Joint Security Declaration adapted to the 21st century, after a year of very hard work. It strengthens the commitment of the world's two largest economies to work together to maintain peace in the Asia-Pacific region, a region that buys one-half of America's exports and supports over 3 million American jobs.

Here in Moscow, I am working with other world leaders in a summit to improve nuclear safety, protect the environment and public health against nuclear accidents, and prevent nuclear materials from falling into the wrong hands. Again, in the last 3 years we've done a great deal to reduce the number of nuclear weapons, the number of countries holding nuclear weapons; and there are no nuclear weapons pointed at the American people anymore. Still, there is a great deal of work to be done. We need a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, greater protections against environmental and public health damage, and we have to do even more to ensure the security of the nuclear materials that are out there now.

Just as we work with our friends and allies to protect the security of our people, we also must do our part at home, making sure that we're as well-prepared as possible to do what needs to be done to combat the forces of destruction, whether they are homegrown or whether they come from beyond our borders. This is especially true of our efforts against terrorism. That's why I'm very pleased that Congress has agreed to give the American law enforcement people important new tools to fight terrorism.

Yesterday was the first anniversary of the bombing in Oklahoma City. We owe it to the fine Americans who were killed there, those who were wounded, and their families to do all we can to fight terrorism. Last year I sent Congress a bill to strengthen law enforcement's ability to protect Americans from terrorism. Right after the Oklahoma City bombing I strengthened the proposals, and congressional leaders promised swift passage of the legislation. This past Thursday, Congress passed the antiterrorism bill at last. Now, my fellow Americans, there will be no more delay. I will sign this bill into law early next week, and by Wednesday, law enforcement will have new tools to crack down, track down, and shut down terrorists.

Even though I'm pleased with what Congress, both Republicans and Democrats together, did, I am disappointed that some of my proposals were left out of the bill. I believe we should help police keep suspected terrorists under surveillance. I believe we should give law enforcement more time to investigate and prosecute terrorists who use machineguns, sawed-off shotguns, and explosive devices. These and other important antiterrorism measures were left on the cutting-room floor.

But this bill still makes important progress. It will make it easier for police to trace bombs to criminals who made them by requiring chemical taggants in some explosive materials. It will make it much harder for terrorists to raise the money they need to fund their crimes. It may not go as far as I would like, but it does strike a real blow against terrorism, and I will be happy to sign it.

From Egypt to England, from the Tokyo subway to the World Trade Center, from the heart of Jerusalem to America's heartland, terrorism ignores borders and strikes without discrimination. As we recognize crime victims everywhere this National Crime Victims' Rights Week, we must vow never to relent against these forces of destruction.

By working with other nations, we can put terrorists on the defensive and make the world a safer place. And by working together at home, we will keep America strong and secure as we move into the new century.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11 p.m. on April 19 at the Radisson Slavjanskaya Hotel in Moscow for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 20. The National Crime Victims' Rights Week proclamation of April 19 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

The President's News Conference in Moscow
April 20, 1996

The President. I would like to begin my remarks by thanking President Yeltsin for his leadership in first initiating and then hosting this conference. The work that we all did here in Moscow, for me, is a part of my most important duty as President: increasing the safety and security of the American people. At this nuclear summit, we have done that by reducing the grave dangers posed by nuclear weapons and the materials used to build them. The steps we have taken here today and the foundation of cooperation we've set for the future will make not only the American people but people all over the world more secure.

First, we resolved to complete a true zero-yield comprehensive test ban treaty this year. Never before have all our nations joined as one and embraced this goal which would ban any nuclear explosion, including weapons test explosions. American leaders since Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have sought a comprehensive test ban to help stop the spread of nuclear weapons and to strengthen the security of the United States and nations throughout the world. Today, because of the progress made here in Moscow, we are closer to this goal than at any time since the dawn of the nuclear age. Our work will speed progress on the treaty, which we hope to sign in September at the United Nations. With more hard work we can soon see the day when no nuclear weapons are detonated anywhere on the face of the Earth.

In this time of rapid technological change and increasingly open borders, one of the greatest dangers we face is the possibility of nuclear materials falling into the wrong hands. Today we agreed to work together more closely than ever to prevent that from happening. We will strengthen safeguards on fissile materials and components that might be used to build a bomb. We have created a joint program to fight trafficking in these materials by dramatically increasing cooperation among our nations' law enforcement, customs, and intelligence authorities.

Preventing the spread of nuclear material is a global problem that demands global cooperation. We want to enlist others in this effort as well. Already Ukraine has endorsed the program adopted here. We invite other nations to do the same and to join us in this crucial work.

We also took steps to make the civilian use of nuclear energy safer. The 10th anniversary of Chernobyl is only a few days off. We're determined to do more to increase reactor safety and prevent another tragedy from happening. We reaffirmed our agreement with President Kuchma to close Chernobyl by the year 2000, and we'll work to end the dumping of nuclear materials in oceans.

All our efforts here have been driven by a single principle: When we use nuclear energy, our first and highest priority must be safety.

From the beginning it has been a crucial goal, a central goal of my Presidency to further reduce the nuclear threat. I'm proud of what we've achieved so far. Because of my agreement with President Yeltsin, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are targeted at United States cities. We secured the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, froze North Korea's dangerous nuclear program, cut existing nuclear arsenals by putting the START I treaty into force, and cleared the way for even deeper cuts by ratifying the START II treaty. And we persuaded Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakstan to give up the nuclear weapons on their soil.

There is more we must do. In this new era of possibilities we do have real opportunities to make all our citizens safer, but we know

there are real challenges there as well. This important summit has put these issues of nuclear safety at the top of the international agenda. Today we took yet another step back from the nuclear precipice. We must not rest until these dangers have been reduced, until the cloud of fear has been lifted, until we can feel safe that the power of the atom is being used to benefit human life and not imperil it.

Support of Russian Denuclearization

Q. Mr. President, even with the millions previously pledged by the United States, Russia is still said to be many years away from being able to properly guard nuclear materials and facilities. This summit, however, is producing no new financial pledges to such programs and instead is producing more paper agreements of the type Russia's already been slow to comply with. How confident can you be in Russia's will—in its financial goals to carry out the agreements it's signed, particularly if it has——

The President. Well, first of all, we do have some funds set aside for this purpose that have not been fully drawn down. And secondly, in terms of the United States and Russia, we've been working on this issue for better than 2 years now, and I can say that in the last year we have seen a substantial number of specific things being done by the Russians to increase nuclear safety here. So I think there has plainly been movement. I think they're clearly moving in the right direction.

Let me state furthermore that this is a global problem. Russia is not the only country in the world that has this problem by a long shot. And if you read this document, it is clear that the document will only have meaning if we act on it, but the unusual thing about this document compared with past ones is that this is, as far as I know, the first time that these eight nations have agreed together to do very specific things to try to control the trafficking in nuclear materials, which is something we're all very concerned about. And given the rise of terrorist networks and the interconnections through computer technology in the world, it is all the more important.

But this situation with regard to Russia is better than it was a year ago. There are still funds that can be drawn down. And as specific things come up, if we can't fund them, I think that we'll be able to find the funds available. I am not worried about the money on this aspect of this large issue that we've been talking about.

Go ahead, Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press], you're next.

Iran

Q. Mr. President, after the Summit on Nuclear Safety, President Yeltsin said that Russia is going to go ahead with its sale of nuclear technology to Iran, a state that you consider a terrorist nation. Do you still consider this sale a bad idea, and does it undercut this whole summit?

The President. No. Yes, it's a bad idea; no, it does not undercut the summit. I think it's a bad idea because we're against any nuclear cooperation with Iran for one simple reason: We believe they're trying to develop a nuclear program, notwithstanding what they may say to the contrary.

The defense that Russia has made is that they're simply giving them the technology that we propose to provide to North Korea. The difference is, we are moving North Korea down on the scale of nuclear capacity in a cooperative effort that, so far, North Korea has fully kept its word on. We are moving down, and we are dismantling a nuclear threat. In the case of Iran, they are moving up in their nuclear capacity even though what Russia proposes to transfer itself cannot be used to develop a nuclear weapon. And we just don't believe that there should be any nuclear cooperation with a country who's trying to develop a nuclear program. We don't need any more states with nuclear capacity in this world to make weapons. We don't need that. So that's our position.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN].

Judicial Appointments

Q. Mr. President, while you've been here, Senate majority leader Bob Dole delivered a major speech in Washington criticizing your record on fighting crime and your record in appointing what he describes as liberal judges. I wonder if you'd care to respond to Senator Dole.

The President. Well, I will respond at greater length after I get home. Since I do not believe—I like the old-fashioned position that used to prevail that people didn't attack the President when he was on a foreign mission for the good of the country. It has been abandoned with reg-

ularity in the last 3½ years, but I don't think that makes it any worse a rule.

I will just say this: Senator Dole voted for 98 percent of the judges that I appointed, and the rating systems for judges, going back to the Eisenhower administration, by the American Bar Association indicate that I have appointed the best qualified judges of any President since Mr. Eisenhower was in this job. And my record on the crime issue is quite clear, and I'll have a chance to reaffirm it next week when I get back and we sign the antiterrorism bill.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC].

Northern Ireland and Middle East Peace Processes

Q. Mr. President, events from Lebanon to London—there have been setbacks for the peace efforts in which you have invested yourself and your prestige. I wonder if you may now feel that settlements you might have thought were almost within your grasp are now slipping away from you?

The President. Well, if these peace efforts were easy, they would have been concluded a long time ago. And I never expected the road to be completely straight. I will say this: I had a good talk with Prime Minister Major today about the Irish peace process. The United States supports all-party talks and supports the elections that the Irish and British Governments have proposed as a vehicle to get to them. We strongly believe, I personally strongly believe that the cease-fire should be reinstituted. I believe that's what the overwhelming majority of the people of Northern Ireland of both traditions want. And we'll keep working toward that end. I think we've got a chance to see that process succeed.

With regard to Lebanon, I had a long talk with Secretary Christopher this afternoon. He is in Syria now; he will see President Asad this evening. He will also have contact with the other foreign ministers that are there. And we're going to do the best we can to get this back on track. We have got to get the cease-fire. And we need to restore something like what existed in 1993, before it was broken a few days ago.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, to follow up on that, a few hours ago, I guess it was, President Chirac was very optimistic about the prospects for a cease-fire, saying he thought that it was possible that could happen today or tomorrow. Do you share that optimism, first of all? And secondly, do you think that there is any life left at all in the overall peace process after what has been happening over the past 10 days?

The President. Oh, yes. I don't think if—I think what happened in the past 10 days happened because there is life in the peace process. I think the resumption of the rocket—the Katyusha rockets, was a direct attempt to drive a stake through the peace process, through the heart of the peace process. I don't think this is very complicated.

I think Hezbollah did what they did, and I think they have probably been very pleased in a tragic way that the Israeli reaction included the misfiring of certain shells that killed all those civilians, because that's what they want to do. They want to kill the peace process. And I think the fact that they want to kill it shows that there is still life in it. And so I do believe that this is a difficult period.

Now, in terms of—President Chirac and I talked about this extensively today, and as I said, the Secretary of State will have contact with the two European foreign ministers and the Russian foreign minister who are in Syria. He will then see President Asad, and he will then—I expect that he will probably go back to Jerusalem tonight, sometime late tonight.

But I have found that predictions are not particularly useful, so I don't want to voice optimism or pessimism. I do want to say that there are two things we have to do here: We have got to stop the violence, but we also have to get some sort of understanding that will enable the people of Lebanon and the people who live in the northern part of Israel to go back to a normal life.

And my heart really goes out to them. The people who live in southern Lebanon are basically caught in a political web that is far beyond their ability to control. And so I hope to goodness we can give them back the elements of their life, so they at least have the security of peace in the next—for the indeterminate period. But if we can do that, I think the peace process can be put back on track.

Yes, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS]?

Russian-U.S. Relations

Q. I wanted to go back to the question that Terry asked you earlier. You said that you didn't think that Russia's cooperation with Iran on

sharing of nuclear technology undercut what happened here today. And then you seemed to lay out all of the problems that that would lead to.

The President. No, what I mean——

Q. I wasn't quite finished. I wanted to ask if you didn't think that that might also lead to some skepticism about the entire relationship between the United States and Boris Yeltsin when he seems to persist in doing something that seems so clearly against the interest of not only the United States but the rest of the world as you see it.

The President. No, because on balance, we've gotten a lot more progress out of this nuclear relationship with the Russians than this one setback would indicate, number one. And number two, he didn't say one thing and do another here. I mean, he publicly said what they were going to do, so there's no evidence of dishonesty on the part of the Russian position whatever. I just think they're wrong.

But if you compare that action, which I disagree with, with Yeltsin's detargeting the missiles, with putting START I into effect, with his support for START II, with his willingness to accelerate further our reduction and mutual efforts to reduce the nuclear threat, with the support that he's given us for the indefinite extension of the NPT, with the work that they have done with us to increase the security of nuclear materials in the last year—when you add up all the things that have been done and the things that Russia has committed to do in this treaty going forward, including supporting the zero-yield comprehensive test ban, supporting the effort to end ocean dumping, supporting the convention on radioactive waste management, the answer is, this one thing that I strongly disagree with does not come close to outweighing the benefits that we've gotten out of this relationship.

As I said, there are—Russia is not the only country that believes that they're just giving Iran the same technology that we've already approved for North Korea in terms of generating nuclear power. The difference is we're bringing North Korea down; they will bring Iran up by some marginal capacity to deal with and understand nuclear technology and continue to build toward nuclear capacity. And we believe, notwithstanding what they say to the contrary, that they want to have the ability to produce weapons. So we think it's a very serious thing.

Russian Elections

Q. Mr. President, I know you don't like to comment on the Russian Presidential elections other than to say that the U.S. supports those who are in favor of democratic reform, but based on that policy, I wonder if you could explain your thinking and rationale for meeting tomorrow with the leading Communist candidate at a reception.

The President. Well, yes. First of all, the last time I was here I met with a representative group of political leaders across all the parties and had a joint discussion—I didn't have any individual bilaterals—because Russia is essentially a multiparty state. And so I'm going to do that again tomorrow. But that's not inconsistent with our position that in democracies, we believe the people have to make their own decisions, and we will honor the decisions that they make. In the countries that have essentially two-party systems, when I go to a country I virtually always meet with the leader of the opposition. And that's not just my policy; that's been the policy of the American President over a long period of time.

So anybody who is playing by the rules here, the democratic rules, participating in the democratic system, is entitled to do it under the Russian Constitution, and I'm going to meet tomorrow with—the Ambassador invited a number of people here from the different political parties, and I'm still not sure who is coming and who is not. But I will meet with those who come and let them say whatever they want to say, and I'll ask them a few questions.

Q. Do you consider that a way of keeping the door open?

The President. Absolutely not. It's not opening a door or closing a door, it should be—there is no significance to that in terms of this election process in Russia. This is something I do everywhere. When I go to other countries and I meet with the heads of government, when there is one clear head of an opposition, I meet with the opposition. In this case, Russia is an emerging democracy with a lot of different parties.

The last time I was here, I had a good talk with eight or 10 different leaders from around Russia, including leaders of other parties in the Duma and a couple of governors, heads of other provinces, or oblasts. And so that's what I do, and I'm going to do it again tomorrow.

George [George Condon, Copley News Service].

Q. Mr. President, have the Russian economic and political reforms reached a point where they are essentially irreversible, or are they sufficiently fragile that the election of the wrong person here would bring us back to an adversarial state or even a resumption of some modified form of the cold war?

The President. I believe that when you—what did Nelson Mandela say—the most important—one that Nelson Mandela says—the most important election is the next election, or—no, Aristide said that the most important election, when a country becomes a democracy, is the second election.

What I believe is that the Russians have established a pretty vigorous democratic system already. And if they have another Presidential election that's a free and fair election with a significant amount of participation by the voters, I think every time you do that, it makes the path of democracy stronger and a reversal less likely.

There is clearly more room for differences of policy on economic and on foreign affairs matters, but I believe that the growth of free enterprise in Russia and the beginnings of people, ordinary people feeling the economic benefits of it, plus the need that any great country has today for attracting capital from around the world through the international financial institutions and through private investments, are going to be at least strong incentives to maintain at some pace a direction toward economic as well as political reform.

You know, no one knows—no one can predict the future, but I think on balance, the Russian people have been about the business of defining their greatness as they look to the future and not to the past. And if their greatness lies in freedom of expression of their people and of their accomplishments rather than their ability to either dominate others or have themselves dominated by a strong, central, autocratic state, that whatever election results come out, the future will probably be all right.

But this country just kind of got started on this a few years ago, so I don't know that any of us know the future. I can just say that the United States supports the democratic movement in Russia and we support economic reform, and we believe the country has enormous talent and enormous resources, and if it can get through this difficult period of transition with forward-looking leadership, that it will be a prosperous, strong, invaluable member of the world community in the future. And it all depends upon how the Russian people, ultimately, through their democracy, decide to define their greatness.

Q. Mr. President, that answer could let some people believe that you don't think there's really that much difference between the reelection of Boris Yeltsin and the election of Gennady Zyuganov. That isn't what you believe, is it?

The President. I believe that that's the story you want to write, one way or the other. [*Laughter*] And the right, the correct, position for the United States is not to become involved in any direct way.

I have had a good relationship with President Yeltsin. He has done a lot of good things in terms of removing the nuclear threat from the world and in terms of increasing the security of the Russian people, the American people, and others who are affected by it. And we have worked together to get international financial institutions to support Russia's economic transition because it's been a very difficult thing. And everyone knows of that relationship.

But it is not right for the United States or for any other country to tell people how they should vote. That's what democracy is about. How would you like it and how would you be affected by it if leaders of all the other countries in the world showed up in the United States between now and November and said vote for President Clinton or vote for Senator Dole? Most Americans would say, "Well, I hope we'll be friends when this is over, but I don't much care who you think I should vote for. I believe I'm smart enough to make that decision for myself."

That's the only point I'm making. You should read nothing into this one way or the other except the fact that the United States and Russia, in my view, have a big obligation to their people to continue to be allies, to have a constructive relationship, to resolve as many of their differences as possible, and to move forward together into the future.

Our soldiers are side by side with IFOR in Bosnia today. We have done a lot of things together. And my specific belief is that neither the President of the United States nor anyone else has any business telling the citizens of Russia in any kind of explicit way how they should

vote. Yes, there will be consequences to the votes they cast, and they will be able to sort out those consequences. And sometimes voters are right about what the consequences are of their votes, and sometimes they're not. And that's not only true in Russia, that's true in the United States and lots of other places.

But our business is to support a certain direction, to reaffirm our own values, our own interests, and the terms on which we want to engage Russia in partnership. That's our business here. The business of the Russian people is to be good citizens in a new democracy and become well-informed and make up their own mind and go and vote and chart their own destiny. And that's what they're going to do.

Domestic Criticism and Foreign Relations

Q. Mr. President, at any of the tables that you've been sitting at in your three stops this week, have you felt undercut as a leader because of the criticism from home, the political criticism from home?

The President. No. Not at all.

Assistance to Russia

Q. Mr. President, I represent one of the newspapers, and we see all around us, in Moscow even, children starving, some of them dying. What are we going to do? How can you help us? We hear that there is assistance coming from the United States to help our children. Where is this assistance going? We don't see it. It's disappearing. Can you tell us anything about what we can do? Help us work our way through this thing. But we see the money just disappearing. Please.

The President. First of all, most of the direct aid that the United States has given to Russia has been in the area of dealing with the aftermath of the cold war. And we put a lot of resources into helping bring down the nuclear threat so that Russia would be able to find other resources to deal with the human problems of the people.

Secondly, we have recently worked very hard to qualify Russia for very large sums of funds through the international financial institutions, which should be beginning to flow now.

Thirdly, we are working on what specific things we can do in addition to that to, both on our own and through international cooperation with other countries, to deal with some of the most urgent humanitarian problems. Just yesterday, for example, when I was in St. Petersburg, I had a conversation about what we could do to help to get more humanitarian aid to benefit the Russian children in some specific areas of problems that have been outlined.

So I know this is frustrating to you because the economy collapsed so much, and it's not totally recovered. But I believe that the economy is getting better and that, because of that, more aid will be able to flow now. And I think that if you can stay on the course of reform, I believe that there will be marked improvements in the next couple of years. That's what I believe.

But I also think, as a practical matter, that I and other world leaders who want to support Russia need to examine much more specifically some of the humanitarian problems that we could alleviate at what is a relatively small cost to ourselves with a huge benefit to the people of Russia.

Peter, do you want to translate that? Did you understand? Can you hear me? Peter, are you going to say that in Russian or not? Do we need to do that? Oh, it's simultaneous.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 120th news conference began at 7:07 p.m. in the Radisson Slavjanskaya Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine; Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom; President Jacques Chirac of France; President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria; President Nelson Mandela of South Africa; and Jean-Bertrand Aristide, former President of Haiti. (Due to a delay in receipt of this news conference for publication in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, it was formerly designated as No. 125. News conferences which follow in this volume have been redesignated by order of their occurrence as appropriate.)

The President's News Conference With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Moscow
April 21, 1996

Russia-U.S. Relations

President Yeltsin. Dear members of the press, ladies and gentlemen, our discussion with the President of the United States of America lasted sufficiently long, about 5 hours, and in substance became the continuation of the discussions that were started within the G–7, issues which we discussed within the 8, and today's meeting also to a great extent coincided. First of all, this was security; regional stability was also discussed in the bilats.

I think that today's discussion gave a rather large contribution to the successes of the G–7 in Moscow in the security area—discussions of a whole series of issues on nuclear security and how to move ahead on START II, to strengthen the ABM Treaty of 1972. We now have rather good schedules on what Russia has to do, what the United States has to do by October of this year.

We've reached progress on European security as well. In May, we have an important meeting which should be dedicated to reviewing the CFE Treaty and forces in Europe. We agreed to work in this area and to concentrate more in the future on the wording of the treaty itself. You'll probably have questions at this.

Our two countries as cosponsors of the Middle East peace process we discussed in great detail. We discussed the situation in Israel and Lebanon. They were discussed also at the meeting of the 8 and now the ministers of foreign affairs of our countries are continuing talk. We're constantly in touch with them, and today we summarized a bit on some of the decisions reached.

Russia and the United States play a key role in the settlement in Bosnia. Our peacekeeping troop units are working very well. We have to reinvigorate this and aim it at nonmilitary aspects of the settlement, such as holding elections, providing for human rights, and rebuilding the destroyed areas.

I want to especially underscore here the fact that the elections do not interfere with the long-term cooperation between our two countries. I mean, our Presidential elections do not stand in the way. Our policies allow us to speak about various issues and we have a practice now and a tradition with Bill to hold normal, regular meetings whenever we meet, and whenever we make comments to each other and react to each other's statements. This is as any family would have it. There are sometimes comments made to each other—these issues at least have no ideological nature whatsoever. The United States and Russia are great powers. It's not just for us to get involved with big global issues, but we look out for our own interests.

In today's meeting, we have defined more carefully our policies, our tasks. We have established on the basis of equality—we've added the words "on the basis of equality" in our cooperation, which is in consistence with the interest of our two countries. And in the majority of cases, the lion's share of cases, others support both us and the United States in all of this. Our partners all have interest and see interest in the positive development of U.S.-Russia relations. They view our relationship as a factor which promotes international cooperation. This is very good.

Next week, I'm going to China. There, I plan to touch upon many of the issues which we discussed yesterday and today in Moscow. I'm counting on understanding from the Chinese.

I want to say that I'm very pleased with my discussion with the President of the United States, and I hope that Bill will also express his points of view, how he assesses our meeting today.

Thank you, Bill.

President Clinton. Thank you very much, President Yeltsin.

Ladies and gentlemen, just a few years ago the mere fact of a meeting between the American and Russian Presidents was news. But this is my 3rd trip to Moscow as President and my 10th meeting with President Yeltsin. So now the news is no longer that we are meeting, but instead what we're meeting about and what is being done for the benefit of our people.

After this meeting there is much to report. First, let me thank President Yeltsin for initiating and then hosting yesterday's nuclear summit. It is fitting that this summit was held in Mos-

cow. For 3 years, the President and I have worked together in trying to make the world a safer place by reducing the nuclear threat that all our citizens face. Because of those efforts, Russian and American missiles are no longer pointed at each other's cities or citizens. We've both made deep cuts in our nuclear arsenals by putting START I into force. And we'll make even deeper cuts when the Duma ratifies START II.

We've worked with Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakstan to dismantle nuclear weapons on their land. And yesterday, with other world leaders, we took important steps to make nuclear materials more secure so they don't fall into the wrong hands, to make the civilian use of nuclear power safer, and to strongly support the passage of a comprehensive test ban treaty this year.

The United States and Russia are also working together to promote peace in the world's most troubled regions. The President and I reviewed the situation in Bosnia, where our troops are serving side by side to help its people rebuild their land and their lives.

As cosponsors of the Middle East peace process, we discussed the terrible outbreak of violence in Lebanon and northern Israel. We agree on the need to secure a cease-fire to stop the violence, and as all of you know, our foreign ministers are both in the region as we speak. The best way to prevent violence from returning is to continue implementing the agreements between Israel and the Palestinian Authority and to secure a comprehensive peace in the region that includes Lebanon and Syria.

The political and the security partnership between our nations is strengthened by our growing commercial ties. We've worked hard to take down the old barriers to trade and to investment. Thanks to President Yeltsin's leadership, 60 percent of Russia's economy is now in the hands of its people, not the state. Inflation has been cut; democracy is taking hold. Since 1993, trade between the United States and Russia is up 65 percent. And the U.S. is now the largest foreign investor in this great nation. That's helping to create more good jobs and new opportunities in both our countries.

The President and I also discussed areas in which we have differences, as he mentioned. The flank issue of the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty is one of them. But we are working hard to find a solution to that that is acceptable to all parties prior to the review conference in May, and I can say with confidence that we did move closer to that goal today.

We also made important progress in distinguishing between antiballistic missile systems that are limited by the ABM Treaty and theater missile defenses which are not. As a result, we'll send our negotiators back to Geneva next month with the aim of concluding an initial demarcation agreement this June.

From St. Petersburg to Moscow, these last 3 days have allowed me and our entire American delegation to see the richness of Russia's past, the achievements of its present, and the promise of its future. I want the Russian people to know how much the American people support Russia's commitment to democracy and to reform. We've learned from our history that building a thriving democracy is not easy or automatic, but Russia is making dramatic progress, as evidenced by the Duma elections last December and the coming Presidential elections this June.

This is a time of real possibility and opportunity to make our people more prosperous and more secure. The United States wants a strong, stable, and open Russia, to work with us as equal partners in seizing those opportunities and turning the challenges of a new era in the common solutions.

Thank you.

President Yeltsin. Thank you. Please, questions.

U.S. and Russian Elections

Q. A question to both Presidents: To what extent do the elections in Russia and the United States in November define the U.S.-Russian relation today? Thank you.

President Clinton. Who will go first? I'll go first. Well, I think all elections have consequences, and so the relationship will be defined obviously by these elections in important ways. The United States supports the direction that Russia has taken in building a vibrant and open democracy and in moving toward an economic reform which would put more of the economy in the hands of the people. And we now see, after some very difficult years, some real progress being made. And we look forward to being a good partner in that effort, as well as in making our countries more secure and ending the nuclear threats and in finding ways to work together to solve other problems around the world.

Two great nations like ours have a lot of common interests for the future, and I would hope no matter what happens we'll be able to pursue that. But I don't think we should be under any illusion that people run for office on platforms that they intend to implement and, therefore, all elections involve choices and have consequences. And so the people of Russia and the people of the United States will have to come to grips with that and make their own judgments, as great democracies do.

President Yeltsin. I, too, would like to answer since the question was to both Presidents. I have to say that with every meeting with the President of the United States, our relations improve. Not a single meeting has yet been empty. It always has given us not only to our countries, to our peoples, but all of us some sort of a positive.

Undoubtedly, also, yesterday's meeting of the 8 has given a lot, and today's meeting with the President, since the meetings touched upon a large variety of issues and problems, bilateral, international in nature where issues came together, coincided, et cetera.

But I just wanted to tell those who in the press and in the media have already tried to tally up the score and say, "Well, they especially really contrived this whole meeting in Moscow in order to help the President of Russia, President Yeltsin"—that's not so. This was planned a long time ago; way back in Halifax we had statements to this effect. And no questions which have to do with any kind of mutual obligations or tie-ins to the elections both here or in November in the United States—we did not have any tie-ins, any mutual obligations to each other, especially material or financial. We gave no assurances, any deals. We were here open, honest. So don't suspect here—suspect us in any way, a meeting such as the 8 or a meeting of two Presidents of two great nations.

Q. In Sharm al-Sheikh it was reported that you told President Yeltsin that you would support his reelection bid with positive U.S. policies, and that you asked him for help with clearing up some negative issues such as the poultry dispute. Was there a—did you talk about politics today? I mean, what were your political discussions? And how do you both think that a meeting like this helps you with voters?

President Clinton. First of all, let me clear up the report from Sharm al-Sheikh. What I said in Sharm al-Sheikh and what I believe is that the best politics is to do the right thing and advance the interest of our people. I did bring up that trade dispute, just as I have brought up a dozen or more trade disputes with other leaders all around the world. That's a big part of my job now, and I think I did the right thing.

Today at our luncheon, the President gave me a brief overview of what he thought—quite brief—was the present lay of the land with the elections coming up and again said that he was trying to do his job, that he wanted to do his job. And I told him I thought that producing concrete results for the people by doing your job was the best thing to do politically. So that's the—which is essentially what I also said when we talked at Sharm al-Sheikh.

Whether these things have any benefit or not, who knows? You know, most of our people are—most democracies all over the world are people preoccupied with problems at home, somewhat skeptical about foreign policy. But I can tell you this: Because of this nuclear summit the people of Russia and the people of the United States are going to have a more secure future. And that's what's important. And because of the meeting we had today, we're much closer to resolving a couple of very important issues that relate to our ability again to make the world a safer place: the CFE Treaty, the demarcation between antiballistic missile systems and theater missile defenses, and a number of other areas in which we need to cooperate for the safety and for the future of our people.

So it seems to me that that's what we ought to look at. Have we done the right thing or not? Are people going to be better off or not? Are they going to be safer or not? Is the future going to be brighter or not? That is how I think that we would both wish to be judged. And I think it's a great mistake to put too much of a political spin on this since typically, at least, foreign policy does not play that big a role in voting patterns. But it's very, very important to how people live and what kind of future we have.

President Yeltsin. I agree with President Clinton that the discussion was on the go constantly, during the breaks. And just as before, we said we have to have an equivalent partnership of the two countries. We have to support this relationship and help each other, all the Presidents, just like we support each other as countries, as people. And this is only natural. Now, as

far as any specific issues having to do with campaigns and helping each other in campaigns in specifics, there was none.

Now, the second part of the question, Bill didn't touch upon the second part—I don't know, maybe he or I can maybe respond and say that the production of fowl which came from the United States was—there was one batch that was stopped and held up by our health service. After that we quickly got together. We set up a commission; let the Gore-Chernomyrdin commission figure it out, get into the details in the poultry question. And they did and they were convinced that, yes, there was some violations. Those violations were taken care of, and now trade once again has been reestablished and it's back to normal.

Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty

Q. You've already spoken about European security. Can you tell us a little more in detail specifically what the CFE Treaty—how it was touched upon, and the limitations on the flanks, please, if you would?

President Yeltsin. The question of European security has a lot of aspects, including NATO. So I don't think that we've got to lay all of these issues out to you at this very moment and how they relate to the central question, but more specifically and in detail we discussed the issues of the limitations on the flanks, since this really has to do with our direct interests on the Caucasus and in the northwest of our country near Kaliningrad.

But the way it turned out was that in Germany when we were moving our forces back to Russia, the closest way to go was to Kaliningrad. And so we saturated Kaliningrad with our troops and forces and equipment, and the whole oblast—really a lot of saturation—and went beyond the limits that were provided for in the CFE Treaty itself.

Also another situation here is the Caucasus because, as you know, what we have there, because of the situation in Chechnya—right now it's not bad, so what we're doing is implementing my plan on finding a settlement in the Chechnya problem. And things are going according to plan the way it's been approved. Nonetheless, there is a concentration of conventional forces, tanks and things; in some cases it varies from what the CFE Treaty may be calling for.

So President Clinton, at my request, very carefully reviewed with his advisers and specialists, and they went and decided that temporarily we would be given the opportunity to, within the overall framework of the overall total numbers, to do some movement of forces on the territory. Of course, the conference in May is going to finally decide that. But they expressed their opinion, and once again, this issue has been discussed. There was one question to us that we move from one site a part of our equipment. We didn't argue; we're going to move it. And in short, there really is no question for discussion remaining. We hope that around May 15, when the conference is held, this treaty is going to be adjusted somewhat and everything will be fine.

Chechnya

Q. President Yeltsin, you just mentioned that things were going according to plan in Chechnya. But there are other reports that hostilities there continue and human rights groups are complaining still about the behavior of Russian forces. I wonder, for President Clinton, what do you say to those who believe that the United States has not been firm enough, hasn't been critical enough, and that even now the criticism is muted specifically because the United States is anxious to see President Yeltsin reelected?

And for President Yeltsin, what would you say to those who believe that your call for a cease-fire was motivated largely by short-term political interests?

President Yeltsin. In your question you made a couple of errors right off the bat. First of all, you said that the United States is seeking the reelection of President Yeltsin. I have different data. Second, military actions in the Chechnya region are not going on. No military operations are being carried out from March 31. It's another matter—some bands are still running around. Out of 22 regions of Chechnya, 19 of them have signed agreements. In three, there are still—the bosses there are still the bands; they're still in charge. And in fact, it's true they are making life difficult for a lot of people.

But I repeat again, there are no military operations now underway. A state commission has been set up headed by Chernomyrdin; contact has been established with Dudayev through intermediaries. The intermediaries we have,

Shaimiev, Orlov—we have people like that, King Hassan II, the King of Morocco, who have agreed to act in the role of intermediaries and to talk to Dudayev, to influence him from the point of view of negotiations only on one question that he is not in agreement with, in other words, that the Chechen Republic from our point of view—and this is an absolute—must be and will remain within Russia.

President Clinton. Let me make two brief points. First of all, I think the record will reflect that the United States has consistently supported a political solution to the Chechnya crisis and offered its support for that. And when President Yeltsin made his announcement on March 31st, we supported that.

You say that there are some who say we should have been more openly critical. I think it depends upon your first premise; do you believe that Chechnya is a part of Russia or not? I would remind you that we once had a Civil War in our country in which we lost on a per-capita basis far more people than we lost in any of the wars of the 20th century over the proposition that Abraham Lincoln gave his life for, that no State had a right to withdraw from our Union.

And so the United States has taken the position that Chechnya is a part of Russia, but that in the end, a free country has to have a free association, so there would have to be something beyond the fighting, there would have to be a diplomatic solution. That's what we have done.

But we realize this is a very difficult problem. And we have—President Yeltsin said today in our private meeting he wanted a diplomatic solution. He specifically asked me to do a thing or two that he thought might be helpful to him in securing a peaceful resolution of this and an end to the fighting and a real reconciliation between the people of Chechnya and the rest of Russia. So I intend to do what he requested in that regard, and I will continue to try to advocate an end to the violence and do what the United States can to support a resolution of this.

Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. As a whole, how do you assess the progress in the field of security, including the issue of ABM? And how is this going to affect the future of equal partnership between Russia and the United States?

President Yeltsin. The word "equal" or "on an equivalent basis"—when we first signed the first treaty we weren't around, that word wasn't around. And it occurred later, because we saw some sort of discrimination practiced against Russia. And that's why the word "equal" or "on an equal basis in all respects"—that's what appeared.

Now, as far as security, we discussed in detail these issues. And in general, of course, for some time we're not going to be forcing the widening of NATO at our request. President Clinton promised this and somehow to influence his colleagues.

I believe that, in fact, it will be thus for a while. Then gradually maybe we ourselves will find, together with NATO, a relationship, maybe to come up with an agreement that, let's say, no country will be allowed to enter NATO, let's say, without Russia's agreement, and then maybe only through a consensus will be NATO changing. In other words, there is a variety of solutions for this problem, but we yet have to work on this.

We talked about it in detail, but, look, we're not going to be sitting here giving you everything exactly in detail what we did for 5 hours. We're going to have a 5-hour press conference then.

President Clinton. A brief comment on the two issues President Yeltsin mentioned. The United States has within it some people who have had questions about the ABM Treaty to which we're a signatory. I believe the United States should keep its treaty commitments. I think if we expect Russia to keep its treaty commitments, we have to keep ours. Not so long ago I vetoed a defense bill passed in the Congress because I thought it would have put us out of compliance with the ABM Treaty.

What we have to do now, because the ABM Treaty does not prohibit the development of theater missile defenses, is to define clearly what the lines between the two are, both regular velocity and high velocity theater missile defense. We made real progress here in doing that. And I'm convinced that if we do this in an open way that has a lot of integrity, that requires—where no one can question our commitment to the ABM Treaty, I think we'll all be just fine on this, and I think it will work out very well.

With regard to NATO, our differences are well-known, but I think it's also worth pointing

out that as with other aspects of this relationship, they have been clear and open, there have been no surprises, and from my point of view there have been no changes.

I will say again: My goal is for a democratic, undivided Europe. The world has been caused a lot of trouble in the last 1,000 years repeatedly because of the divisions of Europe, number one. Number two, my goal is to see the United States and Russia over the long run develop a strong, equal partnership of two great democracies, freedom-loving countries that define their greatness in terms of their values and their example and the achievements of their people and not the domination of other nations. And I believe that we will find a way to work that out that's consistent with the position I've taken on NATO.

And so I feel—I believe that as this thing goes along we'll find answers to that. And so my position hasn't changed about NATO, but I do not in any way, shape, or form mean any threat to the security of the long-term legitimate interests of Russia there. And the more important thing is—by the way, practical thing—is the progress we have made here with the ABM theater missile defense issue. That's a very significant advance for both countries in resolving a real, as opposed to an imagined, security problem.

President Yeltsin. One minute, I didn't respond to part three of that second question on the ABM.

The thing is that, really, we did have at one time differences when the U.S. side began to develop its own system beyond the ABM. And we expressed our surprise at this. And when Bill Clinton became President we agreed solidly that we are going to abide by the ABM Treaty. And for all this time, all the times we've met, we've had never any doubts, and we've had never any claims or questions to each other or any doubts that this treaty is in any way going to be changed or modified or changes introduced or anything like that.

It's another matter now that, as Bill Clinton said, that we've got to, simply from the technical point of view, have that demarcation between strategic and theater nuclear systems. But that's being carried out now by our specialists and experts, U.S. experts. And that will be fulfilled to not the detriment of either the United States or the Russian Federation.

Russian Elections

Q. The two Presidents: Both of you today have talked very optimistically and hopefully about U.S. and Russian relations. But again to return to the elections, if the Communists were to win in this election, do you believe that this close relationship can continue? And particularly to Mr. Yeltsin, do you believe your Communist opponents are in fact a different kind of Communists than the ones whom you helped put out of power and the party that you once walked out of?

President Yeltsin. I have nothing to think here on this score. There's nothing to think about because I am sure that I will be victorious.

President Clinton. Well, my answer's irrelevant. [*Laughter*]

Should we take one more? Do you want to take one more?

President Yeltsin. One more question. One more question each—you and I, each side, one more question.

Nuclear Testing

Q. Boris Nikolayevich, a question to you: Have you discussed the issue of banning nuclear testing, and is there any difference of opinion on nuclear testing?

President Yeltsin. Yes, this issue was discussed yesterday at the meeting of the 8, since the topic was, after all, nuclear security, and everything there, practically speaking, starts with nuclear materials and testing. So when we talked about testing, banning testing yesterday, I will say that we had a very, very loyal discussion, a pleasant talk. All, to the very last one, agreed that this year we've got to sign the treaty on banning and testing in any size of tests forever and forever.

But not all nuclear states participated at yesterday's meeting of the 8. Now, with the others we're going to have to do a little work, especially with China. Well, that's why we, the leaders of the states, and that's where members of the 8 which decide these big political issues and other issues in order to somehow move forward and make progress on these big issues and to reach agreements and to prepare accords with other states. And we're going to be attempting to do that. I have got the conviction that we are going to find an agreement and, after all, I think we will be able to sign this year.

President Clinton. I'll just make a brief supplemental remark there. We have all agreed to

go with the so-called Australian language, which is a strict zero-yield comprehensive test ban treaty. That is the only kind of treaty that can give the people of the world the certainty that they really are seeing the end of the nuclear age of the big weapons.

Some other countries want to kind of leave a big crack in the door for so-called peaceful tests or experimentation. And we all believe that we just have to try to persuade them to our way of thinking. I think the biggest and most important issue now is trying to persuade the Chinese to adopt the position that we have adopted. And I suggested on behalf of the 8 that we ask President Yeltsin to take this issue up on his trip to China. He agreed to do that, and the rest of us agreed to do our best as well to support that and try to persuade the Chinese that this is the right course for the future. And I have every hope that we can succeed.

Assistance to Russia

Q. Mr. President, the U.S. assistance to Russia after communism fell has been a fraction of what the Marshall plan did for Europe to help rebuild Europe after World War II. With many Russians questioning whether capitalism and democracy have really made their lives better, do you feel that the West has missed a historic chance to help Russia? And if you're reelected next year and there's a new Congress, do you foresee anything more ambitious in the future?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, the short answer to your question is no, I don't think that the West has missed an historic chance. The present Congress I think has underestimated the impact that a relatively small amount of investment assistance in other countries can have, not just in Russia but in other places in the world. And so I think that's a mistake. I think not paying our U.N. dues is a mistake, not investing in the International Development Association is a mistake.

But let me ask you—you compared this to the Marshall plan. There are some things that are quite different. For one thing, we are now the largest—the United States is the largest private investor in Russia, and the flow of private investment is much broader and quicker than it was at the end of World War II. For another thing, the United States has strongly supported the multi-billion-dollar aid package coming out of the international financial institutions, which were not available to do those things, again, as a part of the Marshall plan on anything like this scale. Thirdly, even though our assistance to Russia has dropped in the last couple of years, the Nunn-Lugar funds are still helping the denuclearization movement, and funds that I asked the Congress to adopt in the '93–94 timeframe, those funds have by no means all been used up. That is, they're still awaiting specific projects. So money has been appropriated for investment here that can still be invested here as the projects come on line.

So our commitment to the economic revitalization of Russia is very strong. And I would point out that I believe Russia has privatized a higher percentage of its economy than any of the other countries of the former Soviet Union. And the economic problems that Russia has endured began before the Soviet Union disappeared. And we see the economy coming back now, and I think that things are going in the right direction.

I do believe that the United States and the rest of the advanced economies should continue their commitment to investment and to support democracy and economic reform. I don't think we should let up. But I think it's a mistake to say that a historic opportunity has been missed, because a great deal has been done.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 121st news conference began at 2:42 p.m. in the Executive Office Building at the Kremlin. President Yeltsin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. In his remarks, President Yeltsin referred to Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin of Russia, President Jawhar Dudayev of Chechnya, and President Mintimer Shaimiev of Tatarstan.

Russia-U.S. Joint Statement on the Highly Enriched Uranium Agreement: Transparency Measures

April 21, 1996

The United States and Russia have agreed on transparency measures that provide assurances that the sides are fulfilling the obligations undertaken under the HEU Agreement to transform "megatons into megawatts."

The transparency measures that have been developed are the culmination of two years of negotiations between official U.S. and Russian delegations and are evidence that irreversible nuclear disarmament is achievable if we work together. By blending-down HEU derived from nuclear weapons to low-enriched uranium that can only be used as fuel in commercial nuclear power reactors, we ensure that this material can never again be used in nuclear weapons.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

Remarks on Earth Day in Great Falls, Maryland

April 22, 1996

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you all for being here today and for the work that you do. I want to thank the Vice President for being the constant conscience of our administration and of the national debate on the environment. I thank Anthony Hildebrandt and Ashley King for the example they are setting for the young people of America. I want to thank these young folks with the Montgomery County Conservation Corps and the others who have volunteered to work in this park.

I want to say a special word of thanks to the employees of the National Park Service all over this country and here. They do a magnificent job for America. I want to thank Carol Browner, our EPA Administrator, and Katie McGinty, who represents the Nation's environmental concerns in the Environmental Council in the White House. And I want to thank Secretary Babbitt, who can't be here because he can't be in more than one place at once; even Bruce Babbitt can't do that. And, as the Vice President said, he's at the Sterling Forest event this morning representing us.

I want to thank the Members of Congress who are here for their fidelity to the Nation's environment and their willingness to stand and be counted in some pretty difficult moments over the last year or so. They have helped us to continue our commitment and to protect this country's natural resources. And I want you to know that I never appreciated them more than I have in the last year or so when they've been in some of the difficult challenges they've been in. I thank them all, these who are here and their counterparts.

You know, I just came back, literally just came back from a remarkable journey all around the world. I flew from here to Alaska and refueled, and then I went to Korea and Japan and on to St. Petersburg and Moscow. And I was thinking, standing here today, I saw some of the most magnificent manmade creations anywhere in the world: the Imperial Palace in Tokyo; the great Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg; the entire Kremlin has just been redone and restored to its historical grandeur. But none of it is any more beautiful than this wonderful nature that God has given us right here in this national park.

And not everybody can travel to see the great palaces of the world. Even the great art galleries of the world are beyond the reach of many of our fellow citizens. But everybody can come to this park without regard to their income, their station in life, what their other resources are. This belongs to all the American people, and we have to dedicate ourselves to making sure that as long as there is an America there will be a national park system with these treasures there for every single citizen of this country.

We have done a lot of work since I became President to try to improve our national parks

and to preserve them. We are dramatically cutting back on noise from aircraft flights over the Grand Canyon and the Rocky Mountain parks and other treasures. We are moving, I say as I hear the plane, to restore a natural quiet in our parks. We are expanding the Point Reyes National Seashore in California, where Hillary and I spent our second wedding anniversary, by 38,000 acres. We are calling on Congress to pass legislation to designate new wilderness areas and purchase the Sterling Forest in the New York-New Jersey border. And I am directing the Park Service to take more than a dozen other steps to make visiting the parks more pleasurable for America's families and for our guests from all around the world. Our duty is to pass on to future generations these treasures that God has given to us.

Remember, it was a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, who set our Nation on the path of conservation. In 1908 he said, "Any right-thinking parent earnestly desires and strives to leave a child both an untarnished name and a reasonable equipment for the struggle of life. So this Nation as a whole should earnestly desire and struggle to leave to the next generation the national honor unstained and the national resources unexhausted." It sounded good in 1908, and it's even more important as we stand on the edge of a new century.

Let me say that I consider that I was very lucky as a child to have the privilege of being raised in a national park. My hometown is the only city in America that actually contains a national park, Hot Springs National Park. And I grew up in a State where more than half the land was covered by forests. I took for granted things that many children in our cities never, ever see.

And frankly, I had to grow up a little before I realized that none of that could be taken for granted. And a lot of people along the way had a big influence on me; the most recent, of course, is the Vice President. But since he's here today I want to thank my senior Senator, Dale Bumpers, who has been one of the most courageous conservationists and environmentalists for the last 25 years in America. Thank you. He taught me by the power of example that Governors have a responsibility to the environment as well.

And so I say to all of you, there's something for each of us to do. But the remarkable resurgence in support for clean air, for clean water, for a safe environment in our urban areas as well as our rural areas, for standing up for our national parks, that has not come from those of us in public life. Fundamentally, it has come from those of you who are the citizens who live in our neighborhoods and walk our streets and climb our mountains and walk our trails day-in and day-out. You have given America back its soul, its conscience, and its commitment on the environment. And don't ever give up your responsibility for doing that.

So on this Earth Day, as we stand beneath the eagle in this wonderful treasure that we have been given, let us vow that there is more to do. None of our children should have to live near a toxic waste dump or eat food poisoned by pesticides. Our grandchildren should not have to live in a world stripped of its natural beauty. We can and we must protect the environment while advancing the prosperity of the American people and people throughout the world.

When it comes to protecting the environment, we can't turn back. We have to go forward, and it has to become a part of our every decision as a people. If we make that commitment and stick to it, then America will have a bright future indeed.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:18 p.m. at the Great Falls observation deck in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historic Park. In his remarks, he referred to Anthony Hildebrandt of Boy Scout Troop 241, and Ashley King of the Girl Scout Council of the Nation's Capital. The related memorandums of April 22 on planning to address impacts of transportation on national parks and public-private partnerships for protection of the national parks are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at the National Teacher of the Year Award Ceremony
April 23, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, Secretary Riley. To all of our Teachers of the Year and their friends and family members; to Senator Wellstone, Senator Grams, Congressman Minge; and to the educators and their supporters who are here, let me say that this is a day I look forward to every year. And every year God has blessed us with good weather in the Rose Garden, and that ought to tell you something about where teachers will stand in the ultimate measure of things. [*Laughter*]

As I think you know, I have been away now for some days on a trip which literally took me around the world, from Korea to Japan to Russia. And before I make the remarks I'd like to make in honor of our Teacher of the Year and her counterparts here, I think it's important to comment on a couple of events that are unfolding now here in Washington.

Let me begin with a compliment to the Congress for working in a bipartisan way for the American people. Last week Congress passed strong legislation to crack down on terrorism which I expect to sign right here tomorrow. I thank them for that. I also am pleased that Congress is moving forward on the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill which would improve access to health care for 43 million Americans and, if an amendment adopted by the United States Senate is carried through, would include mental health coverage for American families who need that.

I'm also pleased to report that we're continuing to make significant progress on bipartisan agreement for the remaining spending bills this year. There is, of course, more to do. I am very hopeful that Congress will now, as a result of movements in the House and comments in the Senate by Republican Members, go ahead and raise the minimum wage for working people. No one can raise a family on $4.25 an hour, and if we're going to have family values coming out of Washington, we ought to start by valuing families that are working hard, trying to stay off welfare, and doing their best to raise their kids. We ought to do it with no gimmicks, a bill that I can sign into law.

And finally, let me say that I hope that Congress can now bring this bipartisan momentum to bear on the challenge of finally passing a 7-year balanced budget plan. Last year and early this year, we had over 50 hours of negotiation between the congressional leaders, the Vice President, and me. We made real progress toward agreeing on a balanced budget. Our plans have in common more than enough savings to balance the budget, provide tax relief to working families, and reflect our values by protecting the fundamental structures of Medicare and Medicaid and our commitments to education and a clean environment.

Last week, the Congressional Budget Office certified that the budget plan I presented to Congress would balance the budget in 7 years. This is the first time in 17 years that the Congressional Budget Office has determined that a President's proposed budget is balanced. Moreover, the CBO has issued new and now more optimistic budget projections which will make the task of agreeing on a balanced budget significantly easier for both sides.

It's been over 3 months now since the negotiations over how to balance the budget were suspended. I think we all understood there were intervening events that required this work to be suspended. But the time for waiting is now over. Now is the moment to finish the job and work toward a balanced budget.

We should resume negotiations over how best to do this in 7 years. My door is open, and it's time to get the job done. We should begin again to seriously talk about this budget process. We should include congressional leaders, obviously the leadership, but also a broad enough range of representatives from both parties and both Houses who represent a broad diversity of views so that we can actually agree on something that can pass. We should put together a mainstream coalition to get the job done.

Now if we do that, that will help all the educators. Why? Because if we have a balanced budget amendment, interest rates will come down, investments will go up, the economy will be stronger, and people will pay more funds in local school taxes so that they can support your educational institutions.

We can make this a season of bipartisan achievement. We're off to a good start. There

will be time enough for us to honestly debate our disagreements in the fall. We don't need a yearlong campaign. Most countries just have campaigns of 5 or 6 or 7 weeks. In the coming weeks, we should take the time to sit down and work together on an area where we are very, very close to real agreement. If we stop fighting about yesterday and balance the budget, we can face the challenges and have the debates of tomorrow.

Let me say, too, that this is really about laying a foundation for the future, the same kind of work that you do. There is nothing more important than building the right kind of future for America, whether it is in balancing the budget or teaching our children. This fact was brought home to me again very forcefully in my recent visits to Korea and Japan and Russia. At each stop, I had discussions with leaders of those countries which focused on a fairly simple but very big question: How can we all work together to preserve world peace, to enhance human freedom and define ways to enable all of our people to seize the opportunities of this new information technology-driven age?

The dimensions of economic change we are now experiencing, because of these sweeping changes and because of the end of the cold war and the growth of a global market, are the most profound changes affecting our economy and, therefore, how our people work and live that this country has experienced in 100 years, since people moved fundamentally from the farm to the factory.

And I might say that Bill Gates, the American computer wizard, gave a speech not very long ago that I had the privilege to hear, and he wrote in his book "The Road From Here" that the changes we are now experiencing in communication are the most profound the world has experienced in 500 years since Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Europe with a printing press.

We have to build a bridge to the 21st century that all Americans who are willing to work for it have a chance to cross. Education is the way we do it, the way we can give every child a future, to live the American dream, to make the most of his or her own life, to build solid families and strong communities and a strong America. If our children succeed, America will do very well indeed.

So we have to renew our schools and throw open the doors of college to all who want to go who are qualified for it. That's why, even as we cut the deficit in half in 4 years, we have maintained our commitment to invest in education, all the way from Head Start through the Goals 2000 program that Secretary Riley mentioned, through access to college. But we also have to acknowledge that the demands of the 21st century require an honest assessment of what is right and wrong with our educational system, what money will fix, and what cannot be fixed by money alone.

The education agenda Secretary Riley and I are pursuing is consistent with what parents and States have called for, tougher standards and accountability and higher expectations and greater opportunities. I believe that in a fundamental way, education is a matter of high expectations, high standards, good teachers, concerned parents, and a supportive community.

High technology will play a bigger and bigger role, and that's why the Vice President and I are trying to make sure that every school and every library in this country, every classroom and every library in the country, from the smallest rural school to the largest urban one, all of them are connected to the information superhighway by the year 2000.

But we all know that we have to have those other things: the good teachers, the concerned parents, the high expectations, the high standards. We know that these things will make a difference. At last month's National Governors' Association education summit, I challenged the States and the Governors there to create a system that rewards and inspires and demands higher standards for teachers, removing barriers that attract the most talented people, rewarding teachers who meet these high standards, making it easier to remove people who should leave the classroom.

But in the end, we know that what we have to do, all the rest of us who give these speeches, is to support the good teachers. The magic that occurs between the teacher and the student is still the ultimate—the ultimate key to successful education. It is partly a science but largely an art. It is sometimes a mystery and always a wonder.

All of us who ever amounted to anything like to tell people that we were born in a log cabin we built ourselves. We'd like for everybody to believe we were self-made. But the truth is, I don't believe there's a single person in America who is really successful today, at least there

aren't many, who can't point to at least one and sometimes a lot more teachers that had a profound impact on his or her life. I know that is certainly true of me. I carried on a correspondence with my sixth-grade teacher until the day she died at the age of 90; she wrote me a week before she died. I have kept up with many of my teachers from elementary and high school and college all my life, because I know that I wouldn't be here if it weren't for them.

And I'm so glad that our Teacher of the Year not only brought her own fine children who are a pretty good monument to her teaching—Sarah and Christie and Mark—but also five of her students, because they really represent the ultimate success of all of your endeavors.

I want to thank, again, Mary Beth Blegen and all of you for devoting your lives to teaching. Mary Beth has taught humanities, history, writing, and English for more than 30 years at Minnesota's Worthington High School. When she was first hired, it was a violation of the child labor laws.

Mary Beth Blegen. Right. Thank you. Thank you very much. Oh, you are such a good man.

The President. She has seen many of the changes that all of us have witnessed in America. Worthington has evolved from a mostly white and rural middle class community into one that is more economically and ethnically diverse. It is a community that has seen a shift in jobs from primarily agricultural jobs to factory jobs and other supporting jobs.

Her greatest achievement has been her ability to help her students understand the complex relationships that exist in our changing world. And I might say that that may be the toughest thing we all have to do. We have to figure out how to meet the challenges tomorrow while preserving our basic values. We have to understand that for every complicated problem there is normally a simple, appealing answer that is wrong. That does not mean that our values can't be simple, straightforward, and unbending, but it does mean we have to understand these kind of complex relationships that she has done such a marvelous job of explaining to her students.

She is the embodiment of the all-American teacher, a hard-working, dedicated, caring person, always working to do better. Her approach to teaching, they tell me, is just as fresh and enthusiastic today as it was 30 years ago. I think anyone who can do that and avoid burnout and, instead, keep burning on deserves an award for that, if nothing else. And she's done it while raising these three fine children of her own, one of whom has followed in her footsteps as a teacher.

Mary Beth likes to say, good teaching changes lives. She has changed countless lives in 30 years of teaching, and I am proud that she is here as a symbol of all the good that America's teachers do every day all across America.

[*At this point, Ms. Blegen, National Teacher of the Year, made brief remarks.*]

The President. Thank you very much. We're adjourned.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Message to the Congress Reporting on Narcotics Traffickers Centered in Colombia

April 23, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments concerning the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order No. 12978 of October 21, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On October 21, 1995, I signed Executive Order No. 12978, "Blocking Assets and Prohibiting Transactions with Significant Narcotics Traffickers" (the "Order") (60 *Fed. Reg.* 54579, October 24, 1995). The Order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of four significant foreign narcotics

traffickers who are principals in the so-called Cali drug cartel centered in Colombia. They are listed in the annex to the Order. In addition, the Order blocks the property and interests in property of foreign persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, (a) to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or (b) to materially assist in or provide financial or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of persons designated in or pursuant to the Order. In addition the Order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the Order (collectively "Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers" or "SDNTs").

The Order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDNTs, and any transaction that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions contained in the Order.

Designations of foreign persons blocked pursuant to the Order are effective upon the date of determination by the Director of the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the *Federal Register*, or upon prior actual notice.

2. On October 24, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice containing 76 additional names of persons determined to meet the criteria set forth in Executive Order No. 12978 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 54582–84, October 24, 1995). A copy of the notice is attached to this report.

The Department of the Treasury issued another notice adding the names of one additional entity and three additional individuals, as well as expanded information regarding addresses and pseudonyms, to the List of SDNTs on November 29, 1995 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 61288–89). A copy of the notice is attached to this report.

3. On March 8, 1996, FAC published a notice in the *Federal Register* adding the names of 138 additional individuals and 60 entities designated pursuant to the Order, and revising information for 8 individuals on the list of blocked persons contained in the notices published on November 29, 1995, and October 24, 1995 (61 *Fed. Reg.* 9523–28). A copy of the notice is attached to this report. The FAC, in coordination with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, is continuing to expand the list of Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers, including both organizations and individuals, as additional information is developed.

4. On October 22, 1995, FAC disseminated details of this program to the financial, securities, and international trade communities by both electronic and conventional media. This information was updated on November 29, 1995, and again on March 5, 1996. In addition to bulletins to banking institutions via the Federal Reserve System and the Clearing House Interbank Payments Systems (CHIPS), individual notices were provided to all State and Federal regulatory agencies, automated clearing houses, and State and independent banking associations across the country. The FAC contacted all major securities industry associations and regulators, posted electronic notices to 10 computer bulletin boards and 2 fax-on-demand services, and provided the same material to the U.S. Embassy in Bogota for distribution to U.S. companies operating in Colombia.

5. There were no funds specifically appropriated to implement this program. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from October 21, 1995, through April 20, 1996, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers are estimated at approximately $500,000 from previously appropriated funds. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of Justice, and the Department of State.

6. Executive Order No. 12978 provides this Administration with a new tool for combating the actions of significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia, and the unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm that they cause in the United States and abroad. The Order is designed to deny these traffickers the benefit of any assets subject to the jurisdiction

of the United States and to prevent United States persons from engaging in any commercial dealings with them, their front companies, and their agents. Executive Order No. 12978 demonstrates the U.S. commitment to end the scourge that such traffickers have wrought upon society in the United States and beyond.

The magnitude and the dimension of the problem in Colombia—perhaps the most pivotal country of all in terms of the world's cocaine trade—is extremely grave. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their violent and corrupting activities as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 23, 1996.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Ilyas Harawi of Lebanon and an Exchange With Reporters

April 24, 1996

Lebanon

President Clinton. Let me begin by saying I'm very pleased to have the President of Lebanon here today to discuss what we can do to bring about an end to the present violence and to establish conditions so that it will not occur. I believe all Americans are profoundly concerned and regret the loss of innocent civilian life. And we support whatever can be done to end the violence as quickly as possible. And that's what Secretary Christopher is working on in the Middle East today.

Q. Mr. President, there's a perception among some that the United States is more interested in the reelection of Shimon Peres than the bloodshed in Lebanon. If that's not true, why is the United States so cool to the French peace initiative in Lebanon?

President Clinton. Well, those two things have nothing to do with one another. What the United States is trying to do is to maintain a coherent capacity to talk to both sides so that we can move quickly as we did in 1993 when we were able to move alone to reestablish circumstances that obtained until, frankly, right after Sharm al-Sheikh when the violence started again when the agreement of 1993 was broken. And that's what we're trying to do. And we don't object to anybody trying to help achieve that.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Do you think that Syria's President Asad snubbed Secretary Christopher yesterday by not meeting with him?

President Clinton. I really don't know. I haven't talked to him. I'm not sure that's accurate. But the main thing is they're going to meet; we're going to talk; we're going to keep working. And I think we'll eventually get this worked out. But sooner is better than later. It should have been done yesterday.

Lebanon

Q. Mr. President, there is also the perception that you condemn violence against Israelis more than you do the Lebanese in the south, and you have not condemned the occupation of southern Lebanon for so long. I mean, you wouldn't tolerate one inch of our territory being occupied.

President Clinton. The United States supports the United Nations resolution on this. We don't believe there should be any foreign troops in Lebanon. I'd like to see Lebanon completely sovereign and free and independent. And if Lebanon were completely sovereign, free, and independent, none of this would have happened.

The Lebanese people have been subjected to all kinds of problems because of—frankly, because of the influence of outside forces in the country. But our position has been consistent that we think the only way to reestablish Lebanese sovereignty is to have a comprehensive resolution of the problems in the region. And no

one has worked harder for that, including for the sovereignty of Lebanon, than the United States.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, how close are we to a cease-fire?

President Clinton. Well, I hope we're quite close. I have some, you know—I've gotten some encouraging news, but I can't announce one. And I've learned the hard way to understate rather than overstate where we are.

But I think every thinking, feeling person knows that this has gone on way too long. And it needs to stop.

Lebanon

Q. There were some Arab-Americans here yesterday who asked for emergency U.S. aid to Lebanon. Are you prepared to respond positively to that?

President Clinton. We are going to provide some emergency aid, and I'll have a chance to talk to the President about that as we have our meeting.

Q. Could we ask the Lebanese President a question? Mr. President, is there anything the Lebanese Government can do to stop the Hezbollah from launching Katyushas on northern Israel?

President Harawi. I wish that the Lebanese Army and security forces were present in this section of the country. Then I could answer your question much more clearly. But we don't have authority over this part of our country occupied by the Israelis.

1996 Election

Q. Is that a sign that you'll be spending more time on the campaign now?

President Clinton. [*Inaudible*]—at this time——

Q. That's all it means?

President Clinton. That's what it means.

Budget Negotiations

Q. Are you looking forward to seeing Senator Dole here at the White House today?

President Clinton. I expect to. I was pleased by what he said yesterday. Let me say again, we know we're going to sign the antiterrorism bill today. We have proved that we can do some things. The Senate passed the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill 100 to nothing yesterday. So we have a big consensus now that we ought to go ahead and balance the budget. And the recent revision by the Congressional Budget Office makes us even closer together. So I was pleased to see Senator Dole's response to what I said yesterday, and I intend to call him today.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

President Clinton. I'm going to call him today. We'll see. I'm going to call him.

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

Lebanon

Q. Mr. President, do you have any message to the Lebanese people who are living now in difficulties?

President Clinton. Yes. First of all, the United States is deeply concerned and very regretful of the loss of life and the dislocation of innocent civilians who have been caught up in this conflict. We are doing everything we can to bring an end to the fighting and to get a set of understandings which will prevent it from recurring. We had such an understanding in 1993, and it held for more than 2 years. We would like to see a new agreement in place, and we know there must be an end to the fighting.

Now secondly, I want to have a chance to discuss with the President what we might be able to do in the short run in the way of humanitarian assistance to the people who have been displaced, and we'll be discussing that.

And finally, let me just say, over the long run, what our goal is is to see a Lebanon with strong sovereignty, with the sovereignty of the country protected. And so then I hope we can achieve it. I think we can only achieve it if we can resolve the larger problems in the Middle East. We have seen too many times that until there is an ultimate peace settlement, Lebanon unfortunately is going to continue to be victimized.

Q. When do you think we're going to achieve a full, fair peace to the Lebanese people and the Lebanese territory, especially now that you're meeting with President Harawi?

President Clinton. Well, as you know, I've been working hard for it for 3 years now. And I hope and believe that if we can re-establish a cease-fire and the conditions under which violence will not recur, then we can get back to the peace process. The issues are fairly clear, and the timing is largely in the hands of the

parties. But the United States is working hard. And I can't set a timetable on it, but it could be done before too long if we can reestablish the peace. But first of all, we have to stop the killing.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, on what basis do you ask for a cease-fire?

President Clinton. We ask for a cease-fire, first of all, on strictly humanitarian terms—that the people who are being hurt by this, starting when the shelling started 6 weeks ago, are innocent civilians on both sides of the border and that all these people who are being dislocated, the people who have died, they're not a part of the larger fight that's going on here.

We, first of all, want to reestablish peace. Secondly, we want to do what we can to help Lebanon deal with the problems of the refugees. The third thing we want is an arrangement so that the violence doesn't recur. And then—then—we want to go back to the peace process.

We do support U.N. Resolution 425. We do support the sovereignty of Lebanon. We don't think there should be any foreign troops in Lebanon. But history has shown us, from our point of view, at least, that the only way to achieve that is to get a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. And I have worked very hard for that. I have tried to be an honest arbiter, if you will, of the positions of both sides. I have done everything I could to that end, and we are still working. And we will continue to work for that.

Q. Mr. President, the view in Lebanon and in the Arab world is that your administration was very slow in intervening to stop the carnage last week, that the United States had not even sent condolences to the victims, to the families of the victims, until it was too late. What is your view of this?

President Clinton. Well, all I can tell you is, the moment I heard about the fighting, I instructed the Secretary of State to immediately try to achieve an end to it and to protect the lives of the people involved—the minute I heard about it.

We were—as you know, our whole foreign policy team was in the Far East. And I instructed the Secretary of State to leave our mission—we were going to Russia for the nuclear summit—and fly directly to the Middle East to try to reestablish a cease-fire and stop the killing. And as soon as I had an opportunity to publicly comment on it, I expressed my profound condolences to the people who were killed—the minute, the first opportunity I had to say something about it.

I am sorry that the people feel that way, but the important thing is to stop others from being killed and help people put their lives back together and restore some sense of normalcy and peace. And that's what I'm trying to do.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:55 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the Service Employees International Union Convention

April 24, 1996

Thank you for that wonderful welcome, and thank you, Dick, for that fine introduction. I really enjoyed working with you, and I want to congratulate you on the many years of service you have given to your great union. I look forward to working with your new president, Andy Stern. I know he has also made a tremendous contribution as your organizing director, and I wish him every success.

I want to also acknowledge your secretary-treasurer, Betty Bednarczyk, and my wonderful Secretary of Labor Bob Reich. I know that you enjoyed his speech, and I thank him for his work on your behalf.

And finally, let me thank SEIU for one of its greatest gifts to America, John Sweeney. Because of John's leadership, and because of your commitment, labor is back. I know in this political season some people aren't too happy about that, but I am delighted. I am proud that in 1996 the voice of organized labor, the voice of working men and women from all across our country, will be heard in our national debate.

I welcome your voice. America needs to hear it. And I promise you this: You will be heard.

You know, in a way, it's hard to believe that SEIU is celebrating its 75th anniversary, for you stand out as America's most dynamic and innovative union, a shining example of labor's revival. Not only has SEIU given renewed hope for millions of union members, you've also pioneered new ways to organize both workers in low-wage industries and workers in fast-growing industries like health care.

Of course, we all know your contributions to America stretch far beyond collective bargaining. From civil rights and family and medical leave to the minimum wage and the fight to save Medicare and Medicaid, SEIU has been a leader in the struggle to achieve economic and social progress for all Americans.

In many ways, we're on a shared mission. Four years ago our economy was drifting with high unemployment, a deficit twice as high as it is now, and very few new jobs. I took office determined to change our course, to cut the deficit in half in 4 years, to invest in education and training, to shrink and reform the Government so that it works better and costs less. Our Government is now the smallest it's been since 1965, but it's still strong enough to protect workplace safety, pure food, clean air and water, to help Americans to get the education and training they need, to help grow the economy and to protect our seniors through Medicare. And I'm proud of that strength. You helped to get it there, and you helped to keep it there, and I thank you very much.

In 1992, I told the American people that if we carried out our economic plan, two things would happen, we'd get 8 million new jobs and the deficit would be cut in half. Well, just a couple of weeks ago, we learned that our economy has already created 8.5 million new jobs, nearly all of them in the private sector. And last month the Congressional Budget Office said that by the end of this year the deficit will be less than half of what it was when I took office. Over 8 million new jobs; the deficit cut in half.

Those are two important commitments you helped me keep to the American people. We also have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. Our auto and telecommunications industries are now leading the world again. We have a 15-year high in homeownership, and we have finally halted the decade-long slide in real hourly earnings.

But let's face it, we all know this is a record to be proud of, but to build on, not to sit on. Too many Americans still are working harder just to hold on. We have to do more. We have to continue to focus on the concerns of working Americans, the concerns they have about their own families' economic security at a time when the country is undergoing profound economic transformation, a transformation every bit as momentous as the shift from farms to factories a century ago.

As I said in the State of the Union, one of the main challenges we face is to make sure that this new economy with all of its opportunity doesn't leave behind people who are willing to work for their own opportunities. We need to make sure that every American can be a winner in this time of economic change, to make sure that every American has access to education and training and good health care and secure pensions. And we absolutely have to get wages rising again in our country. We have got to do that for working people and working families.

That's why I fought for the passage of the Family and Medical Leave Act. That's why we have dramatically expanded the earned-income tax credit, to give tax cuts to more than 15 million working families with incomes under $28,000. That's why just after I took office I swept away my predecessor's anti-worker, anti-union Executive orders. And that's why, with an Executive order of our own last spring, this administration said in no uncertain terms we will not allow companies who replace striking workers permanently to do business with our Government. I also want you to know that I directed the Justice Department to take all appropriate steps to overturn a recent court decision blocking that Executive order.

Now unfortunately, for the past year you and I have been trying to work with a Congress that didn't always see eye to eye with us when it came to putting in place an agenda that would make the American dream accessible to all Americans. I'm proud to say that in these battles we've had with Congress we've more than held our own. Not only have we managed to stall or defeat practically every major attack on America's working families and on the unions that represent them, we may be poised on the verge of major victories.

I challenged Congress to pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, which would improve access to health care for 43 million Americans, so that you don't lose your health care when you change jobs, and you can't be denied coverage if someone in your family has been sick. Now Congress is finally moving forward with that important legislation. Yesterday it passed the Senate 100 to zero. That's the kind of thing we all ought to be doing more of for the American people.

And I want to challenge the Senate and the House to get together and pass a good version, a clean version of that bill. Pass something that can pass 100–0 again in the Senate and 435–0 in the House. And when it does, that bill will be law the minute it hits my desk.

I challenge the Congress to raise the minimum wage, which is on the verge of hitting a 40-year low. Now, you and I know that no one can raise a family on $4.25 an hour. So if we're going to talk about family values in Washington, we ought to reinforce them in the heartland of America. Last year, I proposed that Congress increase the minimum wage to $5.15 an hour. For a parent working full time, this 90-cent-an-hour increase would help pay for groceries for 7 months, for 4 months of rent or months of child care. Raising the minimum wage will help many of our hardest working people. Six out of 10 of them are working women, many trying to raise children and hold their families together.

I'll say again: If we're going to have family values coming out of Washington, we should start by valuing families that are working hard, staying off welfare, doing their best to raise their children. They're living by the values we say we all believe in, and it's harder for them than it is for most of the rest of us. I say it's time to give them a hand up; they don't want a handout, just a hand up.

Now Congress appears, at last, to be moving forward with a bill that would raise the minimum wage. They should do it, and they should do it without gimmicks. That's another bill I want to be the law of the land now. And I want to say a special word of thanks again to my friend John Sweeney for his hard work on this. The dignity of America's working people should be above reproach. If you work full time and you have children in your home, you should not live in poverty. We can afford this, and there's all the evidence in the world it will not cost us jobs.

Let me say next, I hope Congress will start moving right now on my "Retirement Saving and Security Act," which would expand coverage to help 51 million working Americans who are not now covered by an employer-provided retirement plan. The bill would also increase portability so workers can take their retirement savings with them and keep saving if they change jobs or lose their jobs.

And finally, I urge Congress to come back to the table and work with me to pass the right kind of 7-year balanced budget. Now, in all those hours of negotiations over the winter, congressional leaders and I have come up with plans that have in common more than enough savings to balance the budget, provide tax relief for working families, and protect our values by protecting Medicare and Medicaid and our investments in education and in the protection of our environment.

We can make this a season of progress. We can get back to work and balance the budget in the right way, so we can bring interest rates down again, make homeownership more affordable, get investment in the economy and grow jobs, and still protect the things we believe in that keep us coming together as a country.

But make no mistake: I will not stand for a budget that jeopardizes these bedrock commitments to Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. And I will not accept legislation like the T.E.A.M. acts, which would repeal the ban against company unions, or legislation that weakens OSHA. We can't afford to jeopardize the future of working Americans by undermining the safety and the solidarity of the workplace. And if such legislation crosses my desk, I'll do what the Constitution entitles me to do: I'll veto it.

You and your families and the millions and millions of working families just like you, you're the heart and soul of the American dream. We have to keep working together, not just to preserve what's been won but to continue to fight for better jobs, stronger unions, higher wages, more justice, for things that will bring us together.

I honestly believe the 21st century can be the next American Century. Our children and our grandchildren can enjoy more freedom and more opportunity than any generation of Americans, if we do the right thing. If we stand up to those who would take this country backward, if we stand up for the men and women who

work hard every day to build our country, we can realize the promise of this great Nation.

You know, there is a lot of talk in Washington about empowerment. Sometimes people in the other party mean giving people more choice but not caring much about whether they can exercise the choice. Well, we want empowerment, too. We want to make sure every person, every family, every community, has what it takes to make the most of their own lives and live up to their dreams. With your help, we will realize that goal.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon by satellite from Suite 520 of Media Technologies to the convention meeting in Chicago, IL. In his remarks, he referred to Richard Cordtz, interim president, Service Employees International Union, and John Sweeney, president, AFL–CIO.

Remarks on Signing the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996

April 24, 1996

Thank you very much, Mary Jo White, for the work you do every day. Thank you, Attorney General Reno. Thank you, Mr. Vice President. To Senator Dole and Chairman Hatch and Chairman Hyde, the other Members of Congress who are here; Governor Keating and the attorneys general who are here and the others in law enforcement; to the members of the administration, and especially to the victims' families who are here.

I thank the families for coming today. I thank their advocates for coming. But I think we should all acknowledge that the importance of this event is embodied in no small measure by the fact that the families were willing to come here, knowing that it would in some measure force them to relive the pain that they have endured because of acts of terror. It took a lot of courage for them to endure that pain. So while this is a good day for America, we can't really say it is a happy day. Not all good days can be happy days, but every American is in debt to these families for standing up for the need for the changes that we have experienced. And I ask the rest of us to acknowledge that. And we thank you.

I also would point out that Presidents can advocate and the executive branch can enforce the laws, but this would not have happened but for the remarkable convergence of Republicans and Democrats in the Congress. The Vice President introduced those who were especially active in the leadership, who are over here to my left, who will come up in a moment when we sign the bill. But there are so many more Members of Congress here, for the benefit of all of you, I would like to ask every Member who is here and who worked so hard on this legislation to please stand and be recognized. Would the Members of Congress please stand? [*Applause*] Thank you very much.

This is a good day because our police officers are now going to be better prepared to stop terrorists, our prosecutors better prepared to punish them, our people being better protected from their designs. This legislation is more important today because of the very forces which have unlocked so much potential for progress: the new technologies, the instant communications, the open borders. These things have done so much good. But they have also made it easier for the organized forces of hatred and division to endanger the lives of innocent people. We have seen terrorism take its horrible toll all around the world, from Tokyo to London to Jerusalem and, of course, in our own country.

When a terrorist car bomb took the lives of 241 American Marines in Beirut, we felt the shock waves here at home. When savage killers took the life of Leon Klinghoffer, countless Americans wept for him and for his family. When Pan Am 103 went down over Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 270 people including 189 Americans, we saw again that there are no borders or bounds on the forces of hatred. When the bomb exploded at the World Trade Center, as Mary Jo said, by the grace of God killing only 6 but injuring over 1,000 people, we knew again that we had no place to hide. And of course, 5 days ago we marked the first anniversary of

the most terrible terrorist attack upon these shores in our history, reminding us that even the very young and the most innocent are not immune.

We also have to remember as we remember those who were lost that, as painful as that loss is, their deaths and their destructions are not the terrorists' only goals, for each and every act of terrorism is also a means to another end, the unbelievable idea that it is all right to kill an innocent person to achieve a political goal, to stop us from living our lives in the light of liberty, to force us to cower in the dark grip of fear, to terrify us as targets into submission.

So let us honor those who lost their lives by resolving to hold fast against the forces of violence and division, by never allowing them to shake our resolve or break our spirit, to frighten us into sacrificing our sacred freedoms or surrendering a drop of precious American liberty. Rather we must guard against them, speak against them, and fight against them.

Fighting terrorism is and will for a long time to come be one of the top security priorities of the United States. On our own and with our allies, we have implemented strong sanctions against states that harbor terrorists and encourage them. We have intensified partnerships with other countries to stand together against terrorists around the world. We have increased our investment, our personnel, and our training for law enforcement efforts here at home.

I sent Congress antiterrorism legislation over a year ago, and after the Oklahoma City bombing I asked for additional measures. I applaud the great majority of Congress who stood up for the safety of the American people, worked through the policy debates, and made sure that in the end politics faltered and common sense prevailed. Democrats and Republicans, Republicans and Democrats, people who love their country as patriots came together, worked together, and got the job done.

The antiterrorism bill is grounded in common sense and steeled with force. Because of this bill, law enforcement will be better prepared than ever to stop terrorists before they strike and to bring them to justice when they do. From now on we can quickly expel foreigners who dare to come to America and support terrorist activities. From now on American prosecutors can wield new tools and expanded penalties against those who terrorize Americans at home or abroad. From now on we can stop terrorists from raising money in the United States to pay for their horrible crimes. From now on criminals sentenced to death for their vicious crimes will no longer be able to use endless appeals to delay their sentences, and families of victims will no longer have to endure years of anguish and suffering.

We have new laws and better controls against chemical and biological weapons. We have agreed to put chemical markers in plastic explosives that will help us to detect explosives like those used to bring down Pan Am 103. We will be able to require chemical taggants in some other explosive materials as well. They will make it easier for police to trace bombs to the criminals who made them and bring those criminals to justice.

This legislation is a strong step forward for our security, but we mustn't stop there. I am directing the Secretary of the Treasury to complete the study of taggants required by Congress and propose appropriate regulations as quickly as possible. We must also address the problem of black and smokeless powders, routinely used to make illegal smokeless devices like pipe bombs. I'm directing Secretary Rubin to consult with industry representatives and the law enforcement community to report back with appropriate recommendations.

Finally, I believe we have to take additional steps. I believe we must do more to help police keep terrorists who are—suspected terrorists under surveillance. I believe we should give law enforcement more time to investigate and prosecute terrorists who use machine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and explosive devices. I agree with police officers that instead of creating a commission to study them, in the end we must ban cop-killer bullets.

Nonetheless, make no mistake about it: This bill strikes a mighty blow against terrorism, and it is fitting that this bill becomes law during National Crime Victims' Rights Week, because it stands up for victims in so many important ways. There are a lot of victims' advocates and victims here, and I thank them for their presence today. This bill recognizes that victims have a compelling interest in the trials of those accused of committing crimes against them and requires closed-circuit television coverage when Federal trials are moved far away, a provision we owe to the vigilance of the Members of

Congress from Oklahoma. And we thank you for it.

I'd like to close with a word to all of the family members of Americans slain by terrorists and to the survivors of terrorism, to the children who lost their parents in Pan Am 103 and parents who lost their children in Israel, to all of you from Oklahoma City, to Andrew Kerr on my staff of the National Security Council whose father was murdered in Beirut, to each and every one of you with us today and those who are watching all across this great land of ours. Your endurance and your courage is a lesson to us all. Your vigilance has sharpened our vigilance.

And so I sign my name to this bill, in your names. We renew our fight against those who seek to terrorize us, in your names. We send a loud, clear message today all over the world, in your names: America will never surrender to terror. America will never tolerate terrorism. America will never abide terrorists. Wherever they come from, wherever they go, we will go after them. We will not rest until we have brought them all to justice and secured a future for our people, safe from the harm they would do—in your names.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:50 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mary Jo White, New York U.S. Attorney, whose office prosecuted the World Trade Center bombing. S. 735, approved April 24, was assigned Public Law No. 104–132.

Statement on Signing the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996

April 24, 1996

I have today signed into law S. 735, the "Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996." This legislation is an important step forward in the Federal Government's continuing efforts to combat terrorism.

I first transmitted antiterrorism legislation to the Congress in February 1995. Most of the proposals in that legislation, the "Omnibus Counterterrorism Act of 1995," were aimed at fighting international terrorism. After the tragedy in Oklahoma City, I asked Federal law enforcement agencies to reassess their needs and determine which tools would help them meet the new challenge of domestic terrorism. They produced, and I transmitted to the Congress, the "Antiterrorism Amendments Act of 1995" in May 1995.

Together, these two proposals took a comprehensive approach to fighting terrorism both at home and abroad. I am pleased that the Congress included most of the provisions of these proposals in this legislation. As a result, our law enforcement officials will have tough new tools to stop terrorists before they strike and to bring them to justice if they do. In particular, this legislation will:

—provide broad new Federal jurisdiction to prosecute anyone who commits a terrorist attack in the United States or who uses the United States as a planning ground for attacks overseas;

—ban fundraising in the United States that supports terrorist organizations;

—allow U.S. officials to deport terrorists from American soil without being compelled by the terrorists to divulge classified information, and to bar terrorists from entering the United States in the first place;

—require plastic explosives to contain chemical markers so that criminals who use them—like the ones that blew up Pan Am Flight 103—can be tracked down and prosecuted;

—enable the Government to issue regulations requiring that chemical taggants be added to some other types of explosives so that police can better trace bombs to the criminals who make them;

—increase our controls over biological and chemical weapons;

—toughen penalties over a range of terrorist crimes;

—ban the sale of defense goods and services to countries that I determine are not "cooperating fully" with U.S. antiterrorism efforts. Such a determination will require a review of a country's overall level of cooperation in our efforts to fight terrorism, taking into account our counterterrorism objectives with that country and a realistic assessment of its capabilities.

By enacting this legislation, the United States remains in the forefront of the international effort to fight terrorism through tougher laws and resolute enforcement.

Nevertheless, as strong as this bill is, it should have been stronger. For example, I asked the Congress to give U.S. law enforcement increased wiretap authority in terrorism cases, including the power to seek multi-point wiretaps, enabling police to follow a suspected terrorist from phone to phone, and authority for the kind of emergency wiretaps available in organized crime cases. But the Congress refused.

After I proposed that the Secretary of the Treasury consider the inclusion of taggants in explosive materials, so that bombs can be traced more easily to the bomb makers, the Congress exempted black and smokeless powder—two of the most commonly used substances in improvised explosive devices.

I asked that law enforcement be given increased access to hotel, phone and other records in terrorism cases. I asked for a mandatory penalty for those who knowingly transfer a firearm for use in a violent felony. I asked for a longer statute of limitations to allow law enforcement more time to prosecute terrorists who use weapons such as machine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and explosive devices. But the Congress stripped each of these provisions out of the bill. And when I asked for a ban on cop-killer bullets, the Congress delivered only a study, which will delay real action to protect our Nation's police officers.

I intend to keep urging the Congress to give our law enforcement officials all the tools they need and deserve to carry on the fight against international and domestic terrorism. This is no time to give the criminals a break.

There are three other portions of this bill that warrant comment. First, I have long sought to streamline Federal appeals for convicted criminals sentenced to the death penalty. For too long, and in too many cases, endless death row appeals have stood in the way of justice being served. Some have expressed the concern that two provisions of this important bill could be interpreted in a manner that would undercut meaningful Federal habeas corpus review. I have signed this bill because I am confident that the Federal courts will interpret these provisions to preserve independent review of Federal legal claims and the bedrock constitutional principle of an independent judiciary.

Section 104(3) provides that a Federal district court may not issue a writ of habeas corpus with respect to any claim adjudicated on the merits in State court unless the decision reached was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court. Some have suggested that this provision will limit the authority of the Federal courts to bring their own independent judgment to bear on questions of law and mixed questions of law and fact that come before them on habeas corpus.

In the great 1803 case of *Marbury* v. *Madison,* Chief Justice John Marshall explained for the Supreme Court that "[i]t is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is." Section 104(3) would be subject to serious constitutional challenge if it were read to preclude the Federal courts from making an independent determination about "what the law is" in cases within their jurisdiction. I expect that the courts, following their usual practice of construing ambiguous statutes to avoid constitutional problems, will read section 104 to permit independent Federal court review of constitutional claims based on the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution and Federal laws.

Section 104(4) limits evidentiary hearings in Federal habeas corpus cases when "the applicant has failed to develop the factual basis of a claim in State court proceedings." If this provision were read to deny litigants a meaningful opportunity to prove the facts necessary to vindicate Federal rights, it would raise serious constitutional questions. I do not read it that way. The provision applies to situations in which "the *applicant* has failed to develop the factual basis" of his or her claim. Therefore, section 104(4) is not triggered when some factor that is not fairly attributable to the applicant prevented evidence from being developed in State court.

Preserving the Federal courts' authority to hear evidence and decide questions of law has implications that go far beyond the issue of pris-

oners' rights. Our constitutional ideal of a limited government that must respect individual freedom has been a practical reality because independent Federal courts have the power "to say what the law is" and to apply the law to the cases before them. I have signed this bill on the understanding that the courts can and will interpret these provisions of section 104 in accordance with this ideal.

This bill also makes a number of major, ill-advised changes in our immigration laws having nothing to do with fighting terrorism. These provisions eliminate most remedial relief for long-term legal residents and restrict a key protection for battered spouses and children. The provisions will produce extraordinary administrative burdens on the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The Administration will urge the Congress to correct them in the pending immigration reform legislation.

I also regret that the Congress included in this legislation a commission to study Federal law enforcement that was inspired by special interests who are no friends of our Nation's law enforcement officers. The Congress has responsibility to oversee the operation of Federal law enforcement; to cede this power to an unelected and unaccountable commission is a mistake. Our Nation's resources would be better spent supporting the men and women in law enforcement, not creating a commission that will only get in their way.

I hope that there will be an opportunity to revisit these and other issues, as well as some of the other proposals this Administration has made, but upon which the Congress refused to act.

This legislation is a real step in the right direction. Although it does not contain everything we need to combat terrorism, it provides valuable tools for stopping and punishing terrorists. It stands as a tribute to the victims of terrorism and to the men and women in law enforcement who dedicate their lives to protecting all of us from the scourge of terrorist activity.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 24, 1996.

NOTE: S. 735, approved April 24, was assigned Public Law No. 104–132.

Statement on Signing the 13th Continuing Resolution

April 24, 1996

Today I have signed into law H.J. Res. 175, the Thirteenth Continuing Resolution for fiscal year 1996.

House Joint Resolution 175 provides for a temporary extension of appropriations—through April 25—for activities covered by the five fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills that have not been enacted into law.

It is my hope that this very brief extension will enable the Congress to complete acceptable legislation to fund these activities for the remainder of the fiscal year.

When the fiscal 1996 process is complete, we should resume our efforts to achieve a balanced budget. A balanced budget that is consistent with our Nation's values should be our ultimate goal. I am determined to continue working toward that goal.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 24, 1996.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 175, approved April 24, was assigned Public Law No. 104–131.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Savings Association Insurance Fund Legislation
April 24, 1996

Dear _____*:*

The Congress has before it a proposal from the Administration that would restore the Savings Association Insurance Fund to full health and assure that interest payments on the so-called FICO bonds continue uninterrupted. With the enactment of this legislation, we could all take pride in achieving a resolution of the last remaining consequences of the thrift industry's problems of the 1980's. Moreover, we can do so without imposing additional costs on American taxpayers.

This necessary proposal will protect taxpayers, who have already paid over $125 billion to assure that no insured depositor suffered any loss as the result of these problems. I believe this legislation has broad bipartisan support, and I urge the Leadership to consider immediate Congressional action.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Robert Dole, Senate majority leader; Thomas A. Daschle, Senate minority leader; Richard K. Armey, House majority leader; and Richard A. Gephardt, House minority leader. This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release.

Remarks on the Legislative Agenda and an Exchange With Reporters
April 25, 1996

The President. This is "Take Your Daughter To Work" Day. [*Laughter*]

Q. How about you?

The President. This is "Take Your Parents To Work" Day. [*Laughter*] They all brought you here. I'm glad you're here. I think it's a wonderful thing. I think it's terrific, and I'm glad to see you all.

Good afternoon. The budget agreement which is now being voted on by Congress is good for the American people. It cuts billions of dollars in spending, cuts the deficit, keeps us on the path to balancing the budget. At the same time, the budget reflects our values by preserving our commitments to education, to the preservation of the environment, and to health care.

The budget continues to put 100,000 police on the street. It will enable us to enforce anti-pollution laws. It gives me authority to block provisions that would put at risk our natural resources, our parks, and our environment. It protects our efforts in education to shrink class size, to improve teaching standards, to keep our children safe, and it funds AmeriCorps, the national service program.

Today we are showing that we can work together to cut the budget and to honor our values. But our work is not done. Now we should summon this same bipartisan spirit and we should work together to finish the job of balancing the Federal budget in 7 years.

The most important thing to happen today is simply this: We have shown that we can work together and that when we do we can get results that are good for the American people today and for our future. But when the leadership of Congress insists on going it alone, one party alone, we get gridlock, stalemate, vetoes, Government shutdowns.

Today was a real victory for progress over partisanship. Both the Republicans and the Democrats in Congress deserve credit. Let's keep it going. The message to the Republicans in Congress today from me is simple. It is a line first used in a very different context by President Kennedy: Let us never fear to negotiate.

Since I took office we've cut the budget deficit in half and more than half. Earlier this year I proposed to Congress a plan that the Congres-

sional Budget Office has certified as balancing the budget in 7 years. And our plans have in common more than enough savings to balance that budget and to provide a modest tax cut. I truly believe we can convene a true mainstream coalition to continue this progress toward a balanced budget and that we can reach agreement pretty quickly because there are so many savings common to both plans.

I want to meet with Members of Congress. I'll do it in a large group or a small one, or a one-on-one, but I want to finish the job. We have an opportunity; we can't let it slip from our grasp. We have seen now with this year's budget and the antiterrorism bill that we can do things together.

We have other important work to finish as well. Congress should pass an increase in the minimum wage. I'm disappointed that the leaders of Congress have refused to schedule a vote on the minimum wage so far. As I have said so many times, you simply can't raise a family on $4.25 an hour, but millions of Americans are trying to do that. They don't want to be on welfare. They don't want to be dependent. They do want to be rewarded for their work, and they want to be able to raise their children in dignity. The increase in the minimum wage I have proposed will help them to do that.

And Congress should also move forward to send me the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill with no special interest amendments. Again, that bill, as proposed by Senator Kassebaum and Senator Kennedy, passed the United States Senate 100 to zero. That is a clear, unambiguous statement that it is beyond politics to say to the working people of America, "You ought not to lose your health insurance when you change jobs, and you ought to be able to get it even if somebody in your family has been sick."

Let's don't litter this up with special interest amendments. Let's don't let this opportunity pass. Let's don't walk away from the plain, clear, unambiguous needs of millions of American families. Let's pass this bill unadorned, simple, good, and strong.

Again I say that this agreement shows what we can do when we work together. Yesterday with the signing of the antiterrorism legislation, we showed what we can do when we work together. I look forward to joining with the Republican and the Democratic leaders in Congress to give the American people the balanced budget they deserve. I hope they will join with me. We show today that that's the way to get things done in the American system.

Thank you.

Budget Agreement

Q. Why do you think that happened? Why do you think there was a compromise or turning point after all these months?

The President. I'm not sure. We would have happily accepted this budget last year. I think that the forces within the majority party in Congress who wanted to show some positive results prevailed. I think the spirit of principled compromise prevailed. I have shown a willingness to work with them and to compromise with them. And I have also shown that I am very anxious to reduce this deficit.

Even though we still have some problems with our budget, I'd like to point out that it is the lowest deficit of any advanced economy in the world as a percentage of our income. This is going to—the more we keep driving the deficit down, the more we're going to get interest rates down, the more we're going to keep growth going, the sooner we'll be able to see American incomes going up. So I want to do this with them. I don't know what happened, but whatever it was, it was a very positive and good thing.

I want to thank Mr. Panetta for the work that he did on this in negotiating on our behalf very strongly but also in a conciliatory spirit. And I want to thank the leaders in Congress who did the same. We can get this done in lots of other areas if we just keep working at it.

Bipartisan Cooperation

Q. Are you worried that Republicans won't go along with a 7-year balanced budget because they're worried about making you look good before the election?

The President. Well, I don't know. You see, I believe there's enough credit to go around when you do the right thing. Yesterday, when I asked the Members of Congress to stand out there, most of them Republicans who came, although we had a fair number of our Democrats who were there as well——

Q. Senator Dole was way in the back, though.

The President. Well, that was his choice. I think—I saw him—I saw him, in a generous gesture, make sure that the committee chairs,

Senator Hatch and Mr. Hyde, got to go up front. He was just being generous to them.

But I believe that when we do things together, the American people are not fooled. They know that I cannot claim full credit for a bill that goes through a Congress that is majority Republican, and they are more than happy to give credit to people who actually work together to build things.

So I believe that—my argument is this: If we have an agreement that is within our grasp, that we know is good for the country, then the credit will take care of itself, and the credit will probably flow in appropriate proportions to everybody involved in it. Then there are still all these things that there is disagreement on, that you can have a legitimate, exciting, interesting campaign about, thrown into the future.

My view is that, you know, we got into this budget mess because of profligate decisions that no one who was here in Washington during the time in either party is probably completely blameless from, between 1981 and 1993. And I see passing this balanced budget amendment as a way of taking care of a past problem that we need to get rid of. Then we can debate this march into the future, which path are we going to take for the future.

Everybody knows in the next 4 years we are walking right into the 21st century. The answer is, which road are we going to take. That debate will still be out there. The American people can have that debate, make their judgments without being frustrated at the political system in Washington for not producing results today.

So I think we can get these things done, and I hope we will.

Whitewater

Q. The Justice Department is asking Judge Howard to keep your videotaped testimony off TV and out of political ads. Two questions: One, are you afraid of being embarrassed by the tape? And secondly, do you agree with a growing number of people who think that Kenneth Starr should step down?

The President. Well, I'll just answer the question about my testimony, and I'll—I don't think I should answer the other question at this time. The facts are what they are, and they are plain for all to see now on the second question you asked me.

On the first question, what I want to do is to—I was asked to testify. If I have any information that is helpful, I want to be able to give it. I think that the American people and the press should have access to my testimony but that it shouldn't be abused in any way.

And so that is the position that I have taken. And I take it that is the position the Justice Department has taken, and they will have more to say about that as we go along.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. During the exchange, a reporter referred to U.S. District Judge George Howard, Jr.

Remarks on the Agreement With Lebanon, Israel, and Syria and an Exchange With Reporters

April 26, 1996

The President. Good afternoon. As you all know, just a short time ago Secretary Christopher concluded an agreement with the leaders of Israel, Lebanon, and Syria, to end the current crisis in southern Lebanon and northern Israel and to prevent it from starting again. I spoke with the Secretary this morning, shortly after 7 o'clock, and I have just spoken with the Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres, who joins me in welcoming this achievement.

The agreement will stop Katyusha rocket attacks on northern Israel and protect both Lebanese and Israeli citizens. It sets up a mechanism to which Israel and Lebanon can refer complaints, composed of those two countries, the United States, France, and Syria. Because it is in writing, this agreement will be less likely to break down than the informal understandings that had been in place since 1993.

I want to congratulate Secretary Christopher and his team for their tireless efforts over the

past week. Now the civilians on both sides of the border can return to their homes and resume their normal lives with greater confidence and greater security than in the past. I also want to commend Prime Minister Peres, President Asad, Prime Minister Hariri, and the representatives of other interested governments, including France, for providing leadership which was very much needed to end this crisis.

Now, this agreement will only last if all those who worked with us to bring it about now work to make sure it succeeds. We must not and we will not tolerate new attempts to disrupt the calm which has been reestablished at such a terrible cost.

I know I speak for all Americans in saying that our thoughts and prayers are with the innocent civilians and their families in Lebanon and in Israel who have suffered so much during the last 2 weeks. Now we must turn again to the hard work of building a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Thank you very much.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, doesn't this really accept the status quo, and will—the real crux of the problem is Israeli occupation of Lebanon, and the President of Lebanon told you that he could restore order on the border if the Israeli troops got out. Why don't you work on that?

The President. Well, first of all, that will be worked on in the context of resolving—making peace in the Middle East. That is a part of a comprehensive resolution to the Middle East peace process. That has always been our position. But first we had to restore the peace and stop the suffering of the innocent civilians.

1996 Olympics

Q. Mr. President, there are reports that there have been arrests in Georgia in connection, perhaps, with a militia group making some threats against the Olympics. I know you're planning on attending the Olympic games. Can you, first of all, tell us what exactly is going on?

The President. Let me say—as you know, I have to leave—but the Justice Department will make whatever statements are appropriate there. I think it's inappropriate for me at this moment to say more.

Thank you.

Q. Are you concerned, though, about your security going to Atlanta?

The President. No.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:50 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria and Prime Minister Rafiq al-Hariri of Lebanon. A reporter referred to President Ilyas Harawi of Lebanon.

Statement on Signing the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996

April 26, 1996

Today I have signed into law H.R. 3019, the "Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996."

This bill helps us move toward a balanced budget in a way that honors our Nation's values by protecting our commitments to education and training, the environment, law enforcement, science and technology, and national service. It restores $5.1 billion of the $8.1 billion I had sought for these priorities over levels in the appropriations bills that I had rejected. In addition, H.R. 3019 provides emergency disaster funding as well as funding for our troops in Bosnia and for the furtherance of the Middle East peace process.

We should have reached this conclusion 7 months ago, at the beginning of the fiscal year instead of more than halfway through it. Unfortunately, the Congress passed versions of the appropriations bills that were far outside of the mainstream, leaving me no choice but to veto them.

Rather than move quickly to reach a compromise such as the one achieved with this legislation, the Congress shut the Government down twice and then I had to sign a record 13 continuing resolutions funding the Government.

The extent of conflict and delay was unprecedented. It should never happen again.

Nonetheless, 7 months later, we have a bill we can all be proud of, one that achieves savings, protects investments, and avoids outcomes that could have been disastrous for our environment and our people.

For example, the bill eliminates, or permits me to suspend, the most egregious legislative riders that the Congress had sought to attach to the appropriations bills, including those that would have blocked enforcement of some of the Nation's key environmental laws. These riders reflected a philosophy of disregard for our environment that the American people and bipartisan majorities in previous Congresses and Administrations had long ago rejected.

At my insistence the Congress dropped the rider that would have prevented the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from using its authority to protect our Nation's wetlands.

Likewise, this bill provides me the authority to suspend three other riders—authority that I invoked immediately after signing this legislation. If I had not suspended these riders, they would have:

- overridden existing environmental laws and led to unsustainable levels of timber cutting in Alaska's Tongass National Forest;
- drastically undermined the level of protection provided to the Mojave National Preserve by the 1994 California Desert Protection Act; and
- prohibited proposed or final listing actions by the Departments of the Interior and Commerce under the Endangered Species Act, which could have resulted in a greater risk of extinction of some of the over 400 species that are currently either proposed for listing or for which proposed listings are awaiting evaluation.

At my request, the bill also deletes the measure contained in the Senate- and House-passed Interior appropriations bills that would have extended the repeal of environmental laws and allowed the clear-cutting of old growth trees for 3 years or more. That authority is currently set to expire on September 30 of this year, just 5 months away. I am disappointed, however, that the Congress was unwilling to support an immediate repeal of these provisions, despite the fact that, by imperiling salmon and other species, these provisions threaten the environment and economy of the region.

The bill also funds important programs that the House or the Senate—or both—had sought to eliminate.

The Congress, in a bill I vetoed, sought to kill AmeriCorps, the National Service program. This bill retains it, as I had insisted, funding the Corporation for National and Community Service at $402 million. Through National Service, we will continue to allow young Americans to help address vital needs in their communities, such as health care, crime prevention, and education, while earning a monetary award to help them pursue additional education or training.

The House sought to terminate Goals 2000, which is providing schools throughout the country with the resources to improve teacher training and raise academic standards to prepare our children for the 21st Century. This bill restores funding for Goals 2000.

In another bill I vetoed, the Congress sought to end the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program, the commitment I made with the previous Congress to put 100,000 additional police officers on the streets of our cities and towns by the year 2000. At my insistence, that program is continued. As a result, we remain on track for fulfilling our commitment, with 45,000 police officers funded by the end of this fiscal year, including 19,000 provided by this legislation. These police are working hand-in-hand with their communities to fight crime. Crime is down in many communities across the Nation, and we can make further progress through the COPS program and similar efforts.

In the same bill that I vetoed, the Congress proposed to end the Department of Commerce's Advanced Technology Program (ATP), an integral part of my civilian technology strategy to promote economic growth. Adequate funding is provided for that program, while proposed language that would have prohibited new grants was deleted. ATP provides an effective mechanism for augmenting U.S. economic growth through highly-leveraged, industry-led research and development. It is a rigorously competitive, cost-shared program that fosters technology development, promotes industrial alliances, and creates jobs. The continuation of a strong ATP is a fitting tribute to the late Secretary Ron Brown, who deserves so much credit for making ATP what it is today.

Other programs or agencies that one or both houses sought to end, but which this bill restores, include the Community Development Financial Institutions program, the Summer Youth jobs program, and the Council on Environmental Quality.

Very importantly, the bill provides $22.8 billion for the Education Department. I am pleased that the Congress restored critical education programs—among my highest priorities to levels near or above the fiscal 1995 levels. The restorations include important funding for Title I—Education for the Disadvantaged (which the House had sought to cut by $1.2 billion), Goals 2000, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, School-to-Work, and Education Technology.

This bill also ensures that colleges, universities, and vocational schools can continue to choose the Federal student loan program—either the new Federal Direct Student Loan Program or the bank-based guaranteed student loan program—that best serves the needs of their students and ensures that students have access to the most flexible student loan repayment provisions, including income-contingent repayment. Institutions of higher education that now participate in the program or have planned to participate in July 1996 will be able to do so; other schools that wish to participate can enroll without facing limits on the program. Students with guaranteed student loans who want access to income-contingent repayment will be able to switch into the Direct Loan program. The House had sought to place a severe cap on the Direct Loan program, a step that would have had the effect of killing in its infancy an effort that has benefited students, colleges and universities, and taxpayers alike.

The bill also restores other programs to close to, or above, last year's levels that at least one house of Congress had sought to cut deeply. These include Head Start, Department of Labor worker protection programs, and payments to international organizations for peacekeeping and other programs. To help finance these priorities, the bill provides new debt collection authorities, calls for selling the United States Enrichment Corporation, and cuts Government overhead.

The Congress, also at my insistence, dropped from the bill the most seriously objectionable language provisions affecting the Education Department. The Congress also eliminated controversial language affecting Goals 2000, paving the way for renewed bipartisan support for this program.

The bill provides $6.5 billion for the EPA. The cuts originally proposed by the House for the EPA would have crippled its ability to protect the health of families throughout the Nation. I am pleased that the Congress deleted or modified other objectionable legislative riders, including restrictions on the size of the diplomatic presence in Vietnam, the District of Columbia school voucher provision, and a measure that could have resulted in bans on the use of Medicaid funds for abortions for victims of rape or incest.

I am also pleased that the Congress dropped political advocacy disclosure provisions. These provisions could have interfered with the First Amendment rights of such nonprofit organizations as the Girl Scouts, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, and the American Red Cross.

I commend the Congress for repealing the language in the 1996 Defense Authorization Act that unfairly required the discharge of military personnel with HIV.

I am disappointed that the Congress chose to modify the conditions under which prison grant monies are distributed to the States. The Congress carefully crafted a distribution mechanism just 2 years ago to ensure that States implementing "truth in sentencing" would be rewarded for doing so. That mechanism is in place and has no need for change. These program changes will significantly delay getting these resources to the places they are needed most.

I note with regret the other objectionable legislative riders that remain in the bill.

They include a provision intended to allow the construction of a third telescope on Mt. Graham, Arizona, affecting the Mt. Graham red squirrel, Native American cultural lands, and the abortion accreditation provision.

While I am disappointed that the Congress chose to reduce funding for the Legal Services Corporation, I am pleased that the bill assures continued funding of legal services programs for all eligible populations, including migrants.

I am also disappointed that the Congress did not approve my request to increase funding by $250 million for our anti-drug initiative. But I am pleased that the conferees stated their intent to provide additional funds for these important programs in FY 1997, ensuring that we can continue our anti-drug effort at full strength.

Unfortunately, the Congress did not include legislation I had sought to stabilize the Savings Association Insurance Fund. It is important for the Congress to take action on this issue quickly so that we can put the thrift crisis behind us without imposing any further costs on the taxpayers.

In addition, I note that section 119(a) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, contains a legislative veto, which would be unconstitutional under *INS* v. *Chadha* (462 U.S. 919) (1983). However, because I am suspending section 119(a) pursuant to section 119(b), the constitutional problem will be avoided.

With regard to defense, this bill also permits the Federal Government to undertake a multiyear procurement of the C–17 aircraft, the critical next-generation military transport. The C–17 will greatly enhance our ability to respond to crises around the world; buying it this way will save hundreds of millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

This bill represents true compromise and bipartisan cooperation. Clearly, when we work together we can enact good legislation for the American people.

With this in mind, we should build on our efforts here and move on to the larger challenge of balancing the budget over the next 7 years. The American people deserve a balanced budget, and we should give it to them.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 26, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 3019, approved April 26, was assigned Public Law No. 104–134. The related memorandums on suspension of certain provisions for environmental management are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress on Waivers for Environmental Management
April 26, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report that I have exercised the authority provided to me under subsection 325(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, to suspend subsection 325(a) and 325(b) of such Act. A copy of the suspension is attached.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 26, 1996.

NOTE: The President exercised authority to waive certain sections of the Omnibus Consolidation Rescissions Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–134) pursuant to provisions of that act. The suspension memorandum is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message on the Observance of Eid al-Adha
April 26, 1996

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Eid al-Adha.

An observance of sacrifice and a celebration of faith, Eid al-Adha is a sacred day for Muslims in our nation and around the world. On this special day, the entire global Muslim community joins in spirit with those who have traveled to Mecca to complete the Hajj.

The Festival of the Sacrifice reminds all of us of the need for obedience to God, prompts us to reflect on God's mercy, and gives participants a welcome opportunity to join with friends

and family in a community celebration of faith. In commemorating this holy day, Muslims in America and in countries around the world serve as a source of strong faith that can enrich our lives and strengthen our common values.

Best wishes for a memorable and meaningful observance.

BILL CLINTON

Remarks at a Democratic Reception in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
April 26, 1996

Thank you very much. Come on up, Congressman—give Congressman Borski a hand for going to his daughter's soccer game. Give him a hand. [*Applause*] One of the things you need to know if you're in public life is how to make a proper entrance. [*Laughter*] And Bob just qualified. Actually, I saw him this morning. We were both out running at Fort McNair in Washington, DC, and he said he'd be here tonight. And I thank him for keeping his word.

Thank you, Congressman Chaka Fattah, for that powerful introduction and for your great service. Thank you, Congressman Tom Foglietta, for your friendship and your support. Thank you, Gussie, and thank you, Mina Baker Knoll, and thank you, Joe Kohn.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman Fowler, for all the endless nights that you go back and forth across America in search of the magical chemistry of victory, not just for our party and our candidates but for the kind of America we're fighting for. And thank you, Mr. Mayor, for proving that the Democratic Party can be the party of the future and the party of all the people, the party of compassion and competence, the party of the mind and the party of the heart. Thank you all.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply moved by this large outpouring. As President Kennedy used to say, I am deeply touched, but not so deeply touched as you are tonight. [*Laughter*] I thank you for your support, and I thank you for your commitment to your city, your State, and your country. Pennsylvania and Philadelphia have been very, very good to me. And as all of you know, this State and this part of our State has a special place in my wife's heart and her family history. And we're delighted always, either one of us, to have a chance to come.

I think you know why we're here, or you wouldn't be here. But let me just say again very briefly, when I ran for President in 1992 and the State of Pennsylvania gave Bill Clinton and Al Gore its electoral votes, when Philadelphia gave our ticket a larger margin than President Kennedy received here in 1960, we had a very straightforward vision for our country, a vision for what we wanted America to look like in the 21st century and what we wanted America to be like for all the children that are here.

First, we wanted a country where every person who is willing to work for it, without regard to their race, their income, or their background, could have a chance to live out their dreams. Second, we wanted a country that was coming together, not being driven apart; that was reaching across the racial and other lines that divide us to find strength in our diversity and our shared values. Third, I wanted to see our country continue to be the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity and security, so that we could build a framework for the 21st century that would free our children of the worries that two World Wars and the cold war imposed upon generation after generation after generation of Americans in the 20th century.

In short, I really believed that if we did the right thing, the new global economy could open up the greatest age of possibility our people have ever known. I still believe that. And what I come to you to say is that we have a record that we can be proud of. Together we've done what we said we'd do in 1992. But it is a record to build on, not a record to sit on. It is a record to go forward from, and not a record to take a radical turn away from. That is what is at stake here.

The American people in a way are fortunate in this election year. In 1992, there was a big debate about change or the status quo. That's

not what is at stake in 1996. In 1996, there are two very different visions of change that offer us two roads into the 21st century. And the next 4 years, like it or not, are going to take us right into the next century. The question is, which road are we going to walk into the 21st century? That is the question the American people will determine.

Will we walk the road of those who say that Government is the problem in America and the only thing we need to do is to give the American people freedom from their Government? Or will we walk with those of us who believe that we need a smaller and less bureaucratic Government, but Government has a role to play to make sure that every American has a chance to make it, that every family has a chance to make it, that every neighborhood and every community has a chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given capacities?

I think those of us who want to go forward together will prevail in 1996 because of you, and I know that you know that, or you wouldn't be here. And we don't have to guess about what will happen. You know where I am and what I will do. You know where they are and what they will do. You know that our approach produced a deficit that is less than half of what it was in 1992 when we took office, 8½ million more jobs, a real crime bill instead of 6 years of talking about it. It's putting 100,000 police on the street and helping communities to drive the crime rate down to make our streets safer.

You know that it produced new and innovative approaches to protect the environment while growing the economy. You know that it produced a new commitment to the education of all of our children, from expanding the Head Start program to expanding the availability of affordable college loans, to the national service program that your former Senator, Harris Wofford, heads today. You know what we will do, and you know they oppose all those things.

You also know that I have done my best to reach across party lines to work with Republicans of good will; that I think this intense partisanship—the idea that everybody who is not in your party is the enemy of your future and the enemy of your country—is crazy; the idea that you should never work with people even if you agree with them on a specific issue because there might be some, God forbid, benefit to somebody in the other party, is wrong. That is not what made America great. There are enough differences that are honest without that kind of excessive partisanship.

And today I finally signed, 7 months late, a budget for this year that I would have signed 7 months ago. Why? It continues the reduction of the deficit; it continues to cut spending; but it protects education; it protects the protection of the environment; it protects Medicare; it protects Medicaid; it protects our investment in new technologies and the growth of jobs; and it protects the 100,000 police and the AmeriCorps program, all things—all things—that the other party tried in an intensely, completely partisan way to do away with. That was wrong.

But when we came back and rolled up our sleeves and worked together, we did what we should have done: keep that deficit coming down, continue to reduce the size of unnecessary Government, but protect our future and protect our children and protect the things that bring us together instead of driving us apart. That is the way we ought to do things.

A couple of days ago I signed an antiterrorism bill—the same thing, passed in a completely bipartisan way to give us the tools to fight the kind of terrorism that we have seen in Oklahoma City, at the World Trade Center, in Japan, in the Middle East, indeed, all over the world, the use of murder of innocent civilians to achieve a political end. We did that in a bipartisan way by putting America first. That is what I represent and that's what our party will represent as long as I am the President of the United States, and that is what we ought to do.

So I ask you to keep these things in mind. This is an interesting world we're living in. It's full of unpredictable events. Just in the last few weeks we've seen the heartbreaking deaths of my friend the Commerce Secretary, Ron Brown, and some of our finest young public servants and some of our finest business leaders going to Bosnia to try to put the power of the American economy behind saving the peace and tell those people, you have no future if you hate each other because of your religion or your ethnic background. And we are determined now to make something positive happen out of that, to use it to strengthen our ability to stand for peace.

We were afraid that the peace was being shattered in the Middle East with the fighting in southern Lebanon and northern Israel. But, thank God, today they reached an agreement

to restore the cease-fire and to monitor violations and not to resort to that kind of killing again. And yesterday the Palestinians took out of their constitution the provision that required them to be against the very existence of the state of Israel. This was a good day, a good week for peace in the Middle East and moving forward again.

And on the trip I took to Korea and Japan and Russia, let me remind you, it may seem like a long way away, but when I took office the number one threat to America's security was said to be the development of a nuclear program by North Korea and the prospect that they would have nuclear weapons that could be used and could be sold to other countries. Now that is not even in the headlines anymore because they're keeping their word to build down their nuclear program. And we are committed to that.

In Japan, we've had 21 separate trade agreements with Japan, 21. And in those areas, everything from auto parts to cellular telephones to autos to rice, in all those areas our exports to Japan are up 85 percent and our trade deficit is going down. We are creating jobs with free and fair trade, doing the right thing by the American people, and maintaining our security partnership with Japan.

Let me tell you why I went to Russia and how it affects you. Because of the work that has been done with Russia as a democracy in the last 3 years, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there is not a single, solitary nuclear missile pointed at an American child tonight. And I am proud of that, and you should be proud of that.

But unfortunately, not all the dangers of the nuclear age are behind us. We have more work to do to reduce nuclear weapons further. And the waste that is left behind—the waste that is left behind could be used to make small bombs with many times the destructive power of the bomb that blew up the Federal building in Oklahoma City. So we have to work with them to make sure that all that is safe, that it cannot be stolen, that terrorists cannot get ahold of it.

So even these things that happen so far from home affect the way your children live on their streets and their neighborhoods and their schools and their future. That is why I say again, we have to do three things. Every person without regard to their race, their gender, their station in life has got to have a chance if they're willing to work for it. We have got—we have got to fight these impulses that are dividing people all over the world by race, by religion, by ethnic group and say no, no, that's not what America is; America is meeting our challenges together by sharing our values and working together.

And we've got to continue to be the force for peace and freedom and security in the world that only America can be. And we have to do it by saying this is what the Democrats stand for, not big Government solving all the problems but a new, smaller, less bureaucratic Government, the smallest in 30 years, but one still strong enough to help citizens and families and communities make the most of their own lives.

That is tomorrow's progressivism. That's what we stand for. And if any Republicans or independents want to help us, we are not going to be blindly partisan, we're going to say come on aboard, grab us by the hand, and walk into the future together.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:30 p.m. in Franklin Hall at the Franklin Institute. In his remarks, he referred to Gussie Clark, Philadelphia councilwoman; Mina Baker Knoll, State treasurer candidate; Joe Kohn, State attorney general candidate; Donald L. Fowler, national chairman, Democratic National Committee; and Mayor Edward Rendell of Philadelphia.

The President's Radio Address
April 27, 1996

Good morning. This has been a very good week for America. On Friday I signed a bipartisan budget to keep the Government operating for the rest of the year. After a year of intense and sometimes heated debate, Republicans and Democrats in Congress came together and

worked with us to craft an agreement that is good for the American people.

First of all, it keeps the deficit on the downward path we started in 1993. This budget cuts billions of dollars in spending. At the same time, the budget upholds America's most basic values, as I have pledged to do, by honoring our commitment to our elderly, to our children, and to our future by protecting Medicare and Medicaid, preserving our fight against crime, investing in education and in the protection of the environment.

Look how far we've come. A year ago, many in Congress insisted we could only move toward a balanced budget by imposing extreme measures and walking away from those commitments. I knew that wasn't true, and I was determined to hold the line. So now we aren't going to break our promise to put 100,000 new police officers on the street. We aren't going to stop enforcing antipollution laws and risk severe damage to our environment. We aren't going to abandon our effort to shrink class size and raise teachers' standards, to keep kids in school safe and make college more affordable. We aren't going to abandon our commitment to AmeriCorps, our national service program, which also helps young people pay for college as they serve in their communities.

But here's what we are going to do: We are going to cut the deficit for the 4th year in a row. This is the first time that has happened in almost 50 years, since Harry Truman was President. We're on the way to a balanced budget. The deficit this year will be less than half of what it was when I took office. And now we've got to finish the job.

Earlier this year I proposed a plan to balance the budget, and Congress' own economists have certified that plan will balance the budget in 7 years. Republicans in Congress have their own balanced budget plan. If you laid my plan and their plan side by side, you would find enough cuts in common to both plans to balance the budget and provide a tax cut for working families. So the ingredients for a balanced budget are clearly at hand. All we have to do is sit down together and assemble a final agreement based on the things we already agree on.

But that's the problem. I have made it clear that I want to meet with Congress and work this out as soon as possible. I said this week I'm willing to meet with a large group of lawmakers or a small group of Republican and Democratic leaders. When Senator Dole said that maybe the two of us ought to get together and work it out, I told Senator Dole I'd be more than happy to meet with him alone. I don't care how we do it. My singular goal is to work together with the Republicans to craft a bipartisan plan to balance the budget in 7 years while upholding our values and our commitment to the future.

I'd like to take a minute to speak directly to the Republicans in Congress. I know some people in your party are urging you to reject bipartisan negotiation in favor of more partisan confrontation. That would be a terrible mistake. Let me be blunt. I refused to accept extreme proposals for the last year and a half, and I will not accept extreme proposals for the future. If it is your political strategy to concoct a budget that you hope I will not sign, you ought to think again. If you torpedo these negotiations today, after so much progress has been made on a balanced budget, simply to create a campaign issue for later, the American people will see through that with their eyes closed.

So I urge you this morning to take the high road to progress. Do what we did with this year's budget, with the antiterrorism bill, with the telecommunications bill, with the lobby reform bill. Come meet with me and let's finish this job together. This is an historic chance to balance the budget. We're within inches of agreement, and nothing—not politics, not partisanship, not Presidential campaigns—nothing should be allowed to stop us.

Just about a year ago I gave a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. I told them then I did not want a pile of vetoes. I told them I wanted to work with Congress and get things done for the American people. But I also said I'd never accept extreme and unnecessary measures that would jeopardize our ability to care for our elderly, educate our children, and protect our environment. Unfortunately, a lot of Republicans in Congress didn't believe me. They shut the Government down. They refused to cooperate. But look what happened. When they tried to impose these drastic measures I was forced to stop them, just as I said I would. But then last week we worked together, and we quickly agreed on a budget plan that accomplishes what I said could be done all along: The deficit is going down, and our commitments are secure.

Today the Republican leaders in Congress face a similar choice. They can go it alone and we will end up going nowhere, or they can come on down to the White House and we will get a good job done for the American people together. That's how our system works best. That's how we should reform health care and help working families.

Every United States Senator, for example, every single one, 100 of them, voted to pass the bipartisan Kennedy-Kassebaum health care reform bill. Now, Republicans can work with us to make that health care more available to 43 million Americans by passing a bill that says that you ought to be able to keep your health insurance if you change jobs or lose a job, and you ought not to be denied health insurance just because somebody in your family has been sick. We can agree on that, or the Republicans can send me a more partisan bill that has special provisions for special interests.

The Republican leadership can work with us to raise the minimum wage, or they can go on ignoring working families and moderates in their very own party, and do their best to obstruct even a vote on the minimum wage.

Now, if you look at what's been done that is good in the last year and 4 months—this year's budget, the antiterrorism bill, the telecommunications bill, the lobby reform—every single good thing has been done because Democrats and Republicans in Congress worked together and worked with me. That's how to get things done.

The only way for us to move forward is to do it together. That's the right thing to do on balancing the budget, the right thing to do on health care reform, the right thing to do on the minimum wage. That is what we are here for: to move America forward. So let's get together, and let's get to work.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:21 p.m. on April 26 at the DuPont Hotel in Wilmington, DE, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 27.

Remarks to the National Association of Realtors
April 27, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, Art and Michael, Robert, Russ, ladies and gentlemen. Thanks for the warm welcome.

Audience member. Go, Bill! [*Laughter*]

Audience member. Four more years! [*Laughter*]

The President. Let me say that I've been trying to convince the Congress it's too early to start all that. So you've got to help me set a good example. [*Laughter*]

I am delighted to be here and delighted to be with you. I'm delighted to be here once again to express my support for your work every day, and my thanks for the support you have given to me in our common efforts to rebuild this economy and to increase homeownership.

Spring is the traditional start of the homebuying season, and it's a time of hope and, at least for us here in Washington, it came not a day too soon. We suffered through a tough winter, and we thought the spring would never come. But I was glad to see that in March, that home resale activity was up in every region of the country, and there was a 16 percent jump in single-family home sales last month, compared to March of '95. I hope that is a harbinger of a good spring, a good summer, and a good year for you and for the United States.

Art said something—I didn't even have a note on this, I wasn't going to talk about it because I hear everybody is not interested in foreign policy, but I want to tell you something. You made a remark about our common understanding of the importance of homeownership in building our democracy. As I'm sure most of you know, I just came back from a trip to Korea, Japan, and Russia, and I had an astonishing experience in Russia, in addition to being there at a nuclear summit where we made some real strides forward in our unfinished work of removing any danger of nuclear explosions from the face of our children's future. I had an opportunity to meet with 12 leaders from very different political factions in Russia, as they are getting ready to have another election there for President. And it was fascinating. First of all,

they had a virtual brawl of an argument right there in front of me, which I liked. They behaved just like our politicians do. [*Laughter*] Made me think they were kind of healthy. [*Laughter*]

But it was very interesting to see that one of the things that is happening to change that country, to make more people more devoted to democracy and freedom, is the ownership of property. And it is very interesting to see that in the areas where there is more ownership of property, where people, for example, own more of their own businesses, they're more committed to democracy and to economic reform and to the promise of free enterprise, even with all of its troubles as they start. And so now they're trying to get more homeowners, more property ownership out in the rural areas of the country.

And I say that just to say a lot of times we just take it for granted that once you start a democracy, it's just such a wonderful thing we just keep on with it. And we realize that—I mean, we forget that this is the oldest continuous democracy in human history, and it's not all that easy to start one and it's not all that easy to save one. And a lot of times people want to lay down the burden of governing themselves and making all these hard decisions and living under the rule of law and enduring defeat as well as victory in elections and in other big decisions.

And I was there still watching this very great country, with its rich and profound history, essentially still in the process of defining what it wishes to be in the 21st century. And it struck me so clearly there that giving people a piece of the country for themselves, whether it was in the private ownership of a building, private ownership of a farm, private ownership of a home, private ownership of a business, that is the key to making everybody feel that they can really win, even if their side doesn't win every election or if every issue doesn't go their way. So that liberty, free speech, and free elections and personal liberties should include—indeed, I would argue must include—the recognition of private ownership of property in order to make sure that democracies can last. I wish them well, and I know that you do, but I thought you'd be interested in that.

We take this country and everything good about it for granted, and we take our system for granted. And sometimes we don't even show up on election day and we say—nearly every citizen does say—from time to time says foolish things like, well, it doesn't really matter what happens, and all that. We just think it will go on. But one reason it probably will go on is that we all have a piece of America. And even people who don't own property still have a piece of America because they know they can, they know that we all can participate in this.

And so when you see the next couple of months unfold in Russia and you watch that and you see what happens to their democracy, you ought to just think about what they have in common with us. And as they move to have more control in their—individuals and families and communities—over their future, a lot of it will be because they have a personal, private stake in the public future of a free country.

Four years ago when I sought this job I am now privileged to hold, things weren't so good for you or for the rest of the country. Our economy was down; unemployment was high; the deficit was exploding; the debt had quadrupled in just 12 years. I wanted to change the course of this country, and I knew we had to do it, first of all, by getting economic growth back by driving interest rates down. And that meant that we had to do something about the deficit. But to me it was part of a vision that I have about what I want our country to look like in the 21st century and how I want America to be perceived by all of its citizens.

I want this country to be a place where everybody who is willing to work hard and obey the law has a chance to live out their dreams without regard to their race or their region or their station they were born to in life. I want this country to be a place that is coming together, not being driven apart, even though we're rapidly becoming the most diverse democracy in the world. Los Angeles County alone has 150 different racial and ethnic and religious groups within one county. But if we can come together and meet our challenges based on shared values, instead of being driven apart, that's a guarantee of America's strength.

And I want us to continue to lead the world as the greatest force for freedom and peace and security and prosperity, because whether we like it or not, we're living in a global economy and we can't run away from it. So we'd better try to shape it; we'd better try to have more democracies and more people who want to work with us and more people who are com-

mitted to finding nonviolent solutions to their own problems, as well as to the problems that affect us all.

We've seen it lately in the great debate we've had the world over on terrorism. And we know now that in this great open world we're living in, with all of its opportunities, the organized forces of evil can cross national boundaries. You can have a terrorist that's homegrown, or you can have a terrorist that is tied to the forces beyond your borders, as we did at the World Trade Center. And every country is facing these kinds of challenges.

So I want all those things for our country. But I know it all begins by giving individuals and families the power to make the most of their own lives. And we could never have done that unless we started by reversing the disastrous fiscal condition of this country by bringing that deficit down and getting interest rates down and promoting economic growth, while continuing to invest in the things that we all know we have to invest in, like education and infrastructure and environmental protection and the integrity of our medical programs, so that the country can grow together.

Now, that's what I tried to put together in that 1993 economic plan. And this organization supported that, and I will be eternally grateful. But it worked. I predicted that if we implemented it we would cut the deficit in half and generate 8 million new jobs. Well, last month the Congressional Budget Office said that by the end of this year the deficit will be less than half of what it was 4 years ago, and we already have 8½ million new jobs. That's something you can be proud of.

This country is enjoying the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in what used to be called the "misery index" in 27 years. For 3 years in a row we've had a record number of new businesses started and—I like this statistic—a record number of new self-made millionaires, not people who were inheriting their wealth but people who made it the old-fashioned way in America. Our telecommunications and auto industries are once again leading the world. We've halted finally—and this may, over the long run, be the most important thing of all—we have finally halted a 10-year-long slide in average hourly earnings. And most important to you, of course, as has already been said, homeownership is at a 15-year high.

The Government has been reduced in size and it has been reformed so that it is beginning to work better and cost less. I'll just give you one example. The Small Business Administration has cut its budget by over 25 percent and doubled its loan volume. And I'm very proud of that. It's the smallest your Federal Government—as you come here to Washington this month, it's the smallest it has been since 1965. [*Applause*] Thank you.

By the end of this year it will be the smallest it has been since 1963. And yet, we are still working to try to do better. There's been a quiet revolution in the relationship of the National Government not only to the private sector, but to State and local governments. There's been a lot of debate in Washington, for example, about what kind of welfare reform legislation we ought to sign. But I think there's a broad consensus in America that the welfare system ought to empower people to take responsibility for their own lives, not just support people forever who ought to be supporting themselves.

We had some differences here about how that ought to be done. I have a very strong conviction that most people—based on my 12 years as a Governor, I have a very strong conviction that most people on welfare are dying to get off of it if they can be given the ways to work and support themselves and they don't have to hurt their kids. So I'm for a system that is very, very tough on work, very tough on child support enforcement, but is good to the kids, has child care and other support for the children. It ought to be pro-work and pro-family. After all, most of you had to work and raise your families. Most Americans are working and raising children. So what we want is an America where everybody can succeed at home and at work. And if we have to choose one or the other, we get in a lot of hot water because none of us have any more important job than raising our own children well. So that's what we're striving for.

But anyway, you might be interested to know while all this hullabaloo about the legislation has been going on, we have made over 50 agreements with 37 States to get them out from under destructive Federal rules and regulations and let them require people who can work to work. Seventy-three percent of the people on welfare in this country are under welfare reform today, and that's a good thing.

But I want to talk to you today about the paradoxes of this good news, because you have all seen the paradoxes. You know, for example—I mean, if I had told you this 3 years ago, let me ask you if you would have found it hard to believe—if I had said to you, look, you support my economic plan and in 3 years and 4 months we'll have 8½ million new jobs, we'll cut the deficit by more than half, we'll have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years, highest homeownership in 15 years; but wages for the bottom half of the work force would be more or less stagnant, about what they were 15 years ago, and there will be places in our inner cities and rural areas that won't have any new investment, and there will be a lot of people that look like me, 50-year-old white guys, that will be being downsized at big companies just when they're trying to send their kids to college, and they won't know what to do and how to get another job paying anything like what they were making, and there will be a lot of women and people of color going through the same thing, but there are a lot of these big companies—and they'll be out of work for a while—and we'll cut the inflation rate in health care dramatically by having more competition, but we'll still have a lot of people who won't be able to get health insurance because they work for small businesses and it's too expensive, or because they can't take it from job to job with them—you'd say, well, that doesn't make sense, it doesn't compute.

The reason it's happening is that we're going through the period of most profound economic change we've been in 100 years, since we've moved from farm to factory and from the country to the city, as a general rule. Now, we're moving from a cold war set of regional economies in the world to a global economy, and every kind of work is more dominated by information and technology, including yours, than it was 5 or 10 years ago. If you were to go home with me in Arkansas at planting time or harvest time you'd see people driving around in farm equipment with computers, maybe with software in it that they designed themselves.

So with all these changes, what has happened? A lot of work that used to be done by a lot of people can now be done by a few people. And all organizations need fewer people passing orders down and information back up. And there's an enormous mobility in technology and money and information and management. And that's what's creating all these incredible opportunities for people that I just reeled off. But if you happen to be on the wrong side of it on a given day, it can also dislocate your life.

And it happened 100 years ago. When we became an industrial country, there were people who came in from the country and went to cities and got jobs in factories and overnight became middle-class citizens—for the first time in their lives could afford to have their own home and send their kids to good schools and have a decent retirement, maybe even take a vacation for the first time. But there were also tens of thousands of people living in tenement houses in these cities, virtually without the means to support themselves, because when you have this kind of upheaval you have some bad along with the good.

And what we have to do is to find a way to grow this economy fast enough to keep America generating these new jobs, but also give people the chance to raise their families in dignity, to get incomes up, to be able to afford to buy their own home, to be able to have access to education for a lifetime if they have to change jobs and access to health care they can carry around with them from job to job and access to retirement savings that they can carry around with them from job to job, so that we can compose family life and community life and still keep the American job machine growing.

That is the challenge of the moment, and you will play a big role in that. I think you understand that. That is what I hope so much that in this election year we can have an honest debate about. We don't need another stale debate about yesterday's issues, or this one's an alien and the other one ought to be disqualified and all that kind of stuff. We ought to actually have an honest discussion about which path to the future we're going to take, because no great country has solved this problem. Indeed, no other country has done anything nearly as well as the United States has in generating new jobs. But we have to say, even with all these jobs, we need to have a really permanently growing economy that is pro-family and pro-community and that gives everybody a chance to live up to their dreams. That is the challenge we all face as Americans today.

Now, I believe that homeownership is a big part of that. You know that and I do, too. So we ought to balance the budget, but I don't

think that we should do it in a way that undermines the ability of people to own their own home. If we can simplify the Tax Code, I'm all for it. But I don't think we ought to adopt a flat tax that will raise taxes on everybody making less than $100,000 a year and put homeownership out of the reach of all the people in those categories.

Your president has already mentioned that the last time I spoke to you in Anaheim in 1994, I asked you to work with Secretary Cisneros to develop a national homeownership strategy that will take us up to two-thirds of the American people in their own homes, 8 million new homeowners by the end of the century. And we are well on our way to getting there because of the 56 major housing and finance groups that have joined us. I want to thank you for that.

I also want to thank you for your support of FHA, and I want to ask you to continue to support it. Again, there's always an argument for doing anything that will save money to help us to balance the budget. But we don't want to do anything that will undermine our ability to grow the economy. And if you want hard working people on modest incomes to have a chance to be pro-work and pro-family, lower income people have got to have access to buy modestly priced homes. That's why we shouldn't do anything to wreck FHA. And I hope you'll stay with us on this.

Last June, Secretary Cisneros and I were joined by representatives of this partnership, including people from your organization, at the White House. We announced 100 specific actions that we can take to make homeownership more affordable, to target underserved populations, to educate those who haven't considered becoming homeowners. Now, we've now got this national homeownership rate, at the end of the first quarter of 1996, up to 65.1 percent. That's the highest rate since 1981 and the sharpest increase, as you heard earlier, in 30 years. We can make it. We can get up to two-thirds of the American people in their own homes by the end of this decade.

Beginning next week, HUD and FHA will launch the next phase of this effort, a grassroots outreach and education campaign designed to help millions of new Americans become homeowners. The cornerstone is a new toll-free number to provide instant information on the wide variety of home-buying help that HUD offers. We're going to launch a series of home-buying seminars in schools in over 20 markets across the country, to bring together real estate professionals, lenders, governmental and nonprofit organizations to help potential first-time buyers gain an understanding of the process. Outreach and PSA's will show how FHA can open the door to homeownership.

I don't need to tell you about how important that is. And again, I want to thank you for helping. But let me say that the most important thing we can do to help you is to continue to grow this economy. And the most important thing that we can do to continue to grow the economy is to keep the interest rates down by finishing the unfinished business of balancing the Federal budget in a way that is consistent with our values and our long-term economic interests.

Now, yesterday I signed a bipartisan budget that will cover the Government's operations for the rest of this year. We fought about it for 6 months. But I would have gladly signed the budget I signed yesterday on the first day of the new budget year. It was a year of intense and heated debate, but finally the Republicans and the Democrats in the Congress and the White House came together and we crafted an agreement that is good for the American people.

First, the budget I signed for this year keeps the deficit on a downward path. We're now cutting the deficit for the 4th year in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States. The budget cuts billions of dollars in spending and eliminates outright over 200 Government programs. I bet you don't miss a one of them. [*Laughter*] You know, while I was a Governor, every 2 years I'd eliminate a government agency just to see if anybody complained. And I never got the first letter. [*Laughter*]

But let me say that the budget we adopted also upholds our values and keeps my pledge that this budget honors our commitments to our elderly, to our children, and to our future. It invests enough to keep environmental protection going in a responsible way. It invests enough to keep our commitments in education and to keep opening the doors of college education wider, to keep striving for higher standards in education, to keep more kids coming into these Head Start programs. It does the right thing there. It protects the integrity of the Medicare and Medicaid programs while understanding

that we have to do things to lower the inflation rate in them. That's what it did for this year.

Now, this is just a one-year budget. When you hear us talk about the balanced budget up here, that's a multiyear budget plan. And now it's time to finish that job. Earlier this year I proposed a plan to balance the budget, and Congress' own economists have now certified that it will do so in 7 years. The Republicans in Congress have their own balanced budget plan that is now different from the one that I vetoed several months ago. If you laid my plan and their plan side by side, you would find enough cuts in common to both plans to balance the budget and still provide a modest tax cut, stuff we have agreed on already in common spending reductions. The ingredients, therefore, for a balanced budget are clearly at hand.

Are there other things we disagree on? You bet there are. We disagree about the details of how Medicare should be changed. We disagree about certain specific things in the area of environmental policy. We have big disagreements about whether we should abandon our commitment to put 100,000 police on the street—I don't think we should—or whether we should cut back on a college loan program that's making the loans more affordable to our kids. I don't think we should do that.

But if you're just talking about balancing the budget, there is more than enough savings in common to both these plans to do that and provide a modest tax cut right now. All we need to do is to sit down and make the agreement. And I made it clear that I want to meet with the leaders of Congress as soon as possible. I'm willing to meet with a big group of lawmakers or a little group of lawmakers, with the leaders or the followers or the caucuses or the bipartisan groups or any group of them. When Senator Dole suggested last week, perhaps in jest, that he thought the two Presidential candidates ought to sit down and work it out, I accepted within 10 minutes of hearing the offer. I'll do it any way. We can cut it flat around. There's not that much difference, anyway. But the fact is that we ought to do it. We should not have a work stoppage here in April because there's an election in November. We ought to stay at the job and get the job done.

Again I say, while you're here I hope you will urge us—you don't have to take sides in all the details. You don't have to say, the President is right. But I hope your voice will be loud and clear that the time is now, not next year, now, to pass a genuine, compassionate, but tough bipartisan balanced budget plan to keep these interest rates coming down and this economy growing. You will benefit from it, but so will all the rest of America.

Let me say this: In spite of all the fights that we have up here, this budget agreement that I signed was not the only good thing that's happened in the last year and 4 months coming out of the Congress. But they all have something in common. Just a few days ago, I signed an antiterrorism bill that will dramatically increase the capacity of your Government to fight terrorism. A few weeks ago, I signed a telecommunications bill which will create hundreds of thousands of new high-wage jobs in the telecommunications industry and keep America leading in many sectors of that important part of our economy. Just a few days ago, the United States Senate passed 100 to zero the Kassebaum-Kennedy health care reform bill which simply says you ought to be able to keep your health insurance if you move from job to job and you ought to be able to buy it, even if someone in your family has been sick. That's what it says.

Now, all those things, those good things that have happened that I laud the congressional leadership of the other party for supporting, have just one thing in common. Every one of them has one thing in common. They were passed with bipartisan support, and they were negotiated in good faith between the President and the Congress. In other words, we put the public interest over short-term political advantage. And because the right thing was done, everybody was better off. Now, that is what we ought to do on this budget.

I remember once in the heat of the cold war, President Kennedy said in his Inaugural Address, "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate." That is my message to the Congress. Let's get to work and do this job for the American people.

Beyond the budget, I want you to know—a lot of you clapped when I talked about the Kassebaum-Kennedy health care bill. The Senate version passed 100 to nothing. Why? Because it's a clean, simple bill designed to achieve those two objectives. The House version of the bill was far more controversial. Why? Because there were certain specific interests that wanted

other things in the bill. They honestly believe it would be good for America. A lot of the rest of us don't think it would be good; we think it would do more harm than good.

My question to you is, since you all clapped for the two things and they passed 100 to nothing, I urge you again, say to the Congress: Pass that bill clean; don't clutter it up with things we disagree about. These are big things. This will help millions and millions of people. Pass a clean, good bill that has bipartisan support that will help everybody in America. It will be good for America. There's no politics in it if we all do it together. That's the right thing for the country in health care and in the budget. And I ask for your support for that as well.

Let me say in closing that I ask you again to ask yourselves, what do you want America to look like in the 21st century? What are you working for? What do you want your children and grandchildren to feel like when they get up every morning? What kind of world do you want them to live in?

If you want them to be able to live out their dreams if they're willing to work hard for it; if you want them to live in a country that's still the strongest force in the world for peace and freedom and security; if you want them to live in a country where we meet our challenges together, no matter how diverse we are, because we share the same values, then we have to keep in mind two things. First of all, we have to give every American the capacity to make good choices and be rewarded for work; everybody's got to have the ability to do it. There's a lot of talk about empowerment in Washington. It's a buzzword today. I love that word, but it means more than choice. It means the ability to seize the choice you want to make. And the second thing we've got to do is to do it together.

We are moving into a new age. The old categories in which we divided ourselves do not give us easy answers to these new challenges. As I said before, there's not a country in the world that's solved the problem of economic growth—that gives everybody a chance to participate in it, that deals with the downsizing, the areas that don't get investment, the stagnation of wages among people that don't have a lot of education. We're trying to come to grips with that.

But we cannot do it in the old, highly intensely partisan way. That is doomed to failure because we are moving into a new era. We have to break new ground. We have to be willing to give up on some of the things that we used to hold onto, and grab onto each other and work together and solve these problems. And we have to be animated by the vision we have of what we want America to look like. Homeownership has to be a part of it. A growing economy has to be a part of it. A more unified sense of our ability to work together through our diversity has to be a part of it. But it begins by saying we have to put the public interest ahead of short-term politics. I ask for your support as Americans for that goal.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:45 p.m. in the ballroom at the Sheraton Washington Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Art Godi, president, Michael Graeper, public policy forum chair, Robert Galiano, public policy forum vice chair, and Russ Booth, 1996 president-elect, National Association of Realtors.

Remarks at the 25th Anniversary Reception for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

April 27, 1996

That's the most attractive introduction I've ever had. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome, welcome to the White House and welcome here for this occasion. We're delighted to join in the 25th anniversary celebration. And I want to say a special word of welcome to the members of the Kennedy family and to thank them for remaining tireless in their efforts to preserve, promote, and honor our Nation's culture.

The Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts prospers today as our national cultural institu-

tion, thanks to so many people who are committed to that ideal, the ideal that art and culture are not so much a pastime as a definer, a clarifier, a representation of America.

Recently, the First Lady and I returned from a trip to the Far East and to Russia, and, as in other visits, we saw how prized an export our culture is. It's not just coincidence that it is embraced and adapted by a world increasingly sharing our democratic ideals. Visit almost any part of the world and there can be no doubt, our art, our music, our dance and theater are among our greatest ambassadors.

Here in America, the Kennedy Center is the Nation's stage. It's hard to believe that just a quarter century ago it was only a goal. President and Mrs. Kennedy realized the significance of a national cultural center. They even held a telethon to raise funds for the center. Of course, President Kennedy could not have known that he would be the center's greatest inspiration and its namesake. But there could not be a more fitting living memorial, for at the Kennedy Center each night we enjoy great performances. Each year we honor great performing artists. Every day we work to commission and create new works and to reach and educate a new generation.

The Kennedy Center makes our culture accessible as it never was before. Last year more than 2 million people attended performances at the center. Another 20 million saw its touring and broadcast productions. And many of these people who could not otherwise afford the price of admission took advantage of free and low-cost performances.

The Kennedy Center is truly a place for all Americans. It is promise and proof of our shared values. It offers a forum to an amazing variety of God-given talents. The best of art endures, enriches, and enlivens the human condition far beyond the horizon of any of our tomorrows. Our art is the best record of who we are, what we have been, and what we hope to become.

President Kennedy said it best in words inscribed in the marble walls of his memorial: "There is a connection, hard to explain logically but easy to feel, between achievement in public life and progress in the arts. The age of Pericles was also the age of Phidias. The age of Lorenzo de Medici was also the age of Leonardo da Vinci. The age of Elizabeth was also the age of Shakespeare."

Tonight we pause and pay tribute to the deeper sources of our strength, the expressions of the human spirit that light up not only our stages but our national life. We celebrate 25 years of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and we look forward in joyful expectation to new generations of performances. The best of the Kennedy Center is yet to come.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:15 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Statement on Exports of Alaska North Slope Crude Oil

April 28, 1996

Today I am taking action that will allow, for the first time, exports of Alaska North Slope (ANS) crude oil. Permitting this oil to move freely in international commerce will contribute to economic growth, reduce dependence on imported oil, and create new jobs for American workers. It will not adversely affect oil supplies or gasoline prices on the West Coast, in Hawaii, or in the rest of the Nation.

I am also announcing additional measures to address safety concerns relating to oil tankers and other commercial vessels in Puget Sound-area waters in Washington State.

I want to express my appreciation to Congress, led by the Alaska congressional delegation, for its bipartisan support of the legislation that has made exports possible. In addition, I want to express my appreciation to Alaska Governor Tony Knowles. It has been a pleasure to work with him to make ANS exports a reality.

After careful consideration, I have determined that ending the 23-year ban against exporting ANS oil is in the national interest, subject to four important conditions:

1. Tankers exporting ANS crude oil must remain outside of the 200-mile Exclusive

Economic Zone. This will ensure that tankers in the ANS export trade remain far from the U.S. coastline and the environmentally sensitive areas along the Aleutian Islands.

2. ANS export tankers must be equipped with a satellite communications system to permit the Coast Guard to monitor the tankers' positions.
3. ANS export tankers must be inspected annually, in accordance with U.S. Coast Guard policies and procedures. This condition will ensure that the tankers are kept in safe working order.
4. ANS export tankers will be required to exchange their ballast water in deep ocean water prior to entering Alaska's Prince William Sound. Ship logs will record ballast exchanges and will be checked periodically by the Coast Guard. This condition will help prevent the introduction into Alaskan fisheries of nonindigenous, aquatic nuisance species.

These requirements, which will be applied to ANS oil exports as export license conditions, will protect Alaska's unique environment and abundant natural resources. A fifth requirement—that exports be carried in U.S.-flag tankers, crewed by U.S. merchant seamen—is already in place under PL 104–58, the oil export legislation I supported and signed into law last November. That law is also the source of the authority under which I am imposing the four additional export conditions.

By removing the ban that has prevented ANS oil from moving freely in international markets for more than two decades, we will be stimulating increased domestic oil production in Alaska and California, creating new jobs in the oil industry, and preserving jobs for America's merchant seamen.

Over the last several months, my administration has conducted an extensive interagency review of the environmental, economic, and energy aspects of lifting the ban. Led by the National Economic Council and the Council on Environmental Quality, the interagency review team confirmed the Department of Energy's 1994 findings that lifting the export ban would provide important benefits to the economy. Permitting exports will generate up to 25,000 more jobs, particularly for American workers in California and Alaska, but also in States that produce oil industry supplies and equipment. Additional oil production of about 100,000 barrels per day is expected, according to DOE projections, and Alaska, California, and the Federal Government will also benefit from up to $2 billion in additional Federal, State, and local royalty and tax payments.

The review group identified an additional benefit of exports. It determined that overall tanker movements along the West Coast will decline. Because of the ban, the ANS oil that exceeds the West Coast's needs currently must be shipped down the West Coast anyway. Without the ban, that "surplus" oil—which has been suppressing Alaska and California producer prices below U.S. market levels—can now be exported.

While the review group found no likelihood of adverse impacts from ANS exports on Washington State's consumers, refiners, or environment, concern is clearly rising in that State about the increasing volume of vessel traffic projected to occur as a result of *other* factors. For example, the growing international trade between Washington State and Pacific Rim nations, while clearly a boon to the State's economy, is prompting debate over the adequacy of current vessel safety procedures and resources.

I share those concerns. Accordingly, I am requesting the Coast Guard to prepare, by no later than 120 days from today, a status report on its plan for a private-sector vessel assistance system. I am also asking the Coast Guard to accelerate completion of the plan, which will be submitted to Congress, and to offer its assistance to any serious private-sector efforts to improve vessel safety. The plan is required under a provision of the ANS export law authored by Senator Patty Murray, who has been at the forefront of efforts to safeguard her State's waterways. To further support those efforts, I am asking the Secretary of Transportation to determine, by the end of this year, the need for additional, cost-effective measures to protect the marine environment, and to prevent shipping accidents, in Washington State.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that in permitting ANS oil to be exported, I am in no way diminishing my authority under various laws to impose new export restrictions if necessary to respond

to a national emergency, or to deal with severe oil supply shortages.

NOTE: The memorandum of April 28 on exports of Alaskan North Slope crude oil is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee Policy Conference

April 28, 1996

Thank you very much. Mr. Prime Minister, I just thought I was tired, because it was late Sunday night; I never felt better in my life. Thank you very much.

Mr. Prime Minister, Ambassador Rabinovich, Secretary Glickman, Ambassador Indyk. President Dow, thank you for that wonderful introduction. Mr. Grossman, Mr. Sher, Mr. Bronfman, Mr. Levy, to Jack Bendheim, who also gave a wonderful introduction; the cochairs of this event, Art Sandler and Betsy Sheer; to all the young students who are here.

The Prime Minister referred on two occasions to the opportunity that I had on my last trip to Israel to meet with the young people there. It was an incredible experience for me. And I realized that in some ways we have to keep depending on young people to deliver us because they remind us that we can break new ground and make tomorrow different from yesterday.

Just before the Prime Minister and I came in here tonight, we received petitions for peace, signed largely by college students, that were presented by Jonathan Epstein of Trinity College and Abigail Michelson of Brandeis, and I'd like to thank them. I think they're over here. I thank them very much for what they did for that.

I would also like to say a special word of thanks to the Members of Congress who are here who have supported our administration's policies in the Middle East. If I miss someone whom I do not see, write me a nasty note tomorrow. [*Laughter*] But I would like to say a special word of thanks to Senator Lautenberg, Congressman Frost, Congressman Engel, Congresswoman Lowey, Congressman Waxman, and Congressman Levin. And I hope I didn't miss anybody; we can't afford to lose any more friends in Congress. [*Laughter*]

When the Prime Minister said that Israel was now spending as much money on education as defense, I thought of seeing if I could get him to stay another week and just testify before a few committees. [*Laughter*] And when you, sir, said that I had made history for a second time, I can see myself being guilt-peddled into the future; I can make history now every year from now on until the end of my life. [*Laughter*]

Since I associate you with the struggle for peace, I can't help, if you will indulge me, one real purely personal observation: The last time I appeared before this conference before last year was in 1989, when the person who was supposed to appear on behalf of the Democratic Party against Lee Atwater went to his daughter's college graduation. I thought he had his priorities in order, and so when he asked me to replace him, I was glad to stand in for Ron Brown. And since he lost his life on another remarkable mission of peace, I thought I would share that with you tonight, and I hope you will remember that and remember him and his family in your prayers.

I am pleased as the Prime Minister is that we can come here tonight with the northern border of Israel and the southern border of Lebanon quiet—no Katyusha rockets firing down on the people of northern Israel. I thank the Prime Minister for the tremendous work he did. And in his absence—and I hope to goodness he's sleeping right now—I want to thank the Secretary of State for his magnificent herculean effort. I also thank his partner and great unsung hero, Dennis Ross, for what he has done.

As the Prime Minister said, we had an agreement back in 1993, but it wasn't in writing, and it was shattered. For the first time now, there is an agreement in writing that will be more effective in preventing further outbreaks. The violence has stopped. There is now a monitoring mechanism to which Israel and Lebanon can refer complaints. And now it is our fond hope that civilians on both sides of the border

can resume their lives with greater confidence and security. And we will not tolerate further efforts to disrupt the calm.

When I came into office, I was determined that our country would go into the 21st century still the world's greatest force for peace and freedom, for democracy and security and prosperity. We have to promote these values just as vigorously as we did in the cold war. Indeed, in some ways, our responsibilities as Americans are now greater.

I know that you agree with that. You have devoted yourselves to strengthening the bonds between the United States and Israel, a cornerstone of our foreign policy and of our efforts to advance peace and freedom and democracy in the Middle East. I thank you for that and I ask you, too, to continue to speak out in a larger sense for America's role in the world. It has made a difference what we have done in the Middle East and in Bosnia and in Northern Ireland and in Haiti and in fighting against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and in leading the world to take a tougher stand against terrorism. We cannot afford to walk away from these responsibilities to the future of our children, our children's children, and the children of all the world.

What a difference a year can make. It was at this conference last year that Israel's then-Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin said, from day one Israel found itself in a unique alliance with the United States, resting on twin pillars of shared values and strategic partnership. Well, it's still true. And now the United States and Israel are still partners based on shared values and common strategies.

I am grateful for the service, the life, and the sacrifice of Prime Minister Rabin. But I am also very grateful that the man he called his full partner, our friend Shimon Peres, is carrying forward the important work of peace with security. From his earliest days when he helped to establish Israel's military, up to the very present when he has defined a vision of a new Middle East in his remarkable book—which, Prime Minister, I have told the whole world I enjoyed reading, and I'm promoting it for you and I hope I get a certain percentage kickback if it really does very well. [*Laughter*] We just made another agreement. They're just spouting out all over.

I said that in jest—[*laughter*]—to lay the pretext for a serious comment. At least the critical mass of American Jews should read that book and become familiar with its contents, because if you do it will give you the energy for the tasks ahead, because the Prime Minister has been able to imagine what the future might be like beyond the history that can be made with the other peace signings. And that vision is what must drive us all into tomorrow.

We have made a lot of progress with the Declaration of Principles of the Palestinians, the peace of the Araba with Jordan, the interim accord that was signed in Washington. I have watched in these very difficult months since Prime Minister Rabin's assassination Prime Minister Peres rise to this moment. He has been a true and reliable friend of our country, and a true and reliable leader of his own. And I am proud to say, as Yitzhak Rabin said, he is our full partner for peace and security.

This has been a trying time for those who believe that a secure peace is the only true hope for Israel and the Middle East. The Katyusha rockets, the bloodshed in Lebanon, the suicide bombings in Israel—we grieve for the innocent victims, for the Israelis who simply wanted to live quiet lives in their own country, for the innocent Palestinians who were killed in the suicide bombings in Israel, for the children of our own Nation, Sarah Duker and Matthew Eisenfeld, visiting a land they loved; for the Lebanese children in Qana who were caught between—make no mistake about it—the deliberate tactics of Hezbollah in their positioning and firing and the tragic misfiring in Israel's legitimate exercise of its right to self-defense.

I know that in Israel and Lebanon, throughout the Middle East and throughout the world, it would be so easy after yet another round of violence and death to give up, to think that the very best we could expect is a future of separate armed camps. It is that sort of bunker mentality that we fight, indeed, all across the world in different ways today. It would be easy to give in to it in the Middle East, but it would be wrong.

I was asked the other day whether the violence of the last few days was not proof that the peace process was dead. I said no, quite the contrary; it was proof that the yearning for peace was alive. The people who started the violence were trying to kill the longing for peace. It is still alive, and we must not let it die. We must stand up to what they tried to do.

We can still achieve a peace if we conquer fear and restore security and deal honestly with those with whom we have differences. We know it will not be easy. Peace requires in some ways more strength than war. And we must have the patience to endure a few more setbacks along the way. We know that it takes great courage to press forward into an unknown future. It's harder than retreating into a familiar past. It takes great bravery to reach out to a former enemy. It's easier to stay in the false security of isolation.

But I believe that Israel will maintain its resolve for peace. As I said, I saw it in the eyes and I heard it in the voices of the children of Israel when I was there just last month. I saw it in the eyes of those two young Americans who gave Prime Minister Peres and me those petitions. I heard it from two boys in Israel, Uri Tal and Tal Loel, who were badly wounded in the bombing in Tel Aviv—one even deafened. Despite their pain, they wrote to me from their hospital beds, and I quote, from their hospital beds they wrote, "Peace is the only true solution for this area." They showed strength, having lost much, even in their young years. They showed the ability to overcome adversity that is the true genius of the character and history of the Jewish people.

If the Jewish people have endured centuries of exile, persecution, the ultimate evil of the Holocaust, flourishing against all the odds, surely—surely—together they can throw back their shoulders and raise their heads and say, after all this, Hezbollah and Hamas will not succeed where others have failed.

Even as the Katyushas were falling, we saw proof of peace taking hold. We saw it in the meeting between Prime Minister Peres and Chairman Arafat 10 days ago, when they vowed to move ahead on the goals set by the accords. We saw it in the Prime Minister's path-breaking trips to Qatar and Oman this month. And I salute again the Prime Minister for the strength and commitment he has shown in pursuing the peace in this difficult period.

And of course, last Wednesday, on the 48th anniversary of Israeli independence, the Palestinian National Council finally did change the PLO charter and deleted the hateful clause calling for the destruction of Israel. Now, think about that. That symbol of hatred had endured since 1964, before some people in this room were even born. It's a moment we have long waited and worked for. The Palestinian leadership followed through on its commitments and made a better move to a better day. All friends of peace should be heartened by this, and especially by the large margin of the vote in support of Chairman Arafat's policy.

Even during the suicide bombings there was dramatic proof that peace is taking root. Remember, as Prime Minister Peres said, at the Summit of the Peacemakers in Sharm al-Sheikh we had 29 leaders from around the globe and 13 from the Arab world voting and committing themselves for the first time not only to condemn but to work against terrorism in Israel. It was an historic moment. And we are following up on it.

I say again—I want to hammer this home, not only to you who know but to people beyond this room: This progress for peace is the reason the enemies of peace are lashing out. We must restore peace. We must restore security. But we must not be diverted from our ultimate goal, else we will hand them the victory that they have sought all along.

We know the circle of peace cannot be closed only by an end to the fighting in Lebanon. It can be closed only when the Arab-Israeli conflict is truly over—when normalization takes hold in the entire Arab world, when Israel's security is completely assured, when Israel is fully accepted in every way in the region. The circle of peace will be closed only—and I say only—when the people of Israel are confident that what they are getting is worth the risks they must take. Peace and security are indivisible. And Israel must feel comfortable and confident about both in order to achieve either over the long run.

Let me say to you what I hope you already know, the breakthroughs of the past were possible because we built together a bond of trust. And I pledge to you today that this relationship will remain strong and vital, so strong and so vital that no one will ever drive a wedge between us.

Our commitment to Israel's security is unshakable. It will stay that way because Israel must have the means to defend itself by itself. In a time of shrinking resources, we have maintained our economic assistance. We have sought to enhance Israel's security to lessen the risks it has taken and still takes every day for peace.

Israel's qualitative military edge is greater than ever because we have kept our word. Ear-

lier today Prime Minister Peres and Secretary Perry signed an agreement to expand our theater missile defense program so that we can detect and destroy incoming missiles. That way Israel will have not only the advantage it needs today but will be able to defeat the threats of tomorrow.

As part of this effort, we are proceeding with the third phase of the deployment of the Arrow missile program. The United States is committing $200 million to this effort so that the children who lived through the Scud attacks of the Gulf war will never again face that fear. We also pledge to expand work on the Nautilus high-energy laser system, which is designed to destroy Katyushas in flight. Our air forces are working together so that the first of the F–15–I's are delivered as planned next year. And we have offered Israel the AMRAAM, our most advanced air-to-air missile system, so that Israel's air power remains unmatched in the region.

Our strategic cooperation is greater than ever. We are continuing to help build Israel's high-tech capacity through the sale of supercomputers. We are even expanding cooperation in space and preparing to train Israeli astronauts. There may be a few volunteers out there, Mr. Prime Minister. [*Laughter*]

We are also working, as the Prime Minister has said, more closely than ever to defeat terrorism. This week we will complete the agreement to combat extremist violence that we began work on during my visit to Israel last month. Almost as soon as we received word of the bombings, we began sending new equipment to detect explosives. Now we are committing more than $100 million to this program for equipment and training, for development of new technologies and improved communications and coordination. And I am very pleased that in the budget I signed just 2 days ago, the first $50 million was included in our common antiterrorist efforts.

We all know that Israel should have every tool at its disposal in the fight against terror. And we all know that the organized forces of hatred and terror threaten people not only in the Middle East but here at home and around the world. We saw that in Oklahoma City, at the World Trade Center, in the attacks we have thwarted, in the subways of Tokyo, in the skies over Scotland. We see it all around the world. Fighting terrorism will remain one of our top law enforcement priorities for many years to come. And in order to be successful, we have to have the tools we need here, and we have to work together.

I want to thank the Congress and Members in both parties for passing the antiterrorism bill I signed into law just last week. I want to thank many of you in this audience in both parties who worked hard and lobbied hard for that legislation. It will help us to stop terrorists before they strike and to bring them to justice when they do. Now we can more quickly expel foreigners who come here and support terrorist activities. Our prosecutors can wield new tools and expanded penalties against those who terrorize Americans at home or abroad. And we can stop terrorists from raising money in the United States to pay for their crimes anywhere around the world.

Again, I say AIPAC has long been a powerful voice in favor of this legislation. We may not be able to always stop those who are gripped by hatred, but at least now because of your support, we will make a real difference in the fight against terror. And I pledge to you that in America, in Israel, and around the world we will not rest from these efforts until, in the words of the Psalm, "We shall not be afraid of the terror by night, nor for the arrow that flies by day."

When I was in Jerusalem last month, I placed a small symbol of the extraordinary bond of solidarity between the United States and Israel on the grave of my friend Prime Minister Rabin. It was a little stone from the South Lawn of the White House where the first accord with the Palestinians was signed. I put it there in keeping with the Jewish tradition that says one must always add to the memories of those who have died and never detract from them.

Well, it falls to us to add more to the memories of all those who have given their lives for Israel's security and for the hope of peace. And we must do this not only with stones but in kind. We must build a peace as hard and real as any stone. And in so doing, we will add to the memory of every martyr and validate the sacrifice of every martyr and give meaning and breath and life to the dreams of so many who have gone before.

That is my vision to you and my pledge. And I say to you, and especially to you, I will do everything I can to help us achieve it together.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:37 p.m. in the ballroom at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel; Itamar Rabinovich, Israeli Ambassador to the United States; Martin Indyk, U.S. Ambassador to Israel; Melvin Dow, president, Steve Grossman, chairman of the board, Neal Sher, executive director, Edward Levy, vice president, and Jack Bendheim, board member, American Israel Public Affairs Committee; Edgar Bronfman, president, World Jewish Congress; and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority.

Remarks on the National Drug Control Strategy in Coral Gables, Florida
April 29, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you. Didn't Rachel do a good job? Give her another hand. She was great, wasn't she? [*Applause*]

Principal Heise, thank you for hosting us today and for your fine remarks, which I heard from behind the way there. I'm delighted to be on this stage with our two Cabinet members from Miami, Attorney General Reno and Secretary Rubin, and with General McCaffrey, who moved the SOUTHCOM here and wishes he were from Miami. You can tell by the Spanish speech he gave you. And he's doing a wonderful job, and I'm very proud of him.

I want to thank three of your distinguished State officials who came in with me today who are here: Lieutenant Governor Buddy MacKay, Attorney General Bob Butterworth, and Senator Daryl Jones, who has a son here somewhere—there he is. Your son is clapping for you, Daryl.

I want to thank Alvah Chapman and Marilyn Culp and Tad Foote and local television and other media executives. Judge Goldstein, of the local drug court, I thank him and all those involved in the drug court. I thank Dorothy Perry and all the community leaders. I want to thank all these young people in D–FY–IT. And I thank not only those who are here but those who came out to the airport to meet me.

We have the leader of America's Coast Guard, the leader of our Customs Service, and others here today, along with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury and General McCaffrey. We are here in Miami to announce a new drug strategy because of what Miami is doing to make the children of Miami and the future of Miami drug-free. I thank all of you who have been any part of that—the local officials, the religious leaders, the community leaders, the school leaders. And I agree with Rachel that if we keep working, we can have the children of America educating the rest of us about this problem, and then it will go away for sure.

Miami has dealt with the biggest challenges that drugs present to America. And Miami knows that what I have said about the world toward which we are moving is true. We are going into a world of enormous possibility for our people, dominated by global trade and high technology. You have worked very hard to see that the people of southern Florida reap the benefits of global trade and high technology.

But you also know that the more open our borders are, the more freely people can travel, the more freely money can move and information and technology can be transferred, the more vulnerable we are to people who would seek to undermine the very fabric of civilized life, whether through terrorism, the weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, or drugs, and sometimes through all of the above.

So the great challenge we face, my fellow Americans, is how to get the benefits of this world toward which we are moving and not be exposed to the forces that would undermine our ability to raise strong children in strong families in good, strong communities.

That's what this national drug strategy is about. It focuses on rising drug use among children. It confronts head-on the fact that crime and drugs are vicious co-conspirators. You heard General McCaffrey allude to that. A significant percentage of the people in the prison systems of America today are there because of drug problems. If they weren't stealing money to pay for a drug habit, dealing drugs in the first place,

or behaving irrationally because of an addiction to drugs, we would be spending that money on educating our children and building our future instead of maintaining a prison system. And that's what we ought to do.

But all of you here at George Washington Carver are a shining example of what it will ultimately take to make a drug strategy work all across America, people at the grassroots level. This school—I've heard you cheering for it before, but I want you to know why we're here. We are not here by accident, and we are not here because of anything we have done. We are here because of what you have done: zero guns, zero assaults, zero incidents of drug-related violence, zero drugs. That's where America ought to go and where America can go.

We are here because of what Miami has done. I have watched this city and this county recover from a massive storm to host the Summit of the Americas, to attract the Southern Command of the United States military, and now to set a standard that all other cities should follow in reducing the problem of drug abuse. The Coalition for a Safe and Drug-Free Community has worked hard with all the rest of the people here so that drug use dropped more than 50 percent between 1991 and 1993 alone. That was the biggest decline in any metropolitan area in the country. I'd like to see that on some of the TV shows on prime time about Miami.

Let me again thank the members of the coalition. I thank the students here today and I thank the Attorney General, who was a founding member back when she had her other job here in Dade County. Or as those of us in the administration say, back when we had a life, Janet Reno lived in Miami, and I thank her for what she did and for what you are doing.

Now, while it is true that in the end this work has to be done student by student, family by family, school by school, neighborhood by neighborhood, we must acknowledge that the Nation's Government has a role to play. In this new era, when we are reducing the size of Government and its burden, when we have a Federal Establishment that today in 1996 is the smallest the National Government has been since 1965—and by the end of this year it will be the smallest it's been since 1962—we still have responsibilities to help people throughout America make the most of their own lives and their families and their communities. And a big part of that is to make sure Americans can feel secure in their homes, on their streets, and in their schools, with drug-free homes, drug-free streets, and drug-free schools.

Our crime bill is helping reduce the crime rate by giving communities police officers, 100,000 of them, in community settings in America; banning 19 deadly assault weapons. The Brady bill, which now requires a waiting period before you can buy a handgun, has kept 60,000 people with criminal records from purchasing guns and endangering innocent citizens. It is working.

I was so inspired by my personal experience watching your drug court here, and the Attorney General's experience when she took office, that we have worked hard to help others establish drug courts around America. There are now more than 100 of them in the United States. And I think every community ought to have one, and we're going to keep going until every community has the chance to have one.

We've also used the crime bill to help schools fight drugs and violence, to help them support programs like D.A.R.E. and GREAT, to help them with gang prevention, and when they're needed, with things like metal detectors and increased securities. We are opening the way to do more in this area.

But I want to say a special word of thanks to the people here who have taken a pledge to abstain from drugs and alcohol. You heard Rachel talk about that. I believe that if every student in every school in America took that pledge and reaffirmed it on a regular basis, a lot of these other things would not be necessary. So I'd like to ask all the students who have taken that pledge to stand today. If you took a pledge to be free of drugs and alcohol, stand up, and the rest of us would like to applaud you. [*Applause*]

While not every community in America can claim the results that Miami can, you should know that every year for the last 3 years, murders have dropped and robberies have dropped and drug use has dropped. Monthly drug use today is roughly half of what it was 10 years ago in America. The number of cocaine users has fallen by 30 percent in the last 3 years alone. But we have a lot to do. And again, it's why we're at this school. The most perplexing problem that we face in this area is this: While the drug rate has gone down, drug usage among people under 18 has gone up. While the crime rate has gone down, random violence

among people under 18 has gone up. The children who are here today are the battleground of today and tomorrow. They are the people for whom we must fight this great battle, and they are the ones we must rely on to win it by working with them.

That is why I am announcing today a new and intensified strategy to battle drugs that builds and improves on the work we have done over the last 3 years, calls for more resources from the Nation than ever before, and targets those resources better than ever. This National Drug Control Strategy of 1996, as General McCaffrey said, is meant to be a 10-year plan. He worked on it very, very hard with many others. I want to thank him again for it, and I want to thank him for being willing to give up his four stars and his military command to fight America's most important battle for the future.

Very briefly, this strategy has five very concrete goals: Number one, to get young people to reject drugs—that's what you're doing here; number two, to use effective treatment and prevention to break this vicious cycle that links drugs to violent crime; third, to stop drugs at the border, the way we are doing at the Miami Customs Office where technology and street smarts are catching more drugs with less inconvenience to arriving visitors; fourth, to break up the sources of supply, whether they are cocaine farms in Colombia or methamphetamine labs in California; and finally, to reduce the terrible social and economic costs imposed by drugs on our society, $69 billion in the last year.

Now, to meet these goals, we are asking Congress, as we cut spending and move toward a balanced budget, to increase funding for the drug war by 9.3 percent. We can't stop drugs if our schools, hospitals, and communities don't have the tools they need to get the job done. We have to have the support of Congress to do this.

Make no mistake about it, this has got to be a bipartisan, American, nonpolitical effort. If we're going to keep our commitment to put 100,000 new community police officers on the street, we are going to have to do that. If we are going to keep our commitment to give schools the funds they need for the safe and drug-free schools program, we have to do that. And I am proud that the budget I signed last week from the Congress included both those programs.

We are also working hard in Washington to try to protect you from new problems before they come to your doorstep, and that's an important job of the Nation's Government. I thank Secretary Rubin for getting the early warning on Rohypnol, a powerful and dangerous sedative, to stop it from flooding across our borders. I thank the Attorney General for the work she has done with General McCaffrey and others on the methamphetamine strategy. That is a deadly drug. It is gaining in popularity. In 2 years, deaths from this drug have doubled. I'm glad it's not here yet, but we have to stop it before it becomes the crack of the 1990's, and we are going after it right now.

So let me say again, if we're going to win this battle, we have to be prepared to pay the price of time. We have to be prepared to ask ourselves, each and every one of us, what is our job? This National Drug Control Strategy is our effort to answer the question: What is our job? What is the President's job? What is the Cabinet's job? What is General McCaffrey's job?

But we know in the end it is all of you here at the community level doing your jobs that will determine the fate of the children who are here. And ultimately it is their job to say no to destructive forces in their lives and yes to the future, no to an empty fantasy land and yes to the fantasy of an unimaginable future that is out there for all of our young people who will prepare themselves for it. That is ultimately the goal we must all share and work for as Americans.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:46 a.m. at George Washington Carver Middle School. In his remarks, he referred to Rachel Berne, Drug-Free Youth in Town (D–FY–IT) program participant, who introduced the President; Pregri Heise, Carver Middle School principal; Alvah Chapman, director, Knight-Ridder, Inc.; Marilyn Culp, executive director, Miami Coalition for a Safe and Drug-Free Community; Edward T. Foote, president, University of Miami; Judge Stanley Goldstein, 11th Circuit; and Dorothy Perry, chief executive officer, Youth Progressing, Inc.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the National Drug Control Strategy
April 29, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the *1996 National Drug Control Strategy.* This Strategy carries forward the policies and principles of the 1994 and 1995 Strategies. It describes new directions and initiatives to confront the ever-changing challenges of drug abuse and trafficking

This past March I convened the White House Leadership Conference on Youth, Drug Use, and Violence in order to focus the Nation's attention on two major health problems faced by young people today—drug use and violence. The conference brought together over 300 young people, parents, clergy, community and business leaders, judges, prosecutors, police, entertainers, media executives, researchers, and treatment and prevention specialists from across America to examine solutions and keep us moving forward with proven strategies. The Vice President, General Barry McCaffrey, and I met with the participants in a series of roundtable discussions, discussing how to strengthen the efforts of families, the media, communities, schools, businesses, and government to reduce drug use and violence. Participants left with new energy and new ideas, determined to return home and begin implementing the solutions and strategies discussed that day.

This conference took place at an important juncture in America's ongoing fight against drug abuse. In the last few years our nation has made significant progress against drug use and related crime. The number of Americans who use cocaine has been reduced by 30 percent since 1992. The amount of money Americans spend on illicit drugs has declined from an estimated $64 billion five years ago to about $49 billion in 1993—a 23 percent drop. We are finally gaining ground against overall crime: drug-related murders are down 12 percent since 1989; robberies are down 10 percent since 1991.

At the same time, we have dealt serious blows to the international criminal networks that import drugs into America. Many powerful drug lords, including leaders of Colombia's notorious Cali cartel, have been arrested. A multinational air interdiction program has disrupted the principal air route for smugglers between Peru and Colombia. The close cooperation between the United States, Peru, and other governments in the region has disrupted the cocaine economy in several areas. Our efforts have decreased overall cocaine production and have made coca planting less attractive to the farmers who initiate the cocaine production process. And I have taken the serious step of cutting off all non-humanitarian aid to certain drug producing and trafficking nations that have not cooperated with the United States in narcotics control. Further, I have ordered that we vote against their requests for loans from the World Bank and other multi-lateral development banks. This clearly underscores the unwavering commitment of the United States to stand against drug production and trafficking.

Here at home, we have achieved major successes in arresting, prosecuting, and dismantling criminal drug networks. In Miami, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Program, through its operational task forces, successfully concluded a major operation that resulted in the indictments of 252 individuals for drug trafficking and other drug-related crimes. Operations conducted by the Drug Enforcement Administration's Mobile Enforcement Teams programs (MET), a highly successful federal tool for assisting local law enforcement, have resulted in more than 1,500 arrests of violent and predatory drug criminals in more than 50 communities across the nation.

But as the White House Leadership Conference on Youth, Drug Use, and Violence showed, now is the time to press forward. We must not let up for a moment in our efforts against drug abuse, and drug abuse by young people, particularly.

There are many reasons why young people do continue to use drugs. Chief among these are ignorance of the facts about addiction and the potency of drugs, and complacency about the danger of drugs. Unfortunately, all too often we see signs of complacency about the dangers of drug use: diminished attention to the drug problem by the national media; the glamorization and legitimization of drug use in the entertainment industry; the coddling of professional athletes who are habitual drug-users; avoidance

of the issue by parents and other adults; calls for drug-legalization; and the marketing of products to young people that legitimize and elevate the use of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drugs.

All Americans must accept responsibility to teach young people that drugs are illegal and they are deadly. They may land you in jail; they may cost you your life. We must renew our commitment to the drug prevention strategies that deter first-time drug use and stop the progression from alcohol and tobacco use to marijuana and harder drugs.

The National Drug Control Strategy is designed to prevent a new drug use epidemic through an aggressive and comprehensive full-court press that harnesses the energies of committed individuals from every sector of our society. As I said in the State of the Union, we must step up our attack against criminal youth gangs that deal in illicit drugs. We will improve the effectiveness of our cooperative efforts among U.S. defense and law enforcement agencies, as well as with other nations, to disrupt the flow of drugs coming into the country. We will seek to expand the availability and improve the quality of drug treatment. And we will continue to oppose resolutely calls for the legalization of illicit drugs. We will increase efforts to prevent drug use by all Americans, particularly young people.

The tragedy of drug abuse and drug-related crime affects us all. The National Drug Control Strategy requires commitment and resources from many individuals and organizations, and from all levels of government. For the Strategy to succeed, each of us must do our part.

We ask the Congress to be a bipartisan partner and provide the resources we need at the federal level to get the job done. I challenge state and local governments to focus on drug abuse as a top priority. We ask the media and the advertising and entertainment industries to work with us to educate our youth, and all Americans, about the dangers of drug use. Finally, we invite every American—every parent, every teacher, every law enforcement officer, every faith leader, every young person, and every community leader—to join our national campaign to save our youth.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 29, 1996.

Statement on Action on Gasoline Prices

April 29, 1996

Over the last several weeks, I have been concerned about the rise in gasoline prices at the pump. Today I am directing my administration to take the following steps.

First, I am asking the Secretary of Energy to immediately begin the process of orderly sales of approximately 12 million barrels of our Nation's strategic petroleum reserves. This step was authorized by the Congress last week as part of the omnibus appropriations bill.

Second, I am asking the Secretary of Energy to review market circumstances and report back to me within 45 days about the factors that led to the runup in prices. As part of that analysis, I am asking her to evaluate the expected market prices for the remainder of the peak summer driving season.

I believe these are the appropriate steps to take at this time. My administration will continue to monitor developments in this market in the coming weeks.

Remarks at a Democratic Dinner in Coral Gables
April 29, 1996

Thank you very much, Lieutenant Governor MacKay and Senator Dodd. Thank you, Marvin Rosen, for leaving Florida for so much of the time to help me and the Democratic Party return to victory in November. I thank Howard Glicken and Larry Hawkins and Mitch Berger and M.J. Parker and all others who worked to organize this phenomenally successful dinner tonight.

And I want to thank all of you for coming here and for giving us your support in our fight to make sure that America takes the right road into the 21st century.

My fellow Americans, this is a very different race than it was in 1992. In 1992 when I ran for President, I did it because I really felt that the country had no animating vision, that we did not understand as a people the changes we were going through and where we wanted to come out on the other end. We had no strategy for achieving it. And I sought to bring that contribution to that campaign. And I think the American people basically saw that race as status quo versus change.

Now this is a very different circumstance. We now have two very different visions of change before the American people. And the American people don't have to guess; they really know what those visions are. There is no option; when we vote now in 1996 we will be voting to take a certain path right into the 21st century. The only question is which road we decide to walk. There has been a lot of talk over the last couple of years about what we Democrats stand for, whether it is clear, what is the difference between the two parties. Does it matter anymore?

Well, I can tell you this: My belief is that we are going through a period of change in this country as profound as any we've endured in 100 years, since we moved from farm to factory, from country to city. We are now moving from the cold war into the global economy in an ever more global society. We celebrated that here in Miami a couple of years ago at the Summit of the Americas.

We are moving into an economy in which all forms of endeavor, including agriculture and industry, are dominated by technology and information. If you were to come home to Arkansas with me at planting time or harvesting time, you would see farmers riding around in their machinery with computer screens, often working with software they prepared themselves to do the work that they now do.

And we've changed so much the way we work, and in the course of that, the way we live, that we are moving into a time of almost unbelievable possibility but also significant disruption. That is the fact of the time in which we live.

When I became President, I had a very clear idea, which I want to restate to you, of what I think we ought to be working for. We ought to be working for an America in which every person, without regard to their race or their gender or how they start out in life, should have the chance to live up to their dreams if they're willing to work for it. We ought to be working for an America in which all the incredible diversity in this country is the source of our strength, not a source of division and weakness, because we have shared values and because we respect the honest differences among us. And we ought to stop using politics as a way of dividing the American people and start uniting them again. And we ought to be working for an America that is still the world's leading source of inspiration and strength and support for peace and freedom and democracy and security and prosperity. Those are the things that we ought to do.

Now, a lot of that work has to be done by all of you in your private capacities. And we know in this new world of information technology and lightning change, big centralized bureaucracies are not as important as they once were, including the big centralized bureaucracy of the National Government. But that does not mean we do not need a Government in Washington and a spirit in Washington and a presence in the White House committed to those three ideas, that everybody should be able to live out their dreams if they'll work for it, that we ought to be coming together, not being driven apart, and that we must continue to be the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and democracy. That is what has driven me for these 3½ years.

So I say to you, we have—our friends in the Republican Party have condemned the Government and talked about how bad it is. And they say that it's the source of all of our problems, but it was the Democrats who reduced the size of Government so that now in Washington, DC, the United States Government is the smallest that it's been since 1965. They condemned heavy-handed Federal regulation, but we have gotten rid of more regulations than they did. We have given more authority to State and local governments than they ever did; ask Lieutenant Governor MacKay. There are over one million fewer families on welfare today than there were the day I took office because we've given 40 States the power to have welfare reform, to move people from welfare to work.

But when the great crisis over the budget came, and the power of Congress and the majority was used to shut the Government down because I wouldn't go along and Senator Dodd wouldn't go along and the Members of our party wouldn't go along with doing things to Medicare which were unconscionable and unnecessary to save the program; with walking away from a Medicaid program that not only provides care for poor children and pregnant women but also for middle class families with children with disabilities and with parents in nursing homes; with an absolute evisceration of the environmental protection policy of the country, which had been for 25 years a bipartisan policy, shared by Republicans and Democrats until that time; and with a reduction in our commitment to education at a time when what you can earn is more tied to what you can learn than at any time in our history—we said no.

We said there is a national responsibility. There is a national responsibility for putting 100,000 police on the street. There's a national responsibility for helping schools to be drug-free and to be safe. There is a national responsibility for, in other words, growing the economy, expanding opportunity, helping the American people, coming together and maintaining the leadership of the United States of America. That is what this choice is all about in 1996: Which road are we going to walk into the future?

There's a lot of talk about the word "empowerment." And I used it a lot in 1992 and long before I decided to run for President. I believe in it. To use the words of my friend James Carville—and Larry Hawkins said everybody in America ought to read James Carville's book, "We're Right and They're Wrong," so I'll flack for it tonight. But Carville said, "You know, people criticize the Democrats for giving people fish when we ought to be teaching them to fish, but our opponents want to drain the pond."

Now, what does that mean? That means if people can be taught to fish, it's a lot better than giving them fish. That means no one should get anything if they can do for themselves. But it also means don't drain the pond.

Empowerment means more than giving people a choice. The great French writer Victor Hugo once observed that the rich and poor are equally free to spend the night under the bridge. Empowerment means not only having the choice but having the capacity to exercise the choice. That's why we're for education and safe streets and a clean environment and a strong economic policy and a strong foreign policy.

Now, sometimes we reach agreement. And when we do, I'm happy. If you think about the good things that have happened in the last year and a half—and I'll just mention some. I signed a budget bill last week that protects education and the environment and our major economic programs and reduces the deficit so that now we'll have 4 years of deficit reduction and I'll keep my commitment to you: We will cut the deficit by more than half in just 4 years. We did that.

And I signed a very tough antiterrorism bill which will give us the tools we need to kick terrorists out of the country when we find them here from other countries; to kick people out of this country when they come here and raise money for terrorists, which is wrong; to do more to prevent terrorist incidents and to catch terrorists when they commit terrorism. We passed that bill. That was a good thing.

Just a few weeks ago I signed a telecommunications bill which will create at a minimum hundreds of thousands of very high wage jobs in the next few years.

What do all those things have in common? They were passed by a Congress overwhelmingly working in a bipartisan fashion, putting aside the labels and the ideologies and the extremism of the past and the recent past and working together for the practical benefit of all Americans. When we have done that, we do just fine.

In this budget bill, Congress gave me the authority to do something that I did this after-

noon. I want to tell you about it. I've been very concerned about this dramatic, although apparently temporary, rise in the price of gasoline at the pumps. It affects the take-home pay of working people who have to commute to work. It offers a great problem for tourism centers like Florida. We're about to get into the high driving season, and if gasoline is 20 percent higher, there are not going to be as many people driving as far to do whatever it is they're going to do this summer.

So today I instructed the Secretary of Energy to immediately begin the orderly sale of about 12 million barrels of our Nation's strategic petroleum reserve to try to moderate the price of fuel. And I've also asked Secretary O'Leary to report back to me within 45 days about all the elements that caused this sudden burst in the gasoline prices to determine whether it is likely to be short-term or long-term, what the likely impact on our economy would be.

Now I say that in this context. The Congress gave me explicit authority to do that, and I applaud them for doing it. What is unique about it? Well, we stopped all these partisan wars and rolled up our sleeves and sat down and said, "What would be a good thing to do for America?" Not which party can gain the advantage, not can we put the President in a corner and threaten to shut the Government down, but what would be good for America? It would be good to reduce the deficit and increase our investment in education, the growth of the economy, the protection of the environment. And, oh by the way, here's some authority to release barrels of oil from the strategic petroleum reserves.

I say that because I want to follow up on something that Senator Dodd said and Lieutenant Governor MacKay said. This is a very great country. We need two strong parties. There are plenty of differences between us. But when the most extreme position dominates a party's governing so that governing is less important than making a point, even if the point requires you to shut the Government down, then we have gone too far.

Now, the same thing is true on the issues before us. And I want to talk a little more about where we go from here. But there are two great issues still before us. We could solve them both and make the American people much better off.

We've now adopted a budget, 6 months late, for the remainder of this year. I would have happily signed it on the first day of this year, the very first day of this fiscal year. We have not yet adopted a balanced budget plan, but we have identified savings in common to both the Republican and Democratic plans that are more than enough to balance the budget, provide a modest tax cut, and still protect Medicare, Medicaid, and our investments in education and the environment and economic development and in reducing the crime rate and violence in this country. We could do all that. The question is, will we?

The answer is, depends upon whether the majority in Congress decides to play politics a long time before the November election or will it go back and work with me in good faith to pass the right sort of balanced budget plan for America. That's what we ought to do. There's plenty of time for the elections after the conventions this summer. Let's go back to work and give the American people the balanced budget plan they deserve.

There's another big issue that will tell a big tale about where we're going now. That's the so-called Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, a bipartisan bill that passed the Senate last week—listen to this—100 to zero. You say, "Well, if anything got 100 votes, could it have any significance?" You bet it does. You know what it does? The Kassebaum-Kennedy bill says that you cannot lose your health insurance. If you change jobs or lose your job, you can still keep it. It says that you cannot be denied the right to purchase health insurance just because somebody in your family has been sick. It can provide immediate help in health security to millions of Americans who are self-employed, who are working in small businesses, who are working for businesses that may go broke or that may have to lay them off for a while. It can make a huge difference. That's why it passed 100 to nothing. It's a very big deal.

But the version of the bill in the House, it didn't pass by 435 to zero in the House. Why? Because there are all these other things in the bill that are extremely controversial, not necessary to protect the health care interest of American families, and designed basically to jam those who don't agree with them into voting for them and me into signing them in order to get the good things of the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill.

So watch this. Why don't we take the things we disagree with and throw them into the fall election, and let's have it part of all the debates? But why don't we pass Kennedy-Kassebaum pure and clear, 100 to nothing, one more time for the American people? That's what we ought to do.

If you ask me to say in a sentence, "Mr. President, what is the role of the President and the Government in Washington as we move into this new era," I would say it is to give citizens, families, and communities the ability they need to meet their challenges and seize their opportunities and make the most of their own lives and to do it not with big, centralized bureaucracies but with whatever it takes to forge the kind of partnership that will genuinely empower people, genuinely empower people to do that, and to maintain our commitment abroad for security, peace, freedom, and democracy.

Let's just take a few simple issues. The issue of education. Today I was here announcing the new National Drug Control Strategy at a school that has no guns, no violence, and no drugs for the last 2 years. Now, that was done by the people at the school, the principal, the parents, the teachers, the kids; they deserve the credit for that. The National Government will never be able to replace that magic and shouldn't try. But we should make sure that every school has the resources to provide what needs to be provided to be safe and drug-free. And that's why I fought to save the safe and drug-free schools act.

Well, let's take another issue. One of the news magazines this week has the cover—the news magazine—how expensive it is to send a child to college, $1,000 a month. That won't touch it for some of you, depending on where your children go. But we know that every young person in America ought to have the opportunity to go to college. That's why we worked so hard to totally redesign the student loan program, so that anybody could borrow money to go to college and pay it back as a percentage of the income they earn from whatever job they get, so that no child should ever drop out of school because of the burden of the money that has to be borrowed. That's important, and we should keep that.

That is why I've asked the Congress to invest more money in college scholarships and college loans, and why I said to them, "If we're going to give families a tax cut in this country, let's give them a deduction for the cost of college tuition." It would be the best money we ever spent in terms of a tax incentive.

Let me take a controversial issue that always gets me a few demonstrators when I come to Florida. We have very different views in Washington about the environment, although now those views are quickly being blurred as we come toward election day. Here's what I believe. I think Teddy Roosevelt, our first great environmental President and a Republican, was right. I believe that we cannot preserve the American economy unless we have a system for sustaining our natural resources, our land, our air, our water, our trees, our species. That's what I believe.

I believe you can't preserve the very idea of American democracy unless people at least have some ability to preserve the nature, the heritage that they grow up around. I believe you can't maintain the integrity of the democracy of this country if millions of kids live within a couple of blocks of a toxic waste dump and cities have no devices to clean up the environmental pollution of former eras when we didn't know what we were doing. That's what I believe.

I believe Florida will not be able to sustain the population growth that is coming unless you find a way to save the Everglades. That's what I believe. And I believe your Nation has a responsibility to help you. I think it is a national treasure, as well as a local treasure. I believe there are a lot of good people in the sugar industry; there are a lot of good people who have worked hard in that. I believe that many of those companies are doing a better job today with conservation practices than they were doing just a few years ago. I know that is true. All these things are true.

The question is, who is going to pay what in order to save the Everglades? I believe that we can find a way to sustain the economy of Florida in the short run while we move to preserve it in the long run and while we preserve one of the globe's most precious natural resources. We have to save the Everglades. That's what I believe, and I think the National Government has a responsibility to do that.

I believe that we did the right thing to take action in Washington to try to reduce the hazards of young people beginning to smoke cigarettes. Three thousand kids illegally begin to smoke every day, and a thousand of them will die early because of it. And it is wrong, and

we ought to stop it. That is what we are trying to do, but it is very controversial.

I believe we did the right thing in Washington to pass the Brady bill, but it was very controversial. All I know is there are 60,000 people with criminal records who were unable to buy handguns in the last 2 years and to go out and victimize other people because that law was on the books. It was the right thing to do.

You have to ask yourself, what do you believe? None of this had to do with a big, centralized bureaucracy, but I believe we were doing the right things. And as you look ahead, there will be more that has to be done to protect the environment, to invest in education and technology and the growth of the economy, to continue to reach out to the rest of the world with broader commitments to free and fair trade.

And we also have to stand up for freedom. I know a lot of the things that I have done in foreign policy have been controversial, but you know, one of the things that I see, and I wish every one of you could see, is that when I leave the borders of the United States, I am no longer just Bill Clinton or the President. I become all of you, the symbol of America. It is the greatest honor you can imagine.

And I know that there are things that if we don't do them they won't be done. That's why we stood up for peace in Bosnia. That's why we took the initiative to try to bring peace in Northern Ireland, working with the Irish and the British Governments. That's why we have worked so hard for so long in the Middle East and why the Secretary of State was there to try to bring an end to the violence between Lebanon and Israel. And that's why I signed the Helms-Burton bill and why I am working for a free Cuba.

Now, the problem with our involvement around the world is that most everybody can find something they like about that—you hear the different sources of cheers there—but what I want to convince you of is that the general principle is right, too. Think about what the world will be like 20 or 30 years from now. The United States may not have the same dominance we have now. I'm convinced we'll be the strongest country in the world, but others will grow richer. Others will exercise influence. What we do now in this critical period, coming out of the cold war and moving into a global economy and a global society, will have a profound impact on whether other great countries stand up for peace and freedom, whether other great countries define their greatness in terms of whether they can help people live their own lives or whether they can dominate people just because they're smaller and weaker.

And because no one believes we wish to dominate anyone and our purpose for peace and freedom and prosperity and democracy is so clear, we are able to do things that no other country can do now. And I believe we are safer because of it. There are no nuclear missiles pointed at America's children for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age. We are working to reduce that threat more every day.

We have cooperation from other countries in fighting terrorism at home and abroad. And I can tell you, if you look at terrorism, the drug threat, organized crime, money laundering, if you look at the proliferation of dangerous weapons, every one of these things requires the United States to lead and cooperate, and they will affect how your children and your grandchildren live and what kind of future we have in the 21st century.

So I ask you all, when you go into the next few months—I thank you for your financial contributions. I am profoundly grateful. We will spend the money well. Marvin Rosen will make sure we spend the money well. But every one of you who can be here tonight is here because you have accomplished something in your own life. You will be listened to. There are people who look to you. There are people who will listen to what you have to say and care what you think and care how you feel about your country. And I'm telling you, the American people have to decide how we're going into the 21st century. There is no status quo option. And you don't have to guess about our views; we now have almost 2 years where the leaders of the two parties and their philosophies have become clear. And that is a great good fortune.

I believe that it's clear that we did what we said we'd do in 1992. We have cut the deficit in half, 8½ million new jobs, a new commitment to invest in our people and our future and our communities. We did that. I believe in Florida you can see it. The unemployment rate is 2 percent lower. We brought the Summit of the Americas here. We brought SOUTHCOM here. We have a commitment here to help people do what they can to deal with the challenges you face today.

It is clear that we have a record. But the far more important thing is, this is a record to build on, not to sit on. We have created jobs, but we haven't raised everybody's income. We have to do more to allow people who are working for a living to be able to generate lifetime education, lifetime access to health care, and develop a pension they can carry around with them, too, if they move from job to job.

We have done a lot of things to try to bring the American people together and to bring down the crime rate and to reestablish a common national commitment to the preservation of our environment, but there is a lot more to do. We have done a lot of things to do things to make the Government work better and to be smaller and less burdensome to you, but Lord knows there is more to do. And we have taken a stand for America's role in the world. We dare not adopt the easy, short-term, but short-sighted isolationist position that others have advocated.

So I ask you—I thank you for what you have done here tonight, but it's a long time between now and November. So I ask you to take every opportunity you can to be good citizens between now and then. Talk with your friends and your neighbors and your coworkers. Engage people over coffee. Visit with them on the weekends when you run into them wherever they are and say, "You know, this is an election about America's future. This is an election which will determine what kind of country we're going to be in the 21st century. This is an election which will determine what our children and our grandchildren will live like. And this is an election in which I have taken a stand that I want to tell you about." That's what I want you to do. If you do, it will be fine.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:48 p.m. at the Biltmore Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Marvin Rosen, national finance chairman, Democratic National Committee; Howard Glicken, chairman of the board, The Americas Group; Larry Hawkins, Dade County commissioner; Mitchell W. Berger, president and founder, Berger & Davis, P.A.; and M.J. Parker, president and CEO, Engineering Services, Inc. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks on Signing the Israel-United States Counterterrorism Cooperation Accord and an Exchange With Reporters

April 30, 1996

The President. Good afternoon, Mr. Prime Minister and members of the Israeli and American delegations, ladies and gentlemen. For the past 3 years, Israel and the United States have worked hand in hand to advance the peace process in the Middle East. Today, with this U.S.-Israel Counterterrorism Cooperation Accord, we strengthen our partnership to stop the enemies of peace.

With every new step along the path to peace, its enemies grow more and more desperate. They know a new day is dawning in the Middle East, that the vast majority of its people want to enjoy the blessings of a normal life. Their answer, more violence and terror, more bullets and bombs, may seem senseless, but it is the product of cold calculation. By murdering innocent people, they aim to kill the growing hope for peace itself.

We will not do what the enemies of peace want. We will not let our anger turn us away from the pursuit of peace in the Middle East. Maintaining our resolve for peace does not mean, however, turning the other cheek. We must do everything in our power to stop the killing and bring the terrorists to justice. That is the only way to give those who have chosen peace the confidence they need that they have made the right choice and the courage to keep moving forward.

This agreement does just that by deepening the cooperation between our two countries in the fight against terrorism. Prime Minister Peres and I worked on it during my visit to Israel last month, in the wake of a terrible string of suicide bombings. Now we have agreed upon areas for greater cooperation, on information sharing, on research and development, on train-

ing and technical assistance, on investigation, prosecution, and extradition. In each one we will look at very practical ways in which we can work together better.

I am pleased to sign this accord. And I am also pleased that the budget I signed just last week included the $50 million I requested earlier this year for our joint antiterrorism efforts in this year, including today's accords. I thank the Congress for their prompt action here and for the bipartisan support it received.

To my friend the Prime Minister and the people of Israel, let me say the United States stands with Israel through good times and bad because our countries share the same ideals, freedom, tolerance, democracy. We know that wherever those ideals are under siege in one country they are threatened everywhere. We have never been more determined to achieve and to defend those ideals and to achieve our goal of a just and lasting peace for all the people of the Middle East.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Peres. I would like to thank from the depths of my heart, in the name of the people of Israel, the President, his delegation, his team, and him personally for really showing the deepest understanding that one can hope for, the immediate response whenever it is necessary, and the friendship that he has offered time and again over the last years.

I see the difference between the camp of terror and the free world. The camp of terror is operating under orders; it's disciplined; it's organized. The camp of freedom keeps its freedom. You cannot lead the camp of freedom unless you have a leader of great inspiration and outstanding capacity.

In my own judgment, Bill Clinton has this great capacity to inspire the whole free world with his ideas, with his determination, with his capacity to distinguish what is right and what is wrong, what is immediate and what is long-range, what is support and what is response. I feel myself very lucky to see a person like him standing ahead and trying to lead the whole world to peace and to peace for everybody, not just for us, the Israelis, but also for our neighbors; not just for the Middle East but for Bosnia, Haiti, or other places.

We are going and departing by the end of this century a history of bloodshed, and with Godspeed let's hope that we're entering a different world of peace and understanding. The President played a major role in bringing peace between us and the Jordanians, between us and the Palestinians. He and his Secretary of State are now opening a new chapter to bring peace between us, Syria, and Lebanon that may be the last peace which is necessary in order to make the peace comprehensive and all-embracing.

Mr. President, I really, with a full heart of thanks, would like to express both our admiration and gratefulness to you, to your administration, to the American Congress, to the American people. The world is a better place to live with this sort of a policy and this sort of leadership.

Thank you very much.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, those agreements you're talking about that you'd like to have by all accounts will require Israel giving up territory, buffer zone. The help you got on this trip—antimissile help, counterterrorism help—will that make it easier for you to relinquish territory in order to get an agreement with Syria and with Lebanon?

Prime Minister Peres. You're asking me?

Q. Yes, sir.

Prime Minister Peres. We don't intend to remain in Lebanon anyway. We don't have any territorial ambitions concerning Lebanon. And on the first right occasion our army will be more than happy to leave the territory of Lebanon.

We do recognize the international border between Lebanon and ourselves. If the Lebanese Government will take charge and the Lebanese Army will become the only armed authority in Lebanon and disarm all the other terroristic organizations, I see very little reason for us to remain in Lebanon.

Q. Yes, sir, but I asked you about Syria and Lebanon, and I asked you if the agreements and the help you've gotten here on this visit will ease your giving up territory, which you're committed to anyhow, we know. Does it make it easier for you?

Prime Minister Peres. Well, you're talking about territory, and I'm talking about peace. Territory——

Q. I'm talking about land for peace.

Prime Minister Peres. I understand. I mean, if it wouldn't be done what we are doing here, I'm afraid that terror would win the day, and that would be the end of the peace process.

We consider the last campaign as a campaign against peace. Now to answer your question, we have announced that in order to attain peace we are ready to make territorial compromise. Don't expect me now to lay the map on the table.

The President. If I could just say one other thing related to this, this last agreement that was reached and the first one in writing to restore the cease-fire and to set up a monitoring mechanism that involves Israel and Lebanon and Syria and involves France, who has been very active in this, and then has a larger consultative group that involves Russia and other countries. Because this is in writing and because it gives us a chance to restore a normal life there, if this can be properly implemented, I think that it will be a good signal or a good, if you will, a test run to see how—whether other progress can be made.

And I have talked to the Prime Minister about this. We are all very concerned about the civilians, the innocent people in Northern Israel, and all the people in southern Lebanon who have lost loved ones and have suffered great economic disruption. I think we have to implement this agreement faithfully and help the Lebanese to rebuild their infrastructure and restore the stability of their populations.

And I appreciate what the Prime Minister has said to me about that. I wanted to thank you for that.

Prime Minister Peres. I told the President that Israel will clearly respect religiously the understanding that was achieved by the Secretary and his team upon the invitation of the President. Then I told the President that Israel will participate in the effort to restore the damages in Lebanon, together with other nations, and we shall do so.

The President. Thank you for that.

Israeli Elections

Q. Mr. President, the Washington Post wrote today that you are betting on Mr. Peres as the next Prime Minister, and rightly so. Is that the case?

The President. Well, let me say, first of all, in democracies we have—we schedule elections. And that's a good thing. That reminds everybody that the people are in charge. But I think it was not only appropriate, it was virtually necessary for the Prime Minister to come here at this time, in the wake of recent events not only in Lebanon but some of the developments in their relationship between Israel and the PLO—as I think all of you know, Mr. Arafat will be here in the next couple of days—so I think his trip here is entirely appropriate, and it was the right thing to do.

The United States has always said that we do not interfere in the internal decisions of other countries, and Israel and the United States are friends and allies and will be no matter who is elected. I hope that will also be the case no matter who is elected in November in the United States. So our policy on that has not changed and will not and should not.

Q. But, Mr. President, you said in Moscow recently, regarding the Russian election, that elections have consequences, and you did not dispute that that election would have consequences for relations between your government and whatever government is there. Is that not also true here, sir?

The President. Well, and for the Russian people. Then it depends, obviously, on what happens afterward. But all elections have consequences. But the people who decide what the consequences are are the citizens of the country, in this case, the citizens of Israel. You know, they've shown pretty good judgment for quite a long while now, and I'm sure that the Prime Minister would join me in saying that they're in the driver's seat on that question, not me and not anyone else.

Israeli Response to Terrorist Attacks

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, you spoke of the last bombing campaign, so to speak, the four bombings that occurred within little more than a week. In the weeks since, there have been no—I hate to use the word "successful"—bombings in Israel. To what would you attribute that?

Prime Minister Peres. To three things: To the conference in Sharm al-Sheikh that was initiated by the President and created a spirit of cooperation and understanding to work together in order to stop the acts of bombing and suicidal terror. The second is the more serious measures that Yasser Arafat has taken in Gaza and the territories. I feel that he really started to fight terror, and I say it with appreciation. And the third is because Israel itself—maybe that is from our point of view the first thing—got ourself organized to face this danger. I cannot say that we have a full-fledged answer to the problem,

but we are by far much more organized and ready to prevent these sort of actions.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:57 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

United States-Israel Joint Statement
April 30, 1996

President Clinton and Prime Minister Peres have concluded two days of intensive discussions on a broad range of issues relating to the U.S.-Israeli relationship. Those discussions reflect the deep, long-standing and unique bonds of friendship which have characterized the U.S.-Israeli relationship and the legacy of shared values, common interests, and mutual respect for democracy that have made this close and special relationship endure.

The President and Prime Minister reviewed the extent of the U.S.-Israeli relationship in all its dimensions. They agreed that this cooperation in security, economic, and diplomatic areas is grounded in institutions that are functioning extremely effectively to the benefit of both countries. At the same time, they agreed that, in view of continuing threats to regional peace and stability, and in particular the dangers posed by proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and advanced military technologies, U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation will grow in importance.

To this end, the President and the Prime Minister agreed that a steering committee headed by the U.S. Secretary of State and the Israeli Minister of Foreign Affairs would be established to explore means of enhancing and, where appropriate, formalizing, that cooperation. Two working groups will report to the steering committee. The first, dealing with security and defense matters, will consider all options including the possibility of more formal security accords, for how best to meet common threats in the years to come. It will also identify ways to maximize the effectiveness of U.S. aid to Israel. The second will deal with other policy matters relating to U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation.

The two leaders affirmed that the strategic partnership between the two countries will continue to be based on two key principles: first, the United States unshakable commitment to Israel's security and its determination to minimize the risks and costs Israel confronts as it pursues peace; and second, the U.S.-Israeli mutual commitment to a comprehensive peace and their determination to move toward that goal.

With respect to Israel's security, the President specifically reaffirmed the United States commitment to maintain Israel's qualitative edge and to preserve and to strengthen Israel's capability to deter and defend itself, by itself, against any adversary or likely combination of adversaries.

The President and Prime Minister took great pride in signing the U.S.-Israel Counter-Terrorism Cooperation Accord. This agreement sets out practical measures enabling their two countries to make the best possible use of expertise, resources, and capabilities in the war against terror. A Joint Counter-Terrorism Group has been established to monitor and oversee the implementation of the agreement. Israel and the United States also agreed to seek to coordinate their efforts with the international effort against terror launched at Sharm al-Sheikh on March 13, 1996.

The President and the Prime Minister also took note of the joint statement on theater missile defense cooperation signed by the Prime Minister and Secretary of Defense Perry April 28. The United States and Israel recognize the defense of Israel will be made more effective by undertaking necessary steps to ensure that Israel's theater missile defenses are supported by related United States capabilities. The two leaders expressed satisfaction with the positive results to date of the ongoing bilateral dialogue on issues relating to the transfer of equipment and technology to third countries.

With respect to their determination to achieve a comprehensive peace, the two leaders agreed on the importance of implementation of agreements reached and the need to expand the orbit of Arab-Israeli peacemaking with a view toward achieving normal, peaceful relations between Israel and all its Arab neighbors. They welcomed the decision by the Palestinian National Council

to cancel all the provisions of the Palestinian National Covenant which deny Israel's right to exist or are otherwise inconsistent with the September 1993 exchange of letters between Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat. This action is an important demonstration by the Palestinians of their commitment to honor the terms of the 1993 Oslo Accords.

The President and Prime Minister also expressed satisfaction with the improved understanding reached last week on Southern Lebanon as a result of Secretary of State Christopher's negotiating efforts and after discussions with the governments of Israel and Lebanon and in consultation with Syria. They noted the importance of prompt activation of the monitoring committee and consultative group established by the understanding.

Finally, the President and the Prime Minister agreed on the need to end the Arab boycott and to eliminate discrimination against Israel in all international organizations, including the United Nations.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting on Assistance for Cattle Producers and an Exchange With Reporters

April 30, 1996

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, first let me—I want to thank this bipartisan congressional delegation from cattle-producing States for coming in. Cattle producers, by numbers, represent the largest single segment of America's agricultural economy. Cattle prices are at a 10-year low, and feed prices are at—are or have been recently at an all-time high. And we want to discuss some potential recommendations for action the Secretary of Agriculture might take, using traditional means at his disposal to help to deal with this situation and help these producers through this difficult time.

I want to thank the Members of Congress who requested this meeting and who brought this matter to our attention, and I'm looking forward to the meeting.

Q. How much traditional beef are you going to buy, Mr. President?

The President. The Secretary of Agriculture will have an announcement later, once we have time to talk through our options here.

Q. Can you act quickly?

Q. Will you call up the conservation reserve for more grazing nationwide?

The President. Well, we will issue an announcement after the meeting; the Secretary of Agriculture will.

Yes, we're going to act quickly. We won't fool around with it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:43 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House, prior to a meeting with congressional leaders. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority and an Exchange With Reporters

May 1, 1996

The President. First, let me say I am very pleased to have Chairman Arafat in the Oval Office today. We need to take this opportunity to take stock about where we are with our common efforts in the Middle East. I had a good visit with Prime Minister Peres yesterday, and I look forward to this one.

I do want to make two specific points before we begin. First of all, I want to applaud the action that Chairman Arafat has taken in keep-

ing the commitment he made at the Sharm al-Sheikh meeting to revise the Palestinian Covenant. I think that was applauded by all Americans.

And secondly, we now have to work hard on where we go from here. I want to talk to him about what we can do to improve the welfare of the Palestinian people and what we can do to continue to work together to improve security for all the people in the region. And I'm looking forward to that conversation.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, do you endorse a Palestinian State as we did so avidly the creation of the State of Israel?

The President. I endorse the continuation of the talks between the Palestinians and the Israelis to resolve that problem.

Q. Well, how does the U.S. feel?

The President. We are going to do everything we have done—we can do, just as we have since I took office, not to get in the way of these parties making a permanent peace that suits them. That's what we want to do.

Q. Chairman Arafat, can we ask you how you view the state of Israel-Palestinian relations in the aftermath of the Israeli military campaign in southern Lebanon?

Chairman Arafat. First of all, I have to thank His Excellency for giving me this opportunity. It is a great privilege from His Excellency. And no doubt, it is a very important opportunity to speak about how to push forward to strengthen more and more the peace process which we cannot forget His Excellency was from the beginning, which started here under his provision.

Q. How are relations now with Israel in the aftermath of that military action in southern Lebanon?

Chairman Arafat. What is important is that the efforts to stop all the military activities has succeeded, and the two sides have retained back to the agreement of 1993, which is very important, and this is also because of His Excellency's efforts and Mr. Christopher's shuttling visits.

Q. Could President Asad learn anything from your example, sir?

Chairman Arafat. I am sure that President Asad will follow up in his Syrian track the same line so that we can achieve a comprehensive, lasting peaceful solution in the whole area.

The President. Thank you.

Gasoline Tax

Q. Are you going for a gas tax repeal?

The Vice President. That's a good place to leave it, Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]. [*Laughter*]

Q. But what is the answer?

The Vice President. Thank you.

Q. You've got a new press secretary here. [*Laughter*]

The President. He's always been better at it. [*Laughter*]

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

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, when will——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital?

The President. Let me begin by making a statement, if I might. I am delighted to have this opportunity to meet with Chairman Arafat. When we met at Sharm al-Sheikh, he said that there would be a revision in the Palestinian Covenant by the 1st of May. Under difficult circumstances, he kept that commitment. And now it's time for us to discuss the continuation of the peace process, what we can do to help improve the welfare of the Palestinian people, which I know is uppermost on his mind, and we are very concerned about that, and what we can do together to improve the security for all the people in the region. So we're going to discuss all these issues.

Q. Mr. President, when will we see that Israeli negotiations are going to continue to complete the circle of peace that you are talking about?

The President. I believe that they will continue shortly, and we're going to discuss that.

And as to your question, ma'am, my position from the day I got here is still the same position. I believe that those matters are going to have to be worked out by the parties in the region. I do not believe the United States can serve any useful purpose by getting in the middle of decisions which have to be resolved by the parties themselves.

Our purpose is to try to speed the peace process along and to help those like Chairman Arafat who take risks for peace. When people take risks for peace, we want to minimize those risks, and we want to do what we can to help improve life for ordinary people in the region.

And we intend to do that, and that's what we're going to discuss here.

Abu Abbas

Q. Mr. President, 99 Senators asked for you to—and for Chairman Arafat to authorize the extradition of Abu Abbas, the mastermind of the *Achille Lauro* hijacking. Will you ask the Justice Department to issue an extradition request?

And Chairman Arafat, would you honor such a request if it came from the United States?

Chairman Arafat. We should not forget that Abu Abbas came and attended the PNC and voted to change the Covenant of the PLO and to support the peace process.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. Arafat, Mr. Peres said this week that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel forever, and Mr. Savir said the right to return is not going to be given to the Palestinians. What are you going to talk about in the final talks of negotiations, only the settlement?

Chairman Arafat. No, according to what has been agreed upon and what had been signed in Washington and in Cairo and in Washington, that this has to be discussed with other matters—Jerusalem—settlements, borders, and relation with neighbors.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:03 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. During the exchange, reporters referred to President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria and Uri Savir, Director General of the Israeli Foreign Ministry.

Remarks Honoring the United States Olympic Committee's Champions in Life

May 1, 1996

Thank you very much. Let me say that whoever organized this program so that I could follow Buddy Lee—[*laughter*]—should take up another line of work. [*Laughter*] Wasn't he wonderful? Let's give him another hand. [*Applause*]

And thank you, Bonnie Blair, for your story and your example. Thank you, Ralph Neal, for letting us come here to Eastern. I thank the Senior High School Band, and I thank the wonderful Eastern High School Choir that sings for us every Christmas, I'm told. I thank the students from Elliot and Payne and the Head Start kids who are here; thank you. I want to thank Al Oerter and the representatives of the U.S. Olympic Committee and all the Champions in Life who are here.

I am so honored to be here with you today. And I hope that all of you have enjoyed this just as much as I have and has gotten just as much as I have out of it.

You know, I'm very proud that the United States is going to be hosting the Olympics again and that this is the 100th anniversary of the modern games. I'm proud that there will be people from 197 different nations coming here. And when I see these folks behind me, the Olympians and the Paralympians, I know that they will see America at its best.

They'll see our diversity and our unity. They'll see that we have differences that don't divide us. They'll see that we understand individual excellence and teamwork. They'll see, as Buddy Lee said, that no champion wins alone, not in athletics and not in life. There's always a parent who cares or a teacher who listens or a coach who believes or a friend who encourages or a church and community that supports.

And behind them, there must be an America—an America where every child, without regard to race or gender or however they start out in life, has a chance to make the most of his or her own life through a decent education and safe streets and a clean environment and a brighter future.

We know that it takes extraordinary individual effort to achieve. The Vice President talked about Jeff Blatnick's heroism in the face of his cancer. We know that there are incredible stories of heroism here on this stage and throughout the Olympic teams: people like Deanna Sodoma, a cyclist until she was paralyzed, and now she will race in a wheelchair in the

Paralympics, still an Olympic champion; people like Bill Demby, who lost both his legs serving our country in Vietnam, and is now a member of our Paralympics volleyball team.

All these athletes, each in their own way, and in some special way the members of the Paralympics team, remind us that we all have a lot of important muscles in our body, but the most important muscle we ever use on the field of competition as well as in life is the heart. Having heart means doing the very best we can with our God-given capacity, whatever that is, just like Bonnie Blair said.

If you young people have heart, you will remember the pledge that Buddy Lee got you to make: You'll stay in school; you'll stay drug-free; you'll stay away from gangs and violence; and you'll get into developing your minds and your bodies. If you have heart, you know you can be a better student, a better athlete, a better musician, and you can be a good son or daughter, a good brother or sister, a good friend. If you have heart, you know that you have to respect yourself and others, and you have to show the responsibility that every human being can that makes you a champion.

A lot of heart has gone into putting the Olympics together. In the final weeks, it's all coming together. There are a lot of people being recognized in the Olympics for what they do every day, not as athletic champions but because they are champion human beings.

Today, this day, in Boulder City, Nevada, a woman named Irene Wisner is carrying the Olympic torch on its way to Opening Day in Atlanta, July 19th. Most of you have probably never heard of Irene Wisner. She won't be in the Olympics; she is 74 years old. The children in Washington, DC, don't know her, but there are 100 children who know her very well because they were abused children, abandoned children and no one would take care of them, but this one 74-year-old woman took 100 of these children into her love and life to give them a better chance. And for that service, she was one of many Americans selected to carry the Olympic torch.

There are people like that all around. Just this morning before I came out here, I was with one of your fellow students in Washington, Alicia Brown, a young woman who made a television spot with me about violence because she had lost friends of hers, and she was speaking out not only personally but to all the people of this country against violence against our young people. I thank her for that, and I hope all of you will do that in your individual lives.

I hope you young people will watch this torch as it travels through 42 States and 15,000 miles. It will follow the work of countless volunteers who are trying to make this country better. They've cleaned roads, painted houses, even shuttled neighbors to places where they can see the torch passed. I want you all to cheer on our torchbearers and follow their example by holding high the torch of good citizenship in your own lives.

And that's what I want to say, finally, about these Champions of Life behind me. Yes, they all have succeeded in athletics. Yes, many of them have succeeded against extraordinary odds, and every one of them has achieved something extraordinary against the odds. But what they are doing now is in some ways more important because they are trying to set an example for the next generation of champions. We should be grateful to them. And I'd like to ask you to recognize all of them with a warm round of applause. [*Applause*]

The America these champions represent is a place where individual dreams must be realized through our common efforts, a place where all Americans who are willing to work hard can succeed, a place where we have different points of view and different heritages, but a place where, like the champions here today, we come together as a team, wearing the colors of liberty and freedom, respecting our honest differences and working together to help each of us clear life's highest hurdles together. One America, good for all, where we all work for the common good—this is the America we want the world to see in Atlanta, and this is the America that we want you young people to grow up in.

Good luck. God bless you, and God bless America. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:01 p.m. in the stadium at Eastern High School. In his remarks, he referred to Buddy Lee, U.S. Olympic Greco-Roman wrestling team member; Olympic Gold Medalists Bonnie Blair, Al Oerter, and Jeff Blatnick; and Ralph Neal, principal, Eastern High School.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Cyprus
May 1, 1996

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

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous submission covered progress through January 31, 1996. The current submission covers the period February 1, 1996, through March 31, 1996.

In support of the U.N. Secretary General's good office mission on Cyprus, my Administration hopes to be able to take an initiative on Cyprus this year. If the two communities possess sufficient political will to make tradeoffs required for an intercommunal agreement, we believe it should be possible to arrive at a fair and just solution. Attaining this goal requires the active support of Turkey and Greece. Although unavoidable events have delayed the launching of our Cyprus initiative, we have been preparing its groundwork. In this respect, in March I had a useful session on Cyprus with Turkish President Demirel who expressed his government's desire to be helpful. I plan on engaging other visitors similarly in the lead-up to our Cyprus effort.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

Statement on the Family and Medical Leave Act
May 1, 1996

Three years ago, I worked with the Congress to pass the Family and Medical Leave Act so that we could help Americans balance their work and family responsibilities. Americans should not have to choose between their job and caring for a sick child or parent. We said we could do that without hurting businesses, and we were right. Today, a bipartisan commission that studied the act announced its conclusion that this new law has significantly helped working Americans while placing only minimal requirements on their employers.

The commission found that because we have a Family and Medical Leave Act, fewer workers will have to choose between their jobs and their loved ones if a child or elderly parent should need care. That's tremendously important in an era when most households are headed by two working parents or by single mothers.

And as we predicted at the time we fought for this legislation, businesses are finding that the new law is easy to administer and costs are nonexistent or small. The majority of leaves are short in duration, and most workers return to their jobs. In fact, some businesses testified to the commission that the new law has helped them reduce employee turnover, enhance productivity, and improve the morale of their workforce.

The Family and Medical Leave Act has brought many Americans a benefit that was once afforded only to a fortunate few—the knowledge that they can return to their jobs and keep their health benefits if they need unpaid time off to meet medical or family needs. Thanks to the work of this bipartisan commission, we now have further proof of what I have always known: the Family and Medical Leave Act was, and is, the right thing to do for America's working families.

Remarks at the Olympic Dinner
May 1, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you so much. President Walker, thank you for your remarks and for your work, and to Dick Schultz and Jim Hardymon, Steve Green, Anita DeFrantz, and others who are responsible for this dinner tonight. To the Members of Congress who are here, and Mr. Michel, it's good to see you again. I miss you. I'm glad you're here—I'm glad you're here.

I want to thank the Vice President and Mack McLarty for the work they have done on the Olympics and all those others in our administration who have undertaken this endeavor, I must say, with great joy and energy. As the Vice President mentioned, Hillary had the honor of representing our country at the Olympics in Lillehammer and of being in Greece in Olympia with our daughter when the Olympic flame was lit to be brought to the United States. Our experience with the Olympics has been one of the great highlights of our service here in Washington and in this great office.

I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation to the men and women up here on the stage with me, particularly those who were with me today earlier and the Vice President, over at Eastern High School in the Champions in Life program, for truly so many of them have been an inspiration to young people all across the country who may never be Olympic athletes but can be Olympian in their citizenship and character and the contribution they give to this country, and who drew inspiration and strength from what was said for them today.

I want to thank Billy Payne and Andy Fleming and all those who have worked so hard to make the Atlanta Olympics and the Paralympics a great success, but also those who won the competition for the 100th modern Olympics to be in Atlanta. It's a great honor for the United States. And when opening day comes, I believe that the United States will measure up to that honor, that the world will see America achieving a new national best.

The spirit of the United States Olympic Committee was basically born with Dr. William Milligan Sloane, who helped to rekindle the modern Olympic Games and who was so dedicated to getting his team to Athens for the 1896 Olympics that he gave up his own ticket, and his wife's, so that the last 2 of the 13 American team members could go. He didn't even get to see the spectacle he had made possible. Now, I know a lot of you have given very generously to these Olympic Games, but at least you're going to get to see them unfold.

The legacy that Dr. Sloane left us has been richly fulfilled by this U.S. Olympic Committee. When our athletes line up at the starting blocks or face off in the wrestlers' circle or the boxing ring or the basketball or the tennis court, we will see the best in the world. But we have to thank not only them for their dedication, their coaches, their trainers, their families, their friends but also the United States Olympic Committee. Here in America we do it our way; the Government does not finance the Olympic teams. Everyone pitches in and does his or her part, businesses, communities, universities, neighbors, friends, and families.

So not only our athletes but also all of you who have anything to do with the Olympics are part of Team U.S.A. And on behalf of the American people, let me thank you for making Team U.S.A. possible. We are very proud of you.

Not very long ago I had the privilege to spend a few hours with Billy Payne, walking around the Olympic stadium and some of the facilities and being briefed. Andy Fleming was there; others were there. And I'm telling you, they have done a magnificent job down there, and I am in awe of the level of organization, preparation, and execution we are seeing. I am very proud of every aspect of this Olympics, and I will be bursting with pride when the games begin. I hope in some way I can communicate to the American people and to people all over the world what the spirit and character of the Olympics mean, what the standard of excellence within honorable rules set by these Olympians and the Paralympians mean to the United States.

I also want to thank those who were there with me at Eastern High School today, who reminded those young people that no one really makes it alone and that every achievement is worthy of respect. That's what I want the world to see at the Olympics this summer. And if I could leave you with that thought—you know,

when this country gets together, when we reach across all the lines that divide us, when we say, in spite of our differences of color or creed or region or station in life, we really are one nation, helping each other to achieve our individual dreams—when America does that, we are never defeated. And I believe this summer the world will see one America, a place where individual dreams are realized through common efforts, where all Americans who want to work hard are being given a chance to succeed, where different points of view and different heritages are undergirded by shared values that keep this great country strong and secure and give it its character and its future.

I thank you, all of you, for contributing to that and for making America's team still the envy of the entire world. Good luck, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to LeRoy T. Walker, president, and Dick Schultz, executive director, U.S. Olympic Committee; James F. Hardymon, chairman and CEO of Textron, Inc.; Steve Green, chairman and CEO of Samsonite; Anita DeFrantz, member, International Olympic Committee; Bob Michel, former House minority leader; Billy Payne, chief executive officer, Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games; and G. Andrew Fleming, chief executive officer, Atlanta Paralympic Organizing Committee.

Remarks on Vetoing Product Liability Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

May 2, 1996

The President. Good afternoon. Before I make the announcement I invited you here for today, I want to congratulate the Department of Justice on the success of the Zorro 2 antinarcotics operation that Attorney General Reno announced a couple of hours ago today.

Zorro 2 targeted a Mexican-run cocaine smuggling and distribution network in the United States and the Colombian cartel with which it worked. It dismantled both the organization that owned the cocaine and the organization that ran the transportation system, locking up more than 100 individuals across the country, seizing almost 6,000 kilograms of cocaine and 1,000 pounds of marijuana.

Critical to the success of this multi-State operation, which is a part of our southwest border initiative, was the cooperation of over 40 State and local police agencies, the DEA, the FBI, and several other Federal agencies all across the country. They combined their resources and their expertise to take down this extensive drug organization.

Today's arrests are another big victory in the fight against illegal drugs, the fight to keep them off our streets and out of the hands of our children. On behalf of the American people, I want to thank our law enforcement officers for a job well done.

Today I am returning to Congress without my signature the product liability legislation sent to me this week. I take this step because I believe this bill tilts against American families and would deprive them of the ability to recover fully when they are injured by a defective product. I am eager to sign legislation to make our legal system work better at less cost in a fairer way. But this bill would hurt families without truly improving our legal system. It would mean more unsafe products in our homes. It would let wrongdoers off the hook. I cannot allow it to become law.

One of my duties as President is to protect the health and safety of our people. Parents should know the toys their children play with are safe. Families should know the cars they drive will not explode upon impact. Our grandparents have a right to know the drugs and the medical devices they use will not injure them. It is a hallmark of our system of justice that when a product produces injury or death, a family has the right to try and recover its losses. And if someone endangers the health of the public, he or she should be held respon-

sible. I believe we can protect these rights even as we curb frivolous lawsuits.

Let me be clear: We do need legal reform. America's legal system is too expensive, too time-consuming, and does—does—contain too many frivolous lawsuits.

As Governor of Arkansas, I signed several tort reform bills into law. In 1994, I signed legislation in this room to limit the liability of aircraft manufacturers in what I thought was a reasonable and prudent way. We've worked hard to lift the burden of regulation and redtape from business. We cut 16,000 pages of Federal rules, giving a break to small businesses and working for results. I believe we can help the business community in this country without hurting ordinary Americans. But any legal reform must be carefully crafted so that the interests of consumers and businesses are fairly balanced.

For a year I tried to work with Congress to write such a balanced bill. I made it very clear what I would accept in such legislation and what I could not support. When the United States Senate passed product liability legislation, it was clearly an improvement over a much more extreme House bill. I still had a couple of objections to it, which I made very clear. And I expressed the hope that in the conference we could resolve those objections so that a bill would be sent to me that I could sign.

Instead, in the conference the bill moved back toward the House bill in a couple of respects and, perhaps even worse, included some things which were not included in either the Senate or the House bill but, as too often happens in Washington, were put into the final conference version.

This bill is opposed by the American Cancer Society, the Heart Association, the Lung Association, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, and our friend Sarah Brady—where is she, behind me—and the handgun control people. It is opposed by every major consumer and senior citizen group. It is opposed by State legislators and State judges. I'm proud to be joined today by the attorney general of Mississippi, Mike Moore, who opposes it. These are mainstream, Main Street groups, and I believe they are right.

The legislation would make it impossible for some people to recover fully for noneconomic damages. This is especially unfair to senior citizens, women, children who have few economic damages, and poor people who may suffer grievously but because their incomes are low have few economic damages. It would arbitrarily cap punitive damages which are paid by a corporation that has engaged in egregious conduct, such as knowingly making or selling the public a dangerous product. A cap on punitive damages can reward wrongdoers and diminish the deterrent impact of punitive damages.

And if a jury, for example—and many juries are being asked to consider this today—should ever issue a finding that tobacco companies have been not truthful with their customers, this legislation would limit the ability of juries to impose punitive damages on those companies.

And in a provision added in the conference, the legislation would bar the courthouse door to some consumers altogether if they are unlucky enough to be hurt by a product that is 15 years old, even if it's supposed to last more than 15 years. That is the case with two of the people who are in this room today.

In the worst provision added to the conference, it would bail out a gun dealer, for example, who knowingly sells a felon a gun or a bar owner who knowingly sells a drunk another beer before he or she hits the road. And I might say, that is why Sarah Brady is here today. This was supposed to be a product liability bill. This provision has nothing—I reiterate—nothing to do with the manufacture of products that subsequently prove defective and injure people. It shouldn't even be in this bill, and that is probably why it was put in at the 11th hour in the conference without any hearing in the Senate or the House.

I should also point out that there has been a lot of talk in this Congress about the importance of giving responsibilities back to the States. That apparently does not apply to laws relating to the civil justice system. This bill overrides the laws of all 50 States, in spite of the fact that 40 of the 50 States in the last 10 years have acted on their own to reform the tort laws and more than 30 of them have acted in the area of product liability.

So it seems that the Congress is willing to override State laws if they conflict with this bill—but only, I might add, if the State laws are more favorable to the consumers. Now, if the State laws are less favorable to the consumers than this bill, they can stand.

This legislation is arcane, complex; it has a lot of legalisms and loopholes in it. But the real fact is it could have a devastating impact on innocent Americans who can presently look

to our system of justice for recovery. Several of them are with me today.

Janey Fair lost a daughter when her schoolbus burst into flames because the manufacturer wouldn't install an inexpensive safety measure. The bus was hit by a drunk driver with no money. Because she could rely on joint and several liability, she could bring a lawsuit. This is the sort of thing that would be changed, as it relates to noneconomic damages, in this law.

The problem is that children have hardly any economic damages; they're not out there earning money. Poor people may have just as much life expectancy left as you or I, but their economic damages would not be as great, no matter how great their human loss.

Carla Miller was left with her children after her husband was killed when his tractor rolled over. Jeanne Yanta lost the ability to have children after she used a contraceptive that the manufacturer knew was dangerous. Every one of these people is a hard-working American citizen who is law-abiding, tried to do the right thing by their families. Every one would have been prevented from fully recovering for their losses, or in some cases, those who committed civil wrongs would escape full punishment, if this bill were to become law.

I continue to believe that if we were to work together in a bipartisan and open fashion we can craft the right kind of legal reform. I am still willing to do it. Congress knows well my specific positions. If it will send me a balanced bill that cuts back on frivolous lawsuits while being fair to families, that gives manufacturers more predictability but doesn't bail out real wrongdoers, I would sign such a bill without hesitation.

But this bill does not do that. And because of the changes that were made in the Senate bill moving away from rather than toward the specifics that I asked for and because of things that were put into the conference that were not even a part of the House bill, much less the Senate bill, I have no choice but to veto it. And that is what I have done today.

Q. Mr. President, I'm sure you've heard that the Republicans are heaping criticism upon you, saying this veto is a payback to the Trial Lawyers Association whose members have contributed heavily to your reelection. Your response?

The President. Well, I know they've said that. I think you should go back to them and ask them how they could justify depriving Americans who are just like these people of the right to recover for their injuries, and ask them if they really believe that our economy is so fragile that we have to strip from these people the right to be made whole in order to continue to make our economy go forward. Just today we learned that in the last quarter our economy grew at 2.8 percent. We have the lowest unemployment of any advanced economy in the world except for Japan, and many people believe as a practical matter it's even lower than that nation's. I do not believe that we have to have a legal system which shuts the door on the legitimate problems of ordinary people in order to get rid of frivolous lawsuits and excess legal expenses. And I think that we ought to ask those folks that.

You know, before I got into being an elected official, I taught law. I studied the Constitution. I have sat in courtrooms and seen the faces of people who come in there full of fear, full of uncertainty, and full of their own hurts. And so it just seems to me that before they notch this one up as a special interest vote, I would just say two things: One is I made it clear that I would sign legislation that the Trial Lawyers Association did not agree with. I made that abundantly clear. I made my position clear. Two, what is their answer? Can they really look at these people in the face and say, "Boy, our economy needs it so badly that I don't want anybody who's like you in the future to be able to recover and be made whole the way you were"?

And if they—I'll be glad to have the special interest discussion with them if they first say, "It is fine with me if these people, people just like these people, in the future cannot be made whole." They need to answer on the merits before they get to the accusations.

Gas Tax

Q. Your critics say that you're resisting cutting the gas tax. Is that accurate?

The President. Well, first of all, I believe that the better tax cut for Americans is to give people a deduction for the cost of education after high school and to give them a deduction for the cost of raising their children. It's a lot more money. And it's for a more compelling reason.

The gas tax did not drive up the cost of gasoline. After the gas tax was put in and all dedicated to deficit reduction in 1993, gas continued to go down for a year. And we have taken steps to bring the price of gasoline down. We are

moving aggressively on that, and it's beginning to work.

Now if the Congress wants to repeal the gas tax, then it ought to be done—I'll say again—in the context of deficit reduction. They ought to come in here, and we ought to figure out what our balanced budget plan is. We ought to put our common savings together. We ought to have a tax program—a tax relief program that we can afford, and we ought to do it. I would be happy to talk with them about this.

But I think just to sort of out of the blue say we're going to add $30 billion to the deficit, instead of talking about what the best kind of tax relief for America's families is and how we're going to do it in the context of balancing the budget, is not a responsible thing to do. But I'm happy to talk to them about it. But we have to do it, aware of its consequences and of the choices which it will impose upon us. And I think we ought to come in and start these budget discussions, and if they want that to be a part of it, it's fine with me. I'll be glad to talk to them. I'm not shutting the door on that.

Budget Negotiations

Q. Mr. President, in that vein, you've been keeping up pressure on Senator Dole now for a least a good week to come in here and talk with you about the balanced budget. Why isn't that working, would you say? How long are you going to keep——

The President. Well, I don't know. You'd have to ask him that, because, if you remember, the first day I asked for them all to participate again, he suggested that the two of us ought to do it, and then through Mr. Panetta, I accepted. So I'm to willing to meet with them under any circumstances and try to get—I'll meet with him alone; I'll meet with the leadership; I'd meet with a bipartisan broader group. I just think that we need to understand that whenever we have worked together, good things have happened.

You look at the—we've got the telecommunications bill. We've got the terrorism bill. We've got this year's budget. I would have signed the budget I signed last week on the first day of the budget year, 6, 7 months ago. We've got the bill on lobbying reform. Whenever we work together, we can still make good things happen, and we don't need a work stoppage here before the election. And we don't need bills just to be—we don't need bill, veto, bill, veto, bill, veto. We need to work together and pass legislation that I can sign and keep moving the country forward. Then we'll have conventions this summer, and there will be lots of times for the campaign.

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. I'll take one more.

Product Liability Veto

Q. Mr. President, you just suggested you would not sign this bill in part because it would overrule the 50 State laws. But wouldn't any product liability reform overrule the——

The President. Yes, it would. But I want to point out, it's different from like the securities law issue where, essentially, I approved the bill except for the changes that were made in the conference that nobody ever debated. And I made that clear. And that's an area of Federal law.

There is a general feeling among people around the country that there are too many frivolous lawsuits. The only point I'm making is that the States have moved to try to address this. As a result of that, there have been 40 States that have acted in the area of tort reform. And I believe this is right—there may be more, but there have been at least 30 States that have specifically taken action in the area of product liability.

I just pointed out that it is ironic that the Congress which said that what it wanted to do was to give power away from the States, in this area wants to take the power away from the States—at least they want to take it away one way.

Yes, if you have any Federal standards, they will to some extent erode State law. I'm prepared to do that to a limited extent to get rid of frivolous lawsuits. But I think we ought to be aware of the fact that this country has functioned pretty well for 200 years by being very reluctant to do that and letting the States handle that area of our law.

Now, in areas of national commerce, like the securities laws, the Federal Government has been very active. In other areas, the Federal Government hasn't been so active. So it just is another argument for being careful in this area.

It's not like the States have been asleep for the last decade. It's not like they never debated

this, not like they never made any decisions. They've been quite active in this area. We can go further; I am prepared to do it. But I think it's—I am just bringing it out as a reason for further caution.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:43 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Message to the House of Representatives Returning Without Approval Product Liability Legislation

May 2, 1996

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 956, the "Common Sense Product Liability Legal Reform Act of 1996."

I support real commonsense product liability reform. To deserve that label, however, legislation must adequately protect the interests of consumers, in addition to the interests of manufacturers and sellers. Further, the legislation must respect the important role of the States in our Federal system. The Congress could have passed such legislation, appropriately limited in scope and balanced in application, meeting these tests. Had the Congress done so, I would have signed the bill gladly. The Congress, however, chose not to do so, deciding instead to retain provisions in the bill that I made clear I could not accept.

This bill inappropriately intrudes on State authority, and does so in a way that tilts the legal playing field against consumers. While some Federal action in this area is proper because no one State can alleviate nationwide problems in the tort system, the States should have, as they always have had, primary responsibility for tort law. The States traditionally have handled this job well, serving as laboratories for new ideas and making needed reforms. This bill unduly interferes with that process in products cases; moreover, it does so in a way that peculiarly disadvantages consumers. As a rule, this bill displaces State law only when that law is more favorable to consumers; it defers to State law when that law is more helpful to manufacturers and sellers. I cannot accept, absent compelling reasons, such a one-way street of federalism.

Apart from this general problem of displacing State authority in an unbalanced manner, specific provisions of H.R. 956 unfairly disadvantage consumers and their families. Consumers should be able to count on the safety of the products they purchase. And if these products are defective and cause harm, consumers should be able to get adequate compensation for their losses. Certain provisions in this bill work against these goals, preventing some injured persons from recovering the full measure of their damages and increasing the possibility that defective goods will come onto the market as a result of intentional misconduct.

In particular, I object to the following provisions of the bill, which subject consumers to too great a risk of harm.

First, as I previously have stated, I oppose wholly eliminating joint liability of noneconomic damages such as pain and suffering because such a change would prevent many persons from receiving full compensation for injury. When one wrongdoer cannot pay its portion of the judgment, the other wrongdoers, and not the innocent victim, should have to shoulder that part of the award. Traditional law accomplishes this result. In contrast, this bill would leave the victim to bear these damages on his or her own. Given how often companies that manufacture defective products go bankrupt, this provision has potentially large consequences.

This provision is all the more troubling because it unfairly discriminates against the most vulnerable members of our society—the elderly, the poor, children, and nonworking women—whose injuries often involve mostly noneconomic losses. There is no reason for this kind of discrimination. Noneconomic damages are as real and as important to victims as economic damages. We should not create a tort system in which people with the greatest need of protection stand the least chance of receiving it.

Second, as I also have stated, I oppose arbitrary ceilings on punitive damages, because they endanger the safety of the public. Capping punitive damages undermines their very purpose, which is to punish and thereby deter egregious misconduct. The provision of the bill allowing judges to exceed the cap if certain factors are present helps to mitigate, but does not cure this problem, given the clear intent of the Congress, as expressed in the Statement of Managers, that judges should use this authority only in the most unusual cases.

In addition, I am concerned that the Conference Report fails to fix an oversight in title II of the bill, which limits actions against suppliers of materials used in devices implanted in the body. In general, title II is a laudable attempt to ensure the supply of materials needed to make life-saving medical devices, such as artificial heart valves. But as I believe even many supporters of the bill agree, a supplier of materials who knew or should have known that the materials, as implanted, would cause injury should not receive any protection from suit. Title II's protections must be clearly limited to nonnegligent suppliers.

My opposition to these Senate-passed provisions were known prior to the Conference on the bill. But instead of addressing these issues, the Conference Committee took several steps backward in the direction of the bill approved by the House.

First, the Conference Report seems to expand the scope of the bill, inappropriately applying the limits on punitive and noneconomic damages to lawsuits, where, for example, a gun dealer has knowingly sold a gun to a convicted felon or a bar owner has knowingly served a drink to an obviously inebriated customer. I believe that such suits should go forward unhindered. Some in the Congress have argued that the change made in Conference is technical in nature, so that the bill still exempts these actions. But I do not read the change in this way—and in any event, I do not believe that a victim of a drunk driver should have to argue in court about this matter. The Congress should not have made this last-minute change, creating this unfortunate ambiguity, in the scope of the bill.

In addition, the Conference Report makes certain changes that, though sounding technical, may cut off a victim's ability to sue a negligent manufacturer. The Report deletes a provision that would have stopped the statute of limitations from running when a bankruptcy court issues the automatic stay that prevents suits from being filed during bankruptcy proceedings. The effect of this seemingly legalistic change will be that some persons harmed by companies that have entered bankruptcy proceedings (as makers of defective products often do) will lose any meaningful opportunity to bring valid claims.

Similarly, the Conference Report reduces the statute of repose to 15 years (and less if States so provide) and applies the statute to a wider range of goods, including handguns. This change, which bars a suit against a maker of an older product even if that product has just caused injury, also will preclude some valid suits.

In recent weeks, I have heard from many victims of defective products whose efforts to recover compensation would have been frustrated by this bill. I have heard from a woman who would not have received full compensatory damages under this bill for the death of a child because one wrongdoer could not pay his portion of the judgment. I have heard from women whose suits against makers of defective contraceptive devices—and the punitive damages awarded in those suits—forced the products off the market, in a way that this bill's cap on punitives would make much harder. I have heard from persons injured by products more than 15 years old, who under this bill could not bring suit at all.

Injured people cannot be left to suffer in this fashion; furthermore, the few companies that cause these injuries cannot be left, through lack of a deterrent, to engage in misconduct. I therefore must return the bill that has been presented to me. This bill would undermine the ability of courts to provide relief to victims of harmful products and thereby endanger the health and safety of the entire American public. There is nothing common sense about such reforms to product liability law.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

May 2, 1996.

Remarks on the Balanced Budget Negotiations and an Exchange With Reporters

May 2, 1996

The President. I'd like to make a couple of brief opening remarks, and then I'd like to let Senator Chafee and Senator Breaux say whatever they'd like to say. And then after the meeting, after we've had a chance to visit, I may want to say some other things. But I'd like to say less of and more now, and perhaps more afterward.

First, I want to thank this group of Senators for coming to the White House. This has been a good day for our country. We've got some good economic news. We found that the American economy is continuing to grow steadily and without inflation and better than had been expected. But even though we have over 8 million jobs and low inflation and strong growth, we know that if we want to continue this we have got to finish the work of balancing the budget, and we have to do it in 7 years and in a bipartisan way.

In a very real sense for the next several months we will have to face the choice in more than one area between partisanship and progress. But if you look at what has happened in this Congress that is really good, and a lot has happened that is good—the telecommunications bill, the antiterrorism bill, the budget bill that I signed just a few days ago, the lobby reform bill; in the Senate, the passage of 100 to nothing of the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, and then the passage, I think 97 to 3, just before you came over here, of the immigration bill sponsored by Senator Simpson—in every case these things have happened because there was bipartisan cooperation, the people put the interest of the country first.

That is what works. And that is what we're going to have to do to with this budget. So I'm proud to be here with these Senators today. I commend them for what they are doing. I hope it will become the model for what Congress does on this, and I hope it will bring us to a genuinely bipartisan balanced budget. And I'm encouraged, and I'm anxious to get down to the discussion.

Senator Chafee?

Senator Chafee. Well, thank you first, Mr. President. Thank you very much for inviting us down. We appreciate that. This whole group—Senator Dole has invited us to meet with him in a similar fashion next Tuesday, and we all intend to do that, likewise. This is truly a bipartisan group, as you have mentioned.

We are brought together by a desire to get a balanced budget, not just in the 7th year but in the out-years likewise. And we feel very strong. This is not a negotiating group; we're not negotiators on behalf of anybody in the Congress. We have come up with a plan, a bipartisan plan, which we've arrived at after considerable effort, and I want to commend Senator Breaux and all who are associated with him. We think there's a very, very fair budget proposal that we've worked out. And we commend it to you, and we'll have a chance to present it in greater detail as we proceed.

Senator Breaux. Mr. President, we're delighted to be here at your invitation to meet with you and to present what I think is very unique. This is truly a very unique coalition of 11 Democrats working together with 11 Republicans who have come together to present to you and to the administration and to our colleagues a 7-year balanced budget which brings about real reform in areas of welfare and Medicaid and Medicare, as well as a tax cut for individuals and working families.

We think that working from the center out is the way to solve these problems. We've had 2 Government partial shutdowns last year and 13 continuing resolutions. That's not the way to balance the budget. We offer this as a hopeful suggestion as the way we should go about getting it down.

The President. Thank you very much.

Q. Senators Breaux and Chafee, will you have a cut in the gas tax as a part of your plan to balance the budget?

Senator Breaux. That's not part of our plan.

Senator Chafee. That's not part of this plan.

Q. Any tax cuts at all as part of this——

Senator Chafee. Yes, we have a tax cut proposal in our plan.

Q. Can you tell us more about the Medicare and welfare proposals?

Senator Chafee. Well, I don't think we want to get into this in piecemeal.

The President. We'll all have more to say. We want to talk first.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:40 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House, prior to a meeting with Members of the Senate. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Senate Action on Immigration Legislation
May 2, 1996

The Senate has taken an important step today by passing with bipartisan support the Immigration Control and Financial Responsibility Act of 1996, important legislation which ratifies my administration's comprehensive immigration strategy to reverse decades of neglect and restore the rule of law to our immigration system.

This bill builds upon the historic progress we are making. Over the last 3 years, I have directed my administration to use every tool at its disposal to crack down on illegal immigration and to reintroduce the rule of law at the border and in the workplace. We have made illegal crossings at the Southwest border tougher than ever before by increasing manpower by 50 percent and employing state-of-the-art technology. We are deporting record numbers of criminal and other illegal aliens from the United States, and we have put teeth into our immigration laws in the workplace. Earlier this year, I signed an Executive order barring employers who knowingly hire illegal workers from receiving Federal contracts.

I am pleased that the Senate has endorsed our strategy with legislation that answers my administration's call for tougher penalties for alien smugglers, criminal aliens, and manufacturers and sellers of fraudulent documents. The Senate bill also supports our plan to continue to increase the size of our Border Patrol and provides the Justice Department with new tools to fight illegal immigration. While this bill strongly supports our enforcement efforts, it still goes too far in denying legal immigrants access to vital safety net programs which could jeopardize public health and safety. Some work still needs to be done. I urge the Congress to move quickly to finalize and send me this key legislation.

Statement on the Initiative To Reduce Juvenile Tobacco Use
May 2, 1996

Smoking is a pediatric disease that shows no sign of abating, in part because young people are constantly barraged by messages that glamour and grit can be found in pack of cigarettes.

My administration has proposed the Nation's first comprehensive initiative to reduce children's use of tobacco products. But Government cannot solve this problem alone. Everybody must do their share to help parents keep their kids tobacco-free.

I applaud 3M Media for accepting responsibility for the impact billboards have. We must all work together to protect our children from the lures of tobacco.

Statement on Senate Action To Extend the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency Act

May 2, 1996

I applaud the Members of Congress for this overwhelming statement of support for the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency Act. By extending this vital program for 5 additional years, lawmakers of both parties are sending a message of support to thousands of Americans who are living with HIV or AIDS and to their families and friends who offer them love and support each and every day. In its first 5 years of existence, the Ryan White CARE Act has provided high-quality medical care and support services that help to extend the length and improve the quality of life for people living with HIV/AIDS. I have been proud of our recent success in increasing funding for this program by more than 110 percent in the last 3 years, including a $105 million increase in the recently enacted budget agreement for fiscal year 1996. I look forward to signing this bill and continuing this record of bipartisan support.

Remarks at a Dinner Honoring Billy and Ruth Graham

May 2, 1996

Good evening. The first time I ever met Paul Harvey, he and his son played through a foursome I was in on his golf course in Chicago. He never told me the score. But since then he's tried to tell me the score about a lot of other things. [*Laughter*] And I've enjoyed it every time.

To the members of the Graham family, the Members of Congress who are here, ladies and gentlemen: I'm deeply honored to join with you tonight in honoring two of America's finest citizens, two of the world's greatest human resources, Billy and Ruth Graham.

When Billy and Ruth received the Congressional Gold Medal today, they received only the 114th medal in the 220-year history of this country. Since, as Paul Harvey said, George Washington started receiving the first one in 1776, Thomas Edison, Marian Anderson, Elie Wiesel, Winston Churchill—Billy and Ruth Graham belong in their company, and more.

I am going to make a presentation in a moment related to that, but I wanted to say a few words first. I'm very proud that Billy and Ruth have decided to share this honor with the Billy and Ruth Graham children's center of Memorial Mission Hospital in Asheville, North Carolina.

In Galatians 6, St. Paul said that while each of us must make our own efforts to sustain ourselves, we are also reminded to "bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." Sharing this medal in this way does that. But in so many ways Billy and Ruth have fulfilled the law of Christ, in the ministry of the Word going into all nations. I hardly ever go to a place as President, Billy Graham hadn't been there before me preaching. [*Laughter*] And I feel like a poor substitute from time to time, because a lot of the time what I'm trying to do is get people to lay down the hatreds of the heart and reach down into their spirit and treat people who are different from them with the same dignity that all God's children are entitled to.

Billy and Ruth have practiced the ministry of the deed. Hundreds of times the Bible calls upon us to minister to the poor and the needy as they did in trying to help disaster victims in Guatemala and countless other places. And I know yesterday Billy and I were talking about how proud he was of the work that his son Franklin has done, and I saw some of that when I sent our troops into Bosnia and I met some people who had worked with Franklin Graham to try to help the poor children in that war-torn land.

Billy and Ruth Graham have practiced the ministry of good citizenship, being friends with Presidents of both parties, counseling them in countless ways, always completely private, always completely genuine. Yesterday we sat in the

Oval Office reminiscing and talking about current circumstances, and I asked for Billy Graham's prayers for the wisdom and guidance of God. That is a part of his ministry as well.

Perhaps the most moving example of that came when Billy Graham spoke along with me and a number of others at the first service shortly after the bombing in Oklahoma City. And he knew he was speaking to a vast array of people who had been wounded by that incident. Most of them were Christians, but not all of them were. And yet he sought to speak to all of them, and he gave what I thought was one of the most honest messages I had ever heard a minister of the Word give. And I thought to myself as I watched him give it that only a man completely convicted, completely secure in his own faith, could have looked out at that vast wounded array of human beings and said, "I wish I could tell you that I understand completely why things like this happen. But I don't. Even after all these years, I don't. I don't know why this happened. I don't have an explanation for it. But the God we love is a God of love and mercy amidst all the suffering we are asked to endure. We are not supposed to understand everything but instead to lean on God."

And he made it more powerful because he was able to say to his fellow Americans, "Even after all these years, after I have searched the Scriptures and prayed for wisdom, I do not understand everything. I cannot explain this, but that makes the case for our faith even stronger." I'll remember that for as long as I live.

Finally, I thank Billy Graham and Ruth Graham for the ministry of their life and their personal example, for their extraordinary achievement of 5 children, 19 grandchildren, and I think now 8 great-grandchildren. If that achievement could be mirrored by every adult in America, we would have about 10 percent of the problems we've got today in this great country of ours.

I thank them for countless personal gestures that demonstrate that as private people they are what they seem to be in public. I thank them for always doing things that will enable them to minister to people they may not even know. I have said this in public before, but I want to say it again. When I was a small boy, about 12 years old, Billy Graham came to Little Rock, Arkansas, to preach a crusade. That town was torn part by racial conflict. Our high schools were closed there, and there were those who asked Billy Graham to segregate his audience in War Memorial Stadium so as not to roil the waters.

And I'll never forget that he said—and it was in the paper—that if he had to speak the Word of God to a segregated audience, he would violate his ministry, and he would not do it. And at the most intense time in the modern history of my State, everybody caved, and blacks and whites together poured into the football stadium. And when the invitation was given, they poured down together, down the aisles, and they forgot that they were supposed to be mad at each other, angry at each other, that one was supposed to consider the other somehow less than equal.

And he never preached a word about integrating the schools. He preached the Word of God, and he lived it by the power of his example. And one young boy from a modest family for a long time thereafter took just a little money out of his allowance every month and sent it to Billy Graham's Crusade. And I've lived with that all my life.

I'll never forget that when Billy Graham came back to Little Rock 30 years later, probably the most well-known man of God and faith in the world, he took time out one day to let me take him to see my pastor who he'd known 30 years before, because he was dying. And my elderly pastor, with only a few weeks to live, sat and talked to Billy Graham about their life, their work, their trips to the Holy Land, and the life to come. There was no one there. There were no cameras; there were no reporters; there was nothing to be gained. It was a simple, private, personal expression of common Christianity and gratitude for the life of a person who had given his life for their shared faith.

And finally, he got up to go. Billy looked at my pastor, W.O. Vaught, shriveled to less than 100 pounds, and he said, "Smile, W.O., next time I see you we'll be outside the Eastern Gates." I'll never forget that as long as I live.

So the Congress did a great thing; you have done a great thing; Billy and Ruth Graham have done a great thing in sharing this award with future generations of people who will need their help and their ministry even after they have passed their time on this Earth. For all that, as President and in my personal role as a citizen and a Christian, I am profoundly grateful.

I'd like Reverend Graham to come out now, and I will give him a copy of the bill which

I signed and the pen with which I signed it. And perhaps he'd like to say a word to you tonight.

Billy.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:08 p.m. in the Ballroom at the Renaissance Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to radio commentator Paul Harvey. H.R. 2657, to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham, approved February 13, was assigned Public Law No. 104-111.

Statement on Signing Legislation Making Technical Corrections to the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996

May 2, 1996

Today I have signed into law Senate Joint Resolution 53 ("Resolution"). This Resolution makes technical corrections to Public Law 104–134, the "Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996" ("Act"), which I signed into law on April 26, 1996.

Two of the corrections merit comment.

The Resolution repeals two paragraphs relating to the Tongass National Forest, which were mistakenly not deleted when the operative language was moved to another section.

The Resolution also includes the repeal of section 21104 of the Act, which relates to international population assistance programs and which was inadvertently included in the Act. Nevertheless, I believe that the level of funding that the Congress has provided for FY 1996 for these programs remains inadequate, given the critical importance of these services to protecting the health of women, strengthening families, and preventing unwanted pregnancies and abortions. I regret that the House and Senate were unable to come to an agreement to lift the severe limitations placed on U.S. programs by the FY 1996 Foreign Operations appropriations act. It is my hope that the Congress will remove these limitations and provide full funding for these programs in the FY 1997 appropriations process.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 2, 1996.

NOTE: S.J. Res. 53, approved May 2, was assigned Public Law No. 104–140. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 3.

The President's Radio Address

May 4, 1996

Good morning. This week was another good week for America. We learned that growth is up and unemployment is down. That's good for American jobs and good for America's families. We also had more good news on America's families today involving the Family and Medical Leave Act, which I was proud to sign in 1993. This week the bipartisan panel Congress created to study it reported that the law has helped more than one in six American employees take time off because of a serious family health problem, without any danger of losing their jobs. And almost 90 percent of the businesses found that complying with family and medical leave cost them little or nothing. This is making America's families stronger, promoting work and family.

That's what we have to do with welfare reform, too. Our job is to fix a welfare system that too often pulls families apart and turns it into one that helps families pull together, to fix a system that traps too many people in a cycle of dependency that ends up snaring their children as well, and instead, to create one that promotes jobs and independence.

For the last 3 years, we have been working hard to turn the welfare system around. All across America the welfare rolls are down, food stamp rolls are down, teen pregnancy rates are down compared to 4 years ago. And compared to 4 years ago, more and more people on welfare today are working as a condition of receiving welfare.

A lot of this has happened because our administration has worked very hard to free States from Federal rules and regulations which have built up over the years and which contribute to the flaws in the present system. We have slashed this redtape to 37 States, covering 75 percent of all the people on welfare in America, so that they can take steps to fix the broken system. State by State, we are building a welfare system that demands work, requires responsibility, and protects our children.

But more needs to be done. The American people need a welfare system that honors American values: work, family, and personal responsibility. In 1994, and again this year, I sent Congress a sweeping welfare reform plan that would impose strict time limits on how long people can stay on welfare and strict work requirements for people when they are on welfare. My plan would also provide more funding for child care, so single parents can go to work. And it would crack down on parents who skip out on their responsibility to pay child support.

If Congress sends me a welfare reform bill that is tough on work instead of tough on children and weak on work, I will gladly and proudly sign it. Meanwhile, I am going to keep moving ahead to fix the welfare system by promoting work and looking out for our children.

Today I'm acting to help teen mothers break free from the cycle of dependency for good. The only way for teen mothers to escape the welfare trap is to live at home, stay in school, and get the education they need to get a good job. We must make sure the welfare system demands that teen mothers follow the responsible path to independence.

Ohio has used freedom from Federal rules to implement a terrific program they call LEAP—Learning, Education, and Parenting. LEAP cuts welfare checks when teen mothers don't go to school, and rewards them when they do. And it works. A report released just this week by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation shows that for an important group of teens LEAP significantly increased the number of teen mothers who finished school, got jobs, and got off welfare. Every State should follow this example.

That's why today I'm announcing that every State must put in place a plan to keep teen mothers on welfare in school. We are going to audit the progress of every State and make the results public. Second, we are going to make teen mothers who drop out of school go back to school and sign contracts that spell out exactly how they are going to take responsibility for their own lives. And third, we are giving States immediate authority to provide bonuses to teen mothers who go to school and graduate, and to cut back the checks of those who don't.

Finally, I'm challenging every State in the country to use its power to keep children who have children at home where they belong. There should be no incentive to leave home for a bigger welfare check. Unfortunately, even though they can, most States don't require teen mothers to live at home. That's wrong. Of course, if there is an abusive situation at home, children should be living in another safe, responsible setting. But we have to make it clear that a baby doesn't give you a right, and won't give you the money, to leave home and drop out of school. Today we are moving to make responsibility a way of life, not an option.

These commonsense steps have bipartisan support. They will help teen parents escape the cycle of dependency and start down the path to a successful future for themselves and their children. Now Congress needs to do its job and pass welfare reform. I'm glad that a group of bipartisan lawmakers is working on welfare reform. If Congress sends me a clean welfare reform plan that demands work, demands responsibility, protects children, and helps families stay together, I will sign it. Until then, I'll keep working to do everything in my power to reform welfare, step by step and State by State.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Map Room at the White House. He signed a memorandum on the welfare initiative regarding teen parents on May 10.

Message on the Observance of Cinco de Mayo, 1996
May 4, 1996

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Cinco de Mayo.

Each year the Fifth of May reminds us of the blessings of our nation's rich cultural diversity. The Mexican people have made profound and lasting contributions to our society, enriching our national life with the values of family, faith, and love of country.

In commemorating the victory of Mexico's army at the Battle of Puebla, we rededicate ourselves to strengthening the bonds of friendship and partnership between the peoples of Mexico and the United States. Our nations share a legacy of independence and courage in the face of adversity, and each time we celebrate Cinco de Mayo, we reaffirm our reverence for these ideals.

Hillary and I send best wishes to all for a wonderful holiday.

BILL CLINTON

Remarks at the White House Correspondents Association Dinner
May 4, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. Carl, Terry, Mr. Vice President and Mrs. Gore, Mr. Speaker, Governor, to distinguished head table guests, to all the honorees tonight, my colleagues in the administration, to all the entertainers that made all the politicians feel that they came out to get a thrill instead of listen to me.

I apologize for being late tonight, but, as you know, I was at a charity event at Chelsea's school, auctioning off a game of golf. It brought in a few dollars.

Audience member. How much? Tell us how much.

Audience member. Could I ask a followup? [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, I can tell you this: I know I was criticized for putting it up, but it was not bought by the Ambassador from Iran. [*Laughter*] I was hoping Ralph Reed would buy it, but he didn't even bid. [*Laughter*]

Anyway, it got a little money, but the thing that disappointed me was that it didn't generate as much as I had hoped. So I was able to generate some serious cash for the Sidwell Friends School; I auctioned off the shoes I wore the day I shook hands with President Kennedy. [*Laughter*]

By the way, if there's anybody here who would be willing to pay $500,000 for a Presidential humidor, I'll be happy to go out and buy one for you.

Even though I was late, my staff kept me apprised of the evening. This may come as a surprise to you, but you're not the only ones who do pool reports. Since not everybody at the White House can be at every public event, we distribute our own pool reports on what the press has been up to. And so Mike McCurry handed me these notes when I arrived. This is what happened before I got here:

6:02: Helen Thomas arrives at the Hilton. In accordance with time-honored tradition, at 6:04 she asks the first question—[*laughter*]—"Mr. Bartender, can you make a wine spritzer?"

6:22: A van pulls up to the front door. All five members of the McLaughlin Group emerge—[*laughter*]—without a referee, bickering loudly. [*Laughter*] The topic: Is it Kondracke's turn to sit up front on the way home? [*Laughter*]

6:25: Andrea Mitchell arrives on the arm of Alan Greenspan. Greenspan pays the coatroom attendant one dollar—[*laughter*]—and mentions that last year it only cost 75 cents. One minute later, five people in the immediate vicinity rush to call their brokers. [*Laughter*]

6:52: Jim Miklaszewski discreetly tells Brian Williams he's sitting in Tom Brokaw's chair. [*Laughter*]

7:09: Bill Plante arrives at the CBS table and receives many favorable comments about his new George Clooney haircut. [*Laughter*] One CBS executive present, however, suggested he

might try a hairstyle from "Chicago Hope" instead. [*Laughter*]

7:15: Joe Klein introduces the entire Newsweek table to his imaginary friend—[*laughter*]—whom he identifies as "Anonymous." [*Laughter*]

7:39: Brian Williams is back in Tom Brokaw's seat. [*Laughter*]

8:09: Sarah McClendon confronts a man seated at the Vanity Fair table, demanding to know what he has done with the real Oliver Stone. [*Laughter*] Visibly flustered, the man offers up a half-hearted explanation involving Cuban nationalists. [*Laughter*]

8:35: Breaking news. Wolf Blitzer breathlessly does a live feed from the front lawn of the Hilton to announce, "CNN has learned the dessert will be mocha puffs and chocolate sauce." [*Laughter*]

9:06: The President finally arrives at the southeast entrance. Running after him is pool reporter Mark Knoller, who appears to be wearing the shoes President Clinton wore when he shook hands with President Kennedy. [*Laughter*] Paid a pretty good price for them, too.

Well, that's what happened before I got here. Hillary and I are delighted to be with you tonight. I have only one criticism. I took a look at those ticket prices. They seem pretty high to me. So tonight, by Executive order, I am authorizing the release of 1,000 additional tickets. [*Laughter*]

You know who I'm really glad to see here tonight? Howard Fineman—[*laughter*]—where I can keep an eye on him. [*Laughter*] And I mean that—sincerely. [*Laughter*]

I'm glad to be here tonight with our guest speaker. Now, I make it a policy not to mention inflammatory public figures by name, but I am very pleased to share this podium tonight with the author of—[*laughter*]—"What's-His-Name Is a Big, Fat Idiot." [*Laughter*]

I feel a certain kinship with Al Franken. We frankly had a terrible 1994. I had Speaker Gingrich's victory in the midterm elections, and he had "Stuart Saves His Family." [*Laughter*] He asked me to tell that. But we have rebounded pretty well. I mean, after all, I am still here, and he made a gazillion dollars on that book. As much as I enjoyed Al's book, shortly after buying it, I came to regret my purchase. The very week I bought the book, it replaced Hillary's as the number one bestseller.

We have another noted author here, Speaker Gingrich. He's right over there. He's the fellow next to the baby raccoon and the iguana. [*Laughter*] Mr. Speaker, as long as you're here, I think, out in public, in front of everybody, we ought to do a little work on the budget negotiations. You give me my Medicare plan, and you can have my mocha puff and chocolate sauce. [*Laughter*]

It's too bad Senator Dole couldn't join us tonight, but thank goodness one of us is free to watch the kids. [*Laughter*] I must say, seriously now, that was a very interesting assertion he put forth. I sort of thought most kids would rather stay with me than Bob Dole. I mean, after all, they'd get to play Nintendo in the Situation Room. [*Laughter*] Leon promises to let me know whenever "Barney" comes on.

But this babysitter debate raises only one of many pertinent questions that voters have to ask themselves before they choose the next President. An interesting line—for example, let's say you were going on vacation for a couple of weeks. Who do you trust to water your plants? [*Laughter*] Bob Dole or Bill Clinton? [*Laughter*]

And suppose you were too busy shaking hands tonight and you didn't get to eat. And you go home tonight and you decide to order a pizza. Who do you trust to select the toppings? [*Laughter*] Bob Dole or Bill Clinton? [*Laughter*]

Or what about this scenario? Bob Dole is on a train headed toward Spring Valley at 65 miles an hour. [*Laughter*] Bill Clinton is traveling by car from the opposite direction at 35 miles an hour. Given the fact that the train has twice as far to travel as the car, who do you trust to arrive in Spring Valley first? Bob Dole or Bill Clinton? [*Laughter*]

Now, if you don't think these questions are relevant, and they may not seem relevant, I ask you, who are we to question the wisdom of Senator Dole's focus groups? [*Laughter*]

Let me say this, too. This is a serious comment. I think Senator Dole made a mistake not keeping Mary Matalin on his team. And Mary, I saw you up here earlier. Where are you? You are welcome on my team, and I don't care who you're married to. [*Laughter*] Any bald-headed Cajun knows we're right and they're wrong. [*Laughter*]

As you know, this is the very first time in our Nation's history a sitting President is facing a sitting majority leader in the fall campaign. To be fair to all concerned, it's a difficult situation. Just imagine trying to do the job you were

hired to do with an adversary breathing down your neck, questioning your every move, waiting for your next misstep. Trent Lott ought to just cut it out. [*Laughter*]

Now, many of you have been writing about my so-called stealth campaign for reelection. We hit our first major setback this week when the RNC broke the code on our press releases. But I want you to know I'm holding firm to my strategy, and my strategy is working. In fact, according to the New York Times, my Vice President is closer to formally announcing his candidacy than I am. [*Laughter*]

By the way, I want to congratulate the Times on that "Al Gore Wants to be President" scoop. [*Laughter*] Pulitzer's in the bag. [*Laughter*]

Some of you have been asking for 6 months now, when is this announcement speech? In keeping with the stealth campaign strategy, Mike McCurry had this idea that instead of the traditional announcement speech, tonight I should just give an off-the-record announcement on what he calls—he calls—"psych background." [*Laughter*] As if we didn't have enough trouble. So that way I could give you some insight into my truly secret, private thoughts about this election.

So, if we can all agree on the ground rules—[*laughter*]—I'd like to give you a sense of the musings of my inner candidate. [*Laughter*] You can attribute these remarks to a source inside the President's suit. [*Laughter*]

Now, I had occasion to give this topic considerable thought last weekend as I was going through the Sunday classified ads. [*Laughter*] Gosh, there must have been 8½ million listings, all of them at good wages. [*Laughter*] But I couldn't find a single job I'd prefer to this one.

So, in lieu of a formal announcement speech, you can report on psych background that Bill Clinton is under the strong impression that America is a great country, and that we are living in an age of possibility. Bill Clinton suspects that America is moving in the right direction, but we have to keep working together to find common ground. Bill Clinton is inclined to think he can help us meet America's challenges with just one more term.

Now, I'd like to go back on the record to say thank you and good night. [*Laughter*] So you may report that Bill Clinton said, "Thank you, and good night."

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:17 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Carl Leubersdorf, outgoing president, and Terence Hunt, incoming president, White House Correspondents Association; Gov. George W. Bush of Texas; Ralph Reed, Jr., executive director, Christian Coalition; Howard Fineman, columnist, Newsweek magazine; comedian Al Franken; Leon E. Panetta, White House Chief of Staff; and political consultant Mary Matalin.

Statement on Violent Crime

May 5, 1996

For 5 straight years before I took office, violent crime increased in America. Because of our tough and smart decisions to put more cops on the street and get kids, guns, and drugs off the street, we are now beginning to reverse the trend in violent crime.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions

May 4, 1996

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1), and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance

with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council.

The Government of Iraq remains far from compliance with its obligations under applicable Security Council resolutions. The U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM) Chairman Ekeus remarked recently in Washington that Iraq may be hiding up to 16 SCUD missiles, possibly armed with biological warheads. Iraqi officials blatantly violated Security Council resolutions in March when they repeatedly obstructed UNSCOM officials attempting to search buildings in Baghdad for weapons of mass destruction material. Iraqi officials may have removed or destroyed incriminating material during the delay. In a report released on April 11, UNSCOM expressed its concern that Iraq may still be engaged in weapons activities prohibited under Security Council Resolution 687. Iraq continues to evade its duty to return looted Kuwaiti property and help account for hundreds of civilians who disappeared in Kuwait during the occupation. Iraq still provides refuge for known terrorists. The Security Council took all these factors into account in maintaining sanctions without change at its March 8 review.

Saddam Hussein's unwillingness to comply with the norms of international behavior extends to his regime's continuing threat to Iraqi citizens throughout the country. We and our coalition partners continue to enforce the no-fly zones over northern and southern Iraq as part of our efforts to deter Iraq's use of aircraft against its population. Iraq's repression of its southern Shi'a population continues, with policies aimed at destroying the Marsh Arabs' way of life as well as the ecology of the southern marshes.

The human rights situation throughout Iraq remains unchanged. Saddam Hussein shows no signs of complying with U.N. Security Council Resolution 683, which demands that Iraq cease the repression of its own people. The U.N. Human Rights Commission (UNHRC) recently adopted a strongly-worded resolution condemning "massive and extremely grave violations of human rights" carried out by the Government of Iraq. The resolution draws heavily from the report of the Special Rapporteur of the UNHRC. The resolution also continues the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. Parliamentary elections held in late March were as much a farce as last November's "Referendum" on Saddam Hussein's rule. Candidates were required to pledge their loyalty to Saddam Hussein and his Ba'ath Party in order to be eligible. All legitimate international observers and Iraqi opposition groups rejected the legitimacy of both the process and the outcome of the elections.

The United States, together with international and humanitarian relief organizations, continues to provide humanitarian assistance to the people of northern Iraq. Security conditions in northern Iraq remain tenuous at best, with Iranian and PKK activity adding to the ever-present threat from Baghdad. We continue to facilitate talks between the two major Kurdish groups in an effort to help them resolve their differences and increase stability in northern Iraq.

Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 986, Iraq is authorized to sell a prescribed amount of oil for the purchase of humanitarian supplies. Discussions between U.N. and Iraqi officials on implementation of the Resolution continued in April. It remains unclear whether Iraq is serious about implementing the Resolution as drafted. We would like to see the provisions of Resolution 986 implemented, but only with the safeguards envisioned in the Resolution to ensure that Saddam Hussein cannot abuse the Resolution's humanitarian purposes.

In October 1994, the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 949, which demanded that Iraq not utilize its forces to threaten its neighbors or U.N. operations in Iraq and that it not redeploy or enhance its military capacity in southern Iraq. In view of Saddam Hussein's proven record of unreliability, we have felt it prudent to maintain a significant U.S. force presence in the region in order to maintain the capability to respond rapidly to possible Iraqi aggression or threats against its neighbors. We recently deployed an air expeditionary force to Jordan as part of that presence.

Since my last report, the Multinational Interception Force (MIF), conducting the maritime enforcement of sanctions against Iraq, has encountered renewed attempts to smuggle commodities from Iraq. During March and April, MIF vessels intercepted vessels carrying Iraqi petroleum products worth an estimated $1.1 million and Iraqi dates worth an estimated $1.4 million. The expeditious acceptance of these diverted vessels by Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, Oman and the United Arab Emirates has greatly contributed to the deterrent effect of MIF sanctions enforcement operations. It has also enhanced enforcement efforts by allowing MIF vessels es-

corting the diverted vessels to return to patrol operations.

We continue to achieve a significant foreign policy objective in maintaining multinational participation in the MIF. Ships from the United States, the United Kingdom, and The Netherlands participated in MIF operations from February through April of this year. Additionally, we have received firm commitments or serious proposals from Australia, New Zealand, Belgium and Canada to send frigates to participate in the MIF in late 1996 and early 1997.

Other countries have made different but important contributions toward enforcing the U.N. sanctions against Iraq. For example, Honduras recently deflagged four vessels and Belize deflagged three vessels. India has initiated "registry deletion" proceedings against vessels operating under its flag, and the United Arab Emirates is currently considering the deflagging of a vessel diverted twice for violating the sanctions.

We continue to provide briefings to the U.N. Iraq Sanctions Committee as part of our close coordination and consultation with the U.N. and with Security Council members on the issue of maritime Iraq sanctions enforcement. Evidence was provided concerning continued Iranian complicity in the export of Iraqi petroleum products through the provision to vessels violating the sanctions of false paperwork, the use of Iranian territorial waters, and warnings regarding the location of MIF vessels. Evidence was also provided concerning the acceptance of protection fees by Iranian officials in return for this assistance.

Security Council Resolution 687 affirmed that Iraq is liable under international law for compensating the victims of its unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. Although the U.N. Compensation Commission (UNCC) has approved some 790,000 individual awards worth about $3.0 billion against Iraq, it has been able to authorize the payment of only the fixed awards for serious personal injury or death (aggregating approximately $13.5 million). The remainder of the awards cannot be paid because the U.N. Compensation Fund lacks sufficient funding. The awards are supposed to be financed by a deduction from the proceeds of future Iraqi oil sales, once such sales are permitted to resume. However, Iraq's refusal to meet the Security Council's terms for a limited resumption of oil sales has left the UNCC without adequate financial resources to pay the awards. Iraq's intransigence means that the victims of its aggression remain uncompensated for their losses 5 years after the end of the Gulf War.

To conclude, Iraq remains a serious threat to regional peace and stability. I remain determined that Iraq comply fully with all its obligations under the U.N. Security Council Resolutions. My Administration will continue to oppose any relaxation of sanctions until Iraq demonstrates peaceful intentions through its overall compliance with all of the U.N. Security Council Resolutions.

I appreciate the support of the Congress for our efforts and shall continue to keep the Congress informed about this important issue.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 6.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Proposed Legislation To Promote Adoption

May 6, 1996

Dear _____*:*

I am writing to express my strong support for The Adoption Promotion and Stability Act of 1996. Today, families seeking to adopt children face significant barriers, including high adoption costs, complex regulations, and outdated assumptions. I am committed to breaking down these barriers and making adoption easier. Promoting adoption is one of the most important things we can do to strengthen American

families and give more children what every child in America deserves—loving parents and a healthy home. This legislation will help children in need of adoptive homes to be united with devoted parents.

My Administration has worked hard to promote adoption in general, and adoption of children with special needs in particular. We championed the Family and Medical Leave Act which enables parents to take time off to adopt a child without losing their jobs or their health insurance. We strongly supported the Multi-Ethnic Placement Act to help increase the number of adoptions by prohibiting discrimination based on race or ethnicity, and we remain committed to enforcing that law vigorously. As part of our 1993 deficit reduction package, I signed into law a provision that requires ERISA plans to provide the same health coverage for adopted children as for biological children of plan participants. We have worked to preserve Federal support for adoption of children with special needs, and increased by 60 percent the number of children with special needs who have been adopted with Federal adoption assistance.

But together we can and must do more. I strongly support the adoption tax credit in this bill. It will alleviate a significant barrier to adoption and allow middle class families, for whom adoption may be prohibitively expensive, to adopt children to love and nurture. It will encourage adoption of children with special needs. It will put parents seeking to build a family through adoption on a more equal footing with other families.

I believe that the bill is consistent with the Administration's policy and my longstanding goal to end the historical bias against interracial adoptions, which too often has meant interminable waits for children to be matched with parents of the same race. The Administration also has some concerns regarding some of the provisions used to offset the cost of the bill and would like to work with the Congress on these provisions. In addition, we need to ensure that unnecessary provisions are not included in the legislation.

The Adoption Promotion and Stability Act is an important first step toward meeting the challenge of removing barriers to adoption. I look forward to working with you so that the dreams of the waiting children in this country to have permanent homes and loving families can become a reality.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Richard K. Armey, House majority leader; Richard A. Gephardt, House minority leader; and Bill Archer, chairman, and Sam Gibbons, ranking member, House Committee on Ways and Means. This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 6 but was not issued as a White House press release.

Statement on the Death of William Colby

May 6, 1996

Hillary and I were saddened to learn of the death of former Director of Central Intelligence William Colby. Through a quarter century at the CIA, William Colby played a pivotal role in shaping our Nation's intelligence community. A dedicated public servant, he ably led the Agency through challenging times. He made tough decisions when necessary, and he was always guided by the core values of the country he loved. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends in this time of sorrow and grieving.

Remarks During "In Performance at the White House"
May 6, 1996

Thank you very much. There is another benefit to you that we heard them all practicing, which is you won't have to endure our impulse sing-along night. We did that yesterday. [*Laughter*]

The two artists with us tonight are classic examples of the splendid, intricate tapestry of American music. Both have expanded their own musical horizons and ours as they have woven the richness of their own heritage into popular culture.

In 1993, these Grammy Award winners performed during the inaugural celebration for Hillary and me and for all of America. They were truly a highlight of that extraordinary week. This evening we are thrilled to have them join us for the first time here at the White House.

It has been said of Aaron Neville that when he sings, "It's like a knowing angel who has experienced both Heaven and the gritty reality of a working man's life." Aaron's style reflects the lush multicultural mix of his native city of New Orleans. He has blended rock and funk, gospel and country, and rhythm and blues to create the rich, exciting sound that is unmistakably all his own.

Our other guest reflects the finest spirit of our great country. Her willingness to experiment while maintaining the best of the past has helped her sell more than 30 million recordings. By combining the mariachi sounds of Mexico, big band swing, rock and roll, Broadway, and opera, she has won devoted followers everywhere in the music world. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to introduce Linda Ronstadt.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Teleconference Remarks on Kick Butts Day From Woodbridge, New Jersey
May 7, 1996

[*The President's remarks were joined in progress.*]

The President. ——And we have proposed an FDA regulation to crack down on—[*inaudible*]. We've proposed ways to make it harder for children and for teenagers to buy cigarettes by reducing their access to vending machines and free samples. But we also need people who are—[*inaudible*]—be more rigorous. We just spoke to three young people here who said they had no trouble at all buying cigarettes. Two were 16 and one was 13, and they said the overall success rate was something like 74 percent for the students in the middle and high schools who—[*inaudible*]—to buy cigarettes. So we're going to have to work on that.

I just want to say that I believe that this is a problem we can solve if we work together, if we see young people like these young people here working with their parents, their schools, their communities to fight against the lure and the availability of smoking for teenagers. And we're going to do what we can at the national level to do our part as well.

Mark Green, I want to especially thank you for your role in making today happen and for being a critical national leader on this issue; for your successful campaign to ban cigarette machines in New York City in 1990; to your leadership in organizing this national effort. You've really been a pioneer, and we're very grateful to you. And I thought you might like to give a brief overview of this day.

Can you hear me, Mark? We may have lost him.

[*Mark Green, New York City public advocate, said that Kick Butts Day is an opportunity for kids to talk back and fight back against the tobacco merchants and that it is a way to discourage kids from starting to smoke. He then described the effectiveness of tobacco ads di-*

rected at children and praised Kick Butts Day as an effort to educate children.]

The President. Thank you very much, Mark. And I want to say again how much I appreciate the work you have been doing. You have been out there on this issue a long time, and I think the country is coming around. And I think that the young people like those who joined me here today are going to play a critical role in helping us to defeat this problem.

I would like to ask Governor Chiles of Florida, if he is on the phone, to say a few words. He has had a terrific fight in Florida in his efforts to protect children from the dangers of smoking, and I honor him for his courage and his determination not to back down in the face of intense pressure.

Governor Chiles?

[*Governor Lawton Chiles said he was with a group of PRIDE children from several schools, high school students who put on performances with antidrug messages. He added that the Florida Legislature had not overridden his veto and the State's lawsuit against tobacco companies is going forward. The Governor then introduced student Lamont Tinker who indicated that smoking is bad for the whole body and that the Kick Butts campaign is a good thing.*]

The President. Thank you.

Governor Chiles. Mr. President, Lamont and myself and all the kids at Pine View and all of our PRIDE young people are just delighted to have a chance to join with you today.

The President. Thank you, Governor. And I want to thank that young student. He did a terrific job.

I want to say again to the young people who are listening on this call, you can very often have a lot more influence on your peers than the rest of us can. And I'll keep working in Washington to do what we should be doing at the national level, but you have to do your part in making sure that in your community people don't sell cigarettes to minors, that we don't have an excessive exposure to advertising directed at young people. And you can do it. You can have an impact on your classmates not to start smoking, and we can turn this around.

So if we all work together, we'll be successful. And again, I want to thank you all for being a part of this Kick Butts Day and for being a part of a commitment to give your generation a healthy and strong future.

God bless you all, and thank you very much.

Governor Romer, are you on the phone?

Governor Romer. Yes, I am.

The President. Would you like to say a word about your efforts in Colorado?

[*Governor Roy Romer introduced Colorado, California, and Texas students active in the antismoking campaign. He then introduced a student who had participated in a Butt Out Day survey of local stores in which she found tobacco products in the same aisle with candy and ice cream.*]

Governor Romer. Mr. President, thank you. I just wanted to give you a report from the West. I really appreciate your leadership in this effort.

The President. Thank you. And I want to thank Ageno and the other students for the work they did on the survey, and for their reports.

Keep after it. We'll keep working, and we'll keep moving forward. I feel very good about this. The degree of the intensity that so many young people in America feel about this issue is the most hopeful thing about it, and we just all need to stay in there with them and keep working. We can whip this thing.

Thank you all very much, in all the 11 cities on the phone, thank you very, very much.

NOTE: The President spoke by telephone at 1:25 p.m. from Woodbridge High School to participants across the Nation. In his remarks, he referred to Ageno Otii, a student at Morey Middle School, Denver, CO. Due to telephone difficulties, the President's opening remarks were inaudible, and a portion of the remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks on Kick Butts Day in Woodbridge
May 7, 1996

Thank you very much. Senator Lautenberg, thank you for your presence here and your tireless efforts to help protect young people from the dangers of smoking. Mayor McGreevey, thank you for your warm welcome and your strong leadership and the powerful statement that you made today. I hope all of the citizens who elected you were listening. And Jennifer Crea, thank you. Didn't she do a terrific job? Let's give her a hand. [*Applause*] I want to thank Bill Hait from the New Jersey Cancer Institute and Dave Brown and Harry Carson from the New York Giants for appearing here before me. I thank your superintendent, Lee Seitz, and your principal, Dave Peterson, for making me feel welcome here today.

I thank the band for being here today. And I want to thank Professor John Slade and your peer leader, Pam Chesky, and the students who met with me earlier to talk about their efforts to stem the tide of teen smoking. I want to thank all of you who came up with these signs; they're great. I love this—they're great signs.

In his absence, I also want to recognize one person who is not here, the public advocate for New York City, Mark Green, who came up with the idea for this National Kick Butts Day and organized it in cooperation with the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids. He's been working on this now for about 6 years, and I really appreciate his commitment.

I want to talk to the young people here a little in the beginning about how this issue of young people smoking—or hopefully, young people not smoking—fits into my vision for your lives. There is a reason that I became the first President ever to take on this issue, and it's not a negative reason. It is true that previous Presidents have not done it, and it may be that the power of the lobbies on the other side had something to do with that. But I felt that we had no choice.

The Vice President lost a sister to lung cancer at a very early age whom he loved very much. My mother, who died of cancer at the age of 70, smoked two packs a day for most of her life till my 8-year-old daughter talked her out of it, much in the same way Senator Lautenberg's daughter talked him out of it. But beyond that, I want you to understand that we are doing what we're doing because I feel we have no choice, and let me explain why.

I want all the young people here to grow up in an America that is stronger and more full of opportunity for you than any time in our history before. And I believe that in order for that to happen it is my responsibility, number one, to try to help provide opportunities for all those who are willing to work for them; number two, to try to help bring the American people together so that all this diversity—I look out here in this student body and I see the face of America—we have more racial and ethnic groups represented in our great, throbbing, thriving democracy than any democracy in human history. And if we can prove that we can all work together and help each other and respect each other, that will be an enormous asset in the global society of the 21st century. I want our country to be strong and to lead the world for peace and sreedom.

And in order for all that to happen, we've got to have strong people. We have to give you the tools to make the most of your own lives. The first and most important of those is a good education. But you also need a clean environment and safe streets and communities that work and the opportunity to be supported in a strong family. All these things require a partnership between people in public life and private citizens.

But none of this will amount to anything, not the economic opportunities, not the opportunity for America to come together and bridge our differences and be a stronger community, not the strength of your country, not even the quality of the educational system or the fact that we got the crime rate going down and we're continuing to fight for a clean environment, unless you—unless you—make the decision to make the most of your own life.

And it starts with the decision to respect who you are, to respect the resources that God gave you, and to make the most of them. That's what this anti-teen smoking campaign is all about. We now know what the health dangers are. We now know that, advertising notwithstanding, it

is not a glamorous thing to risk your health and your life.

The students that I just met with from Woodbridge showed me an incredible collection of tobacco ads and trinkets, T-shirts, hats and other giveaways, and tobacco products, all of which were found right here in your community, and all of which your fellow students thought were enticing young people to smoke. Now, you've got a group of students here, and we recently—just before I came out, I talked with students in 11 cities throughout the country, all of whom are committed to turning this around. And I know that in many ways the influence of young people on their peers is far greater than the influence of older people, even the President—maybe especially the President. [*Laughter*]

So this is very hopeful. But our administration has issued a challenge to people all across America and especially to our young people to create a groundswell of involvement to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco.

Those of you who are volunteering in this effort are collecting information about advertising and availability of cigarettes, which can help to save lives. It can certainly help to influence business owners to be more vigilant in checking the age of tobacco customers. You may even do something like young people did in Santa Ana, California, when they got billboard companies to remove cigarette billboards located close to schools. You can help encourage people to stay away from tobacco, and you can take on the message of the advertising.

Now, all of these things are profoundly important. You've heard all the statistics, but let me just tell you the one that grips me the most: 3,000 people under the age of 18 start smoking every day, and 1,000 of those 3,000 will die sooner because of it. Oh, maybe they'll die at 60 instead of 65. That may seem a long way away to you when you're 18; it seems right around the corner to me. [*Laughter*] And those 5 years get a lot more important to you as you go along. Not only that, you want to be healthy while you're living them if you can.

Now, we can't control our genetic makeup; we can't control what may happen to us in an unfortunate accident. Some of us will, it's terrible to say, may even become victims of crime. That is no reason for giving up. We should control those things which we can control about our lives. Our obligation is to live as long and as well as we can, to do as much as we can with whatever lot we get in life. We should not be self-destructive; we should do no harm.

That's what this whole thing is about: 3,000 kids start smoking every day; 1,000 will die sooner because of it. All the other facts are not nearly as compelling as that. Do you want to take a one in three chance that you're going to shorten your life?

Let me tell you something. This is hard for you to believe, but I can actually remember when I was in high school. [*Laughter*] I have never missed one of my high school reunions, never, not a one. Every 5 years I show up, every 5 years. I have followed the lives of my classmates, and I am telling you, there are consequences to all the decisions we make.

Your country needs you. We need you to be well-educated. We need you to be able to raise strong families. We need you to be able to raise good kids yourselves. We need you to be able to make contributions to communities like this one. We need you to prove all the cynics wrong when they say we can't adjust to this new society in which we're living, and no country can be a democracy with as much diversity as we have. We need you for all those reasons.

But you deserve the life you are going to be given. Do not throw it away. One in three chance that you will end your life sooner—that is a lousy bargain for no benefit. Don't do it.

I'll tell you something else we know, and it's already been said today, but I want to say it again. About 90 percent of all new smokers are young people under the age of 18. Almost a hundred percent of people who are actually addicted to smoking start when they're under 18. You know, occasionally somebody will try it when they're 21 or 22 or 25. Almost never does anybody become a regular, addicted smoker if they don't start when they're young.

That's an important thing to know. I want to say to all of you, I know you can't do this alone. I'm gratified at the willingness of the adults I met today to support you. I'm encouraged by the statements of the political leaders here today in support of this endeavor. I know that there are things that we have to do as well, but I also want to encourage more people in this community to help. Our religious institutions, our churches, our synagogues in America, increasingly our temples and our mosques—people imparting values to young people to stand up and make the most of their own lives and

to say no. And again I say, we need you young people to influence one another.

We have, as you know, proposed ways to crack down on advertising—Senator Lautenberg referred to it—that make—advertising that makes young people think smoking is cool. Last August I announced the Food and Drug Administration's proposed regulations to make it harder for minors to buy cigarettes by reducing their access to vending machines and free samples and by limiting ads that appeal to young people.

In January we issued the Synar regulation, named for the late former Congressman from Oklahoma, Mike Synar, to demand that in return for the Federal money they get, States must do more to enforce their own laws. The amazing thing is that it is illegal for children to smoke in every State in America right now, but the laws are not being enforced. Now we say if you want the Federal money, enforce your own laws and do the right thing.

In March of this year we had a meeting at the White House with over a hundred leaders in the areas of health, religion, sports, business, education, and other services to children to highlight what they are now doing to help prevent young people from starting to smoke and to pledge an even more intense, unified effort. We know businesses have a special role, and I want to talk about this a moment. Businesses, of course, have the legal right to sell cigarettes to adults, but they also have a legal and moral responsibility to prevent the sale to minors.

I met with a number of your students, as I said before. Three of them told me they went out to see if they could buy cigarettes. Two were 16. One tried 10 times; the other tried 5. They were 15 for 15 in buying cigarettes and not even being carded—15 for 15. One was 13, and smiled in a way that said "I know I look 13, not 18." He was 3 for 8. And none of those 3 people that sold him those cigarettes thought he was 18 years of age, not a single one. So there's a responsibility on the part of business to do better.

I was proud to announce at the White House in March that the chairman of the A&P supermarket chain will recommend to his board this summer that the whole chain discontinue the use of cigarette vending machines by the end of the year. And you may have heard that just last week, the 3M Company and the Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility reached an agreement that 3M would no longer accept tobacco advertising for its billboards, and good for them. This is the first major national media company to take this step. I want to commend Livio DeSimone, the chairman and CEO of 3M, and Reverend Michael Crosby of the Interfaith Center for this remarkable accomplishment.

And finally, I'd like to say something to the tobacco companies. Of course, the students have to do their part, and ultimately, the decision is theirs. Of course, the rest of us have to do our part. But you in the tobacco business now surely see the clear emerging consensus in America that advertising, billboards, and promotions should not appeal to the children of this country.

And so I urge you, be responsible. Do not stay outside of and apart from this debate. Do not engage in practices the American people have rejected. Agree to the commonsense restrictions proposed by the FDA last year on advertising that affects children. Join with us. Do the right thing. Don't do the wrong thing. Do the right thing. Do it now and help us. Play your role in stopping this problem before it starts for millions and millions and millions of young Americans.

I say again to you in closing, the young people here in this auditorium and throughout this country, those of us who are my age and older, we've lived most of our lives. Whatever happens to us, we probably have more yesterdays than tomorrows. This is about you. It's about your future. It's about the kind of America you will live in. It's the kind of America you will leave for your children. We are moving into this era of absolutely unimaginable possibilities, in which, if my generation does its job right, we will leave to you more security from being destroyed from without, more harmony of people working together in this country, and more opportunity than any generation of Americans has ever known.

But you have to take advantage of the opportunity. And that means you need a good education. It means you're entitled to good schools and safe streets and a clean environment. But first, it means you have to decide to do no harm to yourself. Begin with that.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2 p.m. in the gymnasium at Woodbridge High School. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor James E. McGreevey of Woodbridge; student Jennifer Crea, who intro-

duced the President; William Hait, director, Cancer Institute of New Jersey; New York Giants football player Dave Brown and former New York Giants football player Harry Carson; and John Slade, professor, Rutgers University Medical School.

Remarks at a Democratic Dinner in Jersey City, New Jersey
May 7, 1996

Thank you very much. Thank you so much. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the warm New Jersey welcome. Whoopi Goldberg, thank you for what you said and what you've done and for all the time you have given and the time you're willing to give because you never forgot where you came from and never stopped caring about how other people are doing who aren't as fortunate as you are. Thank you, and God bless you.

I want to thank all the dinner chairs and Chairman Fowler and your State chairman, Tom Byrne, and my former colleagues Jim Florio and Brendan Byrne, and Peter Duchin, who I've been enjoying for a year or two now, since I was a younger man. I want to say a special word of appreciation to Ray Lesniak because it's his birthday tonight, so I know we're all glad—[*applause*].

I want to thank Senator Lautenberg for what he said and for what he's done in Washington, for standing up especially for the environment under a period of incredibly intense assault from the majority in Congress. [*Applause*] Yes, you ought to clap for him because he did that.

And as he leaves the United States Senate, I'd like to thank Senator Bradley for his 18 years of service to New Jersey and to America, for many, many years of friendship, counsel, and advice to me, and for the support that he gave this administration in the last 3½ years. I know we all wish him well, and we know that the next chapter of his life will doubtless be just as exciting as the ones that have gone before. Thank you very much, Bill, and God bless you.

You know, there have been a lot of sort of asides tonight about why Congressman Torricelli is not here. I think he is here for you, because he's down there voting on something you care about. And I have a message for those—if there was some designed effort to keep him from coming up here tonight, guess what? He's still going to get the contributions, and we still know where he is, and we know what's at stake, and we're going to elect him in November, so it doesn't make any difference.

One thing you know about Bob Torricelli is that he will stand up and fight for you with every fiber of his being. He doesn't do anything halfway; he is full of passion. He will fight for the water you drink, the land you live on, the air you breathe, the education of your children, the safety of your streets, and the example of your country as a beacon of freedom and democracy.

He's been leading the fight to protect Sterling Forest here, the watershed for most of northern New Jersey. He wrote a section of the Superfund act that is focused on the chemical sites that are polluted here, something I am determined to see us finish the work on and another reason I don't want to see any further attempts to erode our investment in environmental protection. Bob Torricelli will protect all that.

So I ask you to do what you can for the next 6 months to send Bob Torricelli to the United States Senate. Bill Bradley's shoes may be impossible to fill, but the people of New Jersey deserve someone fighting for them who is on their side and fighting for their future, not someone in the grip of an ideological theory that will only undermine our ability to go forward together. So I ask you again, do what you can, send him to the Senate. Do what you can for yourselves and your children and your future. We need Bob Torricelli, and I'm going to depend on you to deliver New Jersey for us.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't want to keep you a long time tonight, but I want to just give a speech that in some ways is not particularly political. And after, I'm going to ask you to do something that is intensely political. Usually these fundraisers—we all know that our political system wouldn't work without them, but

a lot of times I think you come and go and you have your blood stirred, but I wonder if, when you leave, you think you have done your part and that's all there is to it.

I want to talk to you tonight about what I believe is really going on in this country now, what I think is really at stake in this election, and why I hope you believe your financial contributions are only the beginning of your responsibilities as citizens for the next 6 months.

We are clearly living through a time of change as profound as any the United States has endured in a hundred years in terms of the ways we work and live. Every so often our country is confronted with huge challenges, either to our very existence or at least to the ideals with which we started, that all of us are created equal and that we have inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the Government is instituted to promote the general, the common welfare.

We had a lot of trouble getting started in working that out. Then we had to fight a great Civil War to hold the country together and to redeem the promise of equality by extending it when it had to be extended. And then, 100 years ago, we faced a period of change rather like today, when we moved from the farm to the factory, from the country to the city. There were vast new opportunities, but there was a lot of uprooting; a lot of people's lives were dislocated. And the progressive era began, with Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson saying that the power of the United States Government should be used to curb the abuses of that era and to make sure its benefits could be extended to all Americans. They had the antitrust laws, the child laws, the environment protection laws, all designed to let us have the benefits of the new industrial age without being broken by it, without having our identity as a nation, our character as a people, our ideals as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution savaged. That's what it was all about.

And then we underwent the Depression and World War II, and President Roosevelt and the Congress and the leaders of that time had to, first of all, defeat the opponents of freedom who would have killed our way of life beyond our borders and rally the American people to overcome that profound Depression and find a way to build a safety net under this country so that we could manage our economy in ways that didn't permit it to crash again and break the lives of so many millions of people.

Then we had to gird ourselves for the cold war, which we did, and wait for our victory to come, because communism was always founded on a total misunderstanding of human nature and the human condition.

Now we are going through another period of change, economic and social change and the way we relate to the rest of the world, sort of like what happened 100 years ago. Now we've moved from a cold-war world to a global society, not just a global economy. Now we've moved from an industrial age to one in which all work is dominated by information and technology and has vast ramifications which New Jersey has felt for the organization of work: big companies dramatically downsizing; new companies starting at a rapid rate; a lot of people doing exceedingly well; other people left behind; other people feeling uncertain about their future.

When I ran for President in 1992, I got into that race because I was convinced we could no longer just sit by and let it happen, that we needed an aggressive response. And I said then what I repeat to you now: I still believe our vision for the future should be animated by three things:

One, the desire to give the American dream of opportunity to every person in this country without regard to their race, their gender, their station in life, where they live, and what they're up against. That ought to be the first thing.

Two, the understanding that we cannot achieve that in the world in which we are living unless we find a way to come together to respect our diversity, to bridge all those gaps of race and religion and region and ethnicity. This country now has, more or less, 200 different racial and ethnic groups. It's an astonishing thing that we can find ways to come together around our core values and our respect for one another's differences. And I am sick and tired of seeing elections used as wedges to divide people one from another, to try to get people who are in the majority to look down on those who aren't, and then hope we can pick up the pieces after the election. We should be uniting the American people and going forward together.

And the third thing we have to do is continue to be the world's greatest force for peace and freedom and prosperity. And as I have said many times, that sounds great and everybody

is for that in general, but often in particular they're not.

When I took the action I did in Haiti and Bosnia, in becoming the first President to try to do something in Northern Ireland, all of the things we have done in the Middle East, what all the polls said was the most unpopular decision of my administration, trying to keep Mexico from collapsing, everything I did, I did because I know that our country has got to try to be the world's greatest source of energy for peace and freedom and prosperity, and because I know that 20 years from now we can be the strongest country in the world, but others will grow stronger, and we have to work with Russia, we have to work with China, we have to work with a uniting Europe, we have to work with emerging countries, to have them define their greatness in a way that helps us all to go forward in peace and prosperity.

How will these other countries define their greatness? Will it be as we do, by how well they educate their people and what their economic achievements are and what their cultural achievements are and whether they can help their less fortunate neighbors? Or will it be by whether they can bully people just because they are smaller than they are? This a big issue. We cannot walk away from this. You cannot live in the world we are going toward and pretend to stay within your own borders.

So that's what I tried to do in 1992. And ever since I have been in this office, everything I have done can be explained in terms of either trying to create opportunity or to bring us together around our basic values and respecting our diversity or maintaining our leadership for peace and freedom. And you heard Senator Lautenberg talking about it. It is true that we are better off today than we were 4 years ago, 8½ million jobs better off. The deficit is less than half of what it was. The crime rate is down. The welfare rolls are down. We are moving in the right direction. That is true.

It is also true that there are a lot of challenges out there. In the economic arena, we have at least three big challenges, don't we? In New Jersey, you know what one of them is. We have to figure out what to do about all these people who get downsized from big companies but who still have a lot of good years left. And we're working on that. In the next few days, I'm going to have a lot of companies in the country come in, and we're going to highlight the companies that have been able to avoid that and have been able to do things that really help their employees if they have to leave.

We have got to find a way, secondly, to give all of our working people a greater sense of economic security. I have heard Senator Bradley talk about this. If you can't guarantee somebody the same job with the same company for a lifetime, then they have to know if they work hard and play by the rules, they will always be able to get new training for new work, they will always have access to health care, and they will always be able to have a pension they can carry around with them, even if they change jobs. They have to be able to know that.

And lastly, we have to remember that here in New Jersey and throughout this country, in spite of the 8½ million jobs, there are vast expanses within our inner cities and in our rural areas that have not felt any new investment opportunity. And don't kid yourself, when you have new jobs and growth, you also drive down the welfare rolls, you drive down the crime rate, you drive down the despair that people feel. So we have to find a way to bring free enterprise back to the inner cities and back to the rural areas of America. I know we can do it. If we can do it for other countries, we can do it for our own.

If you look at this great country of ours, and you ask, how can we come together instead of be driven apart, you have to start with our basic values. We need to build up families and the integrity and strength of childrearing, not tear it down. That's why I've said many times, I'm all for welfare reform that's tough on work if people can work, but I don't want to hurt the children. We should be supportive of good parenting and work. All of us try to succeed as workers and parents. That's what we should want poor people to do, too. Everybody should be able to succeed in that way. That should be our goal.

We have to create an educational system that gives everybody genuine opportunity. And that means, among other things, what I was doing here in New Jersey a couple of weeks ago, which is ensuring that we hook up every classroom and every library, even in the poorest schools in America, to the information superhighway in the next 4 years. We can do that, and we can revolutionize education if we do it.

We have got to continue our work to lower the crime rate by having more police on the street, more prevention strategies, being tough in keeping the assault weapons ban in the Brady bill and not giving them up, and by actually doing something to give our young people something to say yes to as well as something to say no to. We can bring the crime rate down; we can make our streets safe again; we can make our neighborhoods whole again. We know how to do it. The question is whether we will.

We have to continue this fight to protect the environment. It is woefully short-sighted to believe that we can walk away from our obligations to clean up the messes we've made and protect ourselves from making further ones and gain anything economically by it. Yes, we have to find smarter ways to do it. Our administration has worked hard to find ways to grow the economy and clean the environment. But if we walk away from that, we will not go into the 21st century as a country that is stronger with stronger families and stronger communities and a stronger future. All of these things we must do.

We have to keep working and reaching out to the rest of the world, even when it's frustrating, when there are no easy answers. And to do it, we have to have an idea of Government that is fundamentally different from that embraced by the congressional majority. If you listen to them, what they say is, Government is the source of all of our problems; this new world is going to be so wonderful; if we could just get Government out of the way, all of our problems would be solved; what we need is empowerment defined as more choice and freedom from Government.

If you listen to our crowd, what do we say? We're not for big Government anymore where it's not necessary. Just remember, folks, when election time comes, they bad-mouth the Government, but we're the ones that reduced it. It's 240,000 smaller today than it was the day I became President. But we did it in a way that treated those Federal workers with dignity. We gave them generous early retirement packages and severance packages and time to find other jobs. And we didn't try to make some big thing out of it. We just did it because it needed to be done. But we believe that there is a different sort of empowerment. We believe that real opportunity means not only choice but the ability to exercise the choice.

You remember the great French writer Anatole France said the rich and poor are equally free to sleep under the bridge at night. Now, that's what choice is without the capacity to exercise it. We believe our job in Washington is to give people the ability to make the most of their own lives as individuals, workers, as citizens, in families, in communities, and as citizens of this great Nation. That's what we believe, the power to make the most of their own lives. We cannot guarantee results for people, but if we don't make sure everybody has got a chance to do the most that they can with their lives and live out their dreams, this country will never be what it ought to be in the 21st century. That is the main choice you face in 1996.

And let me say, in terms of the election, why you have to work at it. This is a complicated time. There is a lot of kind of paradox out there. And you have to talk to people about what the nature of this time is, what the nature of this period of change is, and what should we be doing. And every one of you who can afford to be here tonight has a voice, a mind, a spirit that can be brought to bear on your friends and neighbors. And you need to take this opportunity to use this election as elections should always be used, as a genuine educational opportunity to learn about where we are. And every question then becomes, how do we do this in a way that gives everybody a chance to make the most of their own lives? How do we do this in a way that brings the American people together and doesn't divide them? How do we do this in a way that maintains our leadership in the world for peace and freedom?

So it is not a question of whether we balance the budget. We have reduced the deficit more than our predecessors. The question is, how we balance the budget, not whether we do it. So in every case, I ask you to think about this. And you're quite fortunate now, you don't have to guess. You don't have to guess. You know what the choices are. You can look at the budget of 1995, which I vetoed, at the environmental initiatives, at the differences between us. And you don't have to guess.

Who is right about family and medical leave? Were we right to say that you shouldn't lose your job if you've got to take a little time off when a baby is born or a parent is sick or a child is in the hospital? Or were they? We said yes, and they said no. We now have gotten

a bipartisan study of the family and medical leave law that says one in six American workers covered by the law have taken advantage of it, and about 90 percent of the businesses say it didn't cost them any money to comply and didn't cause them any problems.

I think that's what we're about. All we did was to empower people to succeed at work and at home. That's what we should be doing. I think we were right.

Were we right? Were we right to fight for the 100,000 police and the assault weapons ban and the Brady bill? Were we right? I believe we were. All I know is that the crime rate is down all across America now for 3 or 4 years in a row because of more police and prevention. All I know is that no lawful hunter has lost his or her weapon, but there are 60,000 people who did lose their weapons, the 60,000 people with criminal records who tried to buy a handgun and couldn't do it because of the Brady bill in the last year and a half.

Were we right to fight for national service, to give people a chance to serve their community, solve the problems, work with people of different backgrounds, and earn some money to go to college, or were they right to say that's a luxury we can't afford? Were we right to change the student loan laws so that more people could borrow money to go to college on better terms and pay it back as a percentage of their income so that if you have a high tuition cost but you want to be a schoolteacher, a police officer, a nurse, or somebody else doing public service and you know you're not going to be rich, you still can always borrow the money to go to college, and you can still always pay it back? I believe we were right about that.

And in every case, there was no big Government guarantee. All we were trying to do was to give people the means to make the most of their own lives, to seize the American dream, to come together instead of being divided, to stand up for the things we believe in around the world. That's all we did, and it makes all the difference.

So I say to you, this is not like 1992 when the question was the status quo or change. There is no status quo option. There are two very different views of change. They can be well-known and completely understood. The question is, which road will you walk into the 21st century? And I tell you, I see pictures in my mind all the time that give me the answer.

The other day I was at Eastern High School in Washington, DC, where all of the students are African-American except the Russian exchange students, a program you've done a lot of work on. There they were, reaching for unity over diversity. There they were, struggling to come out of poverty. There they were, asking not for a guarantee, but just for a good education and a chance at the American dream. And if I've got anything to do about it, they're going to get it. That's what they're going to get.

I got two letters from two married couples I got to know not very long ago because they had desperately sick children. I know as the father of only one child, there must be no greater pain in the world than having a child die before you do. And both these couples lost their children, but they got to be good parents because of the family and medical leave law that they helped us fight for. I think we were right, and I think that's the kind of change we want.

I got a letter that I signed today back to a man who is now in his mid-sixties who lost a job 4 years ago at an aerospace plant, didn't know where to turn. But he wrote us, and because we found him the kind of training program that others are trying to eliminate, that man started his life over again in his early sixties and is working again and has dignity and is supporting himself and his family. That's what I believe we ought to be doing.

This is not complicated. It is not about big Government programs. It is not about yesterday's ideas. This is about which road we will walk into the future. It is about whether we will walk it together.

Today in Woodbridge, basically your good—anybody here from there? I was over there today at the high school. We were at the high school; Senator Lautenberg talked about it. We did this antismoking program. And I was talking to the mayor on the way in about what kind of community it was. He said, it's sort of a standard New Jersey blue-collar community, and it was. It was, except they had not only Christians and Jews among the student body, they had Hindus and Muslims among the student body, even there.

America is changing. I'm telling you, this business of trying to drive a stake between people in this country based on their race, their ethnic

background, or their religion has got to stop. We have got to stop it. We have got to stop it. Now, you don't have to guess about this; look around the rest of the world. Which road do you want to walk into the future? And I know that either I or my successors will make some mistakes in our judgments about what the United States should do around the world. But basically, it is right for us to continue to reach out to other countries. It is right for us to support peace and freedom and to try to expand our own prosperity by expanding that of others. It is right for us to be partners with other countries, even when we're tired and we want to lay our burdens down, because it's the only way to fight terrorism, the only way to fight drug dealing, the only way to fight organized crime; it is right to do that. So you get to decide about that, which road will you walk into the future.

And I want to ask you when you leave here tonight to think about what else you can do for the next 6 months. I appreciate the money you've given Bob Torricelli and the Democratic Party and our efforts. I am grateful for that. But it is not enough, because the American people are trying to get a grip on this period of change. They're trying to understand what's going on, and you can help.

And it's exciting. You should feel privileged to live in this time. Believe me, there's a lot more good than bad in it. Believe me, if we do the right things, the children that are here in this audience will have the opportunity to live out their dreams more than any previous generation of Americans ever has. You should be happy and proud to have the responsibility of citizenship at this time.

And so I ask you as you leave tonight to think about it: What do you want America to look like for your children and grandchildren, and what are you willing to do to make it happen? And what do we have to do in Washington to help everybody have their chance at the American dream in a country that's going forward together? That is what is at stake.

I think I know what road the American people will walk into the future if they understand what the choices are. You must help your fellow Americans understand the choices.

Thank you, God bless you, and good night.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:30 p.m. in the Old Central New Jersey Railroad Terminal at Liberty State Park. In his remarks, he referred to comedienne Whoopi Goldberg; Donald L. Fowler, national chairman, Democratic National Committee; James E. Florio and Brendan Byrne, former Governors of New Jersey; jazz musician Peter Duchin; and Raymond J. Lesniak, chairman, Clinton/Gore Campaign Committee, New Jersey.

Remarks on the Legislative Agenda and an Exchange With Reporters
May 8, 1996

The President. Good afternoon. Today I want to make a brief statement about the work that Congress and I can do together in the next 90 days. The next 3 months can be a time when we sign into law measures that will truly help us to meet our challenges, protect our values, and move our country forward together.

But right now, Congress is facing a logjam. The Democrats and I believe we must raise the minimum wage, which is nearing a 40-year low. The Republicans want a temporary reduction in the gas tax. There's only one fair way to break this logjam. Congress should pass the minimum wage increase clean, and if Republicans want a temporary reduction in the gas tax, then Congress should pass that clean. That is how we can break the logjam and then get on with the other crucial work at hand.

There's still time for us to balance the budget while protecting our basic values. We can reform welfare, cut taxes, double the size of our Border Patrol, and make sure our people are able to keep their health insurance if they change jobs or if someone in the family gets sick. All this legislation is ready to go right now. Much of it passed with broad support and by large margins. All Congress has to do is send it to me, and we'll be in business. But Congress must send it to me clean.

I'm very concerned by reports that some Republicans in Congress want to ruin these good, bipartisan bills by attaching to them bad proposals that shouldn't be there in the first place. They want to load the bills up with poison pills, measures the Republicans are inserting in the legislation to make sure I will veto it, so they can pretend it's not just the poison pill I'm against but the bill itself.

For example, they know I would sign a welfare reform bill if they sent it to me by itself. But they're determined to link welfare reform to Medicaid changes that cut coverage to children, to pregnant women, to the elderly, and to families with children with disabilities. Or they link it to a tax increase on working people by cutting the earned-income tax credit.

They do that in hopes of provoking a veto, so they can run negative ads in the fall accusing me of being against welfare reform. That's what I mean by poison pill. It may be good politics, but it's not good for the American people.

So I urge Senator Dole and Speaker Gingrich and the Republicans in Congress: Keep the legislation free of poison pills. I say to Republicans in Congress: Work with me to pass welfare reform, a balanced budget, a tax cut, an increase in the minimum wage, health care and immigration reform, without inserting deadly, poison-pill provisions. Join me in 3 months of progress, not 3 months of partisanship.

Let me be clear. If we want a balanced budget, pass it without the poison pill of cutting education or the environment. If we want welfare reform, pass it without the poison pill of cutting the earned-income tax credit and thereby raising taxes on working families, without the poison pill of ending guaranteed Medicaid coverage for poor children, pregnant women, the elderly, or families with children with disabilities. If we want health insurance reform, leave out the poison pill of nationwide, unrestricted, permanent medical savings accounts. If we want to raise the minimum wage, do it without the poison pill of undermining workers' rights. If we want immigration reform, pass it without the poison pill that slams shut the schoolhouse door in the face of innocent children.

Finally, I ask the Republicans in Congress to consider something else. This is the first time your party has controlled both Houses of Congress at the same time since 1954. What is the record you will present to the American people and leave for history? When you have worked with me in a bipartisan fashion, we have done positive things for the American people: a fine telecommunications bill; tough antiterrorism legislation; honest lobbying reform; a budget that gives our country its 4th straight year of deficit reduction while protecting education, the environment, Medicare, and Medicaid. Will this be the record we build on, or will you go your own way again, leaving the American people with a memory of extremism, deadlock, and Government shutdowns?

It's no secret to anybody that this is an election year, but there will be plenty of time for all the politics in the world after we do the work we were sent here to do. So let us treat these next 3 months as the end of the legislative session and not as the beginning of the election season.

Senator Dole and Speaker Gingrich and the Republicans in Congress, I ask you to abandon the strategy of veto in favor of making this a season of progress.

Q. Now, you know that your statement will be taken as a very political one, but are you really saying that you will sign a bill to repeal the tax cut if it doesn't have the minimum wage, or will you veto it otherwise?

The President. What I'm saying is that we have a logjam here. I believe the price of fuel should come down, and I believe it will come down. The price of oil has dropped about $3 a barrel since I announced the modest release from the petroleum reserve and the Energy Department announced its actions, and then, independently, the Justice Department announced its actions. There is still some backlog in the refinery capacity, and that's going to take some time for it to manifest itself in prices at the pump.

But if they want a temporary reduction in the gas tax, the way to do it is to end the logjam, give us a clean vote on the minimum wage increase. We should increase the minimum wage and pass their temporary reduction of the gas tax. But you know, raising the minimum wage is very important to a lot of us and, more importantly, it's very important to millions and millions of working Americans.

And we have got a logjam here, so I have once again come forward and said, "Okay, I'm willing to do my part to break the logjam. Let's do both." And that's the right thing to do.

1996 Election

Q. You seem to be asking the Republicans to put aside politics for 3 months. Will you ask the Democratic National Committee not to run the highly negative ads against Senator Dole that it has been running, and say that no Clinton/Gore money will be spent on these types of negative ads?

The President. Well, first of all, I'm not asking the Republican committee or Senator Dole to refrain from politics. I'm not asking him not to make his speeches. I'm not asking him to refrain from differentiating himself from me. I'm not asking them to refrain from raising and spending money any way they choose, although I do think we should pass the campaign finance reform bill.

So I'm not asking them to do that. They may do whatever they choose. All I'm saying is, when we have worked together in a bipartisan fashion, we've gotten progress. We now have huge, broad areas of agreement here. And I have never let the areas of disagreement affect my willingness to work with them to achieve agreement. And that's all I'm asking. I'm asking them to take the same position.

Legislative Agenda

Q. Mr. President, I'm not sure we got an answer to Helen's [Helen Thomas, United Press International] first question, and that is, would you sign a repeal of the gas tax if there were no increase in the minimum wage? And aren't you just doing the same kind of linkage that you have said Republicans shouldn't do all along, even as far back as the Government shutdowns are concerned?

The President. No, because what they're doing here is refusing even to give us a vote. And Senator Dole has refused even to give a vote on raising the minimum wage, or he wants to put this poison pill in it that will undermine workers' rights.

So the Democrats in the Senate are quite united. They have never been treated like this before, and they did not treat the Republicans like this before. And they have not abused the filibuster in their minority position the way the Republicans did for 2 years solid in 1993 and 1994. They have not done any of that. But they're saying they are sick and tired of seeing millions and millions of American working families get the shaft from a refusal to even schedule a vote.

So what I'm saying is, we've got a logjam in the Congress. The two parties are at loggerheads, and I'm offering a way to fix the logjam. And that's the way to do it. Let's just vote on both of them clean.

Q. First, would you, in fact, sign the gas tax bill? And secondly, if the minimum wage measure is as important to you and your party as you say it is, why did you and your party not propose it when you had control of the Congress?

The President. The reason we didn't is that in the first year—let me just say, I have always been on record in favor of minimum wage increases that more or less keep up with inflation. But in the very first year, keep in mind what I did, we doubled the earned-income tax credit and made it refundable and basically put ourselves on a track where we're going to take working families with children out of poverty.

But meanwhile, when it became apparent to me that the minimum wage was dropping to a 40-year low, it was obvious we had to increase it. And I had no reason to believe that this would be a big partisan issue. I mean, even Republicans had been willing in the past to vote for a minimum wage increase; it was only when they got into the majority that they decided it was a terrible idea. And so I had no reason to believe that they wouldn't. We did the first things first: We doubled the earned-income tax credit first, and then I asked for an increase in the minimum wage.

Now, I believe that we can still get this done. You know, the last time we voted on a minimum wage, there was a Republican President, and a lot of Republican Members of Congress voted for it. I don't know why they have all suddenly decided it's a terrible thing to do.

Q. Will you sign the gas tax?

The President. I have told you what my position is. There is a logjam in the Congress. The Senators have made it clear that they want to vote on both of them, the Democratic Senators have. They are now using the filibuster in the way the Republicans repeatedly used it in 1993 and 1994. I am offering a way to break the logjam. I will be glad to sign both bills. They ought to vote them out clean. At least they should give us a clean vote on the minimum wage. That's what I think should be done.

Medicare and Medicaid

Q. Mr. President, your most recent Clinton/Gore campaign commercials still speak about Republican cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Speaker Gingrich points out repeatedly that these aren't cuts in Medicare or Medicaid; these are simply cuts in the projected growth of Medicare and Medicaid, which you in your own 7-year balanced budget proposal similarly propose. Are you prepared now to stop calling the Republican savings in Medicare and Medicaid cuts?

The President. Let me say this, are you prepared to stop it? Are you prepared to stop it? When I came to Washington I was amazed when I proposed budgets, that that was the language that was used. The press used it. We all learned to use it from the press. I have seen repeated—years and years of articles saying, cuts in this, cuts in that, cuts in the other thing.

And the question is, if you cut below the rate of inflation plus growth, is that a cut? I think it is. Should we say, a proposed cut? If you have 27 seconds to talk to the American people, how long does it take to say, "a proposed cut in the rate of increase but a real cut if it is less than the rate of increase plus growth"?

Now, keep in mind, this language has been used around Washington, not simply by politicians but by others for a very long time. Most average Americans believe that it amounts to a cut in Medicare if they're being asked—if they're living on $20,000 and they're being asked to pay higher premiums for the same thing they got last year, particularly if the premiums go up more than the rate of inflation.

So if there's going to be a change in the language, we ought to all get together and agree on what the language is. The language I am using, sir, is no different from the language the Republicans used when discussing defense all those years and no different than the press used on a regular basis when I arrived here. So maybe we should try to find some new language, but it ill becomes the Speaker to say that when I—you go back and you could probably find reams and reams and reams of speeches that he's given about defense and other issues, talking about cuts that weren't cuts; they were cuts in the rate of increase.

So we'll just—I'm trying to be straight with the American people. And the truth is that the Republicans wanted to reduce the rate of investment in Medicare and Medicaid—we've talked about this in this room many times—to a level that was completely unsustainable when we started this budget process, and that was going to impose significant and unjustifiable burdens on middle class families, working families, the old, the young, families with children with disabilities. And I still believe that what they're trying to do is not advisable, but we are much closer than we used to be.

The real answer is, they left these budget negotiations at the start of their primary season. We were very close together. We were closer together than was ever reported in the press. Why don't they want to come back and sit down and work together and come up with a balanced budget? Once we have an agreed-upon balanced budget, nobody will ever be debating this again. Everybody knows we have to have savings in the projected levels of spending in Medicare and Medicaid. The question is, is what they are trying to do good for Medicare and Medicaid? I don't believe it is.

And they have—I would remind you that they now have a budget which acknowledges that their earlier levels of spending were too low. They do. They have abandoned their first budget already.

Legislative Agenda

Q. Mr. President, if you get an immigration reform bill that forbids education to the sons of illegal immigrants, would you veto it?

The President. Well, I am opposed to that, as you know. And so far, it's not in the Senate bill. So we're trying to keep it out of the final bill, and I will do everything I can to keep it out.

Q. To answer Terry's [Terence Hunt, Associated Press] question, beyond language and beyond your suggestion to break the logjam, having just last night talked about the forces dividing society, how will we see a change in you to usher in this new era of cooperation you seem to be suggesting today?

The President. First of all, you haven't heard me up there condemning the Speaker and Senator Dole in the kind of intense personal terms that they have used. You haven't heard that. You have never heard me doing that. Secondly, I have—I did not end these budget negotiations.

They did. Thirdly, whenever we sign—whenever I sign legislation that has bipartisan support, I always give them credit for the work they do for America.

Now, I am not going to hide my differences from them from the American people, and I have never asked them to hide their differences from me from the American people. I don't ask Senator Dole to suspend his campaign or, you know, I don't ask him to stop doing—going around saying I was wrong when I fought for the Family and Medical Leave Act, which he says all the time, that I was wrong when I stood up for the assault weapons ban or the Brady bill, and he led the opposition to it. I don't ask him to stop that.

All I'm saying is, we're supposed to show up for work here every day. And we were closer than was even reported in the press in the budget negotiations. Now they are adopting a strategy to say that "we're going to use the lawmaking process of the United States to force the President to veto bills where the main subject of the bill he is really for, because we would rather have the veto"—and I think that's wrong—or, "we're not going to permit people to get an increase in the minimum wage. We actually want the minimum wage to fall to a 40-year low." That's what they said.

So if the Democrats in the Senate are going to one time use the filibuster position they have, which the Republicans used over and over and over and over again in '93 and '94, to an extent never before seen in modern history, more than had ever been done before—if they're going to do that, to demand a vote on the minimum wage, I have come here today not to play politics with them but to say, here is a way to balance the logjam. Let's have a clean vote on the temporary reduction in the gas tax. Let's have a clean vote on the minimum wage. Do that. It is the right thing to do. It's the right thing for America to do.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:10 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner

May 8, 1996

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. You may have held your humor in check tonight, but you don't ever hold anything back from America every day in your job. The American people will never really know—at least, until I write my memoirs—all the magnificent things Al Gore has done as Vice President. But I'm telling you, we should all be very grateful to him, and I appreciate it. Thank you.

I want to thank Tipper for so many things: for making me more sensitive to the whole issue of mental health; for making me see the world in a different and deeper way, through the lens of her camera; and for sharing my birthday and all those crazy characteristics we Leos have. [*Laughter*] You know, there comes a time when the four of us are out at 12:30 in the morning on Saturday evening, I don't want to talk about public policy anymore—[*laughter*]—so we just let Al and Hillary go on their way and we talk about music or something.

I want to thank Don Fowler and Chris Dodd for the incredible labor of love and effort they have exerted, and all of those who work with them: Marvin Rosen and the others who have raised so much of the funds, and Terry McAuliffe and those who have helped our campaign. I thank them all so much.

I want to thank Dan and Beth and the other cochairs, and all the committee who worked so hard tonight. And I'm very grateful to Stevie Wonder and to Robin Williams for not only adding a little glamour but adding a little depth to our life in their songs and in their humor. They made us think about what's really important in life and what's really important in public life. I thank them especially for honoring our friend Ron Brown. As I said when I spoke at his memorial service, I probably wouldn't be here if it weren't for Ron Brown, and I'm glad we could be here for him tonight. And thank you, Alma, for being here with us.

I want to thank the host and chairman of this dinner, Peter Knight, who has—if you want to clap for him after what he has done to you for months, I think that is a wonderful thing. [*Applause*] Any man who can pick your pocket and still win your applause—[*laughter*]—deserves to be the campaign manager of the Clinton/Gore campaign. So tomorrow he goes to work in a new job. Ever since he played a major role in our campaign in 1992, I have been profoundly impressed with his mind, his heart, his skill, his discipline. And I look forward to his leadership as we go down the road ahead. I thank him very, very much.

I want to thank the First Lady for so many things over what now are nearly 21 years of our marriage, for these remarkable 3½ years we have had in the White House, for putting up with a phenomenal amount of abuse solely because she happened to be married to me, and doing it with good humor and good grace and a strong heart. And not quite solely because she happened to be married to me; she also happens to stand for some things that some of those in the other party don't like.

But I think it's a good thing that women as well as men and girls as well as boys should have a chance to live this life to the fullest of their ability. And I do believe it takes a village to raise a child. And I think it takes a village to solve our problems and a village to make this country what it ought to be. Stevie Wonder sang it: All for one, and one for all.

And finally let me thank all of you, and let me say that I don't want to speak long tonight because, as Robin Williams said, I know I'm preaching to the saved. But I want to tell you one more time as clearly as I can what is at stake in this year and why it goes beyond the bounds of a normal election and why you cannot leave your commitment at this door, no matter how much you gave or how difficult it was. For your citizenship cannot end here.

When Al Gore and I ran in 1992, I had a clear vision of what I hoped our country would look like in the 21st century, and I haven't lost that vision. I want America to be a place where every child can grow up to live out his or her dreams without regard to their race or their religion or their ethnic group or the station in life from which they start. If they're willing to work, I want them to have a chance to live out their dreams.

I want America to be a place where our incredibly rich diversity of heritage brings us together and where we live together in peace and respect, with safe streets and good schools and a clean environment. I want America to be a place where everyone knows that we're doing our best to preserve our values together, to move forward together. I want America to be the strongest force for peace and freedom in the world in the 21st century. I want us to continue reaching out to other people and standing up for the things we've stood up for. And I believe in order to do that we have got to be willing to work together, to face our challenges and not deny them, to protect our values, not just talk about them and then regularly violate them.

These last 3½ years have been a great opportunity for us. We've still got a long way to go as a country, but no one can doubt that in every important way we're better off today than we were in 1992, when the deficit was twice as high, when we had 8½ million fewer jobs, when we had a higher crime rate, higher welfare rates, higher poverty rates, when we seemed to be drifting.

But what I want to say to you tonight is, more important than any single issue is the differences now before the American people in this election about how we will walk into the 21st century. In 1992 there was so much talk about change. Robin did that great imitation of Ross Perot. Ross Perot and I said we represent change. Sixty-two percent of the people said, "Okay, we're for change against the status quo and kind of a hands-off policy to our problems." And thank goodness in that 62 percent more people voted for me than Mr. Perot, so I got to show up here tonight. And that's what happened.

But it was change against the status quo. That is not true now. There is no status quo option. In this election there are two very different visions of change. And unlike most elections, you don't have to guess. You know where I stand, what I stand for. You know from what we've done in the last 3½ years I'll do my dead-level-best to do what I say I want to do in the next 4 years.

And now you know where they stand and what they will do. They passed a budget in 1995 which will become the law of the land if they control the Congress and the White House in 1997. They tried to do certain things

to the environment and to the fabric of this country, which they will be able to do and which they will do. And you don't have to guess.

So we can look ahead. One side says—their side—that in this great new information age with so many opportunities, Government is the problem and what we really need for the American people is an unlimited number of choices and freedom from Government. If we all just walk away, everything will work out fine. Our side says, that view forgets history. You remember what the great writer Anatole France said: "The rich and poor are equally free to sleep under the bridge at night."

We believe that the future requires not only the existence of opportunity but making sure that every American has the chance to seize that opportunity, and that what we should be doing here at this moment is giving people the ability to make the most of their own lives, as workers, as family members, in communities, and as citizens. That is the central difference between the two approaches in the debate in Washington, DC, and in the country today. And the American people must choose which road they will walk into the 21st century.

And let me reiterate what others have said. I don't care what the polls say today. This is a time of profound change. And just as there is volatility in the economy, just as there is volatility in our society, there will inevitably be volatility in our political life. If you want this to come out in a way that you believe in, then you have to leave here tonight committed to doing everything you can to reach every friend, every neighbor, every person you come in contact with, to try to convince that person that this is the road we should walk together into the 21st century. This is the road we should walk together.

And you have lots of specific examples. They talked about the deficit; we brought it down. They say they want to help working people and value families, but we stood up for the family and medical leave law that Chris Dodd had to fight 7 years for because they fought it every step of the way.

We, those of us who are here tonight, can afford to be here, but we're still for raising the minimum wage, because we want people who raise families and work full time to be able to live in dignity. That's important.

It's one thing to say you're for law and order, but we put a hundred thousand police officers on the street, helping to reduce the crime level. We put money into community programs to prevent crimes so our children have something to say yes to as well as something to say no to. We did pass the assault weapons ban, and we also passed the Brady bill. And you know what? None of those hunters shooting at those moose that Robin portrayed so well tonight have lost their guns. But 60,000 people—60,000 people did lose out. Sixty thousand people with criminal records have not been able to buy handguns because of the passage of the Brady bill. We were right. That was the right decision for America.

We think everybody ought to be able to go to college, because what you can earn depends on what you can learn. And so we fought for a new student loan program, lower cost, less hassle, better repayment terms. We were for it, and by and large they weren't.

So we have very different views. None of those cases—not a single, solitary one—involves the Government guaranteeing an outcome to any citizen. What did we try to do? We tried to guarantee safe streets, the opportunity to get an education, the opportunity to get a job, a healthy economy. And the same thing is true with the environment. I plead guilty to believing we cannot grow the American economy over the long run unless we preserve the quality of our land, of our water, our natural resources, and the animals who inhabit this Earth with us. I am guilty. I plead guilty. And I believe most of the American people would say the same thing.

That doesn't guarantee us anything except the chance to have a decent, coherent life. And so I say to you again, if you believe that every person ought to have a chance to make the most of his or her life; if you are sick and tired of seeing this country divided by race, by religion, over these issues that serve to drive a wedge between the American people, and you know that unless we come together we'll never be the country we ought to be; if you want your country to stand up for peace and freedom, even when you may not agree with the President on every issue—I've done a lot of things that weren't popular with some groups, whether it was Haiti or Mexico or getting involved in the Northern Ireland situation for the first time, and I know that a lot of people say from time to time, well, maybe he does this, that, or the other thing too much.

But let me say this, 20 years from now I want your country to be the strongest country in the world. But other countries will be stronger than they are today. And we have to make sure that other countries join us in fighting terrorism, in standing up against dangerous weapons, in standing up to drug smuggling, in standing up for a decent life for all the children of this world. If we don't cooperate with these countries and try to lead and shape the future, then it will diminish the future for all of us. And if you believe all that, then I ask you to leave here committed not to saying, "Okay, I did my part. I went to that fundraiser. We raised $12 million. Big deal." No, I ask you to walk away and say, "I'm going to work every day between now and election day in November so we walk the right road into the future." That is my commitment, and that's what I want you to do.

Lastly, let me make this point. If we seek to prevail, we must have a strong sense of history and a big heart. This country has had a few major decision points in its history. When we started—Robin did a little debate about the Founding Fathers—all the things we take for granted today, they were big decisions: would we have a Bill of Rights or not; how were we going to limit Government to protect people; would we be one country or just a little collection of States.

The next big crisis we had was the Civil War, when Abraham Lincoln gave his life, first to keep us one country and, second, to make us live up to the letter of the Constitution and get rid of slavery. Then, a hundred years ago we had an age very like today, when the economy changed, the way we lived and worked changed. And Theodore Roosevelt, a great Republican President, and Woodrow Wilson, a great Democratic President, led us into what we now call the progressive era, when we said, "Hey, this industrial age is a great thing. People being able to move out of the country and live in the city, it's a great thing. But it's not a great thing that children are working 60 hours a week. It's not a great thing that women are being abused in the workplace. It's not a great thing that we are destroying our natural resources. It's not a great thing that small businesses are being crushed by unfair monopolies and not having a chance. We think we'll use the power of Government to help people make more of their own lives and preserve what is essential to this country." And that's what we've got to do again today.

When President Roosevelt got us through the Depression and stood up for freedom against fascism in World War II, when we stood up against communism in the cold war, all these things kept America what it is today. And believe me, the decisions we have to make today as we move from the cold war to the global society, as we move from the industrial age to the information and technology age, they're every bit as profound.

No one has all the answers. The most important thing is, what road are we going to walk down? If you want America to be something, we have to have a strong sense of history. We have to understand that we are here today because our forebears were committed to living up to the promise of the Constitution, to meeting our challenges and protecting our values and giving everybody a chance.

And the other thing we have got to have is a little bit of heart. You know, they make fun of me sometimes. They say Bill Clinton is too emotional, feels your pain, and all that sort of stuff. Let me tell you something, you just think about it. When they lay you down for the last time, what are you going to remember? You wish you'd spent a few more hours at the office? No, you're going to think about your children, your family, the people you like, the people you love, how it felt to learn and experience things for the first time, the music that made you feel alive and big. That's what makes life worth living.

Yesterday I was in a little town in New Jersey that was dominated by basically white ethnic schoolkids. We were at an anti-teen-smoking event. But in this blue collar, ethnic town, there were Jewish kids, there were Hindus of Indian heritage, there were two young women in their Muslim formal dress in the school, all living together as Americans. All proving, once again, that we believe that anybody who just shares our values and will respect the honest differences of others should have the chance to live in this way, to live out their dreams that go way beyond economics. And I just want you to know why I feel that way.

Just before I left to come over here tonight, I met with a group of people. I frequently have coffee with people from around the country who are active in public affairs, and most of them couldn't afford to come here tonight. The peo-

ple I met with tonight were four local government leaders from the Northeast, three State legislative leaders from the South and the West, and some Hispanic and African-American women who are active in political organizations all over the country. And I just go around the table and let them talk.

About the 10th person to talk was this very tall, stately, impressive African-American woman from San Francisco. She looked at me—this is self-serving, but I am going to tell you anyway—this woman looked at me and said, "Before we get down to what I came to talk about, let's get first things first." She said, "My daddy is 75 years old, and he lives in St. Louis, but he was born and grew up in Hope, Arkansas"—the same little town in Arkansas I was born in—"and he went to Yeager High School," which was the all-black high school at the time when the schools were segregated. "And he told me that your grandfather, at his little store, was one of only four white people in town that would really do business with black folks." She said, "Is that true?"

I said, "Yes, ma'am, it's true. And I can still remember when I was 5 years old, sitting on that wooden store counter next to a big jar of Jackson's cookies that were this big and sold for a penny apiece, listening to my granddaddy tell me that those people who came into his store were good people, and they worked hard, and they deserved a better deal in life."

Now, let me tell you folks, that's what makes this country great. Our political system is not great because it's a political system. It is not even great because it works economically. It's great because it gives us all a chance to live out our dreams and because in every generation we keep trying to meet the challenges and protect our values and live up to what we say we believe in. That is really what this is all about.

And we cannot go into the global economy of the 21st century by walking away from our common responsibilities and saying that we don't have a common responsibility to help everybody's kids live up to the fullest of their dreams. You think about it, talk about it, stand up for it, work for it. Don't be overconfident, and we will prevail.

Thank you, and God bless you, and good night.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:32 p.m. at the Washington Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Donald L. Fowler, national chairman, Senator Christopher J. Dodd, general chairman, and Marvin Rosen, national finance chairman, Democratic National Committee; Terence McAuliffe, finance chairman, Clinton/Gore '96; Dan Dutko and Beth Dozoretz, dinner cochairs; musician Stevie Wonder; comedian Robin Williams; Alma Brown, widow of former Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown; and Reform Party Presidential candidate Ross Perot.

Remarks to the Saxophone Club
May 8, 1996

The President. Thank you very much. I tell you, there's not much left for me to say. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Matt and all the leaders of the Saxophone Club, and all of you who have been with us all these years. It has always been a joy for me to come to the Saxophone Club and see all of your faces filled with hope and energy. And even when we have to be late coming here and it's midnight, you're still raring to go, and that'll take us to victory and that's good.

I want to say to you how proud I am to be on this stage with Tipper Gore, and all that she's done, how profoundly grateful I am in ways, as I said earlier tonight, that will never be fully known until I write my memoirs, for the contributions that Al Gore has made to the United States of America.

And I want to say that you couldn't have gladdened my heart any more with anything than you did when you gave such an intense and spontaneous and genuine cheer to the First Lady. [*Applause*] Thank you. I want you to know what I whispered to her when you were doing

that the first time—[*laughter*]—I've had occasion to tell her on several occasions the last couple of years, as Senator whatever his name is, with the hyphenated name, got ginned up—I mean, with the apostrophe in his name—[*laughter*].

She's taken a lot of grief just because she happened to be here and she was my spouse. And they didn't want to deal with the issues so they tried to go after her personally, and the rest of us, and because she had the temerity to say it seemed to her that every working family in the country ought to be able to give health care to their children, frankly, and because there are still some folks in this country who just don't think women ought to speak up and be heard and be seen and live their lives and do what they're supposed to do.

But you know, where I grew up we had a saying when things were really tough and unfair. Our saying was, "It's a long road that doesn't turn," and your cheer says this road has turned, and we're going to send them a message about that. This road has turned.

Now, let me just say two points I want to make very briefly. The first is, I don't care what the polls say; this is going to be a hard, tough, close election.

Audience member. You're going to win it!

The President. That's right. We are if you don't change the feelings, the intensity, and the commitment you have tonight any time in the next 6 months. This election is 6 months from today—not today, not tomorrow, 6 months from today. And you have to bear down. That's the first point I want to make. You have got to bear down. Don't let up. Reach other people. Keep talking about it. Talk about what's at stake.

The second point I want to make to you is that this is not just another election. This election will take this country into the 21st century. This is not an election like 1992, where the issue was change versus the status quo. There are two very different but very dynamic visions here. Both approaches would represent a dramatic departure from America's past—two visions of change.

I believe that those of you who are in this audience who are younger, who represent the bulk of the Saxophone Club and the future of this country, will have the most exciting lives of any generation of Americans ever, in terms of not only economic opportunities but opportunities for genuine personal fulfillment. If we guarantee that opportunity to everybody without regard to their race, their gender, their station in life, if we decide that our diversity is a plus to be nurtured, that we should come together, instead of being used to divide us, and if we maintain our willingness to stay involved in the world as the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity and security—if we will do those three things I believe that your future will be the brightest future any generation of Americans ever had and that you will have the opportunity to bring peace and integrity to people in ways that have never been done before.

But it depends on which road we decide to walk into the 21st century. And there is a genuine—the Vice President and I spent 50 hours in those budget negotiations with the Republican congressional leaders and the Democratic leaders. And I can say this in all respect—you know, they will say mean things about me between now and the election. Let me tell you something, the mean things are not what this election is about. It's about two honestly different views. I spent 50 hours with them. They honestly look at the world differently than we do. [*Laughter*] I say that—no, no—with all respect. Their view—let me give you—the most charitable view is—their view is, "Hey, man, this is an exciting world. I mean, there's computers and new businesses and the world is unfolding, and it's not bureaucracy driven and it's not top down and heavy laden like it used to be. So what we need to do is give everybody a whole bunch of choices and demolish the Government, and everything will be great."

And that's what they really believe, that anything public—after national defense, national security, and paving roads—is an oppression of personal liberty. [*Laughter*] Now, what I believe is that we don't need the same old big Government we used to have. Al Gore has changed it. They cursed it. He changed it. We reduced the size of the Government. We did it.

But I believe to say that you can leave this country and every person in this country and the spirit of community in this country and the quality of our environment and the quality of educational opportunity and the safety of our streets to the tender mercies of the global economy unattended by a common effort by Americans to help all of us make the most of our own lives is dead wrong. That's what I believe.

I'll never forget when I was in college and I first read the great French writer Anatole France, who said that in the France about which he wrote, "The rich and poor are equally free to sleep under the bridge at night." Or today you might say everybody is free to go in and buy a Mercedes. What does that mean? Does that mean we should resent the rich? No, we want more people to make money. What it means is that we should work together to give everybody the chance to make the most of their own lives in their work life, as citizens, in their families, in their communities.

That means a good economy, safe streets, a clean environment, good education. It means bringing people together instead of driving them apart. It means America still being willing to stand up for peace and freedom around the world. That's what that means. That's what that means.

And I'm telling you, you don't have to guess—but remember, we're going through a time of huge, sweeping, breathtaking change in the way we work, in the way we live. And everybody is out there struggling to try to figure out what's going on and trying to get a hook on it. And a lot of people are vulnerable to simple wrong answers.

So I say to you, this is a serious thing. We're having a great time tonight. You've made me happier than you'll ever know. I love to come to these things. I love your spirit. I love your enthusiasm. I love your optimism. I love your belief in yourselves and your country. But I'm telling you, this is going to be a hard, tough, close election, because it is a fight for the future. And it is not like 1992. Two dynamic visions, two very different. We're going to get on one road and walk right into the 21st century. You can make sure it's the right road, but you need to keep what you have tonight every day from now until November—every day—to everyone you can speak with.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at midnight in the Regency Ballroom at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Saxophone Club chair Matt Fruman. These remarks were released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 9.

Remarks Welcoming President Konstandinos Stephanopoulos of Greece

May 9, 1996

President Stephanopoulos, members of the Greek delegation, distinguished guests. On behalf of the American people, I am delighted to welcome President Stephanopoulos to the White House. It is an honor to return the warm hospitality the people of Greece showed the First Lady when she visited their wonderful country in March.

Two thousand five hundred years ago, the birth of democracy in Greece lit the landscape of Western civilization. Greek architecture, poetry, philosophy, and law set new standards for human achievement and new measures for human progress. Today, we Americans share with Greece the glory of that ancient legacy. We join with Greece, our ally and our friend, in raising democracy's flag around the world. For a half century, from World War II to the Persian Gulf, our nations have stood together in defense of shared ideals. Now we are working to build a bright future of security, prosperity, and peace. The strengthening of our relations in recent years has paved the way to closer cooperation to the benefit of our own people and all the world. In Bosnia, our soldiers serve side by side to help the peace take hold. Throughout the Balkans, from Albania to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, America looks to Greece to be a force of peace and stability.

And we must stand as one against the deadly scourge of terrorism. May I express, once more, on behalf of all Americans our deep condolences to the families and friends of the 17 Greek citizens who were murdered in Cairo last month.

The partnership between America and Greece is reinforced by the bonds of family. All across our country, Americans of Greek descent have added to the richness and the warmth of America's quilt. The values they have brought here to their adopted home—love of family, faith, and community, taking responsibility, working

hard—have flourished in America, and they have helped America to flourish.

Mr. President, among the countless gifts that Greece has shared with the world, few capture the human heart like the Olympics. This year, the United States is proud to host the centennial of the modern Olympic games. The torch that Hillary had the honor to kindle when she visited your country in Olympia carries the spirit of the past, the promise of this moment, and our common hopes for the future. May its flame burn as strong as the enduring ties between America and Greece.

Again, Mr. President, we welcome you and ask for your remarks.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:13 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Konstandinos Stephanopoulos of Greece and an Exchange With Reporters

May 9, 1996

President Clinton. Let me say that it is a great honor for me to welcome President Stephanopoulos here to celebrate the ties that bind the United States and Greece. And we look forward to discussing the many, many issues between our two countries, including the situation in the Aegean, which we strongly feel should be resolved without any force or threat of force, according to the international agreements and with respect to the territorial integrity of all parties involved.

I'm looking forward to this, and I'm very glad you're here, Mr. President.

China-U.S. Trade

Q. Are you afraid of a trade war with China, Mr. President?

President Clinton. Excuse me?

Q. Are you afraid of a trade war with China?

President Clinton. No, I don't think so. The United States, I think, has been more open to Chinese products than any other country. We buy an enormous percentage of their exports, a far larger percentage than our share of the world economy. And we are—tried to aid the transition of the Chinese economy and to have a constructive relationship with them, but we have a right to preserve the integrity of our own laws and especially our intellectual property laws.

The United States has been fortunate to lead the world in the production of a lot of electronics and computer related equipment and software. And the products of the mind and the laboratories in America should be protected under international agreements, and they should be entitled to that in every country. That's all we ask.

Q. Do you expect them to budge before May 15th?

President Clinton. Well, I hope we can resolve the differences between the two countries before May 15th. We're working hard on it. I hope we can. And we'll do our best to resolve it.

The President would like to make a statement.

Greece-U.S. Relations

President Stephanopoulos. I now want to say how pleased I am to be in the United States on an invitation for such a state visit. I would like to convey to the American people the greetings of the entire Greek people and their admiration. The Greek people are fully aware of the fact that democracy is founded on efforts such as the ones that the United States and Greece make and based on the ideals that our two countries express.

And I would like to assure you that the problems that arise in the Aegean are not at all our responsibility. We always try, and we succeed, in behaving according to international law.

Thank you, Mr. President.

President Clinton. Thank you very much.

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

Q. Good morning, Mr. President.

President Clinton. Good morning. Have we got everyone in? Let's wait until we have everyone in.

Q. There are two Stephanopouloses in the same office.

President Clinton. There are two Stephanopouloses in the same office.

Q. How do you feel about it?

President Clinton. I feel very good about it. I asked George this morning if there are any relations between himself and the President, and he said he had been searching for one desperately, but he hadn't yet found it. [*Laughter*] He was still hoping to find one.

Let me say, first, how very pleased I am, on behalf of all the people of the United States, to welcome President Stephanopoulos here. The ties between America and Greece are well known. The vitality, the importance of the Greek-American community to our country, I think, is well known to the people of Greece. But our partnership for so many years now has meant a great deal to the United States, and I look forward to working to strengthen it.

I also look forward to our discussions of a wide variety of issues. I know we will discuss the matters in the Aegean. I want to say again that we believe these matters should be resolved according to international law, without any force, without any threat of force, and respecting the territorial integrity of all the parties. And we believe that a lot of progress can be made in that part of the world, and that the future of Europe and the future of the Mediterranean region and, indeed, to a large extent the future of democracy everywhere depends upon our ability to work in good faith, to work through those issues.

So I'm looking forward to this meeting and very pleased to have the opportunity to host it.

Aegean Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, a month ago in this same office, you had a meeting with the Greek Prime Minister and you had discussed these problems we had with Turkey. Do you think there is any chance for Turkey to go to the International Court? Do you have any information about that from Ankara?

President Clinton. Well, I believe there is a chance. I was encouraged. Of course, the representatives of the two countries met in Bucharest recently and, I believe, will meet again in Berlin soon. And I think there is a good chance it can be resolved. I believe we have taken a position that is the proper one, and I believe it's consistent with the position that the Greek Government has staked out.

Balkan Peace Process

Q. How will you define the role of Greece in the Balkans?

President Clinton. Excuse me?

Q. How will you define the role of Greece in the Balkans?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I want to thank Greece for their support of the operation in Bosnia. And the President, in particular, I know, has tried to play a constructive role in dealing with the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, in dealing with the problems in Albania.

I believe that Greece will have to be involved in order to have a comprehensive resolution of the problems in the Balkans, and goodness knows we have worked hard for that. And we have seen in the last few years what a terrible price we pay if the problems are not resolved peacefully in the Balkans.

Cyprus

Q. Anything on Cyprus, Mr. President? On the Cyprus issue? On Cyprus?

President Clinton. Well, as you know, I have spent quite a lot of time myself on the Cyprus issue in the last 3½ years. I am sorry that it hasn't produced any more positive results. But we are exploring now the possibility of what else we can do there, and I want to discuss that with the President. And I'm hopeful that the United States can play a constructive role there. And I'm hopeful that it can be resolved. But that is something we need to discuss.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. Participants referred to George R. Stephanopoulos, Assistant to the President for Policy and Strategy, and Prime Minister Konstandinos Simitis of Greece. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President's News Conference With President Konstandinos Stephanopoulos of Greece

May 9, 1996

President Clinton. Good afternoon. Let me say once again what a pleasure it is to welcome President Stephanopoulos to the White House. The alliance, the friendship between our two nations is anchored by our common commitment to freedom and democracy. Much of our discussion today focused on the work we are doing together to build a peaceful, democratic, and undivided Europe. I was glad to have a chance to thank President Stephanopoulos for the leadership the Hellenic Republic has shown in resolving the problems in the Balkans, from Albania to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

I also want to thank Greece, and especially its soldiers, for helping to safeguard the peace in Bosnia. Our Armed Forces are proud to stand with you, Mr. President, in this important mission of peace. The progress we are making there reminds us all that it is possible to choose the promise of the future over the conflicts of the past. This can be the case in the Aegean as well. The United States will continue to help in any way we can to make the region one of peace and opportunity for all its people.

As I emphasized to President Stephanopoulos, the United States strongly supports the principle of respect for international agreements and the territorial integrity of all nations in the Aegean region. We are deeply concerned about the continuing dispute over the islet of Imia. I was personally involved in our efforts to convince our two NATO allies to pull back from their confrontation. And now we are trying to reduce tensions further and to settle the ownership question through an international tribunal. I believe the problems in the Aegean can and must be resolved through peaceful means, without force or the threat of force.

We also discussed the issue of Cyprus, something that has been of special interest to me since I became President. We hope to be able to take an initiative on Cyprus this year. A breakthrough in Cyprus could pave the way to further progress and be a model to other nations that are seeking peace.

Finally, I underscored to the President our commitment to fight terrorism. Greeks and Americans alike have been the victims of terrorist brutality at home and abroad. We know the pain and destruction it can bring, and we have a responsibility to do all we can to defeat it. We look to Greece to be a strong partner in this effort.

As an ally in NATO and a key player in the European Union, Greece is helping to shape the future of Europe and the next half century of our transatlantic partnership. The world's oldest democracy is reaching out to Europe's newest democracies to build an undivided, integrated continent at peace. The United States looks forward to continuing our partnership and to benefiting the peoples of both of our countries and the entire world.

Again, Mr. President, welcome to Washington. The microphone is yours.

President Stephanopoulos. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I would like to thank once more in the warmest and most sincere way President Clinton for his kind invitation, invitation which I accepted with great pleasure. We held interesting talks in which we established once more the identical views on many important issues. The efforts of the United States of America for stability and peace in the Balkans find us in the same camp. Greece, as you know, contributes to the extent they can do to achieve the same objectives.

We discussed what we can do in order to establish peace for good in this turbulent area of the world, which was founded in bloodshed for years and years. It is high time that this region of the world lives in peace and conciliation between its peoples. I assured President Clinton that Greece, vis-a-vis these countries but also vis-a-vis Albania, for which there is common interests of the two countries, is showing the same political willingness in order to develop better political relations with one, of course, precondition, which I will reiterate: The perfect respect of the rights of the Greek minority and, more specifically, their right to practice their religion and to be educated in their own language, the Greek language, which they have spoken for centuries and centuries, as well as all the other Greeks.

We discussed for long the crisis in the Aegean, and I expressed once more the views of the Greek side in my own words and as I see it, of course. And I have been very satisfied hearing Mr. Clinton reaffirming the principles of American policy, namely respect of international principles, international treaties, territorial integrity of all states in the area. And I do believe that these principles, common principles, will finally and ultimately be implemented in the areas, so that this turbulent area of the world will live in peace and cooperation. There are other joint projects with the United States related to technology transfer, common educational programs, assimilation of democratic institutions in which Greece and the United States of America can play an extremely important role.

Our wish is to be useful to the international community. I believe that Greece, as a member of the European Union, not only serves this European ideal of peace and cooperation but also we continue to believe that the most important ally of Europe is and will continue to be the United States of America. With the cooperation between these two entities, the European Union and the United States, many things can be achieved. Greece will be present and participating in all these efforts.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Budget Negotiations

Q. Mr. President, on a domestic issue, yesterday you said that the White House and the Congress were closer together on a balanced budget plan than was ever reported in the press. And then the Republicans produced a plan that cuts back on their tax cuts and scales back on savings and domestic programs. Does that sound like a formula that you could go along with?

President Clinton. Well, I'm encouraged that they moved. I think that's encouraging. They abandoned the proposal to abolish the Department of Education, for example. That's a good thing, but I want to study the details of the program. But it appears to me that we still have significant differences and that they propose big cuts in education and in the environment and to abolish the guarantee of coverage under Medicaid for poor children and the elderly in nursing homes and for families with family members with disabilities. And I think the Medicare number appears to be still too high. But I think it's a movement in the right direction.

There are other specific things that I have concerns about. Again, they seek to abolish the direct college loan program, which has led to lower costs, better terms, better repayments for large numbers of college students. They seek to abolish the national service program. There are a lot of things in there I don't agree with, but it is a movement in the right direction. And this is the point I am trying to make now, that what we ought to do is to resume our negotiations and reach an agreement and do what we did on this year's budget instead of having a replay of a unilateral take-it-or-leave-it deal, which is what was done in 1995.

And so I hope that this is the beginning of a process that will end in a negotiated 7-year balanced budget. We plainly have the savings in common to achieve it. And we are having a better year this year than we thought we were going to have on deficit reduction. And so we can get this done if we'll do it together.

Mr. President, do you want to call on a Greek journalist?

President Stephanopoulos. Yes.

Greece-Turkey Relations

Q. Mr. President, the average Greek is very concerned about the fact that the U.S. is supporting Turkey as a regional superpower, arming Turkey and so on. You also talked about Europe's position to the use of force in the Aegean. The average Greek would like to know from you, sir, what will you do if Turkey is again going to use force in the area? What is the U.S. going to do? If I could just ask President Stephanopoulos, the senior Stephanopoulos in the room—[*laughter*]—what exactly did you ask the U.S. in terms of Greek-Turkish relations in this meeting?

President Clinton. First, let me say, I made my position abundantly clear and very clear to the Turks, including to President Demirel on his recent trip here. We do not favor—we not only don't favor the use of force in the region; we don't favor any threats of the use of force. And we have two countries that are our allies in NATO with which we have good relations. And we want to try to facilitate a peaceful resolution of the disputes in the Aegean, of the issue of Cyprus. If Turkey and Greece could resolve their differences, the potential that they have of working together to stabilize the situation in the Balkans, to promote a Europe at peace and not torn asunder by ethnic and reli-

gious conflicts, to build a better future for all of us, is staggering.

So I'm going to do everything I can to keep down not only force but the threat of force, so that we can have a peaceful resolution of all these agreements, respecting territorial integrity, based on international agreements and without any force. That is clear. And I think the—I do not expect there to be a situation in which force comes into play, because I think that the wisdom will prevail over passion, and we'll avoid that.

President Stephanopoulos. I didn't come to the United States to ask for anything. That was not the purpose of my visit. Greece does not feel the need to ask anyone anything beyond the mere implementation of international treaties and rules of international law. This is the only demand of Greece.

I hope that the region will prevail more reasonable, more peaceful points of view. I think you do know, you and Mr. Papoulias, that there are threats of war against Greece. I hope, also, that these threats will be withdrawn sometime in the future. But if they're not withdrawn, especially if these threats materialize, Greece has the possibility to defend itself very, very effectively. I do not wish to raise the tone of the discussion, but I really do hope that we will not have this opportunity to defend ourselves. I do hope that we will be able to apply international law, and I also hope that our neighbor will realize the need that these differences, some differences which have some legal foundation—and I mean, in this case, the Continental Shelf and Imia.

So I hope that Turkey realizes that the only solution is the resort to the International Court of Justice at The Hague. And in this instance, President Clinton's views and my views do coincide perfectly.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Since you came into office, you have promoted the Middle East peace process. But a Washington Post reporter writes from Cairo that Arab leaders and man on the street believe that because of your all-out support of Israel, including the attacks on the U.N. refugee camp, leaving 50 people killed, that you have lost your credentials as an even-handed, honest broker. What do you say to that?

President Clinton. Well, first of all I'd say, if you look at the fact that the United States has continued its aid to Egypt; if you look at what we have done to try to help Jordan to support its political, economic, and military objectives as it has made peace with Israel; if you look at the efforts that we have made as a government, working with other governments and working with our citizens to try to support Mr. Arafat and what he is doing and to try to ensure that the Palestinian Authority will be successful; if you look at the terms of the agreement that the Secretary of State brokered to restore the cease-fire and to make it enforceable along the border of Israel and Lebanon; if you look at all those things, it seems to me that we have quite good credentials to be fair and balanced and to pursue the interests of all the people in the region.

But I would like to remind—it's easy for the people in the region to forget because the shelling shocked everyone and the fighting, and the Israelis made no secret of the fact that they were dismayed by the deaths in the refugee center and that they did not intend to do it. But I would remind you that——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—think they didn't know where it was?

President Clinton. I would remind you—people make mistakes in war time. There are no such things as perfect weapons. Just because we're living in a high-technology age, if you think we can have sort of surgical battles in which there are never any unintended consequences, that just doesn't happen. It just doesn't happen.

But I would remind you that the Israelis were shelled. And their citizens were subject to shelling on the day—starting the day I arrived in Israel after the Sharm al-Sheikh conference, by people who didn't like the fact that we got together at Sharm al-Sheikh and who didn't want the peace to succeed. And so all—you know, what we always said is that the Israelis had a right to defend themselves.

We also support the United Nations resolution. We look forward to the day when Lebanon will be free of all foreign soldiers, when its sovereignty will be intact, and when its people will live in peace. I just talked yesterday to the Prime Minister of Lebanon on the telephone assuring him that I would do what I could to support the reconstruction of Lebanon as well as the fair implementation of this agreement.

So I think if you—as we move away from the understandable passions that were inflamed

by the violence along the border, is that as time passes and the agreement is implemented, the people in the Arab world will look at what we have done with the Palestinians, with the Jordanians, with the Egyptians, with the brokering of this agreement and what its terms are. And I think they will see that the United States has been fair and honest. We never made any secret of the fact that we did not ever intend to support anybody who wanted to attack and destroy Israel. We never have and never will.

Balkan and Aegean Development and Security

Q. Mr. President, as far as I know, your Government worked on some plans for economic development for security, stability, and peace in the Aegean Sea and Balkans. Would you like to say anything about that?

President Clinton. Is that a question for——

Q. A question to you.

President Clinton. To me? [*Laughter*] I'm hard of hearing, and unfortunately I was trying to put these on and I didn't need them. So would you ask the question again?

Q. Of course. As far as I know, your Government works on some plans for economic development for security, peace, and stability in the Aegean Sea and the Balkans. Would you like to explain to us what exactly——

President Clinton. Well, right now, obviously, in the Balkans our main focus is on trying to make sure that the Dayton agreement and the Paris peace agreement in Bosnia takes hold and works. We have also—and we are working very hard on that. We have also had discussions with the President today about our hopes for the further progress and a final resolution of the difficulties between Greece and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. I am encouraged by what has been done. But I think that is a very important part of stability and growth in the area.

And the President shared with me some of the things which are now being done between Greece and Albania. And we discussed, among other things, what could be done in terms of our partnership in spreading technology in the region in ways that would generate significant economic activity. So we discussed all these things. But most of our immediate money, right now, is going into trying to make sure that we succeed in Bosnia, and then we want to build out from there.

Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Q. Mr. President——

President Clinton. Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize. I'm sorry.

President Stephanopoulos. I would like to answer that. Greece has many possibilities of its own to assist development and cooperation in the Balkans. And this is what we have been doing for a long time now. You very well know that Greek businessmen operate very effectively in our neighboring countries and there are many projects stemming from northern Greece, from which we expect a lot of results. I do also know that the American contribution will be very important and very useful. There are many possibilities for U.S. businessmen to cooperate with Greek businessmen. Greek businessmen know better than anyone else the local conditions. So U.S. and Greek businessmen should work together in order to enhance economic and industrial cooperation in the area.

As far as the Aegean is concerned, local differences should be resolved first before envisaging further cooperation, without this meaning that we exclude cooperation at this point in time. We have established all forms of cooperation with all countries, and we aspire to this cooperation also with the Turkish side. I hope that the time will come when this trade and economic cooperation will be our sole concern.

McDougal-Tucker Trial

Q. The testimony that you gave a few weeks ago for the McDougal-Tucker case is going on in Little Rock right now and is expected to be played this afternoon. I wonder if you could tell us what you want Americans to understand from what you said in your testimony, what you want the jury to understand, and also, if you still object to the release of the videotape publicly?

President Clinton. Well, my testimony will speak for itself. It will be fairly straightforward. All I want the American people to understand is that I was asked to testify because they thought I might have some evidence that was helpful, and I was glad to testify. And then what I said will be a matter of public record when it's run. If it's run this afternoon, it will be.

I believe the press should have access to my testimony. I just think that it ought to be treated like everybody else's testimony in Federal court, and it shouldn't be subject to abuse or misconstruction. I think it's a very straightforward—

it was a very straightforward set of questions, at least most of it, and I gave the best, direct, straightforward answers I could. I don't think it's a very big deal, but I did my best to answer the questions that were asked of me.

Thank you.

Q. You were basically being asked to refute testimony—[*inaudible*]—participate in a fraudulent deal——

President Clinton. I didn't say anything different in the trial that I haven't said in public on that.

Aegean Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, are you planning a Camp David summit for Greece and Turkey over the Aegean issue?

President Clinton. I guess the short answer right now is no, but what I am planning to do is to stay in close touch with this issue. I am encouraged that the representatives of Greece and Turkey have already met once and intend to meet again in Berlin in the next few weeks and seem to be moving toward a resolution along the lines of the standards that the President and I have both endorsed today, along the lines of respect for international agreements, respect for territorial integrity, no force, no threat of force. We believe that is very important.

If it becomes obvious at some point in the future that the United States could constructively play a larger role and that both parties are willing to have that done, I wouldn't rule that out. But I think the important thing is that the parties themselves have to resolve this difference, and they have to agree about the way it's going to be resolved. And I believe that the principles I just laid out had to be embraced by both sides in order for any success to occur.

But I will say again—let me just say again—I believe if the differences in the Aegean and the differences over Cyprus could be resolved so that Greece and Turkey, that are allies in NATO, could become in a general sense better partners, the impact on the whole future of Europe, the whole future of the linchpin area of the Balkans, the connection of that area of Europe down to the Middle East—and therefore the impact on all of us—the positive impact would be breathtaking.

So the rest of the world has a lot riding on whether Greeks and Turks can resolve their differences. So quite apart from the enormous interest that we have in the United States because of our large number of Greek-Americans, we know that the whole world has a lot riding on this. And so if there is anything we can do, we'll do it. But right now, the parties are trying to work it out for themselves, and I think they deserve a lot of support for that, and encouragement.

Thank you.

Yes, please, Mr. President.

President Stephanopoulos. Allow me to add that you're advancing things with your question. Greece has clarified what we can accept in terms of dialog with Turkey. We have clarified that no dialog is possible right now, because it is condemned to failure. If Turkey doesn't accept to send the Imia question to the International Court of Justice at The Hague, then the second precondition is the resolution of the Continental Shelf question through the same way.

So we do not deny dialog. But we want dialog, provided dialog is realistic and that it doesn't affect the sovereign rights of Greece and that it will be carried out according to international treaties and international law. So we should not talk about something which need not be realized now.

President Clinton. Thank you all very much. See you this evening.

NOTE: The President's 122d news conference began at 12:50 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. Participants referred to President Suleyman Demirel of Turkey; Karolos Papoulias, former Foreign Minister of Greece; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; and Prime Minister Rafiq al-Hariri of Lebanon. President Stephanopoulos spoke in Greek, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks at a Dinner Honoring President Konstandinos Stephanopoulos of Greece

May 9, 1996

Good evening. Ladies and gentlemen, President Stephanopoulos, Foreign Minister Pangalos, Education Minister Papandreou, members of the Greek delegation, to all of our distinguished guests from the United States and from Greece.

Hillary and I are delighted to welcome President Stephanopoulos to the White House. Mr. President, throughout your long career in public life, you have shown an extraordinary devotion to democracy and to serving the people of Greece. As a Member of Parliament as well as Minister for the Interior, Welfare, and State, you established a record of exceptional integrity and judgment. As President of the Hellenic Republic, you have represented Greece with dignity and wisdom, befitting the history of your great nation. Hillary and Chelsea were so warmly received by you and by all the Greek people recently. I thank you for that, and it now gives us very great pleasure to return the hospitality to you.

We are especially happy to have the President here at this particular point in the friendship between our two nations. Aristotle speaks at length about how friends strengthen one another by sharing virtues and characteristics. Well, Greece has turned to President Stephanopoulos for leadership, and I have my own Stephanopoulos. [*Laughter*] Mr. President, I think we're both doing pretty well.

Though thousands of miles separate our two nations, America has very deep roots in Greece. The evidence is all around us. Most of you came to dinner through the North Portico, built in Greek revival style during the Presidency of Andrew Jackson. Next door, the Treasury is the largest Greek revival building in the world. There are many other examples nearby. The Lincoln Memorial was originally modeled on the Parthenon. And the architecture we see outside is only the most visible expression of the values we share.

The earliest generations of our leaders who founded our traditions and built our institutions, as the President said earlier today, were deeply influenced by Greek thought, by the passion for truth and justice that had been handed down from the ancients. They studied history's first democracy in the original Greek. I wish I were as well educated. Some were so moved by the struggle of modern Greece for independence that they left home to join in that distant fight for freedom. In 1824 Daniel Webster asked on the floor of the House of Representatives, "Does not the land ring from side to side with one common sentiment of sympathy for Greece?"

In this century, the relationship between our nations deepened as we fought together in two World Wars. Then the desire to help preserve freedom in Greece moved President Truman to stand firm against isolationism and for our postwar engagement abroad. His actions led to the Marshall plan, the establishment of NATO, and a half century of unparalleled success for democracy. We stood together in Korea and the Gulf war. We continue to work shoulder to shoulder today in the former Yugoslavia. Our alliance shows the truth of the Greek proverb: *Ou thaneeskee zeelos eleutherias*; the passion for freedom never dies.

Tonight we also thank Greece for the greatest of all gifts it has given us, wonderful Greek-Americans. Our society has been enriched beyond measure by them, whether an aria sung by Maria Callas, films by Elia Kazan, the brilliant tennis of Pete Sampras. In business, in the arts, in our public life, Greek-Americans have brought such energy and grace to the life of our Nation, and we are all profoundly grateful. In public life, we treasure men and women like Senator Sarbanes and Senator Snowe, former Governor Dukakis, and former Senator Paul Tsongas, people who have shown a deep dedication to serving the United States. And I know that all America is grateful to the more than one million Greek-Americans who have built our communities, our businesses, and our cities. Because of what they have done, America is a stronger and a greater nation.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us raise a glass to the great partnership between our nations, the heritage we share, and the Greek-American community that is one of our greatest blessings.

Zeeto ee Hellada, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:25 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Foreign Minister Theodoros Pangalos and Education Minister Yeoryios Papandreou of Greece, and Michael S. Dukakis, former Governor of Massachusetts.

Remarks on Presenting the Commander in Chief Trophy to the United States Air Force Academy Football Team

May 10, 1996

The President. Good morning. Secretary Widnall, to our distinguished military leaders: General Shalikashvili, General Moorman, General Stein, other distinguished military leaders here, members of the Board of Visitors of the Air Force Academy, Coach DeBerry, and the seniors from the Falcons football team. We gather together for another happy occasion; but for the United States and especially for members of our military family, this is a sad day, for early this morning, two Marine helicopters crashed at a massive training exercise at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina.

At this time, we know that 16 service members were killed and 2 others very seriously injured. Our hearts go out to the families, the friends, and the loved ones of those who lost their lives. Our prayers are with those who were injured for a speedy recovery.

Day-in and day-out, our service men and women put themselves on the line so that our country can remain free and secure. We ask so much of them, to travel far from home, to be apart from their loved ones, to do difficult and often dangerous work. One of the things I confess I did not fully appreciate until I became President was how dangerous the day-in and day-out, year-in and year-out work of our military, just training, just doing the defense of our country, is, and our citizens should know that.

The seniors here behind me will soon become the guardians of our liberty, just like those fine people who lost their lives last night. And though you have been very well prepared for the job you will do, you still must assume the risks of defending that liberty. Every American owes every one of you who will become an officer or a member of the United States military a tremendous debt of gratitude.

I'm happy to see all you here today. I'm beginning to wonder if I can make it interesting. If you ever have really needed proof that we have a joint planning and operation and we're really building a joint culture in the United States military, we're going to give it today with General Shali congratulating the Air Force for another victory over the Army. [*Laughter*]

The friendly but fierce interservice rivalries should mean that almost anything can happen in competition, but at least lately, only one thing happens: The Air Force always wins. This is the 7th year in a row the Falcons have come to the White House to collect this prize. I hope the thrill isn't gone.

I understand this past November you actually lost the Commander in Chief's Trophy for a short time when there was a sneak attack masterminded by Army pranksters invading your field house before the game. Well, that didn't work, either. [*Laughter*] You played a great game this year against Army. I was especially impressed that you came back from a 14-point deficit to win decisively.

I've learned a little something about what it takes to overcome large deficits—[*laughter*]—and I was mightily impressed. I know there were other outstanding highlights of this year's season: beating Brigham Young's Cougars for the first time in a dozen tries, being cochampions of the Western Athletic Conference, going to the Copper Bowl. The Falcons had a very good year.

If the way you played is any indication of what is to come, coach, we expect to see the Air Force back here this time next year. I hope I'll be here to greet you. [*Laughter*] And I should note that, to the best of my knowledge, unlike me, you are not term-limited.

Finally, let me just say that I was most impressed by something that Coach DeBerry said earlier in the season. He said that through football the players on his team are helped to become better people. That is what we need more

of in college athletics and, indeed, in all of our endeavors. It's so important that young people be taught not only to take responsibility for becoming the best they can be in every endeavor, but also doing that in working with a team. That's what makes our military work. That's what makes our country work. And I think sometimes we forget that that is the ultimate object of all of our human endeavors. Winning is wonderful, but everybody who does his or her best and who tries to do it with a genuine spirit of cooperation with others is a winner. In that sense, the Air Force will always be a winner. But today, for the 7th year in a row, you're still the possessor of the Commander in Chief's Trophy.

Coach DeBerry. Let's give him a hand. [*Applause*]

Coach Fisher DeBerry. Mr. President, I appreciate it. Thank you very much, kind words, thank you very much. We are honored to be here, a great big honor for us because it's your trophy.

Thank you, sir.

The President. Thank you.

[*Coach DeBerry, Lt. Gen. Paul Stein, USAF, Superintendent, United States Air Force Academy, and LeRon Hudgins, Falcons team captain, made brief remarks and presented the President with a team jersey and a hat. Mr. Hudgins stated that when the President was elected in 1992, he and his classmates knew they would get a chance to visit through the Commander in Chief Trophy.*]

The President. That's a high level of confidence, that 1992 remark. [*Laughter*] Well, I thank you very much. I will run in the jersey, I'll play golf in the cap, and I'll always remember this day.

One thing I do want to say again is that, as confident as these young people are, I've never heard any of these young men say in the last 4 years anything that could be roughly interpreted as, "When we're not around they won't have a great team anymore." [*Laughter*] And I think again that's a real tribute to the spirit of teamwork that prevails.

So I thank you, I'm glad to be here, and I think we're going to take a couple of pictures, and then we'll break up and shake hands.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

Remarks at the Pennsylvania State University Graduate School Commencement in State College, Pennsylvania

May 10, 1996

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for that very warm welcome. Thank you, President Spanier. Thank you, Mr. Arnelle, Dr. Brighton, Dr. Erickson, Mr. Hollander. I thank the University Brass for playing so well for me. It made me want to take them back to the White House.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here for many very personal reasons, many of which are obvious. I'm very honored to receive the University Scholars Medal and to be the first non-Penn State alumnus to receive it.

As was said earlier, my family has a long history with this State and with this great university. Hillary's family is from Scranton and both my father-in-law and brother-in-law attended Penn State and both played football here. Back in the thirties, according to my father-in-law, he had to play offense and defense. [*Laughter*] That's sort of what I do, so I understand that. [*Laughter*]

I have had some other good personal associations with this university, and for all those I am very grateful. I am grateful for the establishment of a scholarship at the college of education in my late father-in-law's name. It means a great deal to my wife and to me and to our daughter. And I am grateful to be here because of what Penn State represents.

This school was made a land-grant school in the darkest hours of our Nation's history, because President Lincoln and his contemporaries knew even then that our Nation's future depended upon the widest possible dispersion of knowledge. Though faced with the possibility of the very union of our States breaking up,

our leaders were still thinking about the future. And to all the graduates here with advanced degrees, I say, a great nation must always be thinking about tomorrow. Therefore, even as you relish this day, I ask you to join me just for a few moments in thinking about tomorrow, for you will live a great deal of your lives in the 21st century, the most remarkable age of possibility in human history.

I have been told that today, every student at Penn State is given an E-mail account and that more than one million E-mail messages are sent every day. That is just a taste of the world to come, a dazzling, new global economy, giving more and more people a chance to work with their minds instead of their backs throughout a career, many of you in jobs that you have not even invented yet. You will have incredible choices in where you live and how you work. You will be able to raise your children in greater peace and freedom and in the most diverse and vibrant democracy history has ever known. At least that's what I want our country to be like as we move into the 21st century.

Almost 5 years ago at my alma mater, Georgetown, I gave three speeches about my vision of America's future in the 21st century and a strategy for how I thought we ought to achieve that future. I said then and I'd like to repeat now that my vision is pretty simple and straightforward: I want an America in which all Americans, without regard to their race or their gender or their station in life, who are willing to work hard, have a chance to live out their dreams. I want an America that remains the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity. And I want an America that is no longer being driven apart by our differences but instead is coming together around our shared values and respect for our diversity.

As my wife says in her book, I really believe it takes a village of all of our people working together to make the most of our lives. To build that kind of America, we have to be able to honestly meet our challenges and protect our values. We have to find ways to create these opportunities for all Americans. We have to find ways to build strong communities. And we have got to find ways to get more personal responsibility from all of our citizens. Opportunity, responsibility, community: these are values that have made our country strong, that have built great institutions like Penn State, that guide my actions as President. I believe they must guide our Nation as we prepare for the tomorrows of the 21st century.

What I want to do here and in the other commencement addresses I will be making is to talk about what has occurred in the last 4 years and, even more importantly, what must still occur if we are going to realize this vision, to give opportunities to everybody willing to work for them, to keep our country the strongest force for peace and freedom, and to rebuild our sense of unity and community around a shared ethic of responsibility.

Compared to 4 years ago, there is clearly more opportunity, a much lower deficit, increased access to education, a renewed commitment to a clean environment and safer streets, 8½ million new jobs, low inflation, record numbers of new exports in businesses. But we all know there are also a lot of problems in this new economy, a lot of uncertainty, and much more to do to give all our people a chance to succeed.

Compared to 4 years ago, the world is more peaceful and safer. The nuclear threat has diminished. Peace and freedom are taking hold from Haiti to South Africa to Northern Ireland to Bosnia to the Middle East. But there is a lot more to do to make the American people safe from the 21st century threats of terrorism, organized crime, and drug running, weapons proliferation, and global environmental threats.

In future speeches I'll discuss both these things at greater length. Today I'd like to ask you to kind of travel along with me as we look at America's present and its future in terms of that third objective: inspiring a stronger, more united American community, rooted in a greater commitment to personal responsibility and community service.

What you have done here today is in and of itself an act of responsibility. By getting this advanced degree you have honored yourselves and your families, and you have helped America. We need more people—many, many more people—with much higher levels of education and, even more importantly, with the developed ability to learn for a lifetime. We need this kind of personal responsibility from all of our citizens, doing the best to make the most of their own lives. And we must apply the lessons of your success as individuals to our common work as a nation.

I believe we are living through a period of most profound change in the way we work, the

way we live, the way we relate to each other and the rest of the world in 100 years, since we moved from the agricultural into the industrial age. At the turn of the century, about 100 years ago, people who for generations had lived their lives by the rising and the setting of the Sun moved from the country to the city, where they woke to the din of the streetcar and went home to the sound of the factory whistle. That time presented enormous opportunities but also great challenges. A hundred years ago, many people's lives were uprooted but not improved. And for many, not only their livelihoods but the values by which they lived were threatened by the changes of the day.

In response to the challenges of that time, a gifted generation of reformers, led first by Theodore Roosevelt and then by Woodrow Wilson, worked to harness the power of our Nation's Government so that it could extend the benefits of the industrial era to all Americans, curb the excesses of the era, and enable our people to preserve their family and community values. They launched what we now call the progressive era. They brought us the antitrust laws, the child protection laws, the earliest environment protection laws. They were all designed to harness the positive forces of the new age to give everyone a fair chance to protect the values of the American people.

Think what has happened in the 100 years since. The progressives built the foundation of what became known as the American Century, a century in which America won two World Wars and the cold war, overcame the Great Depression, achieved decades of sustained economic growth, scientific breakthroughs, more opportunities for women and minorities, a cleaner environment, remarkable security and good health for senior citizens, and the largest and most prosperous middle class in human history. It all began in the progressive era.

Today, we're living through another time of profound change. Like the dawn of the industrial age, the information age offers vast new opportunities. Today, technology and information are dominating every form of work including agriculture, as I'm sure anyone in the college of agriculture here can attest to.

But this time also presents great challenges, people whose lives are uprooted but not improved and cherished values strained by the pace and the scope of change. I'd like to talk about that a little today.

When I was growing up, Americans could pretty much walk the streets of any city without fear of being hurt by violent crime. Having children out of wedlock was rare and a source of shame. Welfare was a temporary way station for widows and their orphans. It was far from a perfect time, the forties and fifties and early sixties. Women and minorities didn't have the opportunities they have today. But in neighborhoods all across America, people knew it when you were born, cared about you while you lived, and missed you when you died.

For too many young people growing up today, that world exists only in black and white reruns on television. In our toughest neighborhoods and our meanest streets, we've seen a stunning and simultaneous breakdown of community, family, and work, the heart and soul of a civilized society. We've seen a buildup of crime and gangs and drugs, as young people turn to things that will destroy them, ultimately, in part because they are raising themselves without enough to say yes to.

We've seen so much of this now we've almost become numb to it. A lot of us may even be resigned to it. But I want to ask you to think today about what you want America to look like in the 21st century, and I want you to say to yourself, "I refuse to accept this as a normal and unavoidable and irreversible condition. I believe we can mend our social fabric. We've done it before, and we have to do it today."

If we're moving into an era in which we will be judged and our success will be determined by how well we use our minds, we must first be able to function as orderly, law-abiding, decent human beings. We have to, in short, not only meet the changes of the day but reaffirm our enduring values.

In this, to be sure, our Government still has a role to play. But it's not the same role that Government had to play in the beginning of the 20th century because the problems are different. The world of today has moved away from big, centralized bureaucracies and top-down solutions; so has your Federal Government. Indeed, there are 240,000 fewer people working for the United States Government today than there were the day I became President of this great country.

But we still need a Government that is strong enough to give people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives, to enable them to seize opportunities when they are re-

sponsible. That's why I have fought so hard for things like the student loan programs, the Pell grant programs, the scholarship programs, the research programs, because we cannot, on the one hand, tell the American people, go out and be responsible, and on the other hand, jerk the rug out from under them. We have to give people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives.

And whenever we fight for a strong economy or a clean environment or safe streets or investment in research and technology or give a child a chance with the Head Start program, we are doing nothing more or less than giving people an environment in which they still have to make the most of their own lives.

And so what I ask you today is to think about that. What is the role of the individual citizen in making the America of our dreams in the 21st century? What is the role of the individual citizen in making sure that we will move into this global society with everyone having the chance to live up to his or her dreams? It is clear to me that Government alone cannot solve this problem.

If you look at any society's most fundamental requirements, strong families and safe streets, and you ask yourselves, what are all the causes for the stresses on those things in our country, you may come up with a whole laundry list of things that Government can do about them. I know I have. But in your heart of hearts you know that many, many of the things from which we suffer are caused by the lack of personal responsibility on the part of millions of American citizens, the teen mother who leaves school for a life on welfare, a father who walks away from or abuses a family, a criminal who preys upon the rest of us, the neighbors who turn their backs upon the children in need.

I say to you we cannot tolerate this anymore if you really want your vision of the 21st century to become real. We have to be willing to give people a chance to escape lives that are destructive for them and costly for the rest of us. That is our responsibility. But we must also insist that people help themselves and assume responsibility for making their own lives and the life of this great Nation better.

If you just take the welfare system, for example, you can see the point I'm trying to make. I took office believing that a lot of people on welfare were dying to get off it and were trapped in it. I still believe that. It's a system that is too weighted toward a lifetime of dependency instead of demanding responsibility, too willing to let fathers bring children into the world, turn their backs, and walk away and load all the burden onto the young mothers who are left behind, too willing to give the young mothers a check to move out on their own if they have a child instead of staying at home, staying in school, and strengthening the family.

For 15 years, going back to my service as Governor, I have sat in welfare offices, talked to people on welfare, asked them what it would take to turn their lives around, asked them what had happened. I have worked to reform and change welfare from a system that encourages dependency to one that encourages independence, from one that does not encourage work to one that insists upon work but also supports responsible parenting.

If you look at all these people here with their advanced degrees, why are we so proud of them? Because we believe they will be able to succeed not only in the world of work but they will be good role models for the American society. Their children will be able to succeed. They will be able to look at their children and their children will be able to look at them, and they will be able to do great things together. That is what we should want for people on welfare, the simple ability to succeed at work and to succeed at home, to be able to contribute their portion of the American dream.

Now, in the past 3 years, by executive actions, we've been working on what the New York Times called "a quiet revolution on welfare." We've cut redtape for 37 States and now let 75 percent of the people in this country on welfare be a part of welfare reform experiments with little fanfare and no new legislation. We've done things like impose time limits and require work, and we've worked much harder to enforce the National Government's role in child support enforcement across national lines.

And you know what? The welfare rolls have dropped by more than a million. The food stamp rolls are down by a million and a half. Child support collections are up 40 percent to $11 billion a year. And the teen pregnancy rate has even started to go down a bit.

What does all this have to do with you? They are part of your country. If their children wind up in your prisons, you will pay for them instead of investing more money in scientific laboratories at Penn State or giving children a chance

to work in a program to earn a scholarship or otherwise building our future. When others regularly and systematically violate the values we all say we share, it weakens America, and it weakens the future of your vision and your dreams.

We still have a lot to do. Nearly a third of our babies today are born out of wedlock; a whole lot of them end up on welfare. A few days ago, we took an action which should force more responsibility. Every State will have to require teen mothers to stay in school and to sign a personal responsibility contract and to stay at home unless the environment is abusive, so that they must work to turn their lives around if they want to keep those benefits.

I'm still working with Members of Congress in both parties to pass legislation to overhaul the entire welfare system. And I hope we can do it even though this is an election year. There's really no call for a work stoppage, and by the time November comes around you'll have more politics than you can stand. Meanwhile, we ought to be working to give those people what we want for ourselves: independence, work, and responsible parenting.

But what I want to say to all of you—you say, "Well, what's that got to do with me? I'll never be on welfare; I've got a Ph.D. today." [*Laughter*] They are your fellow Americans. Those children are your future. And what I want to say is, it doesn't matter what laws we pass or what programs we put in place, we cannot reverse decades and patterns of behavior unless more of our citizens are willing to take some responsibility for other people's kids in the near-term.

We have to inspire our communities to support programs and adults to participate in programs that we know now will dramatically reduce teen pregnancy. They're out there; they're just not in every community. The hard truth is, too many of our young people don't have the kind of discipline or love, guidance, or support that it takes to grow up into responsible adults. Church groups and neighbors and parents all need to send a clear message to all children, not just their own: We care about you, but you have to take care of yourself. Don't get pregnant or father a child until you're ready to take responsibility. But if you do, we'll help you as long as you are responsible. And you can't walk away from that responsibility. If you do, we'll make you assume it.

Let me say that, in addition to welfare, I have the same view of the crime problem, and it's remarkably similar. Only if we take responsibility for our own communities can we really achieve our objective in crime. We'll never thoroughly transform human nature, but even if you have a Ph.D., you don't want to be a victim of a crime; you don't want your children to be unsafe going to and from school; you don't want to have to worry your heart out if your kids drive to a city to see a play; you don't want to have any kind of country other than one of which crime is an exception.

Someone said to me the other day, "Mr. President, you talk about all this all the time, but you will never eliminate crime." I said, "That's not my goal. My goal is to create an America so that when people turn on the evening news and they see a report of a serious crime, they are surprised and shocked, instead of yawning about it."

Now, there are things that Government can do. There are things that Government can do. In 1994, we passed a crime bill and a Brady bill. The Brady bill has already stopped 60,000 felons and fugitives with criminal records from getting handguns—60,000. We took 19 deadly assault weapons off the street, and not a single hunter in Pennsylvania or in my native State of Arkansas missed a deer season or a duck season or had to have a different weapon. They didn't lose anything.

We said to repeat violent criminals, "three strikes and you're out." We said, "If you kill law enforcement officials, the death penalty is there." But we also said what every police officer in America knows, the best way to fight crime is to reach young people before they turn to crime in the first place. [*Applause*]

Now, you all clap for that, but if you believe it, what it means is that you cannot leave the work of making our streets safe to the police alone. Citizens have the responsibility. Citizens have a responsibility. You can take advantage of opportunities provided in our education bills to keep schools open late so teens have someplace to go besides the streets or to launch community drug courts to give nonviolent offenders a chance to get off drugs before they end up in jail or to make community policing work, something that's making the rounds in Pennsylvania today.

Our crime bill fulfilled a commitment I made to the American people to put 100,000 new

police officers on the street in community policing. It's an old-fashioned idea, really. It means put the police back on the street, in the neighborhood, working with neighbors to spot criminals, shutting down crack houses, stopping crime before it happens, getting to know children on the street and encouraging them to stay away from crime. But community policing only works by definition when there is a community for the police to work with.

Now, whenever this happens crime comes down. Violent crimes have dropped in this country for 3 years in a row now because we're finally getting enough police out there on the street and because people are working with them. In Lancaster County, a 2-hour drive from here, our community police program put 12 new officers into the downtown area—listen to this—they patrolled on foot, bicycle, and horseback, they worked with the community. The crime dropped by 67 percent. Pretty soon they'll be surprised when they hear a report of crime.

This can be done. But I have to tell you, there's a big hurdle up the road, and it can't be solved without more citizen help. Because in spite of the fact that the crime rate has dropped for 3 years in a row, the violent crime rate by people under 18 is still going up. And any of you who are in education know that there is a huge group of young people under 18, now coming into grade school, coming up through our system of education, a higher percentage of them than any previous generation born out of wedlock, born without the guidance of two parents, born into difficult family situations, out there having to raise themselves.

So even if you have a Ph.D., you've got to care about these kids. They're your kids. They're coming home to your roost, and they will affect your country and your children's future and what kind of America we live in. And we cannot solve the problem of rising crime among young people, even with our antidrug strategy, even with our antigang strategy, even with 100,000 more police, unless there are citizens who are willing to step into the gap in those children's lives to teach them right from wrong, to give them a good future to look forward to, to give them the character and values to walk into that future, to make it possible for them to imagine that one day they might get a degree from a place like Penn State. You have to be willing to do that wherever you live.

I will just give you one simple example. There are 20,000 neighborhood crime watch groups in America—20,000. If 50 people join each one of these groups we would have a citizen force of a million new community activists to work with those 100,000 police officers, not just to catch criminals but to keep kids away from crime. Fifty people in every group, a million Americans reaching out to children, stopping crimes, catching criminals. If that happened—and no Government program can make it happen—if that happened in community after community after community in the United States, people would be surprised when they heard at night a news report of a serious crime. And America would be a better place. We'd be a lot closer to our shared vision of America in the 21st century.

And that brings me to the last point I wish to make. We have a lot of challenges as a people to rebuild the strength of our communities and our national community. We're still too divided over racial matters. We're still too divided over religious disputes. We still have other problems that are simply unmet that can't be met by Government. Helping children on welfare to move off of welfare, helping communities to reduce the crime rate, these are not the only areas in which we desperately need more citizen involvement to make America the place it ought to be.

Those of you who have college degrees, those of you who may earn a great deal of money will still find that in too many ways where you live the bonds of community have been weakened. There are too many places where people are working harder, moving more often, spending less time with each other and more time exhausted in front of the television. Even prosperous, happy neighborhoods often find that not everybody knows their neighbors.

So I say to you, with this wonderful, precious commodity of a fine education, I hope you will go out into your community and find some way to give back some of what your country has given to you. No matter what you do or how busy you are, there is always a way to serve a larger community. The story of your generation should be the story of how we restore broken lives and shattered promises through citizen service.

We're going to balance this budget over the next 6 years. We're going to have a big fight about how to do it, as you know. [*Laughter*]

But don't let that obscure the fact; this deficit is less than half of what it was 4 years ago. And it's coming down. Don't obscure the real fact. And that's very important because as we move to balance the budget, we can keep interest rates down and we can keep investment up and create jobs for the American people and get incomes rising again, which has been the source of constant anxiety in places like Pennsylvania where people lost really good jobs and couldn't get other jobs paying at the same or better wages. It's an important thing to do.

I will do my best to protect our investments in education, in the environment, in the quality and character of the Medicare and Medicaid programs. But make no mistake about it: As we shrink Government, until we balance the budget, there will be even more reliance on citizen servants to meet the needs of the American people because we can't shrink from our challenges on the grounds that we're shrinking the deficit.

There's an emerging consensus in Washington, believe it or not, across party lines that we ought to do more to help charities and religious institutions and families and individuals to step in where Government can't anymore or where it shouldn't. I'll give you just a few examples. Leaders in both parties, from Senator Joe Lieberman, a Democrat of Connecticut, to Senator Dan Coats, a Republican from Indiana, have proposed reforms to encourage private citizens to assume responsibilities that are not and cannot be fulfilled by Government agencies alone. For example, making sure every child has a loving home is a national priority. But Government doesn't raise children; only good parents can do that. That's why earlier this week I urged Congress to enact one of these bipartisan proposals, a $5,000 tax credit to help families, working families, adopt children. And just a few hours ago that proposal passed with an almost unanimous vote in the House of Representatives. It is going to become the law of the land.

We created AmeriCorps, the national service program, in 1993, so we could give our young people a chance to earn their way through college by giving something back to their community and their country. Since that time, AmeriCorps has given more than 40,000 young people all across this country a chance to serve, to work with troubled teenagers, immunize children, help seniors who don't have enough support, clean up the environment, do countless other things. I have met so many of these young people around the country who tell me that the experience literally changed their lives and they'll never spend another year of their life without taking some time to rebuild their community. That is the kind of spirit we need to create in all of America.

I want to thank your former Senator, Harris Wofford, for agreeing to head the AmeriCorps program and for ensuring its continuation. I want to thank our constructive critics, like Senator Charles Grassley of Iowa, the Republican Senator from Iowa, who worked with Senator Wofford to strengthen the AmeriCorps program and to preserve it.

Let me just suggest three other things that we could do to get more young people involved. First, I've asked Congress to increase funding for work-study programs for students so that we can have a million students earning their way through college by the year 2000. Today I'd like to ask Penn State and every other institution of higher education in the country to consider using more of this money to promote service, to put thousands of college students to work in community service. If it's good for students to earn money by putting books back in library shelves or working in the dean's office, surely it makes sense for them to earn money helping teen mothers handle their responsibilities, helping older people get around, helping young people to look to a brighter future.

Second, I challenge every high school in America to make service a part of its basic ethic. Every high school student who can do so should do some community service. There are some schools, both public and private, that require community service as a part of their curriculum. I say, good for them. Commitment to community should be an ethic we learn as soon as possible so we carry it throughout our lives.

And third, I challenge every community to help those high school students answer the call of service. Today I'm prepared to make an offer and challenge any school district or civic organization in the country to match it: If you will raise $500 to reward a high school student who has done significant work to help your community, the Federal Government will match your $500 and help that student go on to college. That would cost us, by the way, about $10 million if every high school in the country did it. It would be the best $10 million we ever spent. We would get hundreds of millions of dollars

of improved quality of life and service to people as a result of it.

This fall, I'll announce the winners of a nationwide competition to identify schools that have done the best job in encouraging this kind of service. Students at those schools will become national service scholars. A year from now I want it to be even bigger. I want every principal in America to be able to stand up before a graduating class and announce the name of a national service scholar. We should make service to the community a part of every high school in America and a part of the life of every dedicated citizen in the United States.

So, my fellow Americans, in spite of all we have to do to create more opportunity, we also must find a way to urge, cajole, plead, generate, demand more responsibility for ourselves, our families, our communities, and our country.

This summer in Atlanta we will celebrate the centennial of the modern Olympics. It's a great honor to host those Olympics in the United States. But I ask you to think when you see these young people come out about more than medals and who will win and lose. The real meaning of the Olympics is what miracles happen to people when they make a deep and profound commitment to take personal responsibility for just becoming the best that they can be and when they're willing to work with teammates to make their common endeavors even greater. That is the great strength of America.

You know, the president mentioned earlier that—or maybe it was the chairman of your board—about Pennsylvania's role in starting this country. And I want you to think about this as I close. Our Founding Fathers, who did so much of their work right here in Pennsylvania, would not be surprised that in this new era, with all of its possibilities, there are still a lot of tough problems. They were very smart. They knew there would never be a perfect, problem-free time. They wouldn't be surprised at all. But they would be very surprised and bitterly disappointed if we were to give into pessimism about these problems, deny their existence, and walk away from them. They knew—you can read it in "The Federalist Papers," you can read it in the founding documents—they knew that freedom requires responsibility and service for personal prosperity and for the common good.

You graduates have been blessed with the richest educational experience the world can offer. As Americans, you've been blessed to inherit the greatest country on Earth. Now you have to honor that debt by asking yourselves, "What do I want my country to be like in the 21st century, and what am I prepared to do to make it a reality?"

I will do all I can to give you the opportunities to make the most of your lives, but you must do all you can to assume responsibility for yourselves, your families, and your communities. If you do that, I believe your life will be a lot happier and richer and you will surely make the 21st century America's greatest days.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:11 p.m. at the Bryce Jordan Center. In his remarks, he referred to Graham Spanier, president; Leslie Arnelle, chairman, Board of Trustees; John A. Brighton, executive vice president and provost; Rodney Erickson, professor, Pennsylvania State University; and Thomas Hollander, president, Pennsylvania State University Alumni Association.

Statement on the Death of Calvin A.H. Waller

May 10, 1996

We mourn the passing of Lieutenant General Calvin A.H. Waller, U.S. Army (Ret.), whose dedicated and exceptional career is admired by everyone who knew of his extraordinary courage, inspiring leadership, and selfless service. During a distinguished career which culminated in his service as Deputy Commander of U.S. forces in the Persian Gulf during Operation Desert Storm, General Waller achieved prominence as a skillful and disciplined professional and a caring, enthusiastic commander. His rise from humble beginnings to one of the highest-ranking African-American officers in the U.S. military through stalwart determination and a record of

excellence served as an inspiration to minority and nonminority officers. To General Waller's wife, Marion, his family and friends, and to the Army community, I extend my deepest sympathy. He will be remembered as one of America's finest soldiers and most capable military leaders.

Memorandum on the Welfare Initiative for Teen Parents
May 10, 1996

Memorandum for the Secretary of Health and Human Services

Subject: Welfare Initiative Regarding Teen Parents

This memorandum will confirm my directive to you to implement the plan I announced on Saturday, May 4, 1996, to help teen parents break free of the cycle of welfare dependency by living at home, staying in school, and getting the education they need to get good jobs.

I direct you to exercise your legal authority to take the following steps to implement that plan:

(1) require States to submit plans describing how they will ensure that teen parents stay in school and prepare for employment;

(2) require teen parents who have dropped out of school to sign personal responsibility plans that spell out how such teens are going to move towards supporting and caring for themselves and their children, including attendance at school;

(3) allow States to reward with cash allowances teen parents who stay in school and graduate, as well as require States to sanction teens who do not;

(4) challenge States to use the authority they have to require minor mothers to live at home; and

(5) monitor State performance in the foregoing areas.

You have advised me that you have legal authority to take these actions under titles IV–A and IV–F of the Social Security Act.

The plan I have outlined will help assure that the welfare system requires teen parents to follow responsible paths to independence. Its swift implementation is vital to achieving our goal of further instilling the American values of work, family, and personal responsibility into our welfare system.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The President's Radio Address
May 11, 1996

Good morning. Tomorrow millions of Americans will honor our mothers with hugs and bouquets and visits for dinner. Others of us will simply offer up a silent prayer for the mother who still lives in our heart but who has left this Earth. I miss my own mother very much, especially on Mother's Day. I can't give her roses tomorrow, but with your help we can honor all mothers by giving mothers-to-be something far more important, the assurance that when they bring a baby into this world, they will not be rushed out of the hospital until they and their health care provider decide it is medically safe for both mother and child. Today I want to discuss legislation that will guarantee mothers the quality care they need when they've had a baby.

In 1970, the average length of stay for an uncomplicated hospital delivery was 4 days. By 1992, the average had declined to 2 days. Now a large and growing number of insurance companies are refusing to pay for anything more than a 24-hour stay, except in the most extreme circumstances, and some have recommended releasing women as early as 8 hours after delivery.

This has gone from being an economical trend to a dangerous one, one that carries with it the potential for serious health consequences. Early release of infants can result in numerous problems, including feeding problems, severe dehydration, brain damage, and stroke. In addition, many mothers are not physically capable of providing for a newborn's needs 24 hours after giving birth. Often they're exhausted, in pain, and faced with an overwhelming set of new responsibilities. Many first-time mothers also need more than 24 hours in the hospital to receive instruction in basic infant care and breast feeding. And sometimes an early discharge can be fatal.

Michelle Bauman testified before a Senate committee that she was told to go home 28 hours after her daughter was born. Her baby died within one day of going home. If she had been allowed a 48-hour stay, she would have been in the hospital when her daughter's symptoms appeared. As she so tragically put it, another 24 hours, and her baby's symptoms would have surfaced "so that we could have planned a christening, not a funeral."

Susan Jones and her baby son were discharged after about 24 hours. It turns out he had a heart defect which was not noticed by the hospital or the home health nurse who came to visit on the third day. The baby died. Susan and an independent group of pediatric cardiologists believe the problem would have been noticed in the hospital by the second or third day.

As a nation that values the health of women and children, we must not turn our backs on this problem. There is an emerging national consensus that we must put a stop to these so-called drive-through deliveries. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the American Academy of Pediatrics have issued guidelines recommending a minimum stay of 48 hours following most normal deliveries, and 96 hours following most cesarean sections. Sixteen States have enacted laws to guarantee that level of coverage and 25 more are considering such a move.

A growing number of hospitals have taken it upon themselves to provide the second day of coverage free. And one group of insurers, Blue Cross and Blue Shield Plans of Pennsylvania, has responded to public concerns by voluntarily offering 48-hour minimum coverage. I believe every insurance company should step up to this problem and do what these insurers in Pennsylvania have done.

But in the absence of coverage for all women in all States, we have a responsibility to take action in Washington. Already, a Senate bill and separate House bills have been introduced, most with bipartisan support, to guarantee 48-hour post partum hospital stays for mothers and their children.

I urge Members of Congress to move legislation forward as soon as possible that makes this protection for mothers and their children the law of the land. No insurance company should be free to make the final judgment about what is medically best for newborns and their mothers. That decision should be left up to doctors, nurses, and mothers themselves. Saving the life and health of mothers and newborns is more important than saving a few dollars.

America's mothers hold a special place in our hearts. They provide the lessons and care that enable all of our children to embrace the opportunities of this great land. They deliver the precious gift of life. Let's give them a Mother's Day gift they richly deserve. Let's guarantee them 48-hour hospital stays to protect their health and the health of their newborn babies. Mothers sacrifice so much for us. It's the least we can do for them.

Happy Mother's Day, and thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5 p.m. on May 10 at Pennsylvania State University in State College for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on May 11. A portion of this address could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks Announcing Proposed Anti-Gang and Youth Crime Control Legislation

May 13, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by thanking all of you for coming here and, more importantly, for the work that you are doing. I'm glad that we finally have a chance to talk about these efforts to stop youth violence.

As you know, we were slated to have this event the day that Ron Brown and his delegation tragically lost their lives in the Balkans. Before I go forward, I think I have to acknowledge that today all Americans have heavy hearts over another air tragedy, the one in Miami. We send our prayers, our condolences to the families of those who lost their lives in the Everglades.

The Federal Aviation Administration has been conducting a review of ValuJet since February. Last night the FAA announced it will broaden the review to assure that ValuJet's flights are safe and fully comply with FAA requirements. I have directed Secretary Pena to report to me this week on additional measures the Department of Transportation and the FAA can take to ensure that all our airlines continue to operate at the highest level of safety. I'm determined to do everything I can to make sure that American aviation is the safest in the world.

Now, let me thank the Attorney General and the U.S. attorneys and all of those who worked with them for the work they have done to curb youth violence and gangs. Thanks to the U.S. attorneys and the police chiefs here today, thanks to citizen supporters throughout this country, including a number of ex-gang members who in some communities have been very helpful in this regard, we have been able to see a substantial drop in the crime rate. We are determined to do all we can to help you and to help our young people.

The crime bill of 1994 employed, as the Attorney General said, police, punishment, and prevention, backed by the best of new technologies and supported by communities. We knew this strategy would work because law enforcement people said it would work. And it is working. The 100,000 police, the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban, the other supports have led to drops in violent crime and murder and rape and robbery—everything across the board, except for crimes committed by young people.

Youth violence is on the rise, as you have noted, not just in large cities but in small towns. And whenever there has been a dramatic rise in youth crime, it has a terrifying face, organized gangs. In my State of the Union Address I challenged our country to focus on the problem of youth violence, and I pledged that the United States Government would take on gangs in the way we had taken on the mob decades ago. We're fighting with a strategy that is coordinated and unrelenting, that does rely upon national, State, and local prosecutors and police and, above all, on citizens working with us.

Two weeks ago in Miami, General Barry McCaffrey, our drug policy coordinator, and I set forth our drug strategy. We know what works there, too: education, treatment, stopping drugs at the border, punishing those who sell to the young. We are focusing this strategy more than ever before on young people.

Last Friday at Penn State University, I asked citizens all across our country to play their role. We know that community policing won't work if we rely on police alone, that we need citizens, too. And I asked one million new citizen volunteers to join the 100,000 new police we are putting on the street. That's just 50 new members for every one of the community police watch organizations across this country today.

Today I want to announce two more steps. First, we have just seen a remarkable demonstration of the National Gang Tracking Network, which is an important part of this strategy. I am pleased to announce that the first step of this network will now be funded through the Justice Department for use in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Vermont, Maryland, and Florida. Gangs are no longer local. We saw that today with the statement Miss Seymour made about South Carolina. So we say this: The gangs may run to another State, but they cannot hide. And they will find it tougher and tougher to escape the law.

Second, we are proposing legislation designed with valuable help from the U.S. attorneys here, from local law enforcement officials, and law-

makers, especially Senators Biden and Kohl and Congressman Schumer. Our "Anti-Gang and Youth Crime Control Act of 1996" will use the very same strategy our crime bill used to make the juvenile justice system tougher and smarter, and to help our young people stay drug-free and away from guns and gangs and violence. It makes it easier for prosecutors to prosecute violent youth offenders as adults, toughens penalties for possession and use of firearms, reinstates a ban on guns in the schools, reviving a law that was struck down in the courts. It will establish more juvenile drug courts which give nonviolent offenders the chance to get off drugs before they wind up in jail. It will raise the maximum detention to 10 years and give judges flexibility in sentencing. It will harden penalties for those who sell drugs to children or use children to sell drugs.

All this will help, but we also will have to have more parents being more responsible in teaching their children right from wrong and in looking out for them and more communities showing young people that they care, considering things like keeping their schools open more after school.

We know 50 percent of the juvenile crime in this country occurs in the hours after the school day ends. More communities have considered doing what Long Beach, California, has done and what the Attorney General is trying to help others do, consider whether setting up a school uniform policy will help to reduce the influence of gangs and help to identify gang members and help to keep the crime rate down and the children safer. Regardless, we've all got a role to play if we're going to move toward a 21st century that is more free of guns and drugs and violent gangs.

The message today to the Bloods, the Crips, to every criminal gang preying on the innocent is clear: We mean to put you out of business, to break the backs of your organization, to stop you from terrorizing our neighborhoods and our children, to put you away for a very long time. We have just begun the job, and we do not intend to stop until we have finished.

Let me say again, this legislation I offer today has been developed with help from law enforcement. It is like the crime bill of 1994, straightforward, commonsense, there are no hidden meanings, there are no poison pills. It relies on partnerships with communities and citizens. And I hope Congress will join us in a bipartisan commitment to save our neighborhoods, our families, and our children from the threat of gangs and gang violence.

This again is something we should be able to do, even this year, in a genuine spirit of bipartisanship, because we know it will work, and we know it will make a profound difference.

Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:56 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to the May 11 crash of ValuJet Flight 592. The President also referred to Margaret Seymour, acting U.S. attorney for South Carolina.

Message to the Congress Reporting a Budget Deferral
May 14, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budgetary resources, totaling $1.4 billion. The deferral affects the International Security Assistance program.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

May 14, 1996.

NOTE: The report detailing the deferral was published in the *Federal Register* on May 24.

Teleconference Remarks Announcing Community Policing Grants
May 15, 1996

The President. Hello.

Mayor Willie Brown. Mr. President, Willie Brown, California.

The President. Hello, Mayor.

Mayor Brown. How are you?

The President. You're getting good press over here on the East Coast. [*Laughter*]

Mayor Brown. You're getting better press than I'm getting.

The President. I don't know about that.

Well, I'm glad you're all on the phone. As I think you know, today we are providing more law enforcement dollars to more communities than on any other single day in the history of this country. And in addition to all of you, I'm also here with your colleague John Norquist, the Mayor of Milwaukee. He happened to be in town today, so I asked him to come in and sit with me as I announce that today we are putting almost 9,000 new police officers on the street.

Mayor Brown. Outstanding.

The President. That will bring our total to 43,000 new police officers since I signed the crime bill into law just 20 months ago. That means we're running well ahead of schedule in reaching our goal of putting 100,000 new police officers on the street.

This afternoon I will attend the annual ceremony at the Peace Officers Memorial, and we will honor the memory of the 161 officers who were killed in the line of duty last year.

We now, on this schedule that we're on, we are not only well ahead of schedule, we were prepared to put 100,000 police on the street in 5 years. We're now at 43,000 in 20 months. We're also under budget, and it's helping all of you to make our streets safer and to decrease crime.

We have just learned, I'm sure all of you know, that serious crimes have decreased for the 4th year in a row, including an 8 percent drop in the murder rate. Community policing has a lot to do with this, and I congratulate all of you who have, each in your own way, implemented it, helping to get officers back on the street and involved in the community and working as positive role models and preventing crime as well as catching criminals.

And I want to pledge to you that I will continue to work with you and continue to challenge the American people to work with you. When I was at Penn State last week delivering the commencement address, I urged the American people to join neighborhood crime watch groups and to do other things that would support community policing. And I hope that we will see a big increase in the number of citizens who are supporting our common efforts now.

Let me call on a couple of you, starting with Mayor Riordan. I know your community policing efforts have made a big difference, especially your public-private partnership encouraging businesses to play a role in keeping communities safer. And I'm glad that you will be getting 710 new officers.

Mayor?

[*Mayor Richard Riordan of Los Angeles, CA, thanked the President for his vote of confidence in the city's police department and explained how the increase in officers and community policing programs had helped to prevent and fight crime in his city.*]

The President Thank you very much. And I appreciate that, Mayor Riordan. I appreciate what you're doing.

I'd like to now call on Mayor Mike White in Cleveland. I understand that the help you've gotten from the police program has helped you to permit police officers to live within the neighborhood they patrol and make them a more vital part of the community. And that's a very intriguing idea and an old-fashioned idea, I'm sure, that still works very well. And as you know, Cleveland will be getting more police officers today as well. And so, Mr. Mayor, we would like to hear from you.

[*Mayor Michael R. White thanked the President for his commitment to reducing the crime rate and explained how community policing programs had helped to lower crime in Cleveland by 16 percent in the last 5 years.*]

The President. Thank you very much, Mayor White. And I want to thank the others who are on the line. Let me just call your names and make sure I've got everybody.

Mayor Herenton of Memphis?

Mayor Willie W. Herenton. Yes, Mr. President.

The President. Vice Mayor Sharp of Knoxville?

Vice Mayor Jack Sharp. Yes, sir.

The President. Mayor Corradini of Salt Lake?

Mayor Deedee Corradini. I'm here.

The President. And Mayor Delaney of Jacksonville?

Mayor John A. Delaney. Right here, Mr. President.

The President. Mayor Greco of Tampa?

Mayor Dick A. Greco. Thank you, Mr. President. We all thank you here.

The President. Mayor Bosley of St. Louis?

Mayor Freeman R. Bosley, Jr. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. I'll see you tomorrow, won't I?

Mayor Bosley. Yes.

The President. The day after tomorrow.

Mayor Bosley. Right.

The President. Mayor James of Newark?

Mayor Sharpe James. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Mayor Finkbeiner of Toledo?

Mayor Carty Finkbeiner. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. And Mayor Lanier of Houston, is he on the phone?

Participant. He's stuck in city council. [*Laughter*]

The President. And Sheriff Glover of Jacksonville county, are you on the phone?

Sheriff Nathaniel Glover. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. And of course, Mayor Brown. I said hello to you earlier.

Mayor Brown. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. I thank all of you very much, and I know you will do a lot with these 43,000 additional officers to make the streets of America safer. Thank you very much.

Goodbye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:57 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Willie Brown of San Francisco, CA, and Sheriff Nathaniel Glover of Duval County, FL.

Remarks at the National Peace Officers Memorial Service
May 15, 1996

Thank you very much, Gil Gallegos, for your introduction, your leadership, and your very moving remarks. Thank you, Karen Lippe, Senator Daschle, Senator Biden, Attorney General Reno, Secretary Rubin, General McCaffrey, distinguished leaders of law enforcement, and the supporters of law enforcement who are here. To all the family members who are here, and especially to the families who lost the life of someone you loved because that person was willing to risk his or her life to protect the rest of us, I say thank you from a grateful nation. Thank you for your strength, your courage, and your sacrifice. We are all forever in your debt.

I am proud to stand with you today to honor the memory and the lives of the more than 170 men and women who died for their country last year in the service of law enforcement, who died for law, for order, for justice, and for peace. They were American heroes.

When I joined you last year on this very difficult day, it was not even a month since the bombing in Oklahoma City revealed to all of us the evil of which some people are capable. Today, eight Federal law enforcement officers who lost their lives on that dark day join their brothers and sisters on the memorial wall.

As the shock waves from the bombing reverberated across our Nation, thousands of Americans dropped whatever they were doing and went to help. One of them was a deputy sheriff in Milledgeville, Georgia, named Will Robinson. He worked all day and all night cooking meals for emergency workers and volunteers, doing whatever he could to help. That's what he was all about. That's why he went into law enforcement, to help. That's why he was planning to dress up as Santa Claus and play with kids in prekindergarten last Christmas, just like he did the year before. He wanted the children to have some fun and to know that police officers are people you can count on.

But just before last Christmas, William Edward Robinson, 26 years old, 3 years a deputy sheriff, with a firm handshake and a big heart, responded to a 911 call and was gunned down doing his job, trying to stop an armed robber getting away with a few hundred dollars. Will's boss, Sheriff Bill Massee, called him "everybody's friend, the boy you wanted your daughter to go out with, the boy you wanted to be your son's best friend, the last person I ever wanted to see killed in the line of duty."

My friends, there are 14,064 names on the law enforcement memorial, every one like Deputy Sheriff Will Robinson, heroes who laid down their lives for their neighbors, people we must honor, living up to their example and carrying on their crusade.

I know the American people sometimes take what law enforcement officers do for granted. But the truth is, it is extraordinary. Somehow you find the strength to get up every day, put your badge on, and risk your life for the rest of us, an act all the more wondrous for its simple, silent courage.

Police risk everything, and what do we owe them for it? Well, when police are walking down the street, they ought to feel like every law-abiding citizen is walking with them. When they catch a violent criminal, they should feel confident they will be punished promptly and severely. When they enter danger, they should not have to worry that they will be easily outgunned. They should always know that the fight against crime is a national commitment.

That is what I have tried to bring to our country with the help of men and women in the Congress of both parties. We know the police need reinforcement; you have told us that. And America needs more police. That's why our crime bill puts another 100,000 police on the street over 5 years.

Just today, before I came over here, I spoke to mayors and police chiefs all across this country to award nearly 9,000 new police officers to over 2,500 communities, to bring our total to 43,000 new officers in just 20 months. We're going to meet that 100,000 commitment to you and the citizens you protect.

Thanks to the efforts of Members of Congress in both parties, we took 19 deadly assault weapons off the street and made the Brady bill the law of the land. And not a single, law-abiding sportsman or woman has lost a weapon. But 60,000 people have lost the chance to buy a weapon; 60,000 felons, fugitives, and stalkers were prohibited from buying handguns because of the Brady bill. That makes law enforcement safer and more successful. The crime bill said to repeat violent offenders, "three strikes and you're out." If you murder law enforcement officers, the death penalty is waiting.

And thanks to you and those whom we honor today for their ultimate sacrifice and to citizens who have supported you, crime is coming down in America. Violent crimes have dropped for 3 years in a row. We know it is not enough. We know we must do more. As your president said, the antiterrorism bill will help. And again, I thank the Members of Congress in both parties who supported it.

We also know that citizens have to do more. Just last week I called for a citizen force of one million more volunteers to stand shoulder to shoulder with you. There are 20,000 neighborhood crime watch groups in America. If 50 more people joined each one of them, there would be a million more folks standing by those of you in uniform to prevent crime before it happens, to help catch criminals when it does, to make our streets safer, and make your work more successful. I hope the American people will join you in greater numbers than ever in the months and years ahead.

But we have some work to do up here as well. Today I challenge Congress to follow its admirable work in the crime bill, the Brady bill, the antiterrorism bill, in listening to the police officers across this country in passing a ban on cop-killer bullets. We don't need a commission to study it. We don't need research to tell us what kind of materials make these armor-piercing bullets. We need a simple test and a straightforward ban. If a bullet can go through a bulletproof vest like a hot knife through butter, it should be against the law.

These bullets are designed to kill law enforcement officers wearing bulletproof vests. This is not a complicated issue, my friends. It's a simple, straightforward issue of a commitment to the safety of our men and women in uniform.

The second thing we ought to do is to make sure that anyone in America who commits a truly violent crime serves the time. The Federal Government has eliminated parole. I renew the challenge I made to the States last January in the State of the Union: Guarantee that serious, violent criminals serve at least 85 percent of their sentence.

It is wrong to make our police officers risk their lives to apprehend dangerous criminals, then go to the trouble of trying them and seeing them convicted, and then have to see the same police officers face the same criminals on the street before they have received the full punishment the jury gave them. Police officers should not have to risk their lives and then stand like doormen at a revolving door of a penitentiary.

These are commonsense ideas, but they're more. They're the least we can do for the brave men and women of American law enforcement. So, again I say, as we have often in the last 3 years, let us put aside partisanship and close ranks and work together and get the job done.

My fellow Americans, we lost too many wonderful men and women in uniform last year. We lost more last year than in any year in 6 years. Nothing we can do will ease the sorrow or soften the blow for those of you who survive them. Only God and time and the love you have for each other can do that. But you must know how much the rest of us honor them and how much we honor you. Those who gave their lives in the oldest fight of all, for right over wrong, for peace over conflict, for the safety of their neighbors and their family and their friends, in their memory, we must move forward.

I know, as all of you do, that we will never eliminate crime completely. It is not within the power of any of us to totally transform human nature. But I do believe that we can make America a better and different and safer place.

And the test would be simple for me. I believe we would honor the sacrifice of those whom we honor today if we could create an America where every time you turned on the television news, you didn't see a report of a horrible crime leading the news, and when you did see one, you were shocked instead of numbed; you knew it was the exception, not the rule; you knew we had turned the tide and made this a basically peaceful, law-abiding, safe country for children to grow up in and go to school in and raise their own families in. That is the test by which we must measure our efforts to honor those who have served us with the last full measure of their devotion.

Until then, let me pledge to you that all of us who see you will remain humbled by your courage, know we are safer for your service, and will attempt to be faithful to the standard your sacrifice demands.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:43 p.m. on the Capitol steps. In his remarks, he referred to Gil Gallegos, president, Fraternal Order of Police, and Karen Lippe, president, Fraternal Order of Police Auxiliary.

Letter to Senator Bob Dole on the Announcement of His Retirement From the Senate

May 15, 1996

Dear Mr. Leader:

As I mentioned when we spoke by phone earlier today, you have served your country in so many ways, and you should be proud of your 35 years in Congress. On behalf of a grateful America, as you retire from the Senate, I thank you for your service.

During the fall campaign, you and I will engage in what I believe is one of the most important jobs in our democracy, as we lead a great national debate about how best to move our country into the future. I look forward to participating with you in that discussion.

Until then, I believe that the coming weeks and months can be a moment of genuine bipartisan achievement in meeting the challenges we all face together. Before you go, I look forward to working with you and Speaker Gingrich, and afterwards with your successor, to move ahead to give our people a balanced budget, welfare reform, an increase in the minimum wage and the Kassebaum-Kennedy health care reform.

As you know so well, it is when we work together that we can truly make progress for our country and for the people who sent us here.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 15 but was not issued as a White House press release.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report of the National Science Board
May 15, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by 42 U.S.C. 1863(j)(1), I am pleased to submit to the Congress a report of the National Science Board entitled *Science and Engineering Indicators—1996.* This report represents the twelfth in a series examining key aspects of the status of American science and engineering in a global environment.

The science and technology enterprise is a source of discovery and inspiration and is key to the future of our Nation. The United States must sustain world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering if we are to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

I commend *Science and Engineering Indicators—1996* to the attention of the Congress and those in the scientific and technology communities.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 15, 1996.

Remarks During Panel I of the White House Conference on Corporate Citizenship
May 16, 1996

The President. Thank you very much, Father O'Donovan, for giving those assembled here in 5 minutes the essence of what I got in the 4 years in my Georgetown education. [*Laughter*] When I was a student, I came to this magnificent old hall many times to hear other people say things I thought were very wise. I never imagined I would be here so many times myself in this position, but I am delighted to be back.

This is a peculiarly American event we're about to have today. And I'm glad that the business students from Georgetown are here, the law students, the undergraduate students. I understand this is the day after finals; that shows the level of devotion to this topic—[*laughter*]—that I hope the rest of us can match.

I also want to thank the business leaders who are here and the labor leaders who are here. There's a remarkable collection of people here from large, medium, and small companies, men and women, different racial and ethnic backgrounds, people who represent different kinds of unions and different work organizations, all committed to discussing this very important topic today of citizenship in the workplace.

As the nature of work and the nature of the workplace changes dramatically and we move so rapidly into the 21st century, what do we owe each other in the workplace? What do employers owe employees? What do employees owe employers? What, if anything, should the Government do to help to deal with the new challenges that we face?

We are here today for two reasons: First of all, because there are some very profound changes taking place, and if we respond to them properly, we get very good results. But even in the good results we see some paradox: our economy in the last 3½ years, a deficit that's less than half of what it was when I became President, low inflation, 8½ million new jobs, a 15-year high in homeownership, all-time highs in exports and small business formation. But still, according to studies done by both the Business Roundtable and the AFL–CIO, high levels of uncertainty in our work force, people uncer-

tain about their job security, whether they can get an increase in income even if they work harder, whether they can maintain access to health care and retirement for their families, and people wanting more genuine participation in their jobs, in their work force, in building their own future.

The Government plainly has some big roles to play in reducing the deficit, having good trade policies, promoting our economic interest around the world, investing in technology and research in areas that it's obviously important for a public investment as well as the private investment. There are certain tax incentives the Government has provided traditionally and that I hope will provide again—the incentives for research and experimentation, the incentives for companies to help to finance the education of their own employees, indeed, I would like to see expanded to give a little extra help to small businesses in that regard.

There are certain regulatory changes the Government ought to make. The Vice President's worked very hard to work with our agencies in getting rid of 16,000 of the 80,000 pages of Federal regulations and changing the way we work with the private sector to make the workplace safe and the environment clean. There are some things we have to do to help people become more employable even if they don't have specific job security, in terms of improving access to educational benefits and creating greater portability for health care and retirement.

And we know that Government should do these things, but we also know that most of the action has to be in the private sector. Just as I always say when discussing education, the great magic of education will never be in Washington or any State capital. It's what goes on in the classroom between the teacher and the child. The great magic of the American system of free enterprise is what goes on in the private sector. Indeed, one of the things that I like best about the job figures of the last 3½ years is that the percentage of new jobs being provided by Government is the smallest it's been in 20 years or more. And the Federal Government is almost a quarter of a million people smaller than it was when I became President, and overall, we are relying more and more on private sector job growth. And that, I think, is a good sign. But what that means is that the mutual responsibility that employers and employees feel toward one another and toward the larger society is becoming even more important.

I would just like to mention a couple of things that I do not think we will discuss today, because I think they are illustrative of the way that we can deal with these issues. I have been very, very impressed with the work that the private sector has done with our administration and especially with the Vice President in trying to find new and economically efficient ways to protect the environment: the auto companies working with us to develop a new generation of cars that can get triple the car mileage that we take for granted as the ceiling today; all the companies that have worked with us to—in the Project XL where we say you agree to meet certain high environmental standards, take the thick EPA rulebook and throw it away. And we've got a long line of people that want to get into that particular project.

But it's working. This is exciting. The companies that have worked with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration say, if we involve our workers and ourselves in a joint effort to make the workplace safer, we ought to get to decide how to do it if we can do it more efficiently and get better results. These are achieving good social ends as well as good ends within the workplace.

I want to say a special word of thanks to the entertainment companies that worked with us and that are now hard at work in developing their own rating systems for television programs, for violence and other contents that may be inappropriate for children—no Government involvement at all except our agreement to work with them in the passage of the law that requires the V-chip to go in to the television.

These are very encouraging things. We got some indication yesterday that we may even wind up with an agreement with the private sector in this effort that we've been so intensely involved in to try to curb the teenage smoking, when Philip Morris and the U.S. Tobacco Company indicated that they would agree to legislation to limit sales of tobacco to children and to reduce advertising of tobacco that affects the Nation's children. And I want to thank them for that.

I have to say, in all candor, I believe we should do more because, under the proposal, kids in this country would still be confronted with Joe Camel and the Marlboro Man on bill-

boards and stores and all the magazines. And we know 3,000 children start smoking every day and 1,000 of them are going to die early because of it. So I don't think it's enough. But I do believe that it's an indication that there may be some way that we can agree on legislation to do this. If all of the tobacco companies will voluntarily accept legislation containing the limits that will be as effective as what we're proposed—I will say again, we believe it's better to have the companies come forward and ask for legislation. And the FDA has made perfectly clear that they will stop their efforts to impose regulation if we can have a joint agreement on a legislative solution.

These are the kinds of things that I want to do more of in dealing with the larger problems of society.

But to come back to the main point, the workplace itself has to produce a profit, has to produce a vibrant free enterprise system for America, and what the relationships are in this new economy between employers and employees will have a great deal to do with that. The business leaders who came from all over this country today to be a part of this received a letter from me in which I suggested that there were at least five elements of corporate citizenship that we ought to consider as we move through this period of dynamic change.

First of all, since almost all families have all the adults—whether there are two or one in the family—working, workplaces should be more family-friendly. We shouldn't ask our working people in America to choose between being productive workers and being good parents.

Secondly, health and retirement security are profoundly important. And the nature of benefits, health and retirement benefits tied to the job, has been changing rather dramatically in the last several years. How are we going to continue to ensure health and retirement security?

Thirdly, safe and secure workplaces.

Fourthly, employees that know that they are invested in. How can we continue to develop the capacity of the employees of this country? One business executive, unrelated to this meeting, wrote me a letter saying that he had gone out of his way to invest more in the education and training of his employees once he realized they were less likely to be with him for a lifetime. He said, "I felt that I owed even more than I ever had before to them to make them employable if for some reason they had to leave our company."

And finally, the issue of partnership in the work force. One of our participants said today, in a very moving statement, that he had talked to a man who worked in a factory—one of his company's factories—who had been elected head of his local PTA and was prominent in the society in every other way. But he said it was only recently that his company had decided to let him participate from the neck up. For years and years and years, at work, he'd only participated from the neck down. Everybody else in his community wanted him from the neck up, just his company didn't. That was a profound statement, I thought. And more and more of our companies are looking for ways to let people participate from the neck up. When people feel that they're on the same team, it's a lot easier to take the bad news along with the good.

So these are the things that I hope will be discussed today. The companies that we will hear from up here are being showcased for one reason: They have done all of these things in ways that I believe prove that you can do the right thing and make money, that you can be successful in the American free enterprise system by having better and stronger relationships and ties with your employees. Every company represented out here in this audience today has another story like that to tell.

I hope that—I'm going to do my best just to stay out of the way and let them talk and then let all of you talk, hoping that some good ideas will come out of this because I believe the power of example to change the behavior of Americans is enormous. We have seen it in case after case after case. And I think that the coverage of these issues, on the whole, has been concentrated in negative examples when something bad happens to people, which then may be translated as a general rule. What I want to see us do is to elevate the good practices that are going on, show how they are consistent with making money and succeeding in the free enterprise system, and hope that we can reinforce that kind of conduct that so many of you have brought to bear in your own companies and with your own employees.

Let me say that I know that this is not an issue that can be solved in a day or a year, and that this is not a question of finding an answer. What we have to do is to join together

in a great journey as Americans, to continue to deal with these issues as we go through this dynamic economy. And I have given a lot of thought to what we could do to sort of signal that we're going to do this over the long run.

And today I have an announcement to make that I think reflects the spirit of what we are doing and will help us to continue to do it year-in and year-out forever. I asked a number of business leaders, led by John Bryan, the CEO of Sara Lee, and Larry Bossidy, CEO of Allied Signal, to come together to develop an award, totally financed and operated out of the private sector, not a Government award, to honor every year outstanding corporate citizenship. It would operate something like the Malcolm Baldrige Award does, that recognizes businesses for the quality of their products or services. This award will celebrate business for the quality of their relationship to their workers and their communities.

The award, as I said, will be created and managed entirely by the private sector, and its criteria will be based upon the five principles of corporate citizenship I mentioned earlier. These leaders will seek the advice of members of the business community, workers and their representatives, and others, including educators. It will be presented every year by the President of the United States, and it will be called the Ron Brown Corporate Citizenship Award.

We are honored to be joined here by Alma Brown. Thank you for coming today. Bless you, my friend. Stand up. [*Applause*] If there ever was a person who thought you could do well and do good at the same time, it was Ron Brown. And I can't think of a better way for us to honor him by continuing this work.

Let me end by saying now, we're going to spend the rest of this day listening to you, trying to come to grips with these issues. We know that a lot of them are very difficult, that the facts will be different from industry to industry, sector to sector, company to company. But we also know that this country cannot become what it ought to be, we cannot make this transition into the 21st century unless we create opportunity, unless we all go forward with a sense of personal responsibility, as Father O'Donovan said, and unless the end result is the community of America is stronger.

We have always believed that free markets and free enterprise made our whole country stronger, and we have always believed as Americans that we can find a way to correct the problems of the system so that it could thrive. That really is the whole story of the United States in the 20th century, and I suppose the conversation we're having today will help to tell the story of the United States in the 21st century. We need to give the right answers, and I think we will.

Thank you very much.

Our first panel will deal with the questions of family-friendly workplaces, safe and healthy workplaces, and health and retirement security. We'll start with the question of families, and I'd like to begin by calling on Kenneth Lehman, the co-CEO of Fel-Pro, Incorporated, a third generation, family-owned automotive supply manufacturer in Skokie, Illinois. I'd like to ask him to tell the Fel-Pro story and why such a small company provides such extensive family benefits to its workers and whether this undermines or contributes to its success in the marketplace.

Mr. Lehman.

[*Mr. Lehman stated his company's philosophy that a work force which was treated fairly and decently would be loyal, diligent, quality- and cost-conscious, and customer driven. He gave examples of Fel-Pro's family-responsive programs and cited a university study linking such programs to increased employee productivity and company profitability.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

I would like to illustrate—this is all something all of you know, but I think it's worth just putting the facts out there. These family-oriented policies are much more important today than ever before because 60 percent of the mothers in this country with children under 6 are in the work force—60 percent; 76 percent of all the mothers with school-age children are in the work force; and 12 million families in America are exclusively maintained by working mothers. So these numbers require—give a little greater resonance, perhaps, and meaning to the presentation that's just been made.

I'd like to now call on Fran Rogers to talk a little bit about her company and what she's done with Work/Family Directions.

[*Ms. Rogers, chief executive officer, Work/Family Directions, Inc., cited her personal experience as a working mother who was not considered a serious employee due to accommodations she*

made for her asthmatic child. She described her efforts to manage her own small company and support her employees, and praised the benefits of flexible management policies for larger businesses as well.]

The President. Thank you.

I'd like to make two brief points. First of all, I think the odd concept of all these things as tools that other people use to make the most of their own lives and their family lives is a very helpful way of looking at this, because most people just want you to make it possible for them to make the most of their own lives.

I also should point out that, since Fran didn't explicitly say this for fear that at this meeting she'd look like she was hawking business, this company, Work/Family Directions, is based in Boston, they employ about 250 people, and they provide work and family referral services to larger companies, including child and elder care referrals, adoption referrals, and a number of other services. So she's seen this from the perspective, as she said, of both smaller companies and larger companies.

We should say the size of each of these companies, because I think that's important. Fel-Pro has about 1,700 employees, I think. Is that right?

Mr. Lehman. With 2,000 in the Chicago area and 800 in other places.

The President. Yes, but in the Chicago area, it's about 2,000.

Mr. Lehman. Yes, we have about 2,000.

The President. Now, our next panelist is famous to all of us who have children who love the environment and some of us who like to get out and around ourselves. Yvon Chouinard is the founder of Patagonia. And among other things, Patagonia devotes one percent of its sales to environmental projects and initiatives, something which, when Chelsea and I go Christmas shopping every year, she always reminds me when we decide what to do. [*Laughter*] So I'd like to ask Mr. Chouinard to tell the story about his work-family benefits program and how it's worked into Patagonia's history.

Mr. Chouinard. Thank you, Mr. President. I'd feel a lot more comfortable on top of a mountain than here right now. [*Laughter*]

The President. Pretend that's where you are. [*Laughter*]

[*Mr. Chouinard stated that quality products and quality customer service were linked to a quality workplace, quality of life for employees, and quality of life on the planet. He described the benefits offered by his company and cited its resulting low employee turnover rate of 4.5 percent.*]

The President. Thank you. Let me ask you, how many employees do you have?

Mr. Chouinard. We have 750 worldwide.

The President. And that includes the people that actually work in all the stores where Patagonia is sold?

Mr. Chouinard. That's right.

The President. One of the things that strikes me about—I don't know how many of you have ever been in one of their stores, but every time I go into one I feel like I'm in an evangelical mission because all the young people there—you can't get out of the store; it doesn't matter if you don't even buy anything—you get the line, you know, that the company is really sort of environmentally responsible and you should be too. And they always give you something. Do you do any work on that? I mean, do you actually work on getting these kids to learn how to speak that way or do they do it just because you set a good example? [*Laughter*]

Mr. Chouinard. Well, I think this type of thing can't be done from a desk somewhere in the part of the company that's called the environmental desk. It has to be driven all the way down to every single employee. It's part of everybody's job. So they were doing their job.

The President. Very impressive. Let me also say one other thing that—some of you, if you saw the State of the Union Address, you know that I mentioned what is now the very famous story of Malden Mills, the Massachusetts-based company that had a tragic fire and afterward the gentleman who owned the company told the workers he was going to keep supporting them until they got up and going again. His name is Aaron Feuerstein, and he's here today, too, right out there. Stand up, sir.

The reason I brought it up now is that Patagonia had a 15-year relationship with them, and when he made that announcement, Patagonia announced that they would not have any layoffs as a result of the loss of the customer and that they would continue to support each other until Malden Mills got up and going again. And I think that is also a very credible thing.

I'd like to ask the Vice President now, before we go on to the next topic, to talk about some of the things that are being done in the Federal Government to provide our public workers with access to family-friendly benefits. I must say that this is an area in which the Government has lagged behind at least the most forward-leaning private sector companies. And we've tried to do some things in this regard. I'd like for the Vice President to talk about it.

[*The Vice President discussed the National Performance Review's emphasis on flexible management approaches in the Federal Government and gave examples of the impact of family-friendly initiatives both on military personnel and public housing residents.*]

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. Let me just make one comment here. I'll just invite your best ideas. The military now has about—I think about 60 percent of our personnel are married, and as we have downsized in the aftermath of the cold war we've had to think a lot more about what we need to do to support families. And a lot of times, you read something and you think, boy, this sounds great. For example, if we reduce the number of planned aircraft carrier battle groups—great, no cold war problem, we're going to save a lot of money.

One bottom-line consequence is that we have to extend the average tour of duty of Navy personnel from 6 months to 9 months. That's a 50 percent increase in the time those Navy people will be away from their children, and we have to figure out how to deal with that. The Bosnia deployment—the Vice President said it's a year—we try to make sure we could get everybody at least one break and sometimes two if they have family situations and need it; that's still a long time to be away from home. And this is in, you know, a time of peace, when it's hard to create this sense of national emergency for your children. They wonder, where is Daddy, and in some cases, where is Mom?

So this is a big challenge for us, and if any of you have any other constructive ideas about other things we can do, I'd personally be glad to have them because we're always looking for new ways to try to support an institution that really tries to live by family values but has been strained just by their duty to the rest of us as they exercise it.

I'd like to move on now to the second topic, which is maintaining a safe and healthy workplace, and start with Ralph Larsen, the chairman and CEO of Johnson & Johnson, the largest company so far represented here. They have something over 28,000 employees, anyway—maybe more, including two great plants in my home State. I should say that Johnson & Johnson has been repeatedly recognized for its innovative, family-friendly practices. But we want to ask today Mr. Larsen to discuss the safety program and the efforts that they've promoted in employee wellness and what a safe and healthy workplace has done in terms of the costs to the company and in terms of the benefits.

Mr. Larsen.

[*Mr. Larsen described the safety and health program for Johnson & Johnson employees which had improved their safety performance by 80 percent since 1981.*]

The President. Thank you. Now I'd like to introduce Roger Ackerman, the chairman and CEO of Corning, and Larry Benkowski, who is the president of the American Flint Glass Workers Union, which represents the workers at Corning, to talk about their common experience. In October of 1995, Corning was awarded the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. It's been recognized in many, many other ways. The company has, I believe, over 42,000 employees and has a unique perspective on safety and health and a very strong partnership with its workers. And so I'd like to call on Mr. Ackerman and Mr. Benkowski to discuss their experience.

[*Mr. Ackerman described the safety program adopted by Corning which was instrumental in decreasing the company's accident rate by 50 percent. Mr. Benkowski described the goal-sharing plan and a program to evaluate medical facilities used by Corning to prevent safety and health problems and to ensure high quality health care for their employees.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ackerman. You know, I didn't pay him to say any of that, by the way. [*Laughter*]

The President. You wrote each other's speeches. [*Laughter*]

Let me thank you and thank Ralph and Johnson & Johnson for your example and your words today. We have given a lot of thought to what we might be able to do in a positive way, rather

than in a kind of a negative way, through the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, to make it possible for there to be more stories like the two you just heard.

And I'd like to ask the Vice President to take just a brief minute and explain what we tried to do with our experiment and with OSHA and what the results have been.

[*The Vice President stated that companies taking the kind of approach described by Mr. Ackerman and Mr. Larson should not be adversely affected by the safety and health system designed by the Government for companies that were not providing such programs. He then gave an example of the new approach that the President asked OSHA to adopt.*]

The President. Thank you very much. I'd like to go on now to the final topic of the first panel, and that's health and retirement security. And just to note what is obvious, that is, that over the last 10 years there has been a steady decline in the percentage of people in the work force who have been covered with employer-based health insurance; that the decline has been most pronounced among employees with the lowest levels of education and skills, probably in companies with the smallest profit margins; that there has been a similar change in retirement, although very often it was a change in the form of retirement from defined benefit to defined contribution plans, but there have been other changes and also some loss of coverage.

In 1995, it was the first year in more than a decade that the percentage of people in the work force with health insurance tied to the job did not decline, and that could be in part a result of the fact that the inflation rate in 1995 in health care insurance plans was below the general rate of inflation for the first time in a decade.

But at any rate, this is something that is an issue and a greater issue if you believe that people will change jobs more frequently over the course of the work life than they have in the past. So I wanted to call on, first, Howard Schultz, the chairman and CEO of Starbucks Coffee, a remarkable Seattle-based company that, doubtless, many, perhaps most of you, have frequented in some city or another in this country, and I think they have—they're growing so fast, I don't know how many employees they have, but I know they have 9,000, maybe there are more. How many do you have now?

Mr. Schultz. Fifteen thousand.

The President. Fifteen thousand? This was put together last week. They're growing pretty fast. [*Laughter*] At any rate, Starbucks has been recognized for its rather extensive benefit program for the work force, including the scope of its health care plan. So I'd like for Mr. Schultz to talk about that.

[*Mr. Schultz stated that Starbucks was the first privately owned company to provide a comprehensive medical-dental, 401(k), and vision plan to all of its employees, including part-time employees, and to offer equity to all employees. He attributed the company's low attrition rate to the health care plan.*]

The President. I'd like to now call on David Guiliani, who is the chairman and CEO of Optiva Corporation, actually a fascinating company that was started less than a decade ago with a team of University of Washington scientists who developed a new electronic toothbrush that uses high frequency vibrations to remove plaque, something I care more and more about as I get older. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Guiliani.

[*Mr. Guiliani stated that productivity could be gained by choosing, motivating, and rewarding the best employees. He described the health care, retirement, English language education, and free computer loan programs that Optiva provided to its employees.*]

The President. You were pretty modest, but tell us how fast you are growing.

Mr. Guiliani. We have been tripling each year, and we're now the number two brand in America in powered brushes, and we're a major exporter into Europe and Japan, where our product is marvelously popular.

The President. And how many employees do you have?

Mr. Guiliani. Three hundred.

The President. We don't need to discuss this here, but one of the things that I would like to know from you—I sent a package of proposed pension reforms to Capitol Hill, basically designed to make it easier for even smaller companies than yours to access the 401(k) program. If you or any of the others out here, particularly from smaller businesses, have any suggestions about what else we can do to make this a more

user-friendly option for companies, I would very much like to have it, because I think it's important. And there are things you can do that we have asked for Congress to support, and I believe that it has almost unanimous support, it's just a matter of time working it through. And one of the top three priorities of the White House Conference on Small Business—that will make these things much more user-friendly for self-employed people, small businesses, and then also help people when they move from business to business to maintain the fund, even if they're unemployed for a period of time. So if you or any of the others here have any suggestions about what further improvements we can make in that, I would certainly like to have it.

Mr. Guiliani. I'm sure the SBA could do very well with some conferences and seminars with small businesses participating, because everybody sees the value of starting 401(k)'s early in the worker's life as well as the company's life.

The President. That's the next question I—you answered the next question. Do you believe—then I just want to make it explicit—do you think that the program is a little more accessible than some people know, and that more people would use it if they knew more about it? Do you agree with that?

Participant. Absolutely.

Participant. We had no particular issues in setting it up quite early, I think when we were about 100 people, probably.

Participant. Most of it is teaching people how to use it, understanding it.

Participant. Yes, it's the education process, I think.

Participant. Part of it is the name. Anything that has a 401(k) sounds like it's bad. [*Laughter*]

Participant. It's very bureaucratic.

The President. I wonder, before we take a brief break—we're going to take about a—I'm going to shorten the break, because we started a little late—about a 20-minute break. Before we take a break, before we start the next panel, I wonder if anyone else in the audience would like to make a comment about any of the three topics that were discussed here. And if you would, would you please just identify yourself and say whatever is on your mind.

Participant. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Let me ask before you sit down, why don't we just—we'll take about 10 minutes here. There are at least two other companies whose representatives I see out here who have no-layoff policies. If you can say in a minute or two, I'd like for anybody who's here who can say in a minute or two, if you have a no-layoff policy, how you've been able to maintain it, besides making a bunch of money.

And there is at least another company here that has had wide variations in their orders and has come up with some innovations in managing that problem to reduce layoffs. If you could just describe in a minute or two how you manage this problem, I'd—we'll just start with you, sir, and then we'll go with anyone else who wants to talk for a minute.

Participant. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Who would like to go next? Yes, sir. Go ahead.

Participant. [*Inaudible*]

The President. So as things go down, they share the work that's available with the same number of workers?

Participant. That's right. And nobody gets laid off. Could I just add one thing about 401(k)'s? They're great, but couldn't we raise the limit a little bit? People could invest a little more.

The President. Thank you. You want to raise the limit. That's what you said? Okay. I'm told we're going to address some of this in the next panel, but I'll call on another person or two and then we'll break.

Mr. Correnti.

And answer this question right: You can only talk about—you've got to talk about what you do in the down times as well as the up times, everybody. It's not fair to only talk about finding more business.

Go ahead.

[*John Correnti, chief executive officer, Nucor Corp., stated that the philosophy of his company in tough financial times was that employees and managers would share in the pain of pay cuts or shortened work weeks together. He noted that the resulting employee trust and loyalty made turnover so minimal that workers practically had to be willed a job in one of the plants.*]

The President. I can personally vouch for the truth of that last assertion. [*Laughter*]

I think what we should do now is take a little break. I think the panelists were terrific, and I think that this is a very good panel. I can't wait for the next one. So I'm going to start—it's now 1:15 p.m.—I'm going to start at

1:35 p.m., in 20 minutes. We're adjourned briefly.

Give them all a hand. [*Applause*]

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11:30 a.m. in Gaston Hall at Georgetown University. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. Leo J. O'Donovan, president, Georgetown University, and Alma Brown, widow of former Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown.

Remarks During Panel II of the White House Conference on Corporate Citizenship

May 16, 1996

The President. Thank you very much, Dean.

The last panel will cover the last two elements in corporate citizenship, training and investment in employees and partnerships with employees. And so I'd like to begin here discussing training and investment in employees. And the first company and the first presenter will be Mike Plumley, the chairman and CEO of the Plumley Companies.

[*Mr. Plumley explained that foreign competition inspired the beginning of a major educational effort among employees, including General Equivalency Diploma (GED) instruction.*]

The President. Thank you very much. Let me ask you one question. When you brought the teachers onto the premises of your factory to teach the GED programs, did the workers, did they take those classes either before or after their shift started? Is that when they did it?

Mr. Plumley. The GED program was after the shift. And it's a voluntary.

The President. And did you have to pay for that or did the State provide the service?

Mr. Plumley. No, we paid the instructors ourselves, the teachers from the local high school.

The President. When I was—back when I had another life, when I was Governor, we started a program where we actually sent GED instructors to any work site with more than 100 employees. And I was stunned by the number of people who wanted it, still needed it, and it seemed to work very well. But I applaud you for doing that.

Our next presenter is the chairman and CEO of Cummins Engine Company, Mr. Jim Henderson.

[*Mr. Henderson said the company committed itself to establishing a good relationship with all employees based on trust and open communications and giving them responsibility for planning their work and for improving results for their customers.*]

The President. Thank you. Thank you very, very much.

Our third company dealing with this issue of training and investment in employees is Cin-Made Company, and Bob Frey, the president, is here. I'd like to call on him now to speak.

[*Mr. Frey commented that corporate citizenship is good for companies, the country, the economy, and the family.*]

The President. Thank you. I believe you could sell that position. [*Laughter*] Good for you.

Now, moving along in our story of partnerships with employees, we have a particularly unique example in Republic Engineered Steels. I want to call on Russ Maier, the chairman and CEO, and then he'll be followed by Dick Davis, vice president of United Steel Workers. And they'll tell you the story of Republic Engineered. It's a good story.

[*Mr. Maier and Mr. Davis described how the company became employee-owned through an employee stock ownership plan (ESOP).*]

The President. Thank you. I can't let you go—both of you—without asking you what is clearly the obvious question which is, do you believe that what you have done and how you have done it could be made to work just as well in a setting in which the company is not employee-owned? And if so, would there have to be some other kinds of incentives for the employees? Would there have to be some other kind of compensation scheme or something that would help to kind of re-create the conditions

which exist from the get-go when it's an employee buyout on the front-end? I'd like to just hear both of you comment on that.

[*Mr. Davis said that other members of the panel had shown that other models were possible, and he believed more would evolve. Mr. Maier said that he would like every company to have an element of employee ownership.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

The next person I want to call on is a 40-year veteran of a company that may be the only company represented in this room that I feel comfortable in saying we have probably, every single one of us, been a customer of, Mr. Arney Langbo, the chairman of the Kellogg Company. [*Laughter*]

[*Mr. Langbo said that when faced with a need to reduce capacity and improve efficiency, the company's strategy was accomplished through a negotiated agreement with the employee union.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

I might say, just sort of by way of information background, that the ESOP concept was established in 1974, and since then, the number has grown from 200 to over 10,000. And there are an estimated 12 million ESOP participants that own $60 billion in stock in this country now.

Participation in deferred profit-sharing plans has grown from 8.4 percent of the work force in 1980 to 18.3 percent in 1991. That's the last year for which we have any figures. But you can see that this is not an insubstantial percentage of the American people that are out there working in these kinds of environments.

And again, I think it's important to point out, because we nearly never hear anything about it, that there are literally millions of people out there working in partnerships trying to make their companies more profitable, their lives better, and their country stronger. I think it's worth pointing out.

I thank you, sir, very much. If I might ask you one just brief question because it leads in—I want to ask the Vice President to speak after you about an issue which has been a difficult one for us, and that is how we handle the downsizing of the Federal work force, because I think it's quite interesting. You hear a lot of talk about downsizing in the private sector and how bad it is. I guess that the United States Government in the last 3½ years has been the biggest downsizer in the country. And I know that you had to have a modest one at Kellogg. I'd like you to just explain how you handled it, if you might very briefly.

[*Mr. Langbo said that in recent cutbacks, management sat down with the union and agreed to make use of early retirement, severance pay, and voluntary transfers to other locations. He concluded that recent changes in accounting laws would no longer allow immediate deductions for employee education.*]

The President. Thank you very much for that. I didn't know that.

There's another related issue which is that the tax—the nontaxability to the employee of employer expenditures on education has historically been $5,250. It lapsed, and it's in the process, we hope, of being reenacted. But there are certain restrictions on it which I think are excessive, although they cover most—they don't cover all of the kinds of educational programs that employers would like to do for employees, especially if there might be a downsizing, because the restriction now says that the educational benefits paid by the employer up to $5,250 a year are not taxable to the employee if they're necessary to retrain for the existing job or to train for another job in the company, up the hierarchy. If it's sort of an off-line education program, if you will, it's not covered.

In addition, in the reenacting, if the Congress—the Ways and Means Committee apparently has proposed to eliminate graduate education, which I think is a big mistake as it applies to higher tech companies. I hope we can still get a change in that. But in my view, we need that reenacted with the broadest possible meaning, because that also really matters to the employees, especially if they might be facing another downsizing. And we have proposed—we're going to send a note up to the Hill which also gives a little extra credit to the smaller businesses that may not be able to afford to undertake this, because I think it's a very good—a big thing.

And I will look into this accounting tax issue. I didn't know anything about it. Thank you.

Mr. Vice President.

[*The Vice President summarized the administration's efforts to reduce the number of Federal employees and improve the efficiency of Government operations.*]

The President. I know you may think that the Vice President sounds like a shameless booster—[*laughter*]—but we're pretty proud of what these Federal employees have done. And they did it at a time when they were being routinely condemned and held up as an object of ridicule.

And I might just say that there are companies—there are some really successful companies in this room today that started out with an SBA loan. So before I sign off and go to our last participant, I'll just take the SBA. Three and a half years ago, they had a loan form that was an inch thick; now it's a page long. Three and a half years ago, they took 6 weeks to give you an answer; now it's 72 hours. Their budget has been cut by something like 25 percent, and they've doubled the loan volume.

So it's simply not true that public service is not capable of operating at a very high level of productivity and quality based on pride and partnership of the workers. And so I'm very proud of them. And the Vice President deserves a lot of credit for the work he's done on this.

Our last presenter also has a rather astonishing story to tell. He's the CEO of United Airlines, Gerry Greenwald.

Gerry.

[*Mr. Greenwald said United was trying to pass two tests: to be profitable and to be a good place to work. He noted that employees who owned stock through ESOP's had to retire, die, or quit to cash in their stock, and that he hoped that would change. He also endorsed Government efforts to establish free trade in Asia and Europe.*]

The President. Let me say, as far as I know, you're the first person who ever told me that about the ESOP, that ever presented that as a problem, and I'll be glad to look into that.

Secondly, as you doubtless know, our trade office has spent untold hours in airline negotiations trying to open new routes and be willing—taking on all comers, saying, "If you want more routes in America, let's just have totally open competition." We can't find any takers for that, because the American airlines are so much more productive and competitive than anywhere in the world, and it's a real tribute to you and to the others in that business. But we will continue to work on that.

Let me say, I'd like to—we've got a couple of minutes here, and I'd like to open the floor again to comments, but I do want to say that one of the most heartening things that's come out of this today for me is to hear so many of you say that the job security of your employees is a goal of yours and that you believe in it and that it matters to you and that you believe that you can withstand the cycles of the market and still by and large preserve it, recognizing that from time to time there will be significant problems that will cause some companies to have to downsize. The fact that it is a goal which companies are trying to preserve and pursue I think is very important and especially publicly traded companies who are under enormous pressure to keep their quarterly review of their stock prices up. This is very encouraging to me.

Would anyone like to comment on this whole issue of partnership in training and investment?

Mr. Harman?

[*Sidney Harman, CEO of Harman International, said he believed the conference's central theme was that there were many techniques to reach the desired end, and that the ultimate challenge was to increase workplace security. He joked that it took 6 weeks to make up lost productivity due to the President's visit to Harman's Northridge, CA, plant in March.*]

The President. All right. I'm going to call on you.

Let me just make one very brief comment. It was worth it. It was a great day. The thing that I liked about what you had done is that it seemed to me that you were in a market where you could not possibly control dramatic fluctuations in the orders that were coming in. And yet it was clearly not in your interest, both from a human point of view and from an economic point of view, to have to keep bouncing these workers on and off like a basketball or having them on a yo-yo string.

And so you were actually able to create a whole alternative way of working for them that was just purely ancillary to your primary mission, but it had the effect of allowing you to pursue the goal that the gentleman at Lincoln Electric has set for his company and held to. And I think it's very impressive. And I would think a lot of companies that have similar circumstances would want to take a look at how you did it, because they would save a lot of energy and productivity and loyalty for their company if they could do the same thing.

Yes, sir. And then there were two more back here. Go ahead.

Participant. [*Inaudible*]—once every 4 years we lose an enormous amount of productivity, so I can relate to your point. [*Laughter*]

The President. Especially when I was up there. [*Laughter*]

[*A participant said that there was a good deal of data linking productivity to the kinds of practices outlined in the conference. He concluded by suggesting that a task force be set up to encourage businesses to devote a certain percentage of profits to training, employee ownership, or family benefits.*]

The President. Thank you.

Two back here. You, and then you, and then the gentleman in the corner.

[*A participant said that his fast food company was not offering lifetime employment and suggested that the Government should address portability of health care, pension, and other benefits in order to preserve the economic benefit of the years workers had spent in such jobs.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

There's a gentleman back there in the corner. While you're passing the microphone back, I just want to sort of support that and say that, if you look at the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill which passed the Senate 100 to 0—which is the sort of thing we ought to be doing in this country, I mean, obviously we've got a manifest need like that. It doesn't solve all the problems, but at least it will make portability the rule rather than the exception, and it will make available insurance, even if it's expensive now, for people who have had someone in their family who is ill.

And then the next big challenge will be to make sure that those of you who are in a tough margin and, particularly, smaller businesses are able to get into really, really large pools of purchasers so that people who have a preexisting condition don't have to get soaked on their premiums because the impact on everybody else is so negligible. And we'll just have to do this one step at a time, but we've got to pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill first so that we can get to that next step. And when we do, I think it will make a huge difference in stabilizing the whole work situation for people in these smaller companies and where that job is the first stop on the way to, hopefully, an even better future.

Thank you very much for what you said.

Yes, sir.

[*A participant said that some corporations blamed the financial markets for the need to downsize and asked if it would be possible to create new financial instruments to take into account certain social goals.*]

The President. Would anyone like to take a crack at that, what he said about the—[*laughter*]. Gerry?

[*Mr. Greenwald said he wanted to clarify an earlier point made by a participant that there was clear evidence that companies became more profitable through corporate citizenship. He said he did not think that Wall Street analysts or institutional investors believed that, because if they did, they would not reward instant massive layoffs.*]

Participant. Instant massive layoffs means that management has failed.

The President. Let me just follow up on both of those comments. Look—and let's talk about this—people make mistakes. The President even makes a mistake now and then. [*Laughter*] People make mistakes. And sometimes—and the world changes sometimes. Sometimes a decision that was good this year looks pretty bad next year because things that you couldn't foresee change.

Now, if that happens and you're running a really big company, and let's say two out of six divisions of it no longer make sense for you to be running and you want to have a no-layoff policy, and maybe you shouldn't have gotten into all these things that you got into when it looked like a profitable thing, at least from a financial transaction point of view, to do, how do you get the time from the markets and from your board to make the transition? Maybe if you had 3 years, you could figure out something for all these people, and then you wouldn't have to lay them off.

I mean, I think that's the thing that plagues me, you know. I think over the long run the markets make pretty good judgments. I don't think you can stay very strong in the market over the long run if you're not producing a quality product or service that somebody wants to buy. But I think what has happened is, as these markets have become more global and our ability to move money around just like this—and the people who are moving it make

money based on quarterly returns and also based on how many transactions are churned—it really forces people who are in a tight, in the near term at least, to make decisions that seem draconian. I mean, at least that's what it seems to me.

And is there a fix for that? I mean, is there something that can be done about that, even if it's no more than—to go back to the question the gentleman asked—even if it's no more than changing the attitude of the people that are making those judgments? Because my perception is that some of these managers are under extreme market pressure in a dimension for short-term results that was not the case even a few years ago.

That's my perception. And I would like—anybody else want to comment on that? This is a tough issue.

Participant. I think that's true, Mr. President. And also there are other factors at work, too, that in this day of increased corporate governance today—boards, I think, are looking for more of that, not only the financial markets, but there are higher levels of expectations with boards of directors. I'm not sure it's all bad. Is it good or bad?

The President. Well, I think the point they were making is, if you could be more reluctant to have layoffs because you knew that these folks could be made productive if you had time to do it, are you robbed of the time to do it if you're market dependent on a quarterly basis? I think that's—to go back to our friend, again, from Lincoln Electric, if you stick with your mission and you stick with your mission over decades and then you broaden your production line or you broaden your services, sort of flowing naturally out of your mission, this might not have ever happened to you. But if, in the last 15 years, you have got into expansions that were basically adopting unrelated or tenuously related enterprises, then you are liable to get caught on one of these whipsaws. And I think that's some of what we have seen here in some of the most highly publicized ones.

Sidney, what were you going to say?

[*Mr. Harman, citing the example of an investment firm that specifically supported Harman International because of its policies, expressed his belief that other financial managers would in time have the same point of view.*]

The President. If I might just make one other point, then I want to call on the lady over here in the corner, then we have to adjourn. Earlier today, maybe it was this morning at breakfast, someone said, "The enemy is us." And some of our representatives of the unions here were laughing about it because, of course, the employees' pension funds are among the biggest investors in the stock markets. And if they invest in mutual funds, let's say, their money managers are trying to get the highest return they can for the pension, and perversely, they could be undermining the employment stability of the very people whose retirement they're trying to protect. At least that is arguable.

But if you want the people who are representing you—this is something, it seems to me, that would be really a worthwhile discussion and maybe we could put one together for corporate executives and the union folks and the people in the middle, the people that are supposed to make these investment decisions that you asked about, sir. You see, you gave us a topic for a whole other day. [*Laughter*]

But I mean, I think, these markets, on balance, have served us all very well over time. And so we have to be reluctant to mess them up. But on the other hand, when the incentives get a little out of whack, we have to—we ought to look at it. And I think—anyway, I'll pursue it, and I'll follow up with you all.

Yes, ma'am.

[*A participant said she was a consultant to small corporations which frequently considered corporate citizenship to be a luxury item, something that businesses could afford when they got bigger. She suggested that any followup conference should emphasize that corporate citizenship was essential for any size company.*]

The President. Thank you. And I agree with you. And I would, you know, just point out we have had some companies represented on this platform today that have under 100 employees. And we have even more in the audience. And all of them have various stories to tell. So I think that it is more important, but that's one place where the Government should come in. You know, if there is a particular policy that is more difficult for a small company than a large company to implement, then maybe that's the place where we ought to have a little extra incentive on, for example, extra educational benefits or something like that.

Well, this has been an amazing day for—certainly for me. I hope you think it has been worth your time. I thank you all for coming. I thank you for your support of the idea that we do have responsibilities to one another in the workplace, and that if we fulfill them in the appropriate way, more money will be made, the free enterprise system will be stronger, more jobs will be created, and America will be a better place.

There will be, I assure you, some followup with all of you on this conference, and we'll try to determine where we go from here. But let me say I called this conference for two reasons. One is I wanted to change the perception that there were no companies in America that cared about the employees and that were sticking up for them and trying to do right by them. And the second is, I wanted to change the reality, where we could, by using the good examples here to influence people in the rest of the economy. I believe today we have gone some significant way toward both of those objectives, and I think there are some other things we can do.

Again, I want to thank the executives who have agreed to serve on the board for the Ron Brown award, and we will follow up on that as well.

Thank you all for coming, and we will be back in touch. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 2:10 p.m. in Gaston Hall at Georgetown University. In his remarks, he referred to Robert Parker, dean, Georgetown University school of business. A portion of the President's remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks on the Antipersonnel Landmines Initiative
May 16, 1996

Death of Admiral Jeremy M. Boorda

The President. Thank you very much. Please sit down. I want to thank the members of the veterans organizations who are here. General Jones, thank you for your presence. All the members of the administration and, especially, I'd like to thank Secretary Perry and the Joint Chiefs who are here, not only for their presence and their help on this policy but for their determination to go forward with this announcement on this very difficult afternoon for all of us.

I want to begin with a word about Admiral Mike Boorda, our Chief of Naval Operations, who died this afternoon. His death is a great loss, not just for the Navy and our Armed Forces but for our entire country. Mike Boorda was the very first enlisted man in the history of our country to rise to become Chief of Naval Operations. He brought extraordinary energy and dedication and good humor to every post he held in a long and distinguished career. From Southeast Asia to Europe, he devoted his life to serving our Nation.

I am personally grateful for the central role he played in planning our mission in Bosnia, both when he commanded our forces in southeastern Europe and later when he came here to Washington. He was known for his professionalism and skill. But what distinguished him above all else was his unwavering concern for the welfare of the men and women who serve the United States in our Navy. We will all remember him for that, and much else.

Our hearts and prayers go out to his family, to his wife, Bettie, and his children, David, Edward, Anna, and Robert. And I'd like to ask everyone to just join me now in a moment of silence in memory of Admiral Mike Boorda.

[*At this point, a moment of silence was observed.*]

The President. Amen.

Antipersonnel Landmines

Today I am launching an international effort to ban antipersonnel landmines. For decades the world has been struck with horror at the devastations that landmines cause. Boys and girls at play, farmers tending their fields, ordinary travelers—in all, more than 25,000 people a year are maimed or killed by mines left behind when wars ended. We must act so that the children of the world can walk without fear on the earth beneath them.

To end this carnage, the United States will seek a worldwide agreement as soon as possible to end the use of all antipersonnel landmines. The United States will lead a global effort to eliminate these terrible weapons and to stop the enormous loss of human life. The steps I announced today build on the work we have done to clear mines in 14 nations, from Bosnia to Afghanistan, from Cambodia to Namibia. They build as well on the export moratorium on landmines we have observed for 4 years, an effort that, thankfully, 32 other nations have joined.

To pursue our goal of a worldwide ban, today I order several unilateral actions. First, I am directing that effective immediately, our Armed Forces discontinue the use of all so-called dumb antipersonnel mines, those which remain active until detonated or cleared. The only exception will be for those mines required to defend our American troops and our allies from aggression on the Korean Peninsula and those needed for training purposes. The rest of these mines, more than 4 million in all, will be removed from our arsenals and destroyed by 1999. Just as the world has a responsibility to see to it that a child in Cambodia can walk to school in safety, as Commander in Chief, my responsibility is also to safeguard the safety, the lives of our men and women in uniform. Because of the continued and unique threat of aggression in the Korean Peninsula, I have therefore decided that in any negotiations on a ban, the United States will and must protect our rights to use the mines there. We will do so until the threat is ended or until alternatives to landmines become available.

Until an international ban takes effect, the United States will reserve the right to use so-called smart mines or self-destructing mines as necessary, because there may be battlefield situations in which these will save lives of our soldiers.

Let me emphasize, these smart mines are not the hidden killers that have caused so much suffering around the world. They meet standards set by international agreement. They destroy themselves within days, and they pose virtually no threat to civilian life once a battle is over. But under the comprehensive international ban we seek, use of even these smart antipersonnel mines would also be ended.

We're determined that lands around the world will never again be sown with terror. That is why I will propose a resolution at the 51st United Nations General Assembly this fall, urging the nations of the world to support a worldwide ban on landmines. I have instructed Ambassador Albright to begin work now on this resolution.

Third, while the exceptions I have mentioned are necessary to protect American lives, I am determined to end our reliance on these weapons completely. Therefore I am directing the Secretary of Defense to begin work immediately on research and development of alternative technologies that will not pose new dangers to civilians.

Fourth, as we move forward to prevent the minefields of the future, we must also strengthen the efforts to clear those that still exist today. At this moment, unbelievably, some 100 million mines still lie just beneath the earth in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, and in Central America. To help end the anguish they cause, the Department of Defense will expand its efforts to develop better mine detection and mine-clearing technology for use in the many countries that are still plagued by mines. We will also strengthen our programs for training and assisting other nations as they strive to rid their territory of these devices. For these efforts, as well as those to develop alternatives to antipersonnel mines, we will assure sufficient funding. I will personally work with Congress on this issue.

Many have worked to bring us to this moment. I especially want to say a word of thanks to Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont. Although I know he has differences with our approach, his dedication and his moral leadership on this issue have played a vital role in alerting the conscience of our Nation to the suffering that landmines cause. I also want to thank the many nongovernmental organizations that have worked so hard to put this issue at the top of the international agenda.

As we turn to the task of achieving a worldwide ban, we must work together, and we will be successful. Let me say, again, I greatly appreciate the time and the energy that General Shalikashvili and the Joint Chiefs have devoted to this important issue over the last few months. It may take years before all the peoples of the world feel safe as they tread upon the Earth, but we are speeding the arrival of that day with the decisions announced today. I will do everything I can to implement them all, including the international agreement to ban all antipersonnel mines, as quickly as possible.

Now, I think it is important to turn the microphone over, first to Secretary Christopher and then Secretary Perry, to finish the presentation.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:27 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. David Jones, USAF (Ret.), former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The related proclamation of May 17 on the death of Adm. Jeremy M. Boorda is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

May 16, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report of November 28, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c). This report covers events through March 1, 1996. My last report, dated November 28, 1995, covered events through September 29, 1995.

1. Effective March 1, 1996, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") amended the Iranian Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR Part 535 ("IACR"), to reflect changes in the status of litigation brought by Iran against close relatives of the former Shah of Iran seeking the return of property alleged to belong to Iran (61 *Fed. Reg.* 8216, March 4, 1996). In 1991, Shams Pahlavi, sister of the former Shah of Iran, was identified in section 535.217(b) of the IACR as a person whose assets were blocked based on proof of service upon her in litigation of the type described in section 535.217(a). Pursuant to that provision, all property and assets located in the United States within the possession or control of Shams Pahlavi were blocked until all pertinent litigation against her was finally terminated. Because the litigation has been finally terminated, reference to Shams Pahlavi has been deleted from section 535.217(b). A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

2. The Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal, established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims before it. Since my last report, the Tribunal has rendered one award, bringing the total number to 567. The majority of those awards have been in favor of U.S. claimants. As of March 1996, the value of awards to successful U.S. claimants from the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank was $2,376,010,041.91.

In February 1996, Iran deposited funds into the Security Account, established by the Algiers Accords to ensure payment of awards to successful U.S. claimants for the first time since October 8, 1992. The Account was credited $15 million on February 22, 1996. However, the Account has remained continuously below the $500 million balance required by the Algiers Accords since November 5, 1992. As of March 1, 1996, the total amount in the Security Account was $195,370,127.71, and the total amount in the Interest Account was $37,055,050.92.

Therefore, the United States continues to pursue Case A/28, filed in September 1993, to require Iran to meet its obligations under the Algiers Accords to replenish the Security Account. Iran filed its Statement of Defense in that case on August 30, 1995. The United States filed a Reply on December 4, 1995. Iran is scheduled to file its Rejoinder on June 4, 1996.

3. The Department of State continues to present other United States Government claims against Iran and to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies.

In November 1995, Iran filed its latest Response concerning the United States Request to Dismiss Certain Claims from Case B/61. The United States had filed its Request to Dismiss in August 1995 as part of its consolidated submission on the merits. Iran had previously filed its initial response in July 1995, and the United States filed a reply in August 1995. Case B/

61 involves a claim by Iran for compensation with respect to primarily military equipment that Iran alleges it did not receive. Iran had sought to purchase or repair the equipment pursuant to commercial contracts with more than 50 private American companies. Iran alleges that it suffered direct losses and consequential damages in excess of $2 billion in total because of the United States Government refusal to allow the export of the equipment after January 19, 1981, in alleged contravention of the Algiers Accords. Iran's November 1995 filing failed to show why the Tribunal should not dismiss immediately certain duplicative or otherwise improperly pleaded claims from Case B/61.

In December 1995, the Department of State represented the United States in hearings before the Tribunal on two government-to-government claims. In the first, Chamber Two heard oral arguments in Case B/36, the U.S. claim against Iran for its failure to honor debt obligations created by the sale of military surplus property to Iran shortly after the Second World War. In the second, also before Chamber Two, the Department of State presented the U.S. defense in Case B/58, Iran's claim that the United States is liable for damage caused to the Iranian State Railways during the Second World War.

In January 1996, in Case B/1 (Claims 2 & 3), Iran filed its Rebuttal Memorial Concerning Responsibility for Termination Costs, along with 20 volumes of exhibits and affidavits. In this briefing stream, the Tribunal is asked to decide whether Iran or the United States is liable for the costs arising from the termination of the U.S.-Iran Foreign Military Sales program after Iran's default and its subsequent seizure of the U.S. embassy in Tehran in 1979. The United States is currently preparing a comprehensive response to Iran's brief.

In February 1996, the Departments of State and Justice represented the United States in a hearing before the full Tribunal in a government-to-government claim filed by Iran. Case A/27 is an interpretive dispute in which Iran claims that the United States is liable under the Algiers Accords for Tribunal awards issued in favor of Iran against U.S. nationals. The United States maintains that its obligation under the Algiers Accords is satisfied by the availability of domestic judicial procedures through which Iran can enforce awards in its favor.

Also in February 1996, Iran and the United States settled Iran's claims against the United States filed before the International Court of Justice concerning the July 3, 1988, downing of Iran Air 655 and certain of Iran's claims against the United States field before the Iran-United States Tribunal concerning certain banking matters. The cases in question were dismissed from the International Court of Justice and the Iran-United States Tribunal on February 22, 1996. The settlement, *inter alia*, fulfills President Reagan's 1988 offer to make *ex gratia* payments to the survivors of the victims of the Iran Air shootdown. The survivors of each victim of the Iran Air shootdown will be paid $300,000 (for wage-earning victims) or $150,000 (for non-wage-earning victims). For this purpose, $61 million was deposited with the Union Bank of Switzerland in Zurich in an account jointly held by the New York Federal Reserve Bank, acting as fiscal agent of the United States, and Bank Markazi, the central bank of Iran. Of an additional $70 million in the settlement package, $15 million was deposited in the Security Account established as part of the Algiers Accords. The remaining $55 million was deposited in an account at the New York Federal Reserve Bank, from which funds can be drawn only (1) for deposits into the Security Account used to pay Tribunal awards to American claimants or for the payment of Iran's share of the operating expenses of the Tribunal, or (2) to pay debts incurred before the date of settlement and owed by Iranian banks to U.S. nationals. Under the terms of the settlement, no money will be paid to the Government of Iran.

4. Since my last report, the Tribunal has issued one important award in favor of a U.S. national considered a dual U.S.-Iranian national by the Tribunal. On November 7, 1995, Chamber Three issued a significant decision in Claim No. 213, *Dadras Int'l and Per-Am Construction Corp. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, awarding a dual national claimant $3.1 million plus interest for architectural work performed for an Iranian government agency developing a housing complex outside Tehran, Iran.

The Tribunal held hearings in four large private claims. On October 23–27, 1995, Chamber One held a hearing in Claim No. 432, *Brown & Root, Inc. v. The Iranian Navy,* involving contract amounts owned in connection with the construction of the Iranian Navy Chahbahar and Bandar Projects in Iran. On January 18–19, 1996, Chamber One held a second hearing in claim Nos. 842, 843, and 844, *Vera Aryeh, et*

al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran, in which allegations of fraud and forgery were considered. Finally, the United States Government filed a Memorial on the Application of the Treaty of Amity to Dual United States-Iranian Nationals in three private claims before the Tribunal: Claim No. 485, *Riahi v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber One on January 29, 1996; Claim No. 953, *Hakim v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber Two on February 27, 1996; and Claim 266, *Aryeh, et al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber Three on February 29, 1996. The Memorial argues that a good faith interpretation of the ordinary meaning of the 1955 Treaty of Amity leads to the conclusion that it protects all persons deemed to be U.S. nationals under U.S. laws when they undertake activities in Iran, regardless of whether they also possess another nationality.

5. The situation reviewed above continues to implicate important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12170 continue to play an important role in structuring our relationship with Iran and in enabling the United States to implement properly the Algiers Accords. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 16, 1996.

Remarks at the Inter-American Dialogue Dinner
May 16, 1996

Please, sit down and relax. Thank you. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for the very warm welcome. To our distinguished head table guests, former Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar, President Arias, Secretary Vance, Minister Lampreia, President Iglesias, Mr. Ambassador. To Peter Bell and Alejandro Foxley; my good friend and adviser on Latin America Mack McLarty; Peter Hakim; and of course, to our distinguished friend Mr. Linowitz.

For 14 years, the Inter-American Dialogue has played a leading role in framing the debate on issues that really matter to the peoples of our hemisphere. As we enter a period of even closer cooperation in the Americas, I'm delighted that the Inter-American Dialogue is also intensifying its work.

I'm especially pleased that you're carrying forward your efforts with the creation of the Inter-American Dialogue's Saul Linowitz Forum. By honoring Saul you have paid a fitting tribute to the extraordinary, extraordinary service that this great American and citizen of the world has rendered. In a lifetime devoted to the public, Ambassador Linowitz has helped to foster peace, cooperation, and partnership between the United States, the nations of the Americas, and other nations around the world.

Saul has led here at home as well, working to confront the problems of racism, urban decay, and poverty. And he's called his own profession of law to a higher sense of duty. As the chair emeritus to the Inter-American Dialogue, he continues to make a difference, to promote the exchange and understanding that we need to bring our hemisphere closer together so that all of our people are more prosperous and secure.

In 1967 Saul Linowitz organized the United States participation in the Punta del Este summit which became the model of the Summit of the Americas that we held in Miami in 1994 that Mr. McLarty and Hattie Babbitt and so many others in this room in our administration worked so very hard on. At the Miami summit, the nations of our hemisphere agreed on the challenges we must face together in opening our markets, strengthening our democracies, protecting our shared environment against pollution. And we developed a program to do all that and more so that our region can become more prosperous, more secure, and our freedom wider, broader, and deeper.

In an important way, the Inter-American Dialogue helped to define the goals we set at the Summit of the Americas. And as now we look toward the next century, I'm glad the Saul Linowitz Forum will help to focus our discussions and our actions.

I thank you all for all you have done to help define and shape the currents that flow deeper today in our hemisphere because of your work: democracy, market economics, justice, and growing partnership. I thank you all, and I especially thank Saul Linowitz.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:13 p.m. in the Hall of the Americas at the Organization of American States. In his remarks, he referred to Javier Perez de Cuellar, former U.N. Secretary-General; Oscar Arias, former President of Costa Rica; Cyrus Vance, former U.S. Secretary of State; Minister of Foreign Affairs Luiz Lampreia of Brazil; Enrique Iglesias, president, Inter-American Development Bank; Paulo Tarso Flecha de Lima, Ambassador to the U.S. from Brazil; Peter Bell and Alejandro Foxley, co-chairs, and Peter Hakim, president, Inter-American Dialogue; and Saul Linowitz, former U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

Remarks at the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus Institute Dinner

May 16, 1996

Thank you, Admiral, for that wonderful introduction. And I want to thank Tamlyn Tomita and Garrett Wang, your co-emcees, for standing up here with me. I made them come out. I said, "I want you to stand up here with me because you make me look young and fresh and alive." [*Laughter*] So I thank them for doing that. To Gloria Caoile, your dinner chair; Francey Youngberg, your executive director; Rona Figueroa; and all the Members of Congress who are here. And a couple of former Members of Congress who are here, my good friend Norm Mineta, who is being honored tonight, and Frank Horton, who was the primary sponsor of the bill creating Asian-Pacific Heritage Month. I thank you, sir.

I don't know how many Members of Congress are here. I saw Congressman Underwood, Congressman Abercrombie, Congresswoman Pelosi, and I know Congressman Matsui is here, or Doris would stop speaking to him. So however many Members of Congress who are here, I'm delighted to join you tonight.

I was honored to be here last year at your inaugural dinner. I'm proud of what we have accomplished together since then. More than anything else tonight I would like to say a simple thank you. Thank you on behalf of the United States for the many contributions that the 9 million Americans who trace their roots to Asia and the islands of the Pacific make to our country every day. And thank you, particularly to those of you and those whom you represent throughout this country who have participated in the efforts of our administration and without whom we would not have been able to accomplish much of what has been done.

As we debate the issue of immigration again this year, we should never forget that America is a great country because we have welcomed successive generations of immigrants to our shores. Because we are a nation of laws we should do everything we can and we should do more than we have to stop illegal immigration. I have done more than has previously been done. But we should avoid bashing immigrants. We are nearly, all of us, immigrants or the children or grandchildren or great-grandchildren of immigrants. The Native Americans were here first, and I think they crossed an ice cap to get here.

This is a country founded on a certain set of ideas, a certain set of values, a certain set of principles. And anybody willing to embrace them, to work hard to make the most of their own lives, to be responsible, can be an American citizen. That is the special thing about the United States, and we should never forget it.

I have been especially fortunate to have so many people from the Asian-Pacific American community in our administration, more than 170 all told, more than any previous administration,

and I am grateful. When I took office I learned that it had been 14 years since the last Asian-American had been nominated to the Federal bench. I have nominated four, and I'm proud of every one of them.

I almost hate to start with this, but there are a few Asian-Americans I would feel bad if I didn't mention tonight who have been part of this administration: I thank my Deputy Assistant for Public Liaison, Doris Matsui, who made sure I came tonight; Barbara Chow, Special Assistant for Legislative Affairs; Maria Haley, Director of the Export-Import Bank; Ginger Lew, the Deputy Administrator at SBA; Valerie Lau at Treasury; David Tseng at Labor; Raj Anand at Agriculture; T.S. Chung at Commerce; Dang Pham at Education; Dennis Hayashi at HHS; Will Itoh, now our Ambassador to Thailand, formerly on my National Security Council staff; and Stuart Ishimaru at Justice. Those are a few of the people who serve you every day in the Clinton administration.

Three and a half years ago when I took the oath of office, I did so with a clear vision of what I hoped our country could be like as we move into the 21st century. I wanted this to be a country where every person, without regard to race or gender or income, would have a chance to live out his or her dreams. I wanted this to be a country where we were coming together around our basic values, not being driven apart for cheap, short-term political reasons. I wanted this to be a country that would continue to be the greatest and strongest country in the world and the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity. We've still got a good ways to go, but without question, if you compare where we are today with where we were then, we have made progress on all three fronts.

Our economic strategy to reduce the deficit, expand trade, invest more in our people, our technology, and our potential for growth means that our deficit is less than half of what it was 4 years ago, but we have 8½ million more jobs, the lowest combined rates of inflation, mortgage rates, and unemployment in 27 years, a 15-year high in homeownership, an all-time high in exports and new business formations for 3 years in a row. Nearly 8,500 SBA loans have been approved to start those new small businesses.

We've increased educational opportunities from more positions for children in Head Start to more affordable college loans to the national service program. We've done our part to help lower the crime rate by passing a crime bill which will put 100,000 police officers on the street—we're more than 40 percent of the way there in less than 2 years—banning assault weapons and passing the Brady bill which has kept 60,000 people with criminal records from getting handguns.

We have worked to dramatically increase our protection of the environment from our cities to our rural areas, including our national parks. We have worked to strengthen families through the family and medical leave law; a family tax credit for working families on modest incomes; an increased effort to collect child support; going for the V-chip and for a television rating system to help parents raise their young children without excessive exposure to violence and other destructive elements; and our campaign against childhood smoking, which has attracted a great deal of opposition, but I would just point out, the biggest health problem in America, and 3,000 children a day illegally begin to smoke.

The economy is better off, but it's important to point out that the crime rate is down, the welfare rolls are down. There are over one million fewer families on welfare today than there were 4 years ago. The poverty rate has dropped, and this country is coming together.

I am grateful for what we have been able to do to make this a more peaceful place. There are no nuclear weapons pointed at the children of the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age. The United States is a force for peace and freedom. From Northern Ireland to Southern Africa, to Haiti, to Bosnia, to the Middle East, we are working to bring the countries of the world together to fight our common enemies of terrorism and organized crime and drug running and the proliferation of weapons and the destruction of our precious global environment.

But if you ask me to tell you what it is we really have to do to get into the 21st century with these ideals being met, I would say we have to find a way to meet our challenges and protect our values and to do it together.

If you think about so much of the political rhetoric we have heard in America for, well, a long time now, it seems to be designed to divide people, to make neighbors look upon their neighbors as if they're almost alien, to make people believe that public servants that

are otherwise perfectly normal people are somehow capable of the utmost depravity.

The truth is, this is a pretty great country, or we wouldn't be here after over 200 years. And we should have our debates and our differences and our heated debates on public policy. But we ought to do it in a way that says that we realize that we all love our country, we all love our Constitution, and we know we're going up or down together. And if we persist in dividing ourselves against one another, we will weaken America. If we unite and make a virtue out of our diversity, there is no country as well-positioned for the 21st century as the United States.

We've tried to do that. In the past year, just for example, we hosted two Asian-Pacific American education forums to address the needs of Asian-American students and their teachers. We've approved almost $2 billion in loans from the Small Business Administration to Asian-American businesses. We funded an SBA program targeted to Asian-American women, to provide training and counseling to thousands of women in Chinatown in New York City. We've done all this while shrinking the size of the Government and the burden of regulation.

I don't believe that there's a big Government answer to every problem. The Chinese philosopher Lao Tzu once said that governing a great county is like cooking a small fish; you spoil it with too much poking. [*Laughter*] On the other hand, you can also spoil it if you don't try to cook it in the first place. So the trick is for us to do together those things which will give every American the chance to make the most of his or her life at work, at home, in the community, and in our great country.

We are going through a period of profound change. The economy is changing more than it has in a hundred years, moving into this information technology age, moving into this global economy, indeed, a whole global society. It's been a hundred years since we moved from farm to factory and from the country to the city, since we changed this much. In terms of our communications with our fellow human beings, the changes are even more profound. Bill Gates, the famous founder of Microsoft, says that the digital chip is revolutionizing communications more than at any point since Guttenberg printed the first Bible in Europe 500 years ago.

Now, in this environment we have to understand that things will change. There will be some uprooting. We must meet these challenges. But we can do it if we are determined to do it together and determined to pull together and go forward together.

A big part of that is making sure that you are a part of the American dream and that you and the entire Asian-Pacific community feel that we are moving forward together and that we are moving forward with a vision of the world that includes a strong partnership with the Pacific. My first overseas trip as President was to Japan. The first thing I tried to do in organizing the world in a different way was to establish the leadership summit in the Asia-Pacific Economic Council. The first meeting was held in Seattle; we're about to have the fourth one in Manila later this year.

Already we see the fruits of this engagement. Recently I was in the Pacific, and we reaffirmed our security relationship with Korea. We reaffirmed our efforts with Korea for a new initiative for peace between North and South Korea. We asked our friends in China to join with us in sponsoring an effort to reach this sort of peace. We reaffirmed our security ties with Japan in a very positive way. And we made it clear that what we want—what we want—in northern Asia is peace between all nations. And we want to see all honest differences resolved peacefully so that people raise their children without the fear that has nagged that region through the World Wars and the regional wars of the 20th century. We can't go back to that; we have to go forward in peace. And the United States intends to be a force for peace and reconciliation in Asia and throughout the Pacific region.

Most of you know this, but a lot of our ticket to the future economically is in the Asian-Pacific region as well. It already accounts for a quarter of the world's output, growing every day. Already more than half our trade is with the nations of the Pacific, sustaining 3 million good American jobs. I am proud to say—and I want to hammer this home—that 68 percent of the 8½ million new jobs that have been created were created in high-wage areas of our economy, not low-wage areas of our economy. And that's because we have emphasized trade, which creates better paying jobs for the American people. A lot of you have been in the forefront of that, and I thank you for that.

Exports to Asia have increased by 44 percent. In the 20 areas covered by our specific agreements with Japan in 3 years, our exports increased by 85 percent. That is a staggering amount of advance. Our late Commerce Secretary, Ron Brown, the best friend that American businesses and trade ever had, worked tirelessly to open those markets. His successor, our former trade ambassador who was the most effective trade negotiator we ever had—he negotiated 200 separate trade agreements in 3 years—Mickey Kantor will continue on that path.

But a lot of what we have to do must be rooted in mutual trust and respect and willing—willing—partnerships. We know that. And we know we have a ways to go. I want better relations with China. I recognize the one China policy. I also recognize that an important part of that policy is the commitment that was made by all parties that the differences between China and Taiwan will and must be resolved in a peaceful and lawful manner.

I want a growing understanding between our two countries. I realize that neither of us is perfect, and both of us are going to have a great say over what the future looks like, and we have to work hard to understand each other and to work together. That's why I am committed to securing an extension of the MFN treatment for China and why I want to build better relationships. But it's also why I think we have to insist on fairness in our trade and on honoring all of our commitments in the area of nonproliferation. Some things in this world are more important than money, and not arming rogue nations with weapons that can destroy the future of our children is one of them.

We must be in a position where we don't hesitate to take appropriate action if we can't gain adequate enforcement of the agreement that China has already made with us to stop the piracy of American property. I realize that this has been a problem in developing economies for a long time. But China is not just another developing economy. It is a very great nation, with over one billion people.

A lot of America's meal ticket to the future consists of our ability to take advantage of the information revolution. And today, we are losing as much as $2 billion in opportunities, many of them opportunities that would belong to Asian-Pacific Americans, in Washington State, in Oregon and California, in New England, in the Middle West, all across this country. I have no choice but to take strong action to try to protect the work of the minds of all Americans, and it's their right to be rewarded in the international marketplace.

The main thing I want to say to all of you tonight is that, again, I thank you for your contributions to America. And I thank you for the people you have supplied, both within and without the administration, who have advanced our cause. I think that your devotion to learning, to hard work, to family, to the ideas of entrepreneurialism and the idea of engagement with the rest of the world, these are the kinds of things that will keep America great in the 21st century.

We can go into the next century with a country where everybody who is willing to work for it can live out their dreams. We can maintain this country as the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity. But if we are going to do it, we must be committed to that third element of our vision: We have to be committed to bringing this country together around a mutual ethic of responsibility instead of letting ourselves be divided by differences that ultimately don't matter nearly as much as our devotion to our shared ideals.

You can help bring this country together as well as move it forward, and I'm convinced we can't do one without the other. Asian-Pacific Americans have done both and done them brilliantly. I ask for your continued support as we try to make sure that our entire country does the same.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:52 p.m. at the Sheraton Washington Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Rear Adm. Ming E. Chang, USN (Ret.), chairman, Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus Institute; singer Rona Figueroa; and Delegate Robert A. Underwood of Guam.

Remarks on Signing Megan's Law and an Exchange With Reporters
May 17, 1996

Good morning. I want to welcome Senator Grams and Congressman Zimmer, Congresswoman Lofgren, Bonnie Campbell from the Justice Department.

This has been a week in which our country is moving to combat crime and violence. A couple of days ago we awarded over 9,000 new police officers to some 2,500 communities. That brings us to 43,000 police officers in 20 months along the road to our goal of 100,000. We're ahead of schedule and under budget.

But today the valiant presence of five American parents reminds us that this fight against crime is so much more a fight for peace and for safety for our people and especially for our children. Richard and Maureen Kanka, Patty Wetterling, Marc Klaas, and John Walsh have suffered more than any parent should ever have to suffer. They have lived through the greatest pain a parent can know, a child brutally ripped from a parent's love. And somehow they found within themselves the strength to bear a further burden. They took up the parents' concerns for all children's safety and dedicated themselves to answering that concern.

Each of you deserves the fullest measure of your country's thanks. Because of you, steps have already been taken to help families protect their children. Study after study has shown us that sex offenders commit crime after crime. So 2 years ago we gave every State the power to notify communities about child sex offenders and violent sex offenders who move into their neighborhoods. We're fighting now to uphold these laws in courts all across the country, and we will fight to uphold them all the way to the Supreme Court.

Today we are taking the next step. From now on, every State in the country will be required by law to tell a community when a dangerous sexual predator enters its midst. We respect people's rights, but today America proclaims there is no greater right than a parent's right to raise a child in safety and love. Today America warns: If you dare to prey on our children, the law will follow you wherever you go, State to State, town to town. Today America circles the wagon around our children. Megan's Law will protect tens of millions of families from the dread of what they do not know. It will give more peace of mind to our parents.

To understand what this law really means, never forget its name, the name of a 7-year-old girl taken wrongly in the beginning of her life. The law that bears a name of one child is now for every child, for every parent and every family. It is for Polly and Jacob and Adam, and, above all, for Megan.

I thank the Congress for passing it. I thank those who led the fight. And I thank these families more than anything else. God bless you all.

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

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, you said here that studies have shown sex offenders commit crime after crime. But apparently the courts, especially on the State level, don't seem to recognize that fact. What makes you think that all the way up to the Supreme Court they are going to change that opinion?

The President. First of all, I hope that this law will be upheld if it is challenged. I believe it will be. And before we went forward with this, in consultation with the Congress, including the leaders of Congress who are here now, we did a great deal of legal research on it. And we felt that we could defend it, and we felt that it was right.

And Congress has done its job. And now it is our job to get out there and defend this law, and we intend to do it if it's challenged. And in the meanwhile, we intend to enforce it.

Death of Admiral Jeremy M. Boorda

Q. Have you talked to Mrs. Boorda?

The President. Excuse me?

Q. Have you talked with Mrs. Boorda?

The President. I have not because yesterday—I intend to call her as soon as this is over. But yesterday I asked the Secretary of Defense to determine the family's wishes, and they wanted a day alone, and I understood that. But I intend to speak with her this morning as soon as this is over.

Pennsylvania Avenue

Q. Mr. President, Pennsylvania Avenue has been closed for a year now, and it hasn't exactly become the urban parklike setting that was planned when it was closed. And it is frequently, in fact, cut off from tourist and pedestrian use. What would you like to see?

The President. Well, I would like—if it is the judgment of the Secret Service and the other security people that we should keep it closed, I would like to see it fixed as it was intended in that plan that was developed about 30 years or so ago and turned into a genuine park so it can be made available to all the many people who live in and around Washington and all those who come here to visit. It's quite a nice space, and with a little investment, it could be made, I think, quite attractive. Right now the skateboarders and the rollerbladers seem to like it, but I'd like to see it made more helpful to more people.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Polly Klaas, Jacob Wetterling, Adam Walsh, and Megan Kanka, child crime victims; and Bettie Boorda, widow of Adm. Jeremy M. Boorda. H.R. 2137, approved May 17, was assigned Public Law No. 104–145.

Remarks at Webster Groves High School in Webster Groves, Missouri
May 17, 1996

Thank you very much. Let me say, first, thank you for this very warm welcome. Congressman Gephardt and Mrs. Gephardt and I were talking on the way in—it may be too hot for you, but we have just been through the bitterest winter we can remember in Washington, DC, and it's very comfortable for me. I'll never complain about the heat again. We're delighted to be here.

Mayor Williams; Superintendent Gussner; your principal, Patricia Voss; the police chief, Gene Young; let me thank all of you. Let me thank Mr. Johnson and the Jazz Ensemble One for playing here. I used to play in a group like that, and I liked every day of it. I want to thank Mrs. Genovese and the students who did all the banners and the signs. They're just terrific. Thank you.

I came down here with a lot of people today, but one of the staff members that I brought, someone who works for our Secretary of Labor, Bob Reich, is an alumni of Webster Groves, Catherine Jayne. She came down here with me, and I wanted to mention that, just so you'll know your influence is being felt in Washington.

And I want to say a special word of thanks to the young lady who introduced me, Jocelyn Grant. She did a good job, didn't she? Give her another hand. [*Applause*] I know something of her activities, and I want to thank her not only for the introduction, but for being a very good model of what good citizenship and personal responsibility can mean in a school and a community.

I came here with Congressman Gephardt today to Webster Groves to talk to you about one of the greatest challenges we face as a Nation, the rising tide of violence among our young people. I'm here because this community has worked together to reduce that tide of violence and because we have to work together as a country if we expect your future to be what it ought to be.

You will live most of your lives in the 21st century. It will be an age of unparalleled possibility, the possibility to do things for a living that are more various and more exciting than any generation of Americans has ever known, the possibility to bring this country together across the lines of race and income that divide us, the possibility to live in a world that is more peaceful and free and prosperous and secure than any the world has ever known.

But all those are just possibilities, not guarantees. If you want that kind of country for your future, you'll have to work for it. We'll have to work to make sure that every American, without regard to their station in life, has a chance to live out their dreams. We'll have to work to bridge the differences that still divide too many of our people and make sure that we treat our diversity as a precious asset and that

we come together across racial and regional and gender and income lines. And we'll have to work for a world that is more peaceful.

To achieve that, we'll have to meet a lot of challenges. The Congressman talked about one of them. We have to build stronger families. We have to build a world-class education for all of our people, which is why we've worked so hard for more affordable college loans and more scholarships and more work-study, so that every one of you gets out of here who wants to do it will have a chance to go to college and will never be deterred by the cost of a college education. We want that.

We'll have to work to build a new form of family economic security in this dynamic economy. We'll have to give people now the opportunity for an entire lifetime to get more education, to have access to affordable health care, to have a pension that they'll need for old age that they can carry around with them even if they have to change jobs. We'll have to work to achieve that.

We'll have to work to continue to grow our economy and preserve the environment. But if we don't preserve our natural environment, our clean air, our clean water, our resources, our wildlife, we'll never have the kind of future that America deserves. And I know young people of America are as committed to that as any group of our fellow citizens. We'll have to work to make the world a more peaceful place, more free of terrorism and international crime and drug running and weapons running. And we'll have to work to make sure that you have a Government that does its part. But none of this will matter if we can't fulfill our first responsibility as a society, and that is to preserve lawfulness and to minimize violence in our own homes and streets and neighborhoods and communities.

You know, a lot of Americans are so numb to turning on the television news at night and seeing another report of another violent crime that they just take it for granted; they almost yawn. They say, "Well, I can miss the first 5 minutes of the news, that will be the crime part."

Now, I know that we can never fully eliminate crime from our country because we can't totally transform human nature. But I'll tell you what we can do. We can go back to the time when people go home at night and they turn on the television news and they see a serious crime, when they're appalled, surprised, disgusted, and shocked, when it is the exception and not the rule. That's the kind of America I want again.

We have worked very, very hard to give American communities the tools they need to bring down the crime rate. With the strong leadership of Dick Gephardt in 1994 we passed a sweeping crime bill that, among other things, will put another 100,000 police officers on the streets of America over a 5-year period. We're already at 43,000 and climbing.

And these police officers are different. They're going back to community police work, not sitting behind a desk but walking a beat, working with the communities, reaching out to children, not only catching criminals but learning the neighborhood, so that they can stop crime from happening and give young people something to say yes to in their future. That is the kind of community police work we need in every community, in every neighborhood, on every street in the United States. And we are determined to achieve that.

We have worked hard to deal with the problem of guns and violence. We passed the Brady bill after years of debate. We passed legislation banning 19 kinds of assault weapons. We passed legislation calling for zero tolerance for guns in the schools of this country.

And you know, there was a lot of controversy about that legislation. I heard the awfulest din about it in 1994 you ever saw. But it's 1996 now, and in Missouri and my native State of Arkansas, we have had every kind of hunting season you can possibly have and not a single hunter has lost his or her rifle. But I'll tell you what has happened: 60,000 people with criminal histories, with mental health problems, and with other things that make them unfit to have handguns have been denied the right to get handguns because of the Brady bill. We did the right thing. We did the right thing.

This is working. All across America the crime rate is dropping. We're in the 4th year in a row of a big drop in crime. In Webster Groves you're on your way to making this the lowest overall crime year in almost 20 years. Congratulations to you.

But I have to tell you something, and that's the reason I'm here and we're in this hot gym on this warm day. [*Laughter*] If anybody had told me this 4 years ago, I would not have believed it. If anybody had told me the following fact when I was sworn in as President, that you will have 4 years of declining crime rates

in America, the murder rate will drop, the robbery rate will drop, the rate of rape and arson will drop all across America, but unbelievably, the rate of random violence by children under 18 will go up—if someone had told me that 3 years ago, I would not have believed it. But that is exactly what has happened.

And so I'm telling you what we have to do is to solve that. We can't for long go on being a country where the crime rate keeps going up among young people under 18. We now have the largest group of children starting grade school that we have had since the baby boom generation. Within just a few years we'll have the largest number of young people in schools in America in the entire history of the country.

We cannot stand to have higher juvenile crime rates and violence rates when that huge number of young people come here. We have got about 5 years to do something about this problem, and we cannot do it unless the young people of America lead the way. It is your future, and you have to lead the way.

We have done what we could. We passed a bill called the safe and drug-free schools act. It gives money to schools all across the country to do what they think they need to do. Here our program has helped station a plainclothed police officer at the school. Earlier this week, I saw that your State was moving to help when Missouri lawmakers agreed to a final version of a new school safety law. And I applaud the Governor and the legislature for doing that. People should be safe in school. If there's any place on Earth young people should be safe all day, every day, it is when they are in school. Every young person should be safe.

All over America schools are asking for permission to try different things. I was in Long Beach, California, a couple of weeks ago—that's the third biggest school district in our biggest State—and they voluntarily decided to put in school uniforms in their elementary and junior high school. They let the students pick the uniforms and design them. They had a gang problem, and all of a sudden they realized that when their kids were in their own uniforms, nobody mistook them for gang members anymore. People stopped following them home from school. People stopped attacking them on the play yard. They were able to restore discipline, reduce crime, and increase learning.

There are all kinds of things that are happening all across America. But without exception, we find that they are led by people in the community and especially by active, aggressive young people who say, "I do not want my classmates to live a life of danger; I want us to be safe and secure." That's what we need for you to do today.

Because dangerous gangs are spreading across America, we are working with Federal prosecutors everywhere to try to go after gangs that are seriously violent in the same way our country went after the mob decades ago. We cannot permit the spread of gangs to spread guns, to spread drugs, to spread violence all across the country to communities that don't have to face that today. We are working at that.

We are working to help parents protect their children. Earlier today, before I came here, I signed a bill you may have heard something about; it's called Megan's Law. From now on, every State in the country will be required by law to tell a community when a dangerous sexual predator is in the community.

So we are working on all this. But let me say one more time, the places where crime is down are the places where people are working with the police, the places where young people are taking the lead. I spoke at the graduation at Pennsylvania State University a few days ago, and I asked for a million more volunteers all across America—50 in the 20,000 neighborhoods that have community police watches now—to help bring down the crime rate. So I ask you to do that.

I want your future to be the brightest, best future any generation of Americans has ever known. I believe it can be. I know what the economy will present to those of you who have a good education and who are willing to work. I know what the incredible diversity of America means in a global society where any country would give anything to have the diverse resources of our various racial and ethnic groups, of people educated, committed to freedom, and committed to hard work and free enterprise. But I know, too, that unless we can purge ourselves of crime and violence and drugs and gangs, your future will never be what it ought to be.

So I ask you to stand up, as you have here, for the concept of zero tolerance in school; stand up for the concept that gangs and drugs are wrong; stand up for the idea that you have to participate in a partnership with the police

if you want a safe neighborhood, a safe street, and a safe school.

You have shown what you can do here, but you mark my words, you will have the best future any generation of Americans has ever known if you'll work for it, but only if we can make America a safe place again.

So every one of you—we need your personal commitment: No to crime. No to guns. No to gangs. No to drugs. Yes to your own future. If you do that, your future will be the brightest of any generation in American history.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Richard A. Gephardt's wife, Jane; Mayor Terry Williams of Webster Groves, MO; William Gussner, superintendent of schools; John Johnson, band director; Debbie Genovese, art teacher; and Webster Groves High School student Jocelyn Grant.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Austria-United States Social Security Agreement

May 17, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95–216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Supplementary Agreement Amending the Agreement Between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria on Social Security (the "Supplementary Agreement"). The Supplementary Agreement, signed at Vienna on October 5, 1995, is intended to modify certain provisions of the original United States-Austria Social Security Agreement, signed July 13, 1990.

The United States-Austria Social Security Agreement is similar in objective to the social security agreements with Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Supplementary Agreement, which would amend the 1990 Agreement to update and clarify several of its provisions, is necessitated by changes that have occurred in U.S. and Austrian law in recent years. Among other things, it would introduce a new method of computing Austrian benefits under the Agreement that will result in higher Austrian benefits for certain people who have divided their careers between the United States and Austria. Another provision in the Supplementary Agreement will allow U.S. citizens hired in Austria by U.S. Foreign Service Posts to be covered by the Austrian Social Security System rather than the U.S. system. The Supplementary Agreement will also make a number of minor revisions in the Agreement to take account of other changes in U.S. and Austrian law that have occurred in recent years.

The United States-Austria Social Security Agreement, as amended, would continue to contain all provisions mandated by section 233 and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of section 233(c)(4).

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the Supplementary Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the effect of the amendments of the Agreement. Annexed to this report is the report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the effect of the Agreement on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the Agreement. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Supplementary Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the United States-Austria Social Security Agreement and related documents to the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 17, 1996.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Malaysia-United States Extradition Treaty
May 17, 1996

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Malaysia, and a related exchange of notes signed at Kuala Lumpur on August 3, 1995.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty. As the report explains, the Treaty will not require further implementing legislation.

This Treaty will, upon entry into force, enhance cooperation between the law enforcement communities of both countries. It will thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts.

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States. Upon entry into force of this Treaty, the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Great Britain signed at London December 22, 1931, will cease to have effect, with certain exceptions, between the United States and Malaysia.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 17, 1996.

Message on the Observance of Armed Forces Day
May 17, 1996

For forty-seven years, Armed Forces Day has been celebrated by the citizens of our great nation in recognition of our faith in America's men and women in uniform. This year's theme, "America's Armed Forces: Pillars of Freedom," is a testament to the quiet strength and steadfast resolve with which you, the members of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, uphold the standards of liberty around the world.

Day in and day out, under demanding and often perilous circumstances, you put your skills, your energy, and your very lives on the line in the service of your nation and your fellow citizens. Whether advancing peace in Bosnia, protecting democracy in Haiti, offering humanitarian aid to those in need, or remaining vigilant to the threats of tyrants and terrorists, you have set a shinning example of service for all Americans, inspiring our young people and fulfilling our trust in you.

As Commander in Chief, I am proud that you are the best-trained, best-equipped, and best-led fighting force in the world. But we cannot rest on this record. On this Armed Forces Day, we must rededicate ourselves to keeping the U.S. military strong and confident—sustaining these true pillars that support freedom throughout the world.

I salute you for your courage and dedication in serving your country's cause, wherever and whenever you are called upon to do so, and

on behalf of a grateful nation, I thank you for what you have done and continue to do to keep America strong and free.

Best wishes for a memorable observance.

BILL CLINTON

Remarks at a Dinner for Representative Richard A. Gephardt in St. Louis, Missouri

May 17, 1996

Thank you very much. August Busch, thank you for that introduction. Thank you for your friendship and support. Thank you for all you do for this community.

To Representative Bill Clay and Representative Karen McCarthy, Mayor Freeman Bosley, your county executive, Buzz Westfall, ladies and gentlemen. I am delighted to be here today. I have been here all day. I have been to a wonderful high school. I have talked to a lot of wonderful young people. I have been with Congressman Gephardt and Mrs. Gephardt as we have stormed a bocce ball—or you say bocce here—a bocce ball arena, where I think I better go back to golf. But I loved playing.

In my public life I've had an opportunity to do a lot of things, but I have never given a speech in a domed football stadium before. I feel that I'd be better off passing or punting or something else. But I still feel like it's first down instead of fourth, so I'm going to try to get through the talk.

I know that St. Louis has done a lot of remarkable things in the last few years, including build this magnificent facility and attract the Rams here. I know you're looking forward to celebrating the centennial of the World's Fair and the bicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase. I'm always excited when I come here to the heartland, and I want to congratulate you for what you have done.

I feel deeply indebted to the people of Missouri for many things, and the people of this fine city. But I want to say a special word of thanks to those of you who met with my wife on her recent trip here. She had a wonderful time; she loved the reception. She sold a few of her books, and she came back in a very good humor. And that's something I was very grateful for. Thank you.

I'd also like to say a special word of thanks to you for keeping Dick Gephardt in the United States House of Representatives and enabling him to help to lead our Democratic Party, the Democratic caucus in the House, and this country. I told a group of people earlier this evening that Dick Gephardt had done a lot for this country, and whenever I met him he always wanted to talk about issues of great national concern after he has twisted my arm for one more TWA route to somewhere. And believe me, even though I said "somewhere," I have the list in my pocket; I know exactly what I'm supposed to be lobbying for. [*Laughter*]

I had a wonderful time talking with Dick this afternoon about the weekends he comes home and just goes into neighborhoods and knocks on doors to talk to his constituents and ask them what they think. I must say that one of the things that I miss about public life since becoming President is that I don't get a chance to do that sort of thing so much anymore.

When I sought this office, some of the people on the other side used to make fun of me for being the Governor of a small Southern State. Well, I was, and I'm proud that I was. One of the great virtues of that is you got to know your people. And they felt they could call you by your first name, and they felt they could share their real feelings with you. And that's what helps to make democracy work. And I hope all of you appreciate just how rare it is to see a person who has years of national leadership experience like Dick Gephardt but never forgets the folks back home and always puts their concerns first. That's what makes American democracy work, and I am very grateful for him And I know that you are, too.

I want to ask you to take just a few minutes tonight not so much to listen to me but to kind of listen to yourself. We're just 4 years away now from a new century, indeed a new millennium. We're going through a period of astonishing change in how we work, how we

communicate with each other, how we live, how we relate to the rest of the world.

At a period like this, when everything is changing, the role of your Government in Washington has to change as well. And for the last 3½ years I've been trying to find ways to make those changes work for all the American people, as August said, in a way that creates more opportunity and brings us together as a country.

But tonight I want to ask you to answer these questions that I have to ask of myself all the time. Because in this country the people are still in the saddle. That's what a free country is. That's what democracies mean. That's what elections are for. And in order to make really good decisions, I think you have to know the answer to that question. Here this great country is, more than 200 years old, the longest lasting great democracy in human history, standing on the brink not only of a new century but a whole new era in the way human beings work and relate to each other. What do you want your country to look like in that new era? Most of us in this room tonight are adults. We have lived most of our lives in the 20th century, and we will leave the 21st century to our children and our grandchildren. What kind of America do we want to leave for them? Those are the great questions before the American people today.

When I look ahead into this next century and I see that the nature of work is changing and the nature of American life is changing more than any time in a hundred years, since the beginning of our own century when we moved from being primarily a rural people to being more a city people, when we moved from most of us making our living on the farms to most of us making our living either in the factories or around factories. Now we're moving from a national economy to a global economy, indeed, a global society. We're moving from an industrial economy to one dominated by information and technology in every form of human endeavor, including agriculture. I don't know how many farmer friends of mine at home know more about computer technology than I do, because that's how they have to make their judgments about what to plant and how to bring the crop in.

The great computer genius who is the head of Microsoft, Bill Gates, says that the transformation in technology we're undergoing in communications is the greatest in 500 years, that the digital chip is the most significant thing to happen in the way people communicate with each other since Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Europe 500 years ago.

Now, when I think about that, what I think is that this is an incredible age of possibilities. Most of us have been able to benefit in some way or another from this age of possibility; otherwise you couldn't afford to be here for Dick tonight. And we owe it to ourselves, to our children, our grandchildren, and to our country to think about what kind of age we want to pass on to our children.

I have three simple things I want for America in the 21st century. I want every child in this country, without regard to their race, their religion, their gender, where they grow up or how much they start out with in life, to have a chance to live out their dreams if they're willing to work for it. I want this to be a country that relishes in all of its diversity. Today I was in an Italian-American neighborhood in St. Louis, the Hill. I went to a high school where there were children of many different racial and ethnic groups. The other day I was in New Jersey, in what used to be primarily a white ethnic neighborhood; it's still primarily that, but there were African-American children there, there were Hispanic-American children there, there were children from the Indian subcontinent who are Hindus, there were children from the Middle East who are Muslims. And they were all there in this American school.

All over the world people are consumed with fighting each other and keeping each other down because of their racial, their ethnic, or their religious differences. I have done what I could to end those tragedies, from Northern Ireland to Bosnia to South Africa to the Middle East. But I know that this country has always had a legacy of battling within its own soul, when we look at our brothers and sisters who are different from us and ask, do we have more in common, or are our differences more important?

Now, if you look at this global society in which we are going to live, the diversity of America—all these different kinds of people with different languages, different cultures, different backgrounds, different experiences, different ties to other countries, every country in the world Americans have ties to—that is a meal ticket to the future if we make up our mind we're going into the future together, we're going

to be bound together by the values we share, not divided by the differences among us. That is my second dream for the American people in the 21st century.

The final thing is, I hope and pray that we will not lay down the mantle of leadership in the world that is on us now. I know it is burdensome. I know many of our fellow Americans think that we should not do it. But America has to remain the world's strongest force for peace and for freedom, for prosperity and for security. I am proud of the fact that in the last 3 years there are no more nuclear weapons pointed at the children of America for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age.

But there are still security threats to the children of America. There is terrorism. There is organized crime. There is drug running. There is the proliferation of weapons of destruction, chemical and biological weapons. There is the threat of global environmental destruction. And we have to work with our neighbors. And we have to try to get other great, strong countries to define their greatness in the way we try to define ours, not by whether we can push people around beyond our borders but by what we stand for and what we believe in and what we believe free people can do when they work together. And this is very important. We cannot walk away from that.

So that's what I want: opportunity for all, a country that is coming together instead of being divided, and a country that is leading the world to peace, freedom, and prosperity. If we do that, our children will live in the greatest age of possibility in all human history.

So the question is, what's that got to do with Dick Gephardt? What's that got to do with the House of Representatives? What's that got to do with the future we all hope to share? I can just give you a couple of examples.

When I became President, the deficit was like a lot of problems that a lot of us have in our personal lives: we all say we ought to do something about it, but we never got around to it. It's kind of like that diet I keep meaning to go on. And there was no popular way to reduce the deficit and still keep America's values intact and fulfill our responsibilities to education, to investment in technology, to the environment, to the elderly, to those with disabilities, to people who had legitimate needs.

We couldn't find a perfectly popular way, but we did pass a deficit reduction plan. And now the deficit in America is less than half of what it was 4 years ago. It's the first time the deficit has gone down 4 years in a row since Harry Truman was President. And if it hadn't been for Dick Gephardt and the Democrats in Congress, it would not have happened. And he deserves the credit for it.

The unemployment rate in Missouri when I took office was 6.2 percent. The last time I checked it was under 4, because we got the deficit down, interest rates down, and growth up again. In this country we have 8½ million more jobs than we had 4 years ago; homeownership's at a 15-year high; we've had an all-time high of new business formation—self-made, not inherited, millionaires—self-made, it's a good thing—and an all-time high in the sales of American products around the world.

People told me when I became President we could never work out a fairer trade relationship with Japan. We've negotiated 20 separate agreements. In those areas, our exports are up 85 percent in 3 years. If it hadn't been for the support I had in the Congress demanding not only free trade but fair trade—that would not have happened if it hadn't been for Dick Gephardt and his friends in the Congress and what they stood for. I appreciate that. America is stronger and better because of those efforts.

Four years ago, the Congress had spent 6 long years bickering about the problem of crime, and our country was being gripped by a wave of crime. But people were learning what to do to bring the crime rate down, and a lot of it was pretty old-fashioned: going back to community policing, getting the police out from behind the desks and the cars and on the streets again, in the schools again, talking to people again, not only catching criminals and closing crack houses but preventing crime from occurring.

And we passed a bill that put 100,000 more police on the street, that took a serious position against domestic violence for the first time and gave the communities of this country the resources to help deal with that. It stiffened our abilities to break the serious gangs and to deal with the international threat of drugs. We passed the Brady bill. We passed a ban on 19 kinds of assault weapons. And a lot of this was very controversial.

But here's what has happened. The crime rate is down in America for 3 years in a row—and this year it will be down for 4 years in

a row—the murder rate is down, the robbery rate is down, all serious categories of crime are down. Contrary to what people said who fought us in the crime bill, there is not a single hunter in Missouri or Arkansas who lost a weapon that they used in duck season or deer season or hunting anything else in the wide world. But I'll tell you who did lose weapons: 60,000 people with criminal records and bad mental health histories couldn't buy handguns because we passed the Brady bill. And it wouldn't have happened if it hadn't been for Dick Gephardt.

So it makes a difference. What you do tonight in helping Dick Gephardt and his allies makes a difference. They've made America a more prosperous place. They've made America a more secure place.

We have a lot more to do. We're working in Washington now on a whole range of things to strengthen families, to increase economic opportunity, to say to the working people of this country in this global economy maybe there won't be quite as much ability to say, "I know I'll have this particular job for my whole work life," but at least we owe you the right to get a lifetime access to education, lifetime access to affordable health care, and lifetime access to a pension you can carry around with you if you move from job to job or if you lose your job. That's the way we can keep the dynamism of the American economy, grow the jobs, and help people who work still raise stable, strong families. Those are the kinds of challenges we have to meet.

We have to do more to ensure the education of our children, its quality, and its opportunity. We have to do more to protect the environment in ways that grow the economy. We have got to do more to ensure our position in the world. We've got to do more, as I told the children today here, to fight crime. And to do it we need a different kind of Government.

Let me tell you something you may not know. Under legislation that we passed when Dick was the majority leader, we have reduced the size of the Federal Government by 240,000. It is the smallest it has been since Mr. Johnson was President. By the first of the year, the Federal Government will be the smallest it's been since John Kennedy was the President of the United States of America. We have reduced the size of Federal regulations by 16,000 pages.

But you haven't heard anything about this, probably because we did it in a decent way. We did it in a decent way. Less than one percent of the people in that 240,000 had to be separated involuntarily from the Federal Government; everybody else we got an early retirement. We did it by attrition. We gave them a generous severance package. We found other jobs for them. We did it in the way that we ought to handle transitions.

So, yes, we've got a smaller Federal Government. But when they had the 500-year floods along the Mississippi River, in Missouri and Iowa and other places, nobody wanted a weak Federal Government, they wanted a strong Federal Emergency Management Agency to come in here and help to rebuild Missouri and help to rebuild all the other places that were devastated.

With most of the new jobs being created in small business, nobody wants a weak Small Business Administration. So we cut the budget by 25 percent, but we doubled the loan volume of the Small Business Administration. I am proud of that. That's the kind of Government we need. You're getting more for less, helping America to grow stronger.

We rewrote the student loan laws of America so that young people who want to go to college and are afraid they can't afford it can now get student loans at lower cost on better repayment terms. And if they get out of college and they want to do something that serves the rest of us but doesn't earn them a lot of money, if they want to teach school or be nurses or work as law enforcement officers, they can now pay those loans back as a percentage of their income, so that no child should ever not go to college or drop out of college because they are afraid they can never pay their loans back. That is a change that we made thanks to Dick Gephardt, and it made a difference in the United States of America.

So I ask you to think about these things. There is so much more to do. I honestly believe that even in this year, we've still got a chance to pass the right sort of balanced budget; to pass a good welfare reform plan; to pass the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill that will say to people, if you lose your job or someone in your family gets sick, you can still keep your health insurance. I believe we can do these things. I sure hope we'll get a chance to pass an increase in the minimum wage, so it doesn't fall to a 40-year low.

But the main thing I want you to keep in mind is the big picture. If you want more opportunity for people who show responsibility, if you want us to come together around our shared values instead of being divided in the old ways, if you want your country to lead the world, then we need a Government that is smaller and less bureaucratic, yes, but one that is still strong enough and committed to a central goal, not giving things to people but giving them a chance to make the most of their own lives as citizens, as workers, as members of families, as members of communities, as citizens of this great country. That's what we need. And that's what we're working on. And that's what's at stake.

So when you go home tonight, think about that. Yes, I have worked hard for the economy because I think people need to have a chance to make a decent living and because I think that when people work hard they ought to believe they can do a little better every year. But this is about much more than economics. As I have said many times, if we're fortunate enough, any of us, to know in advance, as a gift from God, when the last time we ever put our head on the pillow is, before we end our life on this Earth, I'll bet you anything we won't be thinking about finances. We'll be thinking about what we really loved, our families, our friends, our children, what we cared about, what we did that made us proud. I want this to be a country where everybody can feel those things are within their grasp. That's what I want. And we can achieve it. But in our system, the President doesn't do that alone. In our system, it requires people in the United States Congress who share a vision and share a strategy for achieving it.

And I can tell you that I have worked with Dick Gephardt for years now, and what you see is what you get. We spent 50 hours together in budget negotiations in the quiet of the Oval Office with the Republican leaders of Congress. He never raised his voice. He never lost his temper. He never did anything that you wouldn't have been very proud of. But he was always, always sticking up for the idea that we had to balance the budget, but we had to do it in a way that would grow the economy, enhance opportunity, bring this country together, and leave us all stronger. You would have been proud of that. There was never a reporter, never a camera, never anything public about it. But his quiet, determined strength impressed me more even than I had been in the past.

So you think about that when you go home tonight. I hope you'll be proud you came here. I hope you'll think your investment was worth it. And I hope, for the rest of this year, for the rest of this decade, which is the rest of this century, you'll be asking this question of yourself and answering it, because America, in all probability, will wind up looking like your vision of it, especially if you work to realize it.

Thank you, God bless you, and goodnight.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:25 p.m. at the Trans World Dome. In his remarks, he referred to August Busch IV, chairman of the board, Anheuser-Busch Co.

The President's Radio Address
May 18, 1996

Good morning. Four years ago, I challenged America to end welfare as we know it, to require work, promote responsible parenting, shift the system from dependence to independence. Just a few days after I took office, I met with the Nation's 50 Governors, and I urged every one of them to send me a welfare reform plan that would help to meet that challenge. In return, I pledged to waive outmoded or counterproductive Federal rules that get in the way of reform.

Most of the Governors took me up on that deal. So in the last 3 years, my administration has granted 38 States welfare reform waivers, clearing away Federal rules and regulations to permit States to build effective welfare reforms of their own. The State-based reform we've encouraged has brought work and responsibility

back to the lives of 75 percent of the Americans on welfare.

We're doing a lot more than signing waivers. We've also pressed ahead on fundamental reforms to make the welfare system reflect the basic values that have stood up so well for so long, that if you bring a child into this world, you must take responsibility for that child; that Government will not subsidize irresponsible or reckless behavior; that welfare is a second chance, not a way of life.

That's why I signed a Presidential order to require Federal employees to pay child support and increased Federal efforts to enforce child support orders across State lines. I toughened sanctions on welfare and food stamp recipients who refuse to work. I took action earlier this month to require teen mothers to stay in school and sign personal responsibility contracts if they are to receive welfare benefits. That's also why I sent Congress a sweeping welfare reform plan that would do all this and more.

Our hard work is paying off. America is in the midst of what the New York Times has called a quiet revolution in welfare reform under our administration. The number of Americans on welfare has dropped by 1.3 million since I took office in January 1993. Food stamp rolls are down by even more, and so are teen pregnancy rates. What numbers are up? Well, child support collections have jumped 40 percent, and the number of people who are required to work as a condition for receiving welfare is also way up.

Today I'm pleased to report that two States, Wisconsin and Maryland, are adding momentum to this quiet revolution. Last week, Wisconsin submitted to me for approval the outlines of a sweeping welfare reform plan, one of the boldest yet attempted in America, and I'm encouraged by what I've seen so far.

Under the Wisconsin plan, people on welfare who can work must work immediately. The State will see to it that the work is there, in private sector jobs that can be subsidized if necessary or in community service jobs if there are no private jobs available. The State says it will also see to it that families have health care and child care, so that parents can go to work without worrying about what will happen to their children. But then they must go to work, or they won't get paid. If they do work, of course, they'll have the dignity of earning a paycheck, not a welfare check. The plan would send a clear message to teen parents as well. If you're a minor with a baby, you'll receive benefits only if you stay in school, live at home, and turn your life around.

All in all, Wisconsin has the makings of a solid, bold welfare reform plan. We should get it done. I pledge that my administration will work with Wisconsin to make an effective transition to a new vision of welfare based on work, that protects children and does right by working people and their families.

Maryland also has come up with its own innovative welfare reform plan. It cracks down on welfare fraud, comes down hard on parents who turn their backs on child support, and helps working parents with child care so they won't be driven onto welfare in the first place.

The reforms in Wisconsin, Maryland, and other States are very encouraging for two reasons: First, they give us hope that we can break the vicious cycle of welfare dependency and, second, because they make it clear that there is now a widespread national consensus shared by people without regard to their political party on what welfare reform should look like. It should be pro-work, pro-family, pro-independence, responsible. Welfare should be a second chance, not a way of life.

So the States can keep on sending me strong welfare reform proposals, and I'll keep on signing them. I'll keep doing everything I can as President to reform welfare State by State, if that's what it takes.

But there's a faster way to bring this welfare reform to the entire Nation. There are bipartisan welfare reform plans sitting in the House and the Senate right now that do what the American people agree welfare reform must do: They require welfare recipients to work; they limit the time people can stay on welfare; they toughen child support enforcement; and they protect our children.

So I say to Congress: Send me a bill that honors these fundamental principles. I'll sign it right away. Let's get the job done. Let's do it now. Let's bring welfare reform to all 50 States. Then we'll move on to the other challenges we face as we stand at the dawn of a new century.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 3:40 p.m. on May 17 at the Italia America Bocce Club in St. Louis for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on May 18.

Remarks to the Pacific Basin Economic Council
May 20, 1996

Thank you very much. Mr. Tooker, Mr. Fynmore, Mr. Lees, members of the administration, my fellow Americans, and our guests from all around the world. Welcome to Washington, and welcome to Constitution Hall.

For nearly three decades, the Pacific Basin Economic Council has stood on the cutting edge of trade, investment, and opportunity. Today, with 19 member nations from Mexico to Malaysia, you're an integral part of this vibrant Asia-Pacific community. I am especially grateful for your active support of APEC.

Today I am pleased to announce the appointment of three talented Americans to the new APEC Business Advisory Council: Frank Shrontz, Susan Corrales-Diaz, and Robert Denham. I also want to say a very special thank you to Les McCraw of the Fluor Corporation for his tremendous contribution to APEC's Pacific Business Forum over the last 2 years.

The world has changed a lot since 1967, when PBEC was founded. Superpower confrontation has given way to growing cooperation. Freedom and democracy are on the march. Modern telecommunications have collapsed the distances between us. The new global economy is transforming the way we work and live, bringing tremendous opportunities for all our peoples. So many of these opportunities and some of our most significant challenges lie in the Asia-Pacific region.

Today half the people on our planet live in Asia. China alone is growing by the size of Canada every 2 years. Asia contains four of the seven largest militaries in the world and two of its most dangerous flashpoints: the world's most heavily fortified border between North and South Korea, and the regional conflict in South Asia where India and Pakistan, two of America's friends, live on the edge of conflict or reconciliation. At the same time, the economies of East Asia have become the world's fastest growing, producing fully one-quarter of our planet's goods and services.

America has vital strategic and economic interests that affect the lives of each and every American citizen. We must remain an Asia-Pacific power. Disengagement from Asia, a region where we have fought three wars in this century, is simply not an option. It could spark a dangerous and destabilizing arms race that would profoundly alter the strategic landscape. It would weaken our power to deter states like North Korea that still can threaten the peace and to take on problems, including global terrorism, organized crime, environmental threats, and drug trafficking in a region that produces 62 percent of the world's heroin.

Our leadership in Asia, therefore, is crucial to the security of our own people and to the future of the globe. It is also important to our future prosperity. The Asia-Pacific region is the largest consumer market in the world, accounting already for more than half of our trade and supporting millions of American jobs. By the year 2000, auto sales in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand could equal our car sales to Canada and Mexico. Over the next 10 years, Asian nations will invest more than $1 trillion in infrastructure projects alone. We can help to shape a region's open economic development, but if we sit on the sidelines, we could watch our own prosperity decline.

When I took office, I had a vision of a Asia-Pacific community built on shared efforts, shared benefits, and shared destiny, a genuine partnership for greater security, freedom, and prosperity. Given all the currents of change in the region, I knew then and I know now the road will not be always even and smooth. But the strategy is sound, and we have moved forward steadily and surely toward our goal.

With both security and economic interests so deeply at stake, we have pursued from the outset an integrated policy, pursuing both fronts together, advancing on both fronts together. Though the end of the cold war has lessened great power conflict in Asia and in Europe, in Asia, just as in Europe, a host of security challenges persist, from rising nationalism to nuclear proliferation, to drug trafficking, organized crime, and other problems.

To meet these tests in Europe, we are adapting and expanding NATO, emphasizing the Partnership For Peace, including a new and more constructive relationship with Russia which is, or course, both a European and a Pacific nation and, therefore, must be a partner in making

a stable and prosperous Asia-Pacific future as well.

Asia has not evolved with similar unifying institutions, like NATO, so we are working with Asia to build new security structures, flexible enough to adapt to new threats, durable enough to defeat them. Each arrangement is like an overlapping plate of security armor, working individually and together to protect our interests and reinforce peace.

Our security strategy has four fundamental priorities: a continued American military commitment to the region, support for stronger security cooperation among Asian nations, leadership to combat the most serious threats, and support for democracy throughout the region. To pursue that strategy, we have updated and strengthened our formal alliances with Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Australia, and Thailand. We have reaffirmed our commitment to keep 100,000 troops in the region.

Just a few weeks ago, we renewed our security alliance with Japan and moved to reduce the tensions related to our presence on Okinawa. Today, that security relationship is stronger than ever. We have reached a series of security access agreements, magnifying the impact and deterrent effect of our forward deployed force. We have supported the ASEAN nations in building a new security dialog[1] in a region long fractured by distrust. We have launched new security initiatives such as the four-party talks President Kim and I proposed in an effort to bring a permanent peace to the Korean Peninsula.

With our South Korean allies, we stopped the North Korean nuclear threat that had been brewing since 1985 when North Korea began to build a plutonium production reactor. Through firmness and steadiness, we gained an agreement that has already halted and eventually will dismantle North Korea's nuclear weapons program. Today, a freeze is in place under strict international supervision. And last month, we began the canning of North Korea's spent fuel. One of the greatest potential threats to peace is, therefore, being diffused with American leadership.

We are meeting today's missile threat to the region by building advanced ballistic missile defense systems to protect our troops and our allies. We have deployed upgraded Patriot missiles to South Korea. We are upgrading the 21 battalions of Patriot systems in Japan and jointly examining future requirements with the Japanese government. We recently reached an agreement with Taiwan that will provide them with a theater missile defense capability. And we are developing even more advanced systems for deployment in the next few years, such as the Navy Lower Tier, THAAD, and Navy Upper Tier programs. The latter two address longer range missile threats.

When China expanded its military exercises in the Taiwan Strait, we made clear that any use of force against Taiwan would have grave consequences. The two carrier battle groups we sent to the area helped to defuse a dangerous situation and demonstrated to our allies our commitment to stability and peace in the region. In the long run, we also strengthen security by deepening the roots of democracy in Asia.

Democratic nations, after all, are more likely to seek ways to settle conflicts peacefully, to join with us to conquer common threats, to respect the rights of their own people. Democracy and human rights are, I believe, universal human aspirations. We have only to look at South Korea, the Philippines, and Taiwan; the Cambodians who turned from bullets to ballots to build a democratic future; Burma's Aung San Suu Kyi and other courageous leaders in the area.

We will continue to support our shared ideals in Asia, as elsewhere, encouraging reform, shining the spotlight on abuse, speaking out for those whose voices are silenced. Reinforcing the security pillar of America's relationships in Asia also advances American economic interests. Security and stability unleash resources for human progress, saving for the future, investing in education and enterprise, expanding trade, drawing the region closer together, and making the case for peace stronger and stronger. As with our security strategy, our economic strategy in Asia employs all the tools available—multilateral, regional, and bilateral—to open markets and thereby create more opportunities and jobs for Americans.

Soon after I became President, as all of you know, I called for the first ever summit meeting of Asian-Pacific leaders. At that historic meeting in Washington State, leaders from China to Indonesia to Brunei embraced a common vision of an Asia-Pacific community of shared strength, prosperity, and peace. One year later in Indo-

[1] White House correction.

nesia, we made a landmark commitment to achieve free trade and investment in the region by the year 2020. And last year in Japan, APEC adopted an action plan to get there.

Next November in Manila, I am confident we will take steps toward concrete measures to lower trade and investment barriers. With APEC, NAFTA, our efforts in this hemisphere and the World Trade Organization, the United States is working to lead the construction of a new global trading system, a world of expanding markets and fairer rules in which America can thrive and people all over the world can have a chance to live out their destinies and dreams as well.

Country to country, we are restoring health and balance to our economic relations through firm negotiations and tough action where necessary, to open markets for our goods and services, today the most competitive in the world. In the past 3 years, our own exports have boomed. They're up over 35 percent to an all-time high, creating a million new jobs that consistently pay more than jobs that are not related to exports. I'm proud to say that once again our Nation is the number one exporting country in the world. You can see the results of our strategy in the progress we have made in working with our friends in Japan. Today we are selling more goods to Japan than ever before. Our bilateral trade deficit in the first quarter was down 25 percent from last year. Since 1993, our two nations have signed 21 trade agreements, focusing on sectors where America's competitiveness is strongest. Our exports in those 21 areas are up 85 percent, 3 times faster than the rest of our export growth in Japan.

In Tokyo today a consumer can drive to work in a Chrysler jeep, talk with a friend on a Motorola telephone, snack on an apple from Washington State, and have American rice for dinner. Of course, a Japanese speaker could say the same thing about an American using all Japanese products, but it's nice now that both of us can tell that story. Of course, our work is not done. We must achieve further progress. But we are making a real difference for American exports and jobs.

Finally, let me turn to our relations with China, for they will shape all of our futures profoundly. How China defines itself and its greatness as a nation in the future and how our relationship with China evolves will have as great an impact on the lives of our own people and, indeed, on global peace and security, as that of any other relationship we have.

China is Asia's only declared nuclear weapons State, with the world's largest standing army. In less than two decades, it may well be the world's largest economy. Its economic growth is bringing broader changes as steps toward freer enterprise fuel the hunger for a more free society. But the evolution underway in China is far from clearcut or complete. It is deep and profound, and today China stands at a critical crossroads. Will it choose the course of openness and integration or veer toward isolation and nationalism? Will it be a force for stability or a force for disruption in the world? Our interests are directly at stake in promoting a secure, stable, open, and prosperous China, a China that embraces international non-proliferation, and trade rules, cooperates in regional and global security initiatives, and evolves toward greater respect for the basic rights of its own citizens.

Our engagement policy means using the best tools we have, incentives and disincentives alike, to advance core American interests. Engagement does not mean closing our eyes to the policies in China we oppose. We have serious and continuing concerns in areas like human rights, nonproliferation, and trade. When we disagree with China, we will continue to defend our interests and to assert our values. But by engaging China, we have achieved important benefits for our people and the rest of the world.

We worked closely with China to extend the nuclear nonproliferation treaty and to freeze North Korea's nuclear weapons program. We welcome China's constructive position regarding the proposed four-party talks for peace on the Korean Peninsula. We are working with China to conclude and to sign a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty by September. And we are cooperating to combat threats like drug trafficking, alien smuggling, and, increasingly, environmental decay.

Last week we reached an important understanding with China on nuclear exports. For the first time, China explicitly and publicly committed not to provide assistance to unsafeguarded nuclear programs in any country. China also agreed to hold consultations on export control policies and practices. We continue to have concerns about China's nuclear exports. This agreement provides a framework to help deal with those concerns.

Our economic engagement with China has also achieved real results. China's elimination of more than 1,000 quotas and licensing requirements has helped to fuel a rise of more than 200 percent in United States exports of telecommunications equipment since 1992. China has become our fastest growing export market, with exports up nearly 30 percent in 1995 alone.

Much remains to be done. Our bilateral trade deficit with China is too high, and China's trade barriers must come down. But the best way to address our trade problems is continue to work to open China's booming market by negotiating and enforcing good trade agreements. That is why we will use the full weight of our law to ensure that China meets its obligations to protect intellectual property. That is why we are insisting that China meet the same standard of openness applied to other countries seeking to enter the WTO—no more, no less. And that is why I have decided to extend unconditional most-favored-nation trade status to China.

Revoking MFN and, in effect, severing our economic ties to China, would drive us back into a period of mutual isolation and recrimination that would harm America's interests, not advance them. Rather than strengthening China's respect for human rights, it would lessen our contact with the Chinese people. Rather than limiting the spread of weapons of mass destruction, it would limit the prospect for future cooperation in this area. Rather than bringing stability to the region, it would increase instability, as the leaders of Hong Kong, Taiwan, and all the nations of the region have stated repeatedly. Rather than bolstering our economic interests, it would cede one of the fastest growing markets to our competitors.

MFN renewal is not a referendum on all China's policies, it is a vote for America's interests. I will work with Congress in the weeks ahead to secure MFN renewal and to continue to advance our goal of a secure, stable, open, and prosperous China. This is a long-term endeavor, and we must be steady and firm.

Where we differ with China—and we will have our differences—we will continue to defend our interests. We will keep faith with those who stand for greater freedom and pluralism in China, as we did last month in cosponsoring a U.N. resolution condemning China's human rights practices. We will actively enforce U.S. laws on unfair trade practices and nonproliferation. We will stand firm for a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue within the context of the one China policy, which has benefited the United States, China, and Taiwan for nearly two decades. But we cannot walk backward into the future. We must not seek to isolate ourselves from China. We will engage with China, without illusion, to advance our interests in a more peaceful and prosperous world.

Asia is in the midst of an historic transformation, one America helped to inspire and one we cannot afford to ignore. I have spoken today about challenge and change, but I pledge to you as President of the United States that one thing remains unchanging, and that is America's commitment to lead with strength, steadiness, and good judgment.

Working together with groups like yours and others, our nations can rise to the challenges of this time, reinforcing our strength and prosperity into the 21st century. We can build an Asia-Pacific region where fair and vigorous economic competition is a source of opportunity, where nations work as partners to protect our common security, where emerging economic freedoms are bolstered by greater political freedoms, where human rights are protected and diversity is respected. We can build a Pacific future as great as the ocean that links our shores. Let us pray that we have the wisdom, the courage, and the firmness to do that. I thank you for your dedication to that goal.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:12 a.m. at Constitution Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Gary Tooker, vice chairman, Russell Fynmore, chairman, and Robert Lees, secretary-general, Pacific Basin Economic Council International; and Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, Burmese opposition leader and Nobel Peace Prize laureate.

Remarks on Signing the Ryan White CARE Act Amendments of 1996

May 20, 1996

Good morning. Senator Kassebaum, Senator Hatch, Senator Frist, Congressmen Waxman and Pelosi and Gunderson—Congresswoman Pelosi. [*Laughter*] And of course, the people who came in with me, our AIDS policy director, Patsy Fleming, and Jeanne White, who deserves a lot of credit for this day. I am pleased to be here to sign legislation to continue the Ryan White CARE Act for the next 5 years.

I also want to thank Secretary Shalala, who is in Geneva, and Senator Kennedy, who couldn't be with us today but who has been a real leader on this issue. I want to thank all of you representing dozens of organizations in this room who are on the frontlines of this struggle and also those whom you represent all across America who could not be here in the room today but who have done their part as well.

And let me once again say a special thanks to Jeanne White for standing here today. Your fine son became a hero to many of us. He was a brave young man who taught America the truth about AIDS. He helped people all over the world to understand that people with AIDS deserve not only the best medical care but also our compassion and our love. And we're eternally grateful for that.

It's hard to believe, but AIDS has now been with us for nearly two decades. In that time, more than half a million Americans have been diagnosed; more than 300,000 of our fellow citizens have died. AIDS has taken too many friends and relatives and loved ones from every one of us in this room. It has shaken the faith of many, but it has inspired a remarkable community spirit, as evidenced by your presence here today.

We are not powerless in the face of this challenge; look how far we've come. At one time AIDS was thought of as inevitably the end of life, the death of hope. But today, through the twin miracles of science and spirit, we're making great progress. People are living longer; infection rates are going down among a number of previously high-risk groups; there is hope for a cure.

We know that AIDS affects all Americans. Every person with HIV or AIDS is someone's son or daughter, brother or sister, parent or grandparent. We cannot allow discrimination of any kind to blind us to what we must do.

The Ryan White CARE Act has been a big part of America's progress. Since it became law in 1990, this bill has helped hundreds of thousands of people to get the care they need in clinics and doctors' offices. It's kept people out of hospitals so they could be cared for at home, surrounded by families and loved ones. It's paid for the growing assortment of promising drugs that are helping so many people with AIDS to live longer and healthier lives. I'm proud that the FDA has speeded up approval of these new drugs.

I'm also very pleased that funding for this program has more than doubled in the last 3½ years. And that's very important, because as all of you in this room know, it fills the gaps in the Medicaid program. Half the people who are infected get their care through the Ryan White CARE Act and, of course, 90 percent of the children do.

As I sign the legislation, I also want to note that today the Department of Health and Human Services has awarded $350 million in funds authorized under this bill in all 50 States and now in 49 U.S. cities, up from 23 just 3 years ago. We're also making available another $52 million to help more people with AIDS get the drugs they need. And this legislation will help States to capitalize on a recent medical breakthrough: We now know that with voluntary testing and the use of AZT, we can prevent HIV transmission from a pregnant mother to her child. In the last year alone, there has been a 10 percent reduction in the number of infected children. It is estimated that we can actually end this tragic form of transmission by the end of this century, just 4 years away. It is our job to make that happen.

But even as we celebrate our progress, we shouldn't forget that the fight is not over. We have to do more to stop the rising tide of infection among women, communities of color, and young people, especially young gay men. Until there is a cure, we cannot and must not rest.

In his autobiography, Ryan White describes himself as "just another kid from Kokomo." We

know he was much more than that. He taught a nation to care instead of hate, to embrace people living with AIDS as a part of our American family, to extend always the hand of hope. There are others in this room who had children that are a lot like him. I thank all of you, and I thank all of you who have fought this battle for so long.

This legislation offers hope for another 5 years. Let us all pray that no President will ever have to sign another bill because, by then, we will have found a cure for AIDS and a vaccine to protect every American.

Let me again thank the Members of Congress who are here and note that this bill passed by a voice vote in the Senate and with only 4 dissenting votes in the House of Representatives—I believe 414 for. So that's a great tribute to the Members of Congress in both parties who spoke out in favor of this. And I thank those who are here, and Senator Kennedy especially, for what they have all done.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. S. 641, approved May 20, was assigned Public Law No. 104–146.

Statement on Signing the Ryan White CARE Act Amendments of 1996

May 20, 1996

Today I have signed into law S. 641, the "Ryan White CARE Act Amendments of 1996." This bill reflects our Nation's continuing commitment to care for people living with HIV and AIDS, as well as our efforts to extend the quality and length of their lives. The reauthorization of this vital program by overwhelming bipartisan majorities in the Congress sends a clear message that this country continues to care about the thousands of our fellow citizens affected by the AIDS epidemic. Under my Administration, funding for the Ryan White CARE Act grants has more than doubled since fiscal year 1993.

This bill would authorize appropriations during fiscal years 1996–2000 for grants that fund medical and support services to people with HIV and AIDS across the Nation. Under S. 641, the Ryan White CARE programs will continue partnerships between the Federal Government, the States, many cities, community organizations and clinics, and a broad array of health care providers. With its emphasis on locally determined, outpatient community-based care, we will relieve the fiscal burden caused by utilizing inappropriate and expensive inpatient care in public hospitals.

Six short years ago when the Ryan White CARE Act of 1990 was first enacted, a cumulative total of over 161,000 cases of AIDS had been reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and over 100,000 Americans had died of the disease. As of March 1996, over 530,000 cases have been reported, and there have been more than 320,000 American deaths. AIDS is the leading cause of death for all Americans aged 25 to 44. It is estimated that between 600,000 and 900,000 Americans are now living with HIV disease, and CDC estimates that approximately 40,000 Americans become infected every year.

Prior to the Ryan White CARE Act, there were many communities where the health care infrastructure was collapsing under the sudden and intense burden posed by the AIDS epidemic. Many individuals with HIV disease were not receiving needed health care and support services. States, cities, and individual service providers were struggling to provide care for the growing numbers of people with HIV disease who increasingly came from disenfranchised groups, with little or no income, and no health insurance or other sources of support to pay for needed care.

Today more than 300,000 people receive services under the various programs supported by the Ryan White CARE Act. These services range from direct provision of outpatient primary care to supportive services that permit people with HIV and AIDS to continue living productive, independent lives. Since the original enactment of the Ryan White CARE Act 6 years ago, the number of cities eligible for special

assistance has grown from 16 to 49, reflecting the growth in the number of people needing services.

Despite this harsh reality, the investment in research to find a treatment and cure for HIV disease is making progress. The rapid approval of a new class of anti-HIV therapies offers new hope that this virus can be held in check for extended periods of time. As soon as we learned of the benefits of these new therapies, I proposed—and the Congress then passed—a $52 million Budget Amendment for fiscal year 1996 so people with HIV could purchase these and other medications. We have also learned that by administering the drug AZT, we can reduce the transmission of HIV infection from mothers to infants by approximately two-thirds.

The Ryan White CARE Act provides the mechanisms and the resources to translate these and other research advances into practice by providing access to state of the art health care for thousands of Americans living with HIV and AIDS. The AIDS Drug Assistance Program, funded under Title II of the Ryan White CARE Act, will help make life-saving and life-extending treatments available to people who could not otherwise afford them. The implementation of the voluntary prenatal counseling and testing guidelines through Ryan White funded programs should dramatically reduce transmission of HIV infection to unborn babies.

There is a long way to go toward finding a cure or a vaccine for HIV and AIDS. Until then, the Ryan White CARE Act programs will continue to help people with HIV disease get the care-related services they need.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 20, 1996.

NOTE: S. 641, approved May 20, was assigned Public Law No. 104–146.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Deployment of United States Forces in Liberia

May 20, 1996

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

On April 11, 1996, I reported that U.S. military forces equipped for combat had entered Monrovia, Liberia, for the purpose of evacuating American citizens and certain third-country nationals from that strife-torn city. This letter is provided, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to update the Congress on the continued deployment of U.S. forces, including the response by those forces to several isolated attacks on the American Embassy complex on April 30, 1996, and May 6, 1996.

As of this date, U.S. forces have evacuated over 2,300 persons from Monrovia, including over 470 American citizens. The U.S. Special Operations and U.S. Army Europe forces that conducted the initial evacuations have been replaced by U.S. Marines assigned to a Marine Amphibious Ready Group offshore in the immediate vicinity of Monrovia. Approximately 280 Marines and other U.S. military personnel from the total U.S. force of 2,500 are currently ashore at the American Embassy complex. In addition to protecting American lives and property at the Embassy complex, the mission of these forces is to maintain the capability to conduct further evacuations if circumstances warrant.

On April 30, 1996, three separate attacks occurred against the American Embassy complex reportedly involving fighters from several factions. In the first encounter, a U.S. Marine was grazed by a round fired by one of the attackers. The Marines did not return fire, and the injured Marine was able to return to duty on the same day. In the second attack, a Marine was struck by plywood splinters dislodged by an incoming round. During this attack, the Marines returned fire, killing two or more attackers. During the final encounter, approximately 40 to 50 attackers, while apparently engaged in a pursuit of fighters from another faction, fired on the Marines. After the Marines returned fire, one of the attackers fired again. The Marines again returned fire, this time killing two or more attackers.

Separately, on May 6, 1996, unknown factional forces fired upon the Embassy complex. The Marines returned fire with machine guns and automatic weapons, driving off the attackers. No U.S. forces were killed or injured in this encounter. One member of the attacking force may have been wounded.

Finally, on May 11, 1996, a U.S. Marine walking on the Embassy compound was struck by a stray round. The Marine was slightly injured. He was treated and returned to full duty. This incident was the result of stray fire between warring factions and appears not to have been directed at the Marines or the Embassy.

The Marine commander reported that during these attacks, U.S. forces opened fire only upon persons who fired upon the Embassy complex. In the judgment of U.S. military commanders, these attacks are sporadic incidents and do not represent an intent to mount a concerted or deliberate attack against the American Embassy or the Marines. We do not intend that U.S. Armed Forces deployed to Liberia become involved in hostilities. Nonetheless, our forces are equipped and prepared to defend American lives and property if necessary.

Our goal is to redeploy U.S. forces once there is no longer a need for enhanced security at the Embassy and a requirement to maintain an on-scene evacuation capability.

I have directed the continued deployment of U.S. forces to Liberia pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed concerning this important deployment of U.S. forces. I appreciate the support of the Congress in this action to protect American citizens and our Embassy complex in Monrovia.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Teleconference Remarks on the Expansion of the Detroit Metropolitan Airport

May 20, 1996

The President. It's Bill Clinton. How are you?

Wayne County Executive Ed McNamara. Well, I'm great. How are you? We have a room full of supporters here.

The President. Well, I'm very glad that Secretary Pena and I could join you today, at least by telephone, to congratulate all of you who have worked so hard to make the expansion of the Detroit Metropolitan Wayne County Airport a reality. I know that a lot of people deserve praise for their hard work, but I want to say a particular thanks to Senator Carl Levin and Governor Engler and former Governor Jim Blanchard and Congressman Dingell, Congresswoman Rivers, Congressman Knollenberg, the executive vice president of Northwest Airlines, Don Washburn. But I especially want to thank you, Ed McNamara, for all the work you've done. We had to have this day; otherwise I could never look at you again without remembering all the times you twisted my arm and put bruises all over me. [*Laughter*]

Mr. McNamara. Well, you've got to know we never would have done it without you. You were the most key individual in this whole show, and you've helped turn Michigan's greatest generator of jobs and economic activity into a reality. So we're grateful.

The President. I'm very pleased that we can provide some extra funding. The $150 million in new funds, in addition to the millions already committed, as you know, will fund the infrastructure for the airport's domestic and international terminals. And this is just a great example of the kind of partnership we need between the Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector.

And I agree with you, it's going to have a tremendous impact on Michigan's economic future. It will help to create nearly $3 billion

in business activity in the Detroit area every year. It will create thousands of jobs. And it will enable the metro airport to be a world-class airport well, well into the 21st century. So it's very exciting.

And let me say that there's one other person that deserves some credit here, and I want to introduce him, our Secretary of Transportation, Federico Pena, who strongly supported this project and worked with us. And I'd like to have Secretary Pena say a word to you, too.

[*At this point, Secretary Pena reviewed the economic impact of the airport expansion.*]

Mr. McNamara. You know, Secretary, Don Washburn and I still remember the cattle prod you used to put us back at the table, and it was very effective. You might tell the President, and I might also tell you, that Mayor Dennis Archer just dropped by to say hi and to congratulate us. He happens to be in the room with us also.

The President. Hello, Mayor.

Mayor Archer. How are you doing, Mr. President?

Mr. McNamara. He says, "How are you doing, Mr. President?"

The President. I'm doing great. I think you all are too.

Mr. McNamara. We certainly appreciate all of your efforts and the fact that you were with us today. And we will promise not to make any more great demands on you for at least a couple of years.

The President. Just make the most of this. I know you will.

Mr. McNamara. I got my fingers crossed.

The President. Thank you all. Goodbye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:24 p.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. John Engler of Michigan.

Remarks Honoring the NCAA Men's and Women's Basketball Champions
May 20, 1996

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much. You can sort of see that as far as this announcement today, I'm the Vice President. [*Laughter*] And Mr. Gore is taking the lead, with his justifiable pride.

I want to welcome the Members of Congress who are here, the presidents of these two great universities, all the coaching staff, and their supporters. I see the Lieutenant Governor of Kentucky over here and many other people who are supporting these two teams.

It is true that I am a—I suppose "a fanatic" would be too mild a word for it—basketball fan. And I tried to watch every game that was on television, at least part of it, during this tournament. It was a fabulous tournament, in both the women's and the men's divisions. The people who won should have won. But as the Vice President said, just because you're ahead and you're the favorite doesn't mean you always win. I hope everybody around here remembers that. [*Laughter*]

I want to congratulate the Lady Vols. They were terrific, especially down the stretch. Michelle Marciniak, their most valuable player, and all the team—they really—to win in the finals you have to play as a team. And I saw—I got a note from my staff before I came out here that says that there is a sign outside their locker room back in Knoxville that says, "Offense fills seats. Defense wins games. And rebounding wins championships." That's kind of the way it works around here. [*Laughter*] And I like that.

And I want to say again, as I did to you on the phone, Pat Summitt, we thank you for your winning ways, and we thank you for the values, the spirit, and the rules that you have followed all these years. You have got a formula for success as well as some exceedingly gifted young women. And we congratulate all of you. You've got a lot to be proud of.

Now, as you might imagine just from Washington, DC's, location and the number of people that work from the Federal Government, we've got a lot of people around here that went to the University of Massachusetts and Syracuse and all those places, you know. And I told everybody that the best basketball in America this year was in the SEC. We nearly had an all-

SEC women's Final Four. SEC did reasonably well in the men's division. And if we hadn't had to start all over again two or three times, we might have had even more in the Final Eight there.

And at the end, I remember—we have one of my staff members who thinks that there's a basketball waiting for him in heaven who lives in Massachusetts. And I said, they really are a team with two great guards on offense and defense, but unless Kentucky has a bad day, no one will get close in this final tournament. And we all know that Kentucky never had a bad day.

And I think one reason is—maybe the overwhelming reason is that even though they had fabulous players, many of which never got the individual recognition they deserve, they had a great team. And when you can consistently put 10 people out there that can shoot from anywhere and that can play defense as well as offense—I read, coach, I don't know if this is true, that no one averaged more than 27 minutes a game for the University of Kentucky. If that's true, that's a stunning statement about the fact that basketball is still a team sport.

Interestingly enough, I thought about you after I saw the clips from the last Chicago Bulls-Magic game because the Chicago Bulls stars didn't get many points that day, but the team played like a dream. That's the way your guys played all year. And that's why you're sporting that 80 percent winning percentage at Kentucky. And that's why Kentucky won the championship that it deserved. And I hope America will remember a lot not only about the stunning play of Tony Delk, who deserved to be the outstanding player of the tournament, but also about the teamwork that you exhibited all year long. And we congratulate you. Thank you very much.

Now, I would like to ask Coach Summitt and Coach Pitino to come up here and say whatever they would like to say and bring whatever players they would like to play, because I know all of you really came to see them. But they are all very welcome at the White House.

Thank you.

[*At this point, Ms. Summitt thanked her University of Tennessee women's team for its efforts during the season and congratulated the University of Kentucky men's team for its success. She then introduced players Michelle Marciniak and Latina Davis, who presented gifts to the President and Vice President. Next, Kentucky Coach Rick Pitino congratulated the Tennessee women's team and introduced players Mark Pope and Tony Delk, who presented gifts to the President and Vice President.*]

The President. I must say I liked having Mark up here. I was sort of standing in the shade back there—[*laughter*]—away from all the bright lights. It was great. What do you think? Hold it up.

Again, let me say—we're going to take formal little photos now with the two teams, and then we will have a receiving line in the next room. So we will break up, but before we break up, again let me thank these two great universities, these two great States, and the coaches and the teams.

I think that America likes March Madness and likes college basketball as much as anything else because it is both an individual and a team sport. And it has both rules and creativity, discipline and energy. And in that sense, it is sort of a symbol of what's best about our country when things are going well.

And I hope we can all remember that. We all need to live with rules and creativity, with discipline and energy, and we all need to remember that, however good any of us are, we're all on a team. And when we're on the team, the team's doing well, the rest of us, we do pretty well individually.

So thank you all for that, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:45 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gov. Steve Henry of Kentucky.

Remarks at the Funeral Service for Admiral Jeremy M. Boorda
May 21, 1996

Mrs. Boorda, Mike's family, Secretary Christopher and our friends from the diplomatic corps, Secretary Perry, Secretary Dalton, General Shalikashvili, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unified commanders in chief, the leadership and Members of Congress who are here, Admiral Johnson and the flag leadership of our Navy, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy Hagan, to our great Navy sailors and all of America's Armed Forces. Today we come to honor and give thanks for the life of Mike Boorda, a special man who earned a special place in the heart of his Navy and the heart of our Nation. He lived a life that makes America proud, beginning, of course, with his family. His first words upon becoming Chief of Naval Operations were, "I wouldn't be here if it wasn't for Bettie, and I wouldn't want to be here without her."

To Bettie and David and Edward and Anna, your families, I know there is nothing we can say or do to ease the loss of your husband and father and grandfather. I hope you find comfort in the love and respect and honor that surrounds you today, here in this great cathedral and all throughout our great land. I thank you for your service to the Navy. I thank you, Bettie. I thank you, Edward and Robert, for your service. I thank you, David, for your work on the radio. I thank you, Anna, for your devotion and for your husband's service, and Edward, for your wife's service. But your entire family is a model, a reflection of Mike Boorda's remarkable love for the Navy, a Navy in which he enlisted when he was just 16.

When he was first in his class at personnelman school in San Diego, he was offered his choice of assignments. Displaying his characteristic compassion, he traded the slot with a friend whose wife was sick and expecting a baby. So the friend got to stay in San Diego, and Mike got shipped to Oklahoma. Oklahoma's coastline leaves something to be desired for people designing a career in the Navy. But it turned out to be a first-rate assignment because that's where he met Bettie.

He was commissioned an officer in 1962. Then his star rose fast and bright with important assignments, from weapons officer aboard destroyers to Chief of Naval Personnel to commander in chief of our Naval forces in Europe and CINC of the Southern Command. And as all of you know, 2 years ago just last month, he became the very first enlisted man in the entire history of the United States Navy to be the Chief of Naval Operations.

At every turn he led in helping us, our country, live up to its responsibilities as the world's leading force for freedom. He served two tours of duty in Southeast Asia. As has been said today, as commander in chief of Allied Forces in Southern Europe, he ordered the first offensive action in NATO's history, the strikes against Bosnian Serb aircraft violating the no-fly zone.

I know his family is especially proud of the role he played and the role that they supported in getting food and relief to the war-torn people of Bosnia. I very much want history to record that Mike Boorda's quiet determination to do all we could do to end the slaughter of the children and the innocents in Bosnia and to bring that awful war to an end had a profound impact on his President and on the policy of this Nation.

Even after he became Chief of Naval Operations, I continued to ask him what he thought we should do to get a reality check on the rest of the advice I was given. And I want to say to all of you what I said to his family this last weekend. It is my belief that perhaps more than any other military officer in this country, Mike Boorda helped to lead us to the point of peace at Dayton. And there are countless thousands of people alive in Bosnia today because of this small man with a big heart, a large vision, and great courage.

He developed new strategies to carry our Navy into the 21st century. He spearheaded projects like theater ballistic missile defense and the arsenal ship that have put our Navy on the cutting edge of technology.

Like all great sailors, he loved the sea, and he loved sea stories. The stories about him are legion and now legend. I'm told that when I nominated him to be the Chief of Naval Operations, he called his mother, Trudy Wallace, from Italy to tell her that he was about to become the CNO. She asked if it was a promotion.

He said, "No, I'm already a four-star admiral." She asked if he were going to get a raise. He said, "No, I'll be making a little less; I'm losing my overseas living allowance." She then said, "Well, surely you'll get a bigger house." And he said, "Actually, it will be smaller than the Mediterranean villa we have now." Apparently, his mother then said, "Well, don't you have enough time in to retire?" [*Laughter*] Now, every family has got a story like that. Well, he didn't get a raise or a promotion or a bigger house, but he got a bigger job, and he did his mother and his family and his country proud.

Many have said before me that his lasting legacy will be his concern for the sailors. He knew the people were the Navy's greatest asset. And every day he made the Navy stronger because he took good care of its sailors. He loved the bluejackets, and he loved the officers. When he came on board a ship or entered a room of sailors, you could see the twinkle in his eye. Without ever ranting or reprimanding, criticizing or cajoling, he found a way to bring out the best of everyone, seaman or admiral, boatswain mate to battle group commander. Talk to him for just a few moments, and you couldn't help but like him; you couldn't help but love our Navy even more and want to do the best you could for our country.

He also understood that beyond the things that he fought for that were material for our men and women in uniform, beyond the better housing, the better pay, the better time at home with families, there was, above all, the importance of caring and compassion. Last year in Norfolk, he spoke to a theater full of sailors. The chief machinist mate nervously stepped up to the microphone and explained his predicament. His wife had recently passed away, and he was left with two young daughters. He told the CNO that he had 6 months before his retirement date, but he would have to reenlist before then, and that meant more sea duty and separation from his children. Right there at the mike, the CNO asked, "So you want to retire in June?" The MMC meekly replied, "Yes, sir." And right then and there, Admiral Boorda said, "Your request is approved. We'll work it out."

The Admiral used to joke about being small in stature. Shortly after I named him Chief of Naval Operations, we were in the English Channel together, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Normandy invasion on the aircraft carrier the *George Washington.* And I spoke just as I am now, but I had the Presidential lectern there. And when I finished, he was coming up, so I pulled out the stand for him to stand on. And he got up, and he looked at me, and he said, "You know, this is the second time you've elevated me in the last couple of months." [*Laughter*]

Well, that's the kind of sense of honor he had. Even though he was very small, the rest of us always looked up to him, looked up to his ability somehow to inspire us all to do better, to reach beyond ourselves.

There was reported in the press a Navy photographer's remarks I would like to repeat who said, "Everyone was always asking me to take photos with him. They wanted to stand next to the best thing the Navy had."

Before I came over here today, I visited the Pentagon. And I went to the Navy Command Center to the briefing room that Admiral Boorda began his day in several times a week to thank the staff who worked with him every day and who can't be with us here today because they're on duty, as he would want them to be. And they were encouraged to tell me whatever they want. I thought you might be interested to know what those people who are now over at the Pentagon, doing the work they did every day for Mike Boorda, had to say to me.

One said, "There's a $5 bill over there on the wall. Do you see it, Mr. President?" I said, "Yes, I did." He said, "That's the bet the Admiral had with the weatherman every time we had a briefing. He always bet against the weatherman. And as of the last bet, he was $5 ahead." Another said that every time there was a briefing in the morning, he brought in strips of bacon and literally shoved bacon at everyone else. He was always trying to share his bacon and make people laugh about it. A third said that the thing that meant the most to her was that at Christmastime he literally greeted every single sailor in the Pentagon. No matter how much time it took, that's what he did.

A young sailor in the office said that the thing that moved her most was that she handled his correspondence, and he would never let her send a form letter. Even when someone wrote to him and went outside the chain of command, he would write a gentle letter back explaining what the chain of command was. But it was always a personal letter, so that the young sailor

who wrote would know that the CNO really cared and really read the letter.

And finally, one very large African-American sailor from the State of Tennessee stood up in the back of the room, and he said, "Mr. President, how can we ever replace this man?"

In the Bible there is the great story of two warriors and friends, David and Jonathan. When they prepared to part, Jonathan said, "Tomorrow there is a new Moon, and thou shalt be missed, because thy seat will be empty." Mike Boorda's seat is empty, and how we shall miss his warm smile, his easy manner, his wonderful voice, his sharp wit. What a legacy he has left behind: his ferocious devotion to all of you; his commitment to give all of you a chance to be the very best that you can be, to give our country its chance for true greatness; his deep sense of honor, which no person should ever question.

Now Mike Boorda's ship is moored. His voyage is complete. But I know when the whistle blew and the colors were shifted, he was welcomed on the pier by God's loving, eternal embrace. May God bless and cherish Admiral Mike Boorda as he blessed and cherished our lives and our beloved America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:26 p.m. at the Washington National Cathedral. In his remarks he referred to Adm. Jay L. Johnson, Acting Chief of Naval Operations, and Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy John P. Hagan. The related proclamation of May 17 on the death of Admiral Boorda is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at the United States Coast Guard Academy Commencement in New London, Connecticut

May 22, 1996

Thank you very much. Secretary Peña, Commandant Kramek—thank you for doing such an excellent job, Admiral,—Admiral Versaw, Commander Wiemer. To the United States Coast Guard Band, thank you today. To the members of this fine class, your families, and your friends, this is your day, and I am deeply honored to share it with you.

I am especially indebted to the Coast Guard right now because there are four members of the White House Staff who are Coast Guard officers. Three of them are graduates of this Academy: Commander Peter Boynton, Lieutenant Matt Miller, Lieutenant Commander Bob Malkowski. The fourth is not a graduate of this Academy, but she is my Coast Guard military aide, and I'm very proud of her: Lieutenant Commander June Ryan. And she informed me that every Coast Guard officer was a supporter of this Academy. I am delighted to be here with all of you.

I must say I only had one pause when I was invited to be your commencement speaker, and that's when I heard that the mascot for the Class of '96 is the guinea pig. [*Laughter*] Having been in that position more than once in my life, I was not particularly anxious to take on another one. [*Laughter*] But then I remembered what a wonderful reception that the "coasties" gave the First Lady and our daughter, Chelsea, when they visited here 2 years ago. And I told the pilot to go on and hold course for New London.

I am honored to be here today. God has given us a beautiful day, and I hope you all enjoy it and remember it fondly for the rest of your lives.

We gather before the Coast Guard cutter *Eagle,* the largest tall ship flying the Stars and Stripes. On its decks and its riggings, you cadets were tested time and again to ready you for the important responsibilities you are about to assume as Coast Guard officers. I can look at you and tell that you are ready.

The course you're on will not always be easy, but it will be exhilarating because you are serving at a time of extraordinary challenge and change, a time of new risks to our security but also real opportunities to make the future brighter for every American, especially the Americans of your generation and the generations to come.

You will know this by the virtue of the work you will be doing week-in and week-out, along

the 47,000 miles of America's coastline, lakes, and rivers, from the frigid waters of the North Pacific and the North Atlantic to the balmy Caribbean, and far from home patrolling the Baltic, the Mediterranean, and the Black Sea with our allies.

Consider the average Coast Guard week—something I hope the American people will get to do as a result of this appearance. Most of your fellow citizens have no idea the sweep, the scope, the importance of the work you do. But in the average week, you and your fellow sailors will seize drugs with a street value of $50 million, stop hundreds of illegal immigrants from reaching our shores, respond to 260 hazardous chemical spills, salvage property worth $17 million, conduct 1,250 search and rescue missions, and save the lives of nearly 100 people. That's an average week. That's a pretty good average, and the American people should be very, very proud of the United States Coast Guard.

But since you're facing such a heavy load in the future, I think I should lighten it for now. So as Commander in Chief, I hereby grant amnesty to all cadets marching tours or serving restrictions for minor offenses. [*Laughter*]

To the members of this graduating class, from this day forward you will be guardians of America's security. There is no higher calling. And so as you celebrate today, I ask you just to take a few moments with me to join in thinking about the future that you will help to shape for your fellow Americans and for the citizens of the world. What do you want the future to look like? What do we want the future to look like? How do we want America to enter the 21st century?

Four years ago, I said that the answer to that question for me is as straightforward as the path ahead is full of twists and turns. For me, America must enter the 21st century as a nation of opportunity for all and responsibility from all, a nation that is coming together, instead of drifting apart, a nation that remains the strongest force on Earth for peace, freedom and prosperity.

For nearly 4 years our administration has pursued that vision with a strategy that involves making American people more secure, by leading a powerful movement now sweeping the globe for democracy and peace, by creating greater prosperity for our people, by opening markets abroad.

And that strategy is working. Our military is stronger, our alliances are deeper, the danger of weapons of mass destruction and the other major threats to our security are receding. Conflicts long thought to be unsolvable are moving toward resolution. More markets than ever before are open to our goods and services. And more markets than ever before are open to the goods and services of other nations as well.

The mission before you is to build on these achievements at a time when the world we live in is going through profound and fast-paced change, perhaps the fastest pace of change in all human history. In so many ways this change is clearly for the good, and you have been a part of it. Democracy and free markets are on the march. The laptops, the CD-ROM's, the satellites that are second nature to all of you, send ideas, products, money, all across our planet in a matter of seconds. Political, economic, and technological revolutions are bringing us all closer together and bringing with them extraordinary opportunities for all to share in humanity's genius for progress.

But we know these same forces also pose new challenges. The end of communism has opened the door to the spread of weapons of mass destruction and lifted the lid on religious and ethnic conflicts. The growing openness we so cherish also benefits a host of equal opportunity destroyers: terrorists, international criminals, drug traffickers, and those who do environment damage that cross national borders.

None of these problems has any particular respect for the borders of the nation you are sworn to defend. Because the cold war is over, some of these challenges are underestimated, and Americans that typically don't have much in common from the left to the right find themselves saying it is now time for us to retreat from our global leadership role.

But we cannot withdraw into a fortress America. There is no wall high enough to keep out the threats to our security or to isolate ourselves from the world economy and other trends in the global society. There are some who say we should lead, all right, but they would deny us the resources to do so. To them I also ask, reconsider your position.

One of the most important lessons of the last 50 years is that democracy and free markets are neither inevitable nor irreversible. They need our support, the power of our example, the resolve of our leadership. My job as Presi-

dent is to match the need for American leadership to our interests and to our values, to act where we can make a difference, to do so wisely, not reflexively, relying on diplomacy and sanctions when we can, force when we must, working with our allies whenever possible but alone when necessary, rejecting the call to isolationism, refusing to be the world's policeman.

It also means, as the Secretary said earlier, form time to time making some decisions that are unpopular in the short run. But if you consider some of those, imagine the alternative. Imagine what the Persian Gulf would look like today if the United States had not stepped up with our allies in Desert Storm. Then 2 years ago, we had to do it again to stop Iraqi aggression. Imagine the ongoing reign of terror and the flood of refugees to our shore had we not backed diplomacy with force in Haiti. And by the way, you ought to be proud that it was a Coast Guard cutter that led our forces into Port-au-Prince Harbor on that mission.

Imagine the shells and the slaughter we would still be seeing in Bosnia had we not brought our force to bear through NATO. Imagine the chaos that might have ensued had we not used our economic power to stabilize Mexico's economy. Imagine the jobs we would have lost if we hadn't taken the lead to expand world trade through GATT and NAFTA and over 200 specific agreements. In each case there was substantial, sometimes overwhelming, opinion against America's course. But because we followed the course, Americans are better off.

For all the new demands on our troops and our treasure, the basic tools of leadership still require a powerful military and strong alliances. Those things allowed us to triumph through two world wars and a cold war. And for this new era, we must first sharpen and strengthen these tools. Our military has never been more ready than it is today, prepared to fight and win on two major fronts at once, to deter aggression and to defeat it.

Because of our military strength, we can often achieve our objectives by ourselves or with our allies without a fight. In the last couple of years, that's why Saddam Hussein pulled his forces back from Kuwait's border, why the military dictators stepped down in Haiti, and why, after a bombing but not a ground campaign, the Bosnian Serbs turned from the battlefield to the bargaining table. We still have the best trained, best equipped, best prepared fighting force in the world. It is being strengthened every day. It is also strengthened by strong alliances and cooperative action with like-minded nations.

As we saw in the Gulf war, in Haiti, and now in Bosnia, there are a lot of other countries who share our goals and who are willing to share our burdens, through NATO, the United Nations, and other coalitions. The end of the cold war presented us with an historic opportunity to broaden our alliances, to build a peaceful and undivided Europe, to forge a stable community of nations in an increasingly open and democratic Asia, to draw our own hemisphere closer together in a shared embrace of democracy and free enterprise. We have seized those opportunities.

In Europe we have reinforced our ties with our longtime friends and opened NATO's doors to new democracies, beginning with the Partnership For Peace. We have worked to support Russia's transition to democracy and a free market economy. Another national election will soon be held there. More than 60 percent of Russia's economy has moved from the heavy grip of the state into the hands of its people. The cooperation between our troops in Bosnia proves that we can have a strong partnership with Russia and with Europe. The main battleground for the bloodiest century in history, Europe, is finally coming together in peace.

We also have vital strategic and economic interests in Asia, the fastest growing part of the world economically. They require new efforts to maintain stability. I recently returned from a trip to Korea and Japan, reaffirming our security relationship with Japan, launching a new initiative to make peace on the Korean Peninsula, committing to maintain 100,000 troops in North Asia, and reaffirming our determination to engage China in developing a productive security dialog.

These are the things that you will have to carry out. By living up to the legacy of American leadership, being steady and strong in the judgments necessary to advance our interests and our values, keeping our military ready, deepening our alliances, we will meet the challenges of your time.

But there is more to be done for America to keep moving forward and to pass on an even safer and more prosperous world to our children as we enter this new century and a new millennium. First, we must continue to seize the ex-

traordinary opportunity to reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction. We have set the most far-reaching arms control and nonproliferation agenda in history, and I am determined to pursue it and complete it. Already, there are no Russian missiles pointed at our cities or our citizens. We are cutting our arsenals by two-thirds from their cold war height. Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazahkstan have been convinced to give up their nuclear weapons.

Our diplomacy backed with force persuaded North Korea to freeze its nuclear program. We have now secured the indefinite and unconditional extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Sometimes I wonder if people know what that is. Now, I know you do. [*Laughter*] I wish I could give you a citation. [*Laughter*]

But we have other things to do. We must continue to help people who will work with us to safeguard nuclear materials and destroy those nuclear weapons so they don't wind up in the wrong hands. We have got to stop an entire new generation of nuclear weapons by signing a comprehensive test ban treaty this year. We have to ban chemical weapons by ratifying the chemical weapons convention now.

All of these things are focused on reducing the threat of weapons of mass destruction. But we also have to be prepared to defend ourselves in the extremely unlikely event that these preventive measures fail. That's why we're spending $3 billion a year on a strong, sensible, national missile defense program based on real threats and pragmatic responses. Our first priority is to defend against existing or near-term threats, like short- and medium-range missile attacks on our troops in the field or our allies. And we are, with upgraded Patriot missiles, the Navy Lower and Upper Tier and the Army THAAD.

The possibility of a long-range missile attack on American soil by a rogue state is more than a decade away. To prevent it, we are committed to developing by the year 2000 a defensive system that could be deployed by 2003, well before the threat becomes real.

I know that there are those who disagree with this policy. They have a plan that Congress will take up this week that would force us to choose now a costly missile defense system that could be obsolete tomorrow. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this cost will be between $30 and $60 billion.

Those who want us to deploy this system before we know the details and the dimensions of the threat we face, I believe, are wrong. I think we should not leap before we look. I believe this plan is misguided. It would waste money. It would weaken our defenses by taking money away from things we know we need right now. It would violate the arms control agreements that we have made, and these agreements make us more secure. That is the wrong way to defend America.

The right way to defend America includes eliminating weapons of mass destruction, stopping their spread, and building a smart missile defense system. It also includes continuing the fight against the increasingly interconnected forces of destruction like terrorism, organized crime, and drug trafficking.

Believe me, no one is immune to their danger, and you will see them more in your career, not the people of Tokyo where the sarin gas attack in the subway injured thousands of commuters, the people of Latin America or Southeast Asia where drug traffickers wielding imported weapons have murdered hundreds of innocent people, not the people of Israel where hatemongers have blown up buses full of children, nor the people of the former Soviet Union and Central Europe where organized criminals are undermining new democracies, and of course, not the people of our United States, where homegrown terrorists blew up the Murrah Federal Building in the heart of America and foreign terrorists tried to topple the World Trade Center, where drug traffickers poison our children and bring untold violence to our streets.

As Coast Guard officers, you will be on the frontlines of this struggle against these forces of destruction, especially drugs. With every seizure, like last summer's record haul of 12 tons of cocaine from a Panamanian fishing vessel, you are literally saving the lives of American citizens. Today I pledge this to you: With our military and law enforcement agencies, you will have the tools you need to get the job done.

We must cooperate as never before with countries around the world, sharing information, providing military support, pursuing anticorruption efforts, shutting down front companies and money laundering operations, opening more FBI training centers. We have to keep up the funding, the personnel, the training for our law enforcement agencies. We have to keep the heat on states that sponsor terrorism or violate international law with tough sanctions like

the one the international community has imposed on Iraq since the Gulf war.

And I'd like to take this occasion to congratulate the Coast Guard, which recently completed its 10,000th boarding in the Persian Gulf in support of those sanctions. Thank you, and congratulations.

Since the forces of destruction never give up, we must never give in. And your job will be to help America remain vigilant and victorious. We also have to continue to advance the fight for peace and democracy faster than before. Nothing can strengthen our security more in the long run. When people are free and at peace, they are less likely to resort to violence or to abuse the rights of their fellow citizens. They are more likely to join with us in common cause.

We see this so clearly here in our own hemisphere where the powerful movement to democracy has produced unparalleled cooperation in dealing with drugs and illegal immigrants and has brought freedom to every single country in our hemisphere but one.

We see the promise of peace in Northern Ireland where negotiations are set to begin next month. We see it in the Middle East where a comprehensive, lasting settlement is within reach. In the last 3 years alone, Israel and its Palestinian and Jordanian neighbors have committed to peace, and they're making good on their commitments, including just a few weeks ago, Chairman Arafat fulfilling his pledge to rid the Palestinian Charter of all references to the destruction of Israel.

We know that many difficult issues remain to be resolved between Israel and Syria, between Israel and Lebanon. We know there will be problems from time to time, as there was in the tragic fighting along the border between Israel and Lebanon, which I am grateful has been resolved now. We know that, most importantly, every step along the path to peace, the enemies of peace will show their own desperation with bullets and bombs.

So I say this to the people of Israel: We've been with you every step of the way for the last 3 years. As Israel takes further risks for peace in the future, it can count on further manifestations of American support. We must be with you every step of the way until there is a comprehensive, lasting peace in the Middle East. Now is not the time to turn back, and the United States must do its part.

Finally, we must never forget that the true measure of our country's well-being and our security not only includes physical safety but economic prosperity as well. Decades from now, people will look back at this period and see the most far-reaching changes in the world trading system in 50 years, since the end of World War II. Changes that are making a dramatic difference in the lives of ordinary people through the negotiations that produced the GATT and NAFTA agreements, through the persuasion we had in working with Japan on 21 separate agreements. Barriers to our products have come down, and our exports have gone up, creating more than one million new jobs in the last 3 years alone.

We still have a lot of to do in the Asia-Pacific region and in other areas of the world. We have to extend free and fair trade on every continent. We have the best workers and the best products in the world. If we give them a fair deal with free trade, they will bring even greater prosperity home to America.

Members of the class of 1996, I want to leave you with this one final thought as you go forward. This new era calls on all of us to rise to more different and difficult challenges than in the past. I know the rewards of serving on the frontlines of change may seem distant and uncertain from time to time, but you will succeed if you remember always to measure your success by one simple standard: Have you made the lives of the American people safer? Have you made the future of our children more secure? That must remain our guiding principle for the years ahead.

If it does, we will enter the 21st century with a military whose fighting edge is sharper than ever; with a peaceful, undivided Europe and a stable, prosperous Asia; with fewer nuclear weapons in the world's arsenals and tough new agreements to control chemical and biological weapons; with terrorists, organized criminals, and drug traffickers on the run, not on the rampage; with more barriers to American products coming down; with more people than ever living with the blessings of peace and democracy.

For 50 years now, our country has been the world's leading force for freedom and progress around the world, and it has brought us real security and prosperity here at home. If we continue to lead, if we continue to meet the peril and seize the promise of this new era, that

proud history will also be your future and the future of your children.

Good luck, and God bless you and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:34 a.m. at Nelson W. Nirchman Field. In his remarks, he referred to Adm. Robert Kramek, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard; Rear Adm. Paul E. Versaw, Superintendent, U.S. Coast Guard Academy; Commander R.O. Bill Wiemer, who gave the invocation; and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority.

Remarks to Fleet Week Participants on Board the U.S.S. *Intrepid* in New York City

May 22, 1996

To the men and women of our Armed Forces gathered here today and their counterparts from Canada and Mexico and the United Kingdom who join us on board the *Intrepid,* first things first: At ease.

Mr. Sowinski, Secretary Dalton, Admiral Johnson, Admiral Flanagan, Rear Admiral Williamson, Mayor and Mrs. Giuliani. I am delighted to be here today. As your Commander in Chief, I've come to see you off on a challenging assignment, one that demands enormous stamina and strength: Fleet Week. A grueling schedule of baseball and theater awaits you, the seamanship olympics, the legendary best chow contests. Your abilities will be put to the test. Your orders for the mission are clear and simple: Enjoy yourselves. Have fun. You've earned it.

All around the world, every day of the year, you show what is best about our country: the commitment to stand up for freedom, to stand against oppression, to give a helping hand, to do all of that together as one America in alliance with our friends.

Among you are soldiers from the 77th Regional Support Command which helped to defeat Saddam Hussein in Desert Storm and now is working to preserve the peace in Bosnia. There are sailors from the U.S.S. *Arleigh Burke* which served as Red Crown in Operation Sharp Guard to protect our Adriatic fleet. There are airmen from McGuire Air Force Base who supported IFOR troops in Bosnia and evacuation airlifts in Liberia. There are coastguardsmen and women from Governors Island who rescued thousands of Haitians and Cubans seeking refuge on dangerous waters. There are marines from Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, who, not shyly, recently returned from Trinidad and Honduras, where they helped to build schools and barracks. And there are citizen soldiers here from New York State who answered the call to action in the wake of recent snowstorms, floods, and fires.

I want all of you to know that America is proud of each and every one of you, grateful for all that you do. Your example explains why people around the world look to us for help and for inspiration.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to those who are here from other nations, for our partnership with our allies have provided us for some of the most important opportunities we have had in recent years to advance America's cause.

Let me say that I know the last few days have not been easy for our Armed Forces and especially for the United States Navy. We lost a great leader and friend in Admiral Boorda. But as we honor his service to our Nation, I ask you to be proud of your own achievements as well. You are members of the world's greatest military, whose values of honor, resolve, and integrity America respects so deeply. You protect our Nation on land, at sea, and in the skies. You project our strength and our values around the world. You stepped forward to serve your country. You do so with courage, commitment, and compassion every time America calls. We are grateful to you and grateful that you are the best trained, best equipped, best prepared fighting force on Earth. As long as I am your Commander in Chief, not only our gratitude but the reality of that statement will remain intact.

Your country and I thank you for everything you do. You have earned a week of celebration and now, liberty call.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:25 p.m. on the flight deck. In his remarks, he referred to Larry Sowinski, executive director, *Intrepid* Sea-Air-Space Museum; Adm. W.J. Flanagan, Jr., USN, commander in chief, Atlantic Fleet; Rear Adm. Robert C. Williamson, USN, commander, Carrier Group 2; and Mayor Rudolph Giuliani of New York City and his wife, Donna.

Remarks on Receiving the U.S.S. *Intrepid* Freedom Award in New York City

May 22, 1996

To tell you the truth, Zack, I thought it was a pretty good speech when you stopped. [*Laughter*]

Mayor and Mrs. Giuliani and members of your family—and I especially want to acknowledge the fact that in the Second World War, the mayor's father-in-law served here on the *Intrepid* and was a Navy man for 25 years. He and his wife are here. Secretary and Mrs. Dalton, Paul Tudor Jones and Max Chapman, Admiral Johnson, Admiral Flanagan, Admiral Williamson; to all the distinguished friends of the *Intrepid* Sea-Air-Space Museum who are here and who share this podium with me; and members of our Armed Forces and our allied forces in Canada, Mexico, and Great Britain. And let me say, as an old musician, I want to especially thank the Royal Marine Band from the United Kingdom. I thought they were quite wonderful. Thank you. There was a time in my life when I had committed to memory almost every important piece of British band music in the last 50 years, and so I am delighted to hear it from the horse's mouth, so to speak.

I thank the United States Marine Corps Honor Guard and the Joint Armed Color Team. And I want to thank all of you for being here today and for your support of the *Intrepid* and your support of our Armed Forces.

I am honored to receive this 1996 *Intrepid* Freedom Award, especially pleased to receive it in the company of two of the best friends of freedom this country ever had, Zachary and Elizabeth Fisher. And I thank them more than I can say.

Just a little over a year ago, it was my privilege to present Zachary Fisher with the President's Citizens Medal. It was a great honor for me because of all the remarkable things that he has done. Most of you know what the Fishers have done for their extended family, the 2.6 million men and women of our Armed Forces and their loved ones. From the Fisher house program that provides a home away from home to the families of hospitalized military personnel to the Armed Forces Scholarship Foundation that has allowed hundreds of service men and women to attend college, few have done more for those who dedicate their lives to defending our freedom. So we thank them for their shining service to America.

Yesterday in Washington, in our Navy's hour of need, Zachary Fisher was there again. When I escorted Bettie Boorda out into the National Cathedral, he was there to sit beside her during that profoundly moving but difficult memorial service as we celebrated the life of Admiral Mike Boorda.

Mike Boorda will be remembered as the first enlisted man who ever became the Chief of Naval Operations. More than that, I think the men and women of the Navy knew that he was not only once an enlisted man, in his heart he always was. He never forgot that he was their man. I saw it in the tears that they shed yesterday by the hundreds in the cathedral. But if he were here today, he would flash his famous smile and tell a few sea stories and say to us, "This is still the greatest Navy in the world. America needs you to be the best you can be. Carry on."

Because of that spirit of "carry on," he would also be grateful, as I am, for the generosity and devotion that so many of you here today have shown when you have helped to transform this veteran of America's triumph over tyranny

into a truly glorious sea-air-space museum. Indeed, I was out there looking at the exhibits, and I was afraid I would miss my entrance. If it hadn't been for "Ruffles and Flourishes," I don't think I would have—[*laughter*]—I'd still be out there looking at the planes somewhere.

For thousands and thousands of people every day, this wonderful old carrier brings to life our Nation's proud military history. It also reminds us of all of those who came before us, of what they gave and what they lost to keep America free and secure. I know it is our most fervent wish that the young people who come here to visit the *Intrepid* will never have to face the horrors of war, that instead they'll have the chance to make the most of their freedom and their God-given abilities in peace. But it's good that they learn these tales of duty and devotion because it's up to them to build a future worthy of the sacrifice that we honor here.

Ladies and gentlemen, today I have received this fine award for contributing to the preservation of freedom and democracy. For a citizen of the United States to become President is something no citizen can ever truly deserve. And in that sense, no award flowing from the service of a President can ever be deserved. So if you allow me, I can only accept it with pride on behalf of my fellow Americans and especially those in the armed services and the diplomatic corps who have made our Nation the greatest force for peace and freedom and prosperity and for the citizens who continue to support America's leadership throughout the world.

I was especially grateful for what Mr. Fisher said about that because in the aftermath of the cold war, with so many pressing measures here at home, it would be easy for the United States to turn away from its responsibilities around the world. But citizens like Zachary Fisher and so many of you understand the great lesson of the past 50 years. It is that what we now see as a global trend toward freedom and democracy is neither inevitable nor irreversible. This trend must have America's support. It must have the power of our example. On occasion, it must have the example of our power. Always it must have the leadership of the United States.

Earlier today I had the honor of presiding over the commencement for some of America's newest leaders for freedom, the Coast Guard Academy's class of 1996. I spoke to them about the challenges we face as we enter the 21st century and especially the challenge to advance the fight for peace and freedom.

Nothing will strengthen our security more in the long run than advancing the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world. When people live free and at peace, they are less likely to resort to violence to settle their problems or to abuse the rights of their fellow citizens. They are more likely to join with us to conquer our common challenges, from old threats like ethnic and religious hatreds that are taking on new and dangerous dimensions to new threats like the spread of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, drug trafficking, international organized crime.

I am proud that America has stood with those taking risks for democracy and peace. Because we are, the dictators are gone in Haiti, democracy is back, and the flow of desperate refugees to our shores has ended. Because we are, snipers' killing fields in Bosnia have once again become the children's playing fields. Because we are, the sound of car bombs in Northern Ireland is giving way to the quiet sounds of children living out normal lives. And because we are, in the Middle East, Arabs and Jews who once seemed destined to fight forever, now are sharing their knowledge, their resources, and their dreams.

Just 11 days before he was assassinated last year, my good friend Yitzhak Rabin stood on this very stage to accept this very same award. I thank you for giving it to him. He surely deserved it. And I can't tell you how moved I am to follow in his footsteps.

The first time I met Prime Minister Rabin after I was elected President, I told him that if Israel would take risks for peace, America would do everything in its power to minimize those risks. Well, Israel has, and we have done our part. In a time of shrinking resources, we've kept up our economic assistance. We've worked not just to maintain Israel's security but to enhance it by making sure Israel's qualitative military edge is greater than ever. We've built a bond of trust with Israel and its people that has given it the confidence necessary to make peace.

Now we all know the risks that Prime Minister Rabin took for peace and the price he paid for his vision. We know, too, that with every step along the path to peace in the Middle East, its enemies grow more desperate with bullets and bombs. So let me say again today, in

honor of the person who last stood in this place to accept this award and of his friendship to me and the bonds between our people and the peace-loving Arab people of the Middle East: We have supported the peace process. We have kept our commitment to minimize the risks that Israel has taken for peace. But the work is not done.

Hard work remains with Syria, with Lebanon, outstanding questions between the Israelis and the Palestinians. If Israel takes further risks for peace, the United States must be willing to have further measures of support to deal with those risks and minimize them. We have been there every step of the way. If you want to see peace in the Middle East in our lifetime, we must stay there every step of the way.

Ladies and gentlemen, because of the accidents and the design of history, at this particular moment our Nation has more ability than any other to help people throughout the world embrace a future of hope. As I told our cadets today, as I travel on behalf of the United States beyond our borders, I see people who look to us not primarily because of our size and our strength but mostly because of what we stand for and what we stand against. If we continue to make good on their trust, we can build an even greater future of peace and freedom and democracy. And it will be good for the American people.

In the next few years, the way we work with other countries, the work we do, and whether we succeed will determine in very large measure what the world looks like for our children and our grandchildren. We have a chance to leave a legacy of peace and freedom, of liberty and prosperity. We have to know what to do and what not to do. We can't be the world's policeman, but we can't try to build a wall around America's good fortune. That is a destiny we must share with freedom-loving people throughout the world.

So I thank you for this award, not because of anything it says about me but because of everything it says about America. And I will do my best to uphold America's ideals, to keep our Nation free and strong, to keep it a force for peace and progress, to keep it a land of opportunity and tolerance for all.

Thank you very much, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:21 p.m. on the hangar deck. In his remarks, he referred to Zachary and Elizabeth Fisher, cofounders of the *Intrepid* Sea-Air-Space Museum; Mayor Giuliani's wife, Gwen, and her father, Robert Kosnovec; Secretary of the Navy John Dalton's wife, Margaret; Paul Tudor Jones, chairman, Tudor Investment Corp.; and Max Chapman, chairman, Fleet Week '96.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the National Science Foundation

May 22, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the provisions of section 3(f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862(f)), I transmit herewith the combined annual reports of the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1994 and 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 22, 1996.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Commodity Credit Corporation
May 22, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress (15 U.S.C. 714k), I transmit herewith the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 22, 1996.

Statement on the Minimum Wage
May 22, 1996

An increase in the minimum wage would honor our values: work, family, responsibility, and opportunity. You cannot raise a family on $4.25 an hour. Over the years, both parties have worked together to ensure that the minimum wage keeps up with the cost of living. To continue that commitment to working families, I have challenged Congress to raise the minimum wage by 90 cents. It is clear that a bipartisan majority of the House of Representatives stands ready to pass this increase.

But the House leadership is today proposing a giant fraud on the American people. Their legislation will eliminate the minimum wage for all workers hired by fully two-thirds of American businesses. I hope Senator Dole will join me in opposing this extreme measure. We must not tolerate sweatshops and a repeal of wage protections for millions of Americans as a condition of assuring a living wage for some workers.

Let me be clear: Eliminating the minimum wage is no way to raise it. If Congress sends me a bill to eliminate the minimum wage and wage protection for millions of workers, I will veto it. Speaker Gingrich and Majority Leader Dole should allow an honest up-or-down vote on the minimum wage.

Remarks at a Democratic Dinner in Stamford, Connecticut
May 22, 1996

Thank you very much. Well, ladies and gentlemen, now that all these other fine people have spoken and told you every good thing about our record, I ought to quit while I'm ahead. [*Laughter*] But I won't. And besides that, we can't.

I want to thank Senator Dodd for his remarks and his remarkable leadership and his personal friendship and his willingness to take a leap into the unknown when I asked him to do this job after our setback in the campaign of 1994. It looked like a job with a lot of downside and not much upside. It could cause him grief at home and not help him abroad. And he did it anyway, because he believed it was the right thing to do. He's done it superbly, and every person in Connecticut should be very, very proud of him.

I also want to assure you that that little riff he went through about,"You can always move the capital to Hartford and make the Seawolf the national fish and the Comanche the national bird," and all that, you know, believe it or not, he does that in private when nobody is looking. [*Laughter*] The first time he did it in private, I didn't think it was very funny; it's a lot more funny in a crowd. [*Laughter*] I think if things get any tighter he'll just buy me a couple of

pets and call them Seawolf and Comanche so I'll never be able to forget it. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Senator Lieberman, who's been my friend for more than 25 years now, for his leadership in Connecticut and leadership in the Democratic Leadership Council and for being a source—a constant source of new ideas for me about how we can move this country forward and bring it together. And I want to thank Don Fowler for his incredibly indefatigable work.

I thank my friend Marvin Rosen—now that Chris Dodd has grounded on him tonight about how Connecticut raised more money than Florida, Marvin might not get any sleep for the next month—[*laughter*]—he'll be thinking about how to get even or get ahead.

I have a lot to be grateful to Connecticut for, as has been said, not the least of which are the people who were up here before me. I thought Harvey and Paul looked pretty good up here when they were doing their one-two act. You ought to give him a better part, Harvey. He'll do a movie if you do that. But give them a hand; they were great. [*Applause*]

And I understand that Mr. Newman introduced me about 15 minutes before I came out. [*Laughter*] That may be because in my old age I'm getting hard of hearing. Or it may be because now that he's become a grandfather he's just preoccupied and he's gotten his lines all mixed up. [*Laughter*]

I thank Governor O'Neill, my former colleague, for being here; and my friend and law school classmate, your attorney general, Dick Blumenthal; your secretary of state, your controller, and all the other officials. I want to say a special word of thank you to Bill Curry, who came down from Connecticut to Washington to work in the White House. And I thank Michael Bolton for both those wonderful, wonderful songs.

You know, when I first met Michael Bolton, I tried to figure out what his ethnic heritage was, and I figured he was Polish. Then he said, "This is a song I sang with Pavarotti." I figured he was Italian. Then he sang "Georgia on My Mind." The only other person I ever heard sing that in public—this will show you how much I like the song—on June 24, 1967, in Constitution Hall, I heard Ray Charles sing that song. I remember that. I carried the ticket stub with me for 10 years. [*Laughter*] I was so excited, I couldn't go to bed. At 5 o'clock in the morning I went out and ran 3 miles just so I'd get tired enough to go to bed.

So I thought you were Polish; then I thought you were Italian; now I know you're African-American. [*Laughter*] Most of all, you're a good person and a good friend, and I thank you for bringing your talents to bear for the benefit of your country. Thank you very much.

I couldn't believe Chris made that joke—I guess it was Chris—about that Peruvian mummy. [*Laughter*] But I want you to know that Hillary went to welcome that mummy to the National Geographic building yesterday, she and President Fujimori of Peru. And then he came over to see me and kind of hurt my feelings that I didn't get to go. He brought me two pictures of that mummy. I don't know if you've seen that mummy. But you know, if I were a single man, I might ask that mummy out. [*Laughter*] That's a good-looking mummy. That mummy looks better than I do on my worst days. I'm telling you, you need to go see her. [*Laughter*] If there was ever an argument against ageism, it's that mummy. I mean, really, you need to go see her. Let me say—I can't believe—I'll hear about that before it's over, but anyway—[*laughter*]—it's been a long day.

I want to say that I wish Hillary were with me tonight. She's coming back from Colorado. But I did something today that she and our daughter did 2 years ago. I went to the Coast Guard Academy to give the commencement address, and it was a wonderful experience. And I want to tell you about just some of the other things that have happened today because I think they are appropriate. It reminded me of many of the times I have been in Connecticut and the various places I have been.

When I got off the helicopter today the first time, I met the people who are active in the Big Brother and Big Sister program who are cadets at the Coast Guard Academy. And they told me that the—you know, the students at the Academy have to work very hard. It's a very rigorous program, both physically and intellectually. They still do 1,100 hours of community service a month at the Coast Guard Academy. That's pretty remarkable.

And then I met a representative of our Department of Education who coincidentally has been a friend of mine for almost 30 years, introducing me to children from Guilford, Connecticut, and children from New Haven, Connecticut. And most of the kids from New Haven

were African-American or Hispanic, and most of the kids from Guilford looked like they live in those beautiful houses in Guilford that I remember so well from law school. And these kids worked together through E-mail. And they sent E-mail messages to each other, and they're trying to help each other learn about their different lives and trying to help broaden their horizons and improve their performance in school. And these kids, they've got a little team jacket they wear to show they're part of the same group. It was an astonishing thing. And they were very excited about what they're doing.

And the reason I mention those two things is it seems to me that that really is a big part of what this election is all about, because the Coast Guard folks, they're doing the best they can with their own lives, and they're doing superbly well. They're very impressive. But they're still taking a little time to help people who are less fortunate, partly because they believe it's part of their responsibility and partly because they know their country will be better if those kids do better. The kids from Guilford and the kids from New Haven are like all children, they're preoccupied with their own lives, but they know if they care about each other their country will be stronger and we'll all be better off.

And that really is the central question before the American people. I'm very gratified about what's been said. It is true that when I ran for President I said that if you vote for me we'll put in a program, we'll cut the deficit in half and create 8 million jobs in 4 years. And we've more than cut the deficit in half, and we've got more than 8½ million jobs now. I'm glad about that; the economy is stronger than it was before.

One of the things that has especially benefited Connecticut is that we have had the biggest expansion of trade in the history of this country, with GATT and NAFTA and 200 separate agreements, 21 with Japan alone. Our exports to Japan in the 21 areas we've made agreements with them are up 85 percent in 3 years. It's really a record without precedent. And it's mostly due to the vigilance and aggression of American companies and their workers and the productivity of their workers. But the fact that we changed the rules had a little something to do with it, I think. And I'm proud of that. And you should be, too.

And I am—they talked about the crime issue—I'm proud of the fact that all the serious crimes are down in America. And it did have something to do with the fact that we passed the crime bill and began to put 100,000 police on the street and banned 19 kinds of assault weapons and passed the Brady bill.

And a lot of Members of Congress underwent unbelievable withering criticism. And we lost a lot of House Members and maybe a couple of Senators because we banned assault weapons and passed the Brady bill, because there were a lot of people that were told they were going to lose their weapons. Well, we've now had a couple of hunting seasons; there hasn't been a single hunter, man or a woman, in any State in this country lose their rifle. But 60,000 people did lose their weapons; they were people with criminal records who got found out and couldn't get their handguns under the Brady bill. It was the right thing to do.

I am proud of the advances we've made with the leadership of the Vice President in improving the environment and finding ways to grow the economy and protect the environment, which I think is a central commitment this country has got to make to itself. I had a fascinating conversation a few months ago with the President of China, Jiang Zemin, in which we were having the kind of discussion we often have in public, and you can imagine what it was like. And I looked at him, and I said, "Mr. President, I do not want to contain China. I want to engage China. I want us to have a good partnership. But," I said, "there's only one way that you really present a threat to our security, and I'm sure it's never occurred to you." And he said, "Well, what are you talking about?" I said, "If everybody in China decides to get rich in exactly the same way people in America got rich and you all insist on buying cars that don't get any better mileage than the ones we've got now, we're going to burn up the atmosphere together. That is a threat to our security. We have to find a way for the Chinese to grow their economy and preserve the global environment, not tear it up." And I believe that, and I think it's a great opportunity for us. So I'm glad we've done that.

I'm glad that we proved that the Democratic Party is not the party of big Government. We've reduced the size of the Government. We've eliminated thousands of pages of regulations. We've gotten rid of a lot of specific, stupid

things. When I became President, the SBA loan form was 78 pages long; now it's a page long. It took months and months to get an answer; now you can get an answer in 3 days. I'm proud of that. I'm glad we—we cut the budget by 25 percent and doubled the loan volume for small businesses. I'm proud of that.

But in spite of all that, that's really not what this election is about. This election, like all elections, is about the future. And I just want you to take just a few minutes, because every one of you will leave here—and the election is still a long way away, and an enormous number of things can happen and there's more than enough time for it to change.

The American people will vote in November based on what they think this election is about and what they imagine their future will be like. And therefore, every one of you, if you can afford to be here and you have the ability to get other people to be here, you also should take a little time to be an influential citizen, to have arguments and discussions and debates about this election that have nothing to do with raising funds but everything to do with delivering voters to the polls in November.

And so I ask you to think about it. Ask yourself, we're 4 years away from a new century that happens to be the beginning of a new millennium; what would you like it to be like? How do you imagine your country in 2010? What kind of country do you imagine your grandchildren living in when they are your age? If you could make it the way you would like it to be, what would you have to do to do that? Does that bear any reasonable relationship to the kind of issues we debate today? And every one of you just think about it.

Before I entered the Presidential campaign in 1992, I decided that more than anything else I had to be able to ask myself those questions and give an answer and then be prepared to update and modify that answer as I learned more about the American people and our circumstances and the world that's unfolding. And I have a very simple answer, even though it's obvious that the road ahead is not simple.

I want this to be a country in which every single person, without regard to their race, their gender, or how much they start out with or without in life, has a chance to live up to their dreams if they're willing to work for it and be responsible. I want this to be a country in which we relish the diversity that we have, all of it. As long as we adhere to the same set of laws and the constitutional values that have kept us around for more than 200 years, we should see our diversity as an asset of unimaginable proportions as we move into a global society. So I want this country to be coming together instead of coming apart.

And that's very important. That's what all of you try to do in your families, in your businesses, in your community activities, in your religious organization. It's only in politics that we try to see how quickly we can divide people. And it doesn't make any sense at all; it is a dumb way to build a future. And I think we should reject the politics of division in this election.

And finally, I want this to be a country which, 20 years from now, 30 years from now, is still the strongest force in the world for peace and freedom and democracy and prosperity. And that means for me I've had to take some fairly unpopular decisions to keep that possibility alive. Not many people thought it was right to go into Haiti, but we don't have all those refugees at our shore, and they've got freedom now. And I'm proud that we did it, and I'm proud of our people who did it.

I was even criticized for becoming the first American President to try to take a hand in affairs in Northern Ireland, but it helped to lead to a cease-fire, and I think we're going to get a resolution to that.

There was literally no support for the steps I took to try to help Mexico when our neighbor to the south was about to collapse, but it didn't collapse. And if it had it would have been a disaster for us and for our efforts to control our own borders. And there were more than half the people against the action we took in Bosnia, but there are people alive today, and that country has a chance for peace and Europe has a chance for peace because of the action that was taken.

So the same thing is true on the trade front with GATT and NAFTA and all the other things we have done. I know that a lot of trade issues have caused some disruption, but this country has come out ahead on the efforts we have made in trade. And we cannot run away from the world, we have to lead it, we have to compete in it, we have to reach out to others and give them a chance to make the most of their own lives as well.

That is what I believe we ought to have. And when you imagine that, you can have—well, my vision is not quite the same. But if you have a vision, then you can say, well, how are you going to get there? Well, the first thing you have to have is a structure of opportunity. And this is a big difference between the two different visions of the future, and I'll come back to that. But I want a structure of opportunity.

We spent now nearly 4 years trying to get the deficit down and all of that. We need to look to the future and say, we're going to have to provide a system that gives people education for a lifetime and access to health care and retirement for a lifetime. Education is the most important thing, and that's why I made the proposals that I've made. If you look at that, that is terribly important.

Then I believe we need a structure for defining our community, or at least a roadmap. What are our obligations to each other? That's really what the welfare reform debate is all about. That's why I tried to say about affirmative action, we should change it, but we shouldn't get rid of it until we get rid of discrimination. That's why I tried to say, as Senator Lieberman said, this is a deeply religious country, but we ought to stop using religion to divide it; we ought to find ways that we can come together around religious values we all share.

That's why we had this meeting the other day that some people in this room came to, where corporate executives came and met with labor leaders and others and said, what are our obligations to our employees in the 21st century in the global economy? Because I believe we have to find a way to say this is what we owe to one another so we can come together around it.

And as you look ahead, it means we need more young people in national service. It means we need more people asking themselves, how can we make it economically attractive to invest in our inner cities so that we can create jobs and free enterprise where Government can't pick up the slack? It means that Bridgeport and Hartford and Newark, New Jersey, and poor rural areas in my part of the country ought to be able to reap the benefits of the global economy if we can find ways to make it attractive for people to invest there.

It means that we have to recognize that in the rest of the world we can never solve all the problems, but we must have, we must have, a system for working with others to fight terrorism and organized crime and drug running and the proliferation of dangerous weapons. And that's why I am working with all these other countries, so we'll at least have a system to give our kids and our grandkids a chance to live in the most peaceful world human history has ever known. Those are the things that I think about and dream about.

Why do we want to fight crime? Because you can't have any sense of community if people are scared to death. Why do we want to preserve the environment? Because you cannot have an organized civilized society without clean air and clean water and natural resources.

Let me tell you, I have concluded a long time ago that what we do in public life is in and of itself not the most important thing, by a long shot, that goes on in this world. But if you think about it, what you do in your worklife is not in and of itself the most important thing that goes on in this world. Why do we work? Why do we have political life? Why do we do these things? Because if we do it right, we give more and more and more people a chance to live out their dreams. That's why.

And if you look at what's going on in this election today, if you look at every single issue being debated and you listen very closely through all the rhetoric for the differences, you see two very different world views about how we should move into the future. And let me give you a charitable description, I think, of the other world view—but essentially accurate, but charitable.

The other folks believe, as I do, that we're living in an era of enormous possibility because of technology and information revolutions and the globalization of the economy; that unlike the great industrial age that we've left, the future will probably not be dominated by big, top-down organizations, either governmental organizations or private ones; that entrepreneurialism, that creativity and rapid change will dominate the future. And therefore, they say, all big, outdated, centralized organizations are the enemy, and especially Government, and therefore we're always better off without Government unless we need it for national defense and one or two other things that we can't get any other way.

But there aren't many things on that list. That's why when they come up with a budget that cuts education, they say, "It's okay; the

Government would mess up a one-car parade; you can't do anything good in education." Or they come up with a budget that says we don't need 100,000 police anymore. Or "Why don't we repeal the assault weapons ban or the Brady bill?" Or "Why do we oppose the Family and Medical Leave Act that Chris Dodd labored for? Oh, because the Government can't do anything good. Get the Government out of it and let a thousand flowers bloom."

Well, I believe that we have to reform the Government. But I don't believe any country ever became great by deciding to give educational opportunity to just a few or deciding to pollute the environment to advance the economy or deciding we don't have common responsibilities to make safe streets for our children. So that is the difference. What do we owe each other? What do we have to do together to create opportunity and to grow together and to build a better country?

And let me just say this in closing, and remember this. I've said this a lot of times, and a lot of people think it's a strange thing for a person in public life to say. If God gives you the gift to know when the last time you put your head on a pillow before you end your life on this Earth, 5 will get you 10, you won't say, "I wish I'd spent more time at the office." You won't be thinking about the last political campaign you worked in. You'll be thinking about who you loved, who you liked, what happened to you that made you feel more alive and more like a human being. The purpose of politics is to give more people the chance to live out those dreams, so when they lay down for the last time, they feel good about what they've done. That is what this whole thing is about. That is what this whole thing is about.

So I ask you to remember this. I thank you for this money. We will invest it wisely in taking this country into the next century in the right way. But you have to be willing to stand up and let your voice be heard. You have to be willing to keep talking and keep working all the way between now and November. You can't let the American people be diverted. You can't let us be divided.

If this election is about how we're going to get to the next century with opportunity for everybody, with a country that's coming together instead of being driven apart and a country that's leading the world to a brighter tomorrow, I don't have any doubt about how it's going to come out. And more importantly, we'll have more people living out their dreams in a better and more decent world.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the Stamford Marriott Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Christopher J. Dodd, general chairman, Donald L. Fowler, national chairman, and Marvin Rosen, national finance chairman, Democratic National Committee; movie producer Harvey Weinstein; actor Paul Newman; William O'Neill, former Governor of Connecticut; Miles Rapoport, Connecticut Secretary of the State; Nancy Wyman, Connecticut Controller; and singer Michael Bolton.

Remarks to the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities Conference

May 23, 1996

Thank you very much, Tony, for your remarks, your support, your friendship, and your leadership of the Committee. I want to say hello to the others who are there, to John Sweeney and to Al Checchi. I want to say a special word of thanks to my good friend Justin Dart, who I know had to leave but who has been a real champion for Americans with disabilities, indeed, for the rights and interests of all Americans. I want to say a special word of greeting to the cochairs of the Committee, the vice chairs: Norm Miller, I. King Jordan, Karen Meyer, Neil Jacobson, Dr. Sylvia Walker, and Ron Drach.

Thank you, all of you who are there for your very warm welcome. I'm sorry I couldn't join you in person today, I have to be in Milwaukee with the German Chancellor. But I didn't want to miss this opportunity to talk with you about what we must do together to ensure the full

participation of the 49 million Americans with disabilities in the vibrant life and economy of our great country.

Three and a half years ago, when I took the oath of office, I had a very clear vision of what I hoped our country could be like as we move into the 21st century. I wanted us to be a country that offers great opportunities for all who are willing to work for them. I wanted us to remain the world's strongest force for peace and freedom. And I wanted us to rebuild our sense of unity and community around the shared ethic of responsibility and a respect for diversity.

Together we've made great progress toward achieving those goals. Our economic strategy to reduce the deficit, expand trade, and invest in our people is paying off. The deficit is now less than half of what it was 4 years ago. We have 8½ million more jobs, the lowest combined rates of inflation, mortgage rates, and employment in 27 years. Homeownership is at a 15-year high, and we have all-time highs in exports and new business formations for each of the last 3 years.

We've also worked hard to increase educational opportunities for all Americans, from more positions for children in Head Start to more affordable college loans to the national service program. We've done our part to fight to lower the crime rate by passing a crime bill, which is putting 100,000 police officers on the street, banning assault weapons, and passing the Brady bill, which has kept 60,000 people with criminal records or other disturbing histories from getting handguns. And we have maintained our commitment to a clean, safe environment for all Americans.

Compared to 4 years ago, the world is also a safer and more peaceful place. The nuclear threat is diminished. No weapons are pointed at the people of the United States. Peace and freedom are taking hold from Haiti to South Africa, to Northern Ireland, to Bosnia, to the Middle East. We have moved a long way in 3½ years.

But today I want to talk to you about our country's future, especially in terms of that first objective, expanding opportunities for every American who is willing to take responsibility for making the most of his or her God-given abilities. The theme of your conference is investing in abilities. That's been something we've tried very hard to do and something I intend to keep on doing.

In 1992 I issued a challenge to our Nation. I said we must not rest until America has a national disability policy based on three simple creeds: inclusion, not exclusion; independence, not dependence; and empowerment, not paternalism. I remain committed to that vision, and I want to thank all of you for working so hard with us to make it a reality. More than ever before in our history, America's greatness in the next century will depend upon the ability of all our citizens to make the most of their own lives. Americans with disabilities are an enormous, largely untapped reservoir of that potential.

Employment is the key to economic security for Americans, including people with disabilities. Even though we have created 8½ million new jobs, it remains a tragedy today that two-thirds of the people with disabilities are unemployed. And it's up to all of us, employers, labor, people with disabilities, and government, to work together to change this picture.

In the past 4 years, we have made progress. We're fighting to make sure that people with disabilities have health care and the living wages they need to live independently. Our strong commitment to the Americans With Disabilities Act has opened up town halls, schools, transportation systems, workplaces, grocery stores, restaurants, and movie theaters to millions of people with disabilities. Our 1997 budget calls for an increase in funding for ADA enforcement at the Department of Justice.

The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act is preparing students with disabilities to get their share of the high-wage jobs that are opening up in this new economy. I know how much the IDEA means to millions of students with disabilities and to their parents. I strongly support it.

High school graduates with disabilities who went to school under IDEA have an employment rate twice that of the overall population of individuals with disabilities. We're building on this achievement by supporting efforts like your high school high-tech program that is guiding promising students to college and careers in science and technology. We're making sure people with disabilities are included in our school-to-work efforts.

No one, no one, should have to go through what Judy Heumann went through to get an education in our country. She's been a pioneer in the struggle for the rights of people with

disabilities. She developed polio when she was 18 months old, and she was denied the right to attend public school until the fourth grade. She had to sue to get a teaching job that was denied her because she uses a wheelchair. And during the seventies, she participated in a sit-in that resulted in the creation of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. As my Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services at the Department of Education, she now runs IDEA. That is a remarkable story, and we need more of them.

But you and I know the ADA and the IDEA alone will not achieve our vision of inclusion, independence, and empowerment for people with disabilities. That's why I fought so hard for measures like the Family and Medical Leave Act. And today I'm announcing that as a result of your work, Federal agencies are now developing a better system for tracking the unemployment rate of people with disabilities.

This new system will strengthen our ability to include people with disabilities in all our employment policies and programs. In addition, I've asked the Secretary of Commerce to work with your Committee and relevant Federal agencies to recommend to me ways that we can ensure that people with disabilities are included in all our efforts to assist entrepreneurs and small businesses. So we are making progress.

But let me say, there is more to do. First, we must preserve the guarantee of Medicaid coverage for people with disabilities. For three decades, Americans have stood on common ground about the need for guaranteed Medicaid coverage for older Americans, pregnant women, low income children, and people with disabilities. But last year Congress sent me legislation to repeal that guarantee, legislation that would have taken away health care coverage from millions of Americans who need it most. I vetoed that legislation, and if they send it to me again and they want to repeal the guarantee again, I will veto it again.

Let me be clear. We can balance this budget without repealing guaranteed Medicaid coverage for the 6 million Americans with disabilities who depend upon it, including one million children. Medicaid is a family issue, as people with disabilities know, making it possible for more people to get care at home and their communities. Without the guarantee, a middle class family with a child with a severe disability could be forced into poverty to pay for the child's medical care. Parents could be forced to give up jobs to stay home to care for a child. Children and adults who live independently today might be forced into institutions. I will not let that happen.

The second thing we have to do is to strengthen the health security of people with disabilities and, indeed, for all Americans, with the passage of the Kassebaum-Kennedy health insurance reform bill. This legislation would not allow insurance companies to deny coverage for anybody with a preexisting condition and will allow people to keep their health insurance if they change jobs or if someone in the family gets sick. So I urge Congress to stop stalling and pass the bill now, as an important step forward.

Finally, let me say I've called on Congress to increase the minimum wage, which will benefit millions of Americans with disabilities who face extra costs for accessible housing and personal assistance. We need that.

All of you know that America is in the best position to be a winner in the global economy of the 21st century because of the depths of our values, the strength of our diversity, the power of our economy. But we don't have a person to waste. We have to continue to expand opportunity, demand responsibility from all of our citizens. And that does mean inclusion, not exclusion.

Again, let me thank you, all of you, for everything you've done and for everything you will do. Thank you for the progress we've made and the progress we still will make.

Just last week I had a very moving visit with Christopher Reeve in the Oval Office, and I mentioned to Christopher that in 1933, the Oval Office was the first Government office designed specifically to be accessible to accommodate President Roosevelt. He said to me that it was too bad that at the time he had to hide his disability.

I hope with Christopher Reeve that as the Roosevelt memorial becomes a reality, with your efforts to remove the stigma of disability, they'll find a way to make sure that the American people know that this great, great President was great with his disability.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at 9:35 a.m. from Milwaukee, WI, to the conference meeting in Detroit, MI. In his remarks, he re-

ferred to Tony Coehlo, chairman, Justin Dart, former Chair, President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities; John Sweeney, president, AFL–CIO, and Al Checchi, cochairman, Northwest Airlines; and actor Christopher Reeve, who was paralyzed in an equestrian accident.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany and an Exchange With Reporters in Milwaukee, Wisconsin

May 23, 1996

Chechnya

Q. Mr. President, there are reports there are peace talks between Mr. Yeltsin and the leader of the Chechnyan group. Is that encouraging to you?

The President. Of course. The Chancellor and I, I think—I don't want to speak for him, but I think we both would be very pleased if that could be resolved and the President could go back to devoting his energies to strengthening democracy and the economy of Russia. I know he wants peace there. I believe he's working toward it.

Chancellor Kohl. I do hope that this will turn out well. It's a very important issue, obviously, also for the elections.

Chancellor Kohl's Visit

The President. Let me say to all of you, as you know, we're going to have a few moments later, and we'll answer all your questions at the press conference.

But I want to welcome Chancellor Kohl back to the United States and to perhaps our most German-American city, Milwaukee, a place which he's now visiting for the first time. I want to thank him for his friendship to our country and for his support for freedom. The world is a better place because of his leadership. And I have benefited greatly from his wise counsel, and we've had a good partnership. And I'm delighted to have him here in the United States and especially in Milwaukee today.

Chancellor Kohl. May I perhaps make a few remarks on my part. I would like to thank the President. I would like to thank you, my friend, Bill, for this very warm welcome. When I was told that this would be on our itinerary, I was very enthusiastic about it because as a student I read a lot about this State, about this part of the country.

And you know that many generations back and throughout many generations, many people from my home region, from the Palatine, immigrated to this part of the world. And the first thing I saw when I arrived yesterday night at the airport was a big sign announcing the product of a company called Kohl. And people are very friendly. Unfortunately, we only have a day, but I do hope that I shall have the opportunity to come back at some later stage.

So now I'm looking very much forward to our talks. I must say, generally speaking, one of the best experiences that I've had in this office is the very good relation that we have been able to strike up, the President and myself, and the good conversations that we've had over the years. And let me say, I'm very pleased that we were able to move matters along in many issues over the years.

And I think more than any other country, the two of us probably also got involved in Russia. And the two of us took a very personal interest in Russia. There are a lot of people who warned us because of the risks that were involved. But let me say, we are very well aware of what it means if Russia now finally goes forward, pursues the path of reform, or the sort of risks it entails when it falls back into the old habits of the past.

And if you want to do something good, please pray now for the rain going away and for us having nice weather. [*Laughter*]

1996 Election

Q. Mr. President, there's a suspicion that election-year politics had something to do with your bringing Chancellor Kohl here.

The President. Well, I'll tell you how we came about to do this. When Prime Minister Major came to the United States, you remember, I took him to Pittsburgh. And it wasn't an election

time then, but his grandfather had been there as a worker. And it seems to me that it's important for the United States to remember a lot of our roots, which in the beginning, of course, were European roots.

When I was with the Chancellor last time in Germany, I gave him a copy of the Declaration of Independence, which was printed in 1776 in German in the State of Pennsylvania because we had so many German-Americans. So those two experiences made me think that the next time he came here for a visit, we should do it here in Milwaukee instead of Washington.

Q. No politics?

Chancellor Kohl. Incidentally, it is true, I mean, elections are part of democracy, are they not? So, you know, there are elections almost constantly in democracies, and the only other choice we have is we say we don't meet when there's an election going on. And then you will write there's no personal chemistry between the two; it doesn't seem to work. And now you're telling us we're not supposed to meet because there's an election going on. So, well, I suppose you will have to write there's an election going on and that's probably—[*laughter*].

The President. Thank you. We'll answer more questions later.

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

Chancellor Kohl's Visit

The President. Let me say, if I might, that it is a great honor for me as President and a great personal pleasure for me as a friend of the Chancellor's to welcome him back to the United States, and especially here to Milwaukee, which is the most German-American city in the United States.

I am personally very grateful to Chancellor Kohl for his wise counsel to me, for his unfailing friendship to the United States, and for his determined devotion to freedom. We have a lot of important things to discuss today. I'm looking forward to that, and of course afterward we will make ourselves available to you again for your questions.

Q. Mr. President, last time you were treated by Chancellor Kohl to some Italian pasta. Will you treat him to some German food today?

The President. Well, we're going to a local diner which is sort of a community place in Milwaukee, and he will be able to eat whatever he wants.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:12 a.m. at City Hall. In his remarks, the President referred to President Boris Yeltsin of Russia. Chancellor Kohl spoke in German, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany in Milwaukee

May 23, 1996

President Clinton. Good afternoon. It's indeed a pleasure for me to welcome Chancellor Kohl back to the United States. He's now in his 14th year in office, the longest serving leader in the West. And not only Germany and the European Union but all of the West has been well served by his leadership, his devotion to freedom and to free markets.

He's a friend to whom three American Presidents have turned for support and wise counsel. And I am especially grateful for the relationship that we have enjoyed and the counsel he has shared with me. During his tenure, the relationship between our two nations has grown stronger and deeper than ever, and it has become a powerful force for positive change.

As Chancellor, Helmut Kohl has visited Washington 23 times. He knows the shortcuts through the traffic better than most of us who have come here more recently. We thought it was high time that the Chancellor saw another part of our great country. What better place than Milwaukee, a city that German immigrants helped to build, a city so rich in German heritage and culture that in the 19th century it was called the *Deutsche Athens*, the German Athens. It is also fitting that as Chancellor, as he approaches the mark for the longest tenure of

all those who have held his office, he is visiting a city that his great predecessor, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, came to 40 years ago.

Today the partnership between our two nations has taken another important step forward. The two aviation agreements we just signed will strengthen our cooperation in this vital economic sector. The safety agreement will help us to clear the way to better, safer air traffic. The open skies agreement will create the largest fully opened bilateral market in the entire world of aviation, dramatically increasing opportunities for consumers and flexibility for our airlines. The Chancellor and I believe this agreement heralds a new era of competition in the over-regulated aviation markets of Europe.

But these agreements are just one example of the work we're doing together to increase growth and prosperity for our people. As the world's two greatest exporting nations, Germany and the United States have a vital interest and are together playing a vital role in bringing down trade barriers and building the international marketplace of the 21st century. We helped to complete the Uruguay round, the most ambitious trade agreement of all time, which has already boosted the greatest export surge in our country's history. Our cooperation in the G–7 has helped the global economy to keep moving forward for the benefit of people all around the world.

Today I also salute the Chancellor for his bold budget and reform program. Strengthening Germany's finances and its capacity to grow and generate jobs will not only benefit the German people but also its many trading partners. Our economic cooperate is also making a difference in the daily lives of our citizens, but it has succeeded only because it has been backed by our security partnership as well, especially our security partnership in NATO, which has provided vital safety and stability for our nations for nearly 50 years.

Today we reviewed the process of NATO's enlargement. We reaffirmed that it is proceeding in a predictable and clear and deliberate way. Much as it did after World War II in Western Europe, NATO can provide an important shelter for the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe that share our values and are ready to bear the responsibilities of allies.

The success of the partnership of NATO in the IFOR mission in Bosnia demonstrates how the Alliance is adapting to the needs of our time. I especially want to thank the Chancellor for the truly historic decision to deploy 4,000 German troops to support the Bosnia peace agreement. Germany is shouldering its security responsibilities in the post-cold-war world, and we are all grateful for that.

As NATO grows, it must also develop a strong and positive relationship with Russia. The seeds for that partnership have already been sown in the partnership of Russian troops alongside our NATO units in Bosnia, where they have served together and served well, and in the Partnership For Peace exercises involving Russian and American troops here in the United States.

This is a moment of extraordinary opportunity. Not since the emergence of the modern nation-state have the prospects been so great for a free and undivided Europe, a cause so many Americans gave their lives for in this century. We will do all we can to see that this vision for Europe is realized. But no one, no one, has done more to make that vision real than Helmut Kohl. For that, the friends of freedom throughout the world are in his great debt.

Mr. Chancellor, welcome again to the United States, and the floor is yours.

Chancellor Kohl. Mr. President, dear Bill, ladies and gentlemen. Allow me to thank you, first of all, for this very warm reception. I would like to thank the Governor. I would like to thank the citizens of this city who in the streets welcomed us so warmly. And it has already been said that this is our first meeting outside of Washington.

And let me say that I immediately accepted the invitation to come to Milwaukee because this is, after all, a region that, as regards the history of the United States and the history of this State of Wisconsin, was in many ways one where German immigrants left their imprint. And I think it's a very good opportunity to be able to address the citizens of this State and of this region and to document once again how close the German-American relations have developed over the years. And let me say that I'm very, very pleased, and it warms my heart to be here.

The many talks that we've had this morning we will continue later on during the day and also later in the afternoon when we fly together to Washington. They document how close and intensive our relationship has developed. I think there are only few examples that I would be able to mention where politicians of countries

meet so often, so regularly, where they exchange letters and phone calls, and where their staff members cooperate in such a close and coordinated way. And obviously, we also have a very close, personal rapport. As has always been the case when we met, we covered a lot of ground. We discussed many issues, and we shall continue to do so.

We signed just now the protocol amending the aviation agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany. I think that this is a very important step for the future, in order to be able to improve the liberalization of air traffic. And this opens up, after all, access of German airlines to all American airports, and the same goes for American airlines in Germany.

This is a milestone, indeed, in the relationship between our two countries, and you mentioned this, Mr. President. And what is also obviously very important for us and what we think constitutes a very important step forward as regards aviation safety is the conclusion of the relevant agreement that was signed today as well. After all, we've seen a history of air crashes just recently, and these are instances where we as leaders ask ourselves, have we really done enough in order to make accidents like that impossible?

Now, this also underscores that we have a common position as regards free world trade. We think that goods and services should move freely between the countries of the world.

Let me just, by way of a brief introductory statement, make a few remarks on NATO. I think we should have time for questions, so I'll keep my remarks short.

Also, in view of what the President said of the former Yugoslavia, we, all of us, wish that what was agreed upon for this year will come true. We hope that—in the discussion going on on the international scene that people assume right from the start that this will be a failure—I think we should, all of us, try everything in order to make this come true, to make the agreements that were reached become reality.

From a German point of view, we as Germans continue to be interested in NATO fulfilling its role and being able to fulfill its role in this changed world after the collapse of communism, of the Communist empire. We think NATO does have a role to play in order to secure peace and freedom for the peoples of the world. And I think that we should do everything—we should use prudence and farsightedness and wisdom, and to bear in mind also the changes in the world of today, and that we should pursue a course that bears these changes in mind and addresses them.

Now, first steps have been taken as regards NATO in Paris. I think that this is a very positive development. I think in the days and months ahead, also as regards to security cooperation in Europe and generally speaking in the world, we will hold necessary talks with Russia and the Ukraine.

So, in a nutshell, ladies and gentlemen, I'm looking forward to my talks with Bill Clinton that will go on during the course of today. I should like to thank all of you for the very warm reception that I have been given.

President Clinton. Paul [Paul Basken, United Press International].

Legislative Agenda and the 1996 Election

Q. Mr. President, in recent days and weeks you've been asked about your support for a series of larger Republican initiatives that have seemed at odds or were criticized at being at odds with your previous positions, such as the gas tax, despite your strong environmental quality; such as the Helms-Burton bill, despite concerns expressed within your administration; such as the Wisconsin welfare plan, despite concerns it might actually hurt children. Is this basically election year positioning, or is this something more fundamental?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I dispute the way you characterized it. On the gas tax, what I said was that I far preferred that we spend our limited money in this budget to give tax relief to people for childrearing and for education but that if the Congress would pass a clean minimum wage that was tied to the gas tax, I would sign that. And I reiterated that.

What we have done to try to bring the price of gasoline down will be more effective in the modest release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and frankly, time will take care of this. We had a spike in the gas tax partly caused by the fact that we had a very tough winter and a lot of oil supplies were refined for home heating oil instead of gasoline.

Now, that's what I said on the gas tax. I reiterate that. I will do that; I will sign it if they will pass it with a clean minimum wage, and that's the price of getting the minimum wage increase in a clean way. But there are

far better ways to get tax relief to the American people.

On the Helms-Burton bill, I would remind you that the defense of freedom in Cuba is not a Republican issue. I came out for the Cuba Democracy Act before President Bush did in 1992. And I made it clear that we had some concerns about Helms-Burton, many of which were answered in the legislation, which gave me some flexibility there. And there was a big intervening event which gave us a clear signal about whether things had changed in Cuba or not. Two planes with American citizens on it were shot out of the sky in international waters. That didn't have anything to do with the election.

And finally, on the welfare issue, I don't see how any member of the American press corps could say that welfare reform is a Republican issue. Now, let me just give you a few facts here.

In 1980, when I was Governor of Arkansas—1980—I asked for and was granted permission to be one of the first States in the first Federal welfare reform experiment in the modern era. I helped to develop the Governors' position in the mid-eighties and helped to write the Family Support Act of 1988. Let's come to the present day. I have granted 61 approvals for State welfare reform experiments. President Bush granted 11; President Reagan granted 13.

Three-quarters of the American people on welfare are now under welfare reform experiments. We have moved to stiffen child support enforcement. The results have been pretty impressive. The welfare roles are down by 1.3 million; child support enforcement collections are up by 40 percent. I don't believe welfare reform is a partisan issue. It's certainly not out there in the country.

If you look at the 21 States where the welfare caseload has gone down—or the 13 States, or how many—I think there are 13 where—there are 21 States where the welfare caseload has gone down by 18 percent or more, 13 are governed by Republicans, 8 by Democrats, almost the exact ratio in the Governors Association as a whole. The State with the biggest drop in welfare caseload is Indiana, which has a Democratic Governor. This is not a partisan issue.

Now, the Republicans passed a bill that I vetoed. Does that mean they're for welfare reform and I'm not? No. Look at the Wisconsin plan—you mentioned the Wisconsin plan. The Wisconsin plan does three things that I think are very important. First of all, it says you got to work immediately, but we'll give you a job and we can use welfare money to subsidize private-sector jobs or to create community service jobs. I asked every Governor in the country to do just that when I spoke at the Governors' conference in Vermont quite a long while ago.

Secondly, it says, if you go to work, we won't ask you to hurt your children; we'll give you child care and health care. Now, it seems to me that those are elements that we all ought to be for. Now that is not what was in the Republican welfare reform bill. It was tough on kids and easy on work, and that's why I vetoed it.

All this election year rhetoric and posturing and gnashing of teeth, if you look beneath the rhetoric, the Republicans are moving toward the position I have advocated all along. And I'm encouraged by that. In the country, this is not a partisan issue. This does not have to be a partisan issue in Washington.

When Senator Dole was here Tuesday, he said some things which it seemed to me were very consistent with what I have said I would be glad to support. He said that he wanted a welfare plan that had tough work requirements, that had a 5-year lifetime benefit, that had no welfare benefits to illegal immigrants except in extreme circumstances, that had tough child support enforcement, more responsibility for teen mothers, and greater flexibility for States to reform welfare on their own. They could require drug testing, or as Texas does, they could require immunization.

Now, I am for all of that. Yesterday the House Republicans introduced a new plan that abandoned most of their extreme proposals. And these proposals—both some of what Senator Dole said and the House plan seem much closer to the bipartisan bills that are in the Senate and the House—the Castle-Tanner bill, the Breaux-Chafee bill that I have supported.

So here's what I'd like to say about it. If we can rely on the common sense of America about this, we ought to still pass Federal legislation. Even though three-quarters of the American people who are on welfare are under welfare reform, not all of them are. Even though the scholar for the American Enterprise Institute says in this week's edition of Business Week that I can justifiably claim to end welfare as

we know it—that's what he said—the truth is, we still need legislation.

So what I say is, this is Senator Dole's plan; I think what he ought to do is to pass this plan through the Congress before he leaves the Senate on June 11th, and I will sign it. And we will put this behind us. My attitude is, let her rip. If this is the plan, let's don't pollute it with a lot of poison pills. Pass this plan through the Congress before you retire on June 11th, and I will sign it. And it will be good for the country.

Chancellor.

Trade With Terrorist Nations

Q. Mr. President, could you comment on the legislature put forward to sanction European companies trading with Iran or Libya, and how did the Chancellor react on that? And do you see on that case any link, probably just morally, with the U.S. secretly allowing weapons being shipped into Bosnia by Iran?

President Clinton. First of all, there is no linkage. Our Congress passed a bill at one point prohibiting us from enforcing the arms embargo against Bosnia. And if you go back and look at the facts, what enabled the peace to be made in Bosnia? What made the Dayton agreement possible?

I would argue that there were two things: one, NATO's willingness to attack through the air, the aggression, the second, the Muslims and the Croats and their Federation began to win military victories on the ground.

The arms embargo had a one-sided effect. We did not violate it. There's a difference in not violating it and being mandated to enforce it. So the two things have no connection.

Now, this legislation that is working its way through the Congress has some provisions with flexibility in it that enables the President to take into account the national interests of the country in implementing it. But I have to tell you, we believe that there are a few countries in the world that all attempts to reason with have failed. And that's why this legislation is moving its way through the Congress. We will do everything we can to implement it in a way that is sensitive to the partnerships we have with our friends and the honest disagreements that we have.

I believe that Chancellor Kohl is as good a friend of freedom and as strong an enemy of terrorism as any democratic country has anywhere in the world. I believe that. And we had a discussion about it today. We are working on a number of things, and I think that's, at this moment, all I should say about it.

Same-Sex Marriages

Q. Mr. President, yesterday your Press Secretary said that you would sign a bill banning recognition of same-sex marriages. What do you say to those who feel that this discriminates against gays and lesbians? And how do you respond to the many gays who supported you who now feel betrayed?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, as I understand it, what the bill does—let's make it clear. As I understand it, what the bill does is to state that marriage is an institution between a man and a woman, that among other things, is used to bring children into the world. But the legal effect of the bill—as I understand it, the only legal effect of the bill is to make it clear that States can deny recognition of gay marriages that occurred in other States. And if that's all it does, then I will sign it.

Now, having said that, I do not favor discrimination against people because they're homosexual. And you asked me what I would say to gay Americans who may disagree with me about this issue; I'd say, "Look at my record. Name me another President who has been so pilloried for standing up for the fact that we shouldn't discriminate against any group of Americans, including gay Americans, who are willing to work hard, pay their taxes, obey the law, and be good citizens."

And let me just say, even though—I will sign this bill if that's what it does, and that's what I understand it does. This is hardly a problem that is sweeping the country. No State has legalized gay marriages. Only one State is considering it. We all know why this is in Washington now—it's one more attempt to divert the American people from the urgent need to confront our challenges together. That's really what's going on here. And I'm determined—this has always been my position on gay marriage. It was my position in '92. I told everybody who asked me about it, straight or gay, what my position was. I can't change my position on that; I have no intention of it.

But I am going to do everything I can to stop this election from degenerating into an attempt to pit one group of Americans against another. Every time we do that the American

people make a mistake. We are a better country than that. We're a greater country than that. And we ought not to do it, and I'm going to do what I can to stop it.

Who else is there? Chancellor, do you want to call on somebody?

Russian Elections

Q. I'd like to bring your guest, the Chancellor, into this discussion here and ask the two of you to give us some insight in how we should feel about what's going on in the Soviet Union. We have talked a lot about issues in our elections here. They have elections coming up there. They're very close to you, sir. How do you feel about that? How should we think about what is going to happen there? And what backing are you giving whom in that election?

Chancellor Kohl. Well, obviously, no one here is in a position to give any sort of safe, ironcast predictions as to what is going to happen. And I must say, I'm always a bit hesitant in such turbulent times—and I think if there ever were turbulent times in Russia, that is certainly going on now—I'm always hesitant in such times to rely on polls that try to make an attempt to clarify a little bit that sort of situation.

Well, the Russian people will now decide in two rounds of elections. My position is a very clear one. I support those political forces that pursue reform, that wish to open up Russia to the rest of the world, and that consider that to be a basic tenet of their policy. And I would support those who are pursuing a policy to build bridges, build bridges after all of the horrors that we have experienced, bridges to Europe but also to the United States of America and to the people of America.

And I think one simply will have to wait for the outcome of this election. I'm not one of those who reveres either of the candidates or any of the candidates as a sort of icon. I observe closely what is going on there, and I do hope—the outcome of that is I do hope that the present President will win the election.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

President Clinton. I would ask the American people and the German people to imagine how the world looks to the Russians. And I understand this has been a difficult period for them. They have freedom in a way they have never had it before. Their voice is controlling now in these elections, as it has been now in Duma elections and in one Presidential election already. But they have been through a traumatic experience, which has cost them great economic hardship. They have withdrawn their forces from Central and Eastern Europe, from the Baltics. They have downsized their defense dramatically.

So they are in the process of doing two things. They are in the process of stabilizing their democracy and regenerating their economy at home but also in redefining how they should relate to the rest of the world. And keep in mind, this is a country that not only has been through economic hardships but has also suffered in the 19th and 20th century two very traumatic invasions.

So the appeal of people who say, we can make it the way it used to be—even though I'm kind of with Will Rogers—do you remember what Will Rogers said about the good old days? "Don't tell me about them. They never was." But still there is that nostalgic appeal, and that's what's making this a tough, tight election in Russia.

The Chancellor and I have admired the way that President Yeltsin has continued to press forward to the future—and not always agreeing with us—trying to define a new system of greatness for the Russian people as well as trying to solidify democracy and bring back economic prosperity. And he and the other forces of reform in Russia, it seems to me, represent the future, and we hope the Russian people will vote for the future.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Partial Birth Abortion

Q. Mr. President, thank you. I want to give you an opportunity to respond to Senator Dole. The Senator in a speech today accused your administration of being without direction or moral vision, citing specifically your veto of the partial birth abortion ban which he said, quote, "pushed the limits of decency too far." Would you respond to that, sir? Thank you.

President Clinton. What would Senator Dole say to those five women who stood up there with me? They're five women of several hundred women every year who are told by their doctors that their babies, severely hydrocephalic, often without functioning brains, sometimes without even a brain in their skull, are going to die right before they're born or during birth or right afterward and that the only way those women can avoid serious physical damage, including losing the ability to ever bear further

children, is to reduce the size of the skull, the head of the baby before it's too late.

What would he say to the fact that at least two of those five women who were with me made it clear that they were pro-life, Catholic Republicans? That one of those women said she got down on her knees and prayed to God to take her life and let her child live? I am always a little skeptical when politicians piously proclaim their morality. He has to answer to those women.

All I asked the Republicans in Congress to do was to pass an exception for women who would face severe physical damage. And their answer was, "Oh, you want to give them exceptions so they can fit in their prom dress." That was the answer. Ads were run saying, "This is what the President wants. They'll be able to drive a truck through this exception."

Well, I know that those 500 or 1,000 women or however many there are a year—they're not many of them—they don't have an organized voice, and they don't have much influence at the election. And I know what appeal this partial birth abortion bill had because it appeals to me; I wanted to sign it. But the President is the only place in this system of ours where there is one person who can stand up for people with no voice, no power, who are going to be eviscerated. And two of those five women had already had other children. One of those women had adopted another child and was physically able to take care of it.

So before he or anybody else stands up and condemns the rest of us for our alleged lack of moral compass, he ought to say—he's looking at those women, and he said there was too much political support behind this; I did not want to be bothered by the facts; it's okay with me whatever—if they rip your body to shreds and you could never have another baby even though the baby you were carrying couldn't live. Now, I fail to see why his moral position is superior to the one I took.

And again, I'm telling you, why did this come up now in this way? Why wouldn't they accept that minor amendment? Why? Because they would rather have an issue than solve a problem. Some people live and breathe to divide the American people and keep them in a turmoil all the time. I work to calm the American people down, to lift their vision, to unite them, and to move them into the future. And I think when it's all said and done, that's what the American people will want to do.

Bosnian Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, Mr. Chancellor, what about a followup to IFOR, and will there be an American participation for a certain IFOR II next year? Thank you.

President Clinton. First of all, I think it's important that we stay on the timetable that has been established. One of the worst things that would happen is if we said that we were going to have an indefinite military presence there as it would slow down all the other efforts. It would slow down the effort to hold the elections on time. It would slow down the efforts to strengthen the Federation. It would slow down the reconstruction efforts and the efforts to create in Bosnia the conditions in which the refugees can return from Germany and other places.

And by the way, I want to thank the Chancellor and thank the German people for the extraordinary financial sacrifice they have undertaken in order to provide a decent home for those refugees who were driven out of Bosnia.

So, for me, it's important to stay on the timetable because otherwise the people involved in economic reconstruction or political reform and all the other aspects of the Dayton agreement will, I think, inevitably, be more likely to get off track. Now, we're going to watch this very closely and see the developments unfold. But I am convinced that we have to continue to try to work within this timetable.

One of the great tragedies of this whole endeavor, as you know, from the American point of view, was the crash of the airplane carrying Secretary Ron Brown and many American business leaders. We're reestablishing that trade mission now. We're going to go back to Bosnia. We're going to try to get some things going there sooner rather than later. And I think that ought to be the feeling that we all have. We should be driven by a sense of urgency to complete the tasks of the Dayton agreement.

Chancellor, would you like answer?

Chancellor Kohl. I would like to say very clearly at this point in time that I completely agree with President Clinton's position. I think it would be a very grave mistake, and it's something that you can see sometimes on the international scene, that people don't speak enough about what is necessary now, what has to be done now. People think too much about what

we should do once the year is over and expectations have not been fulfilled.

But this is a very critical kind of challenge, a very crucial kind of challenge is obvious to all of us. And that we have to do everything in order to attain this goal that we have set for ourselves is equally clear. I think whoever thinks that problems will become smaller when we extend the timeframe, is under an illusion. We have assumed responsibility now. We have devolved this responsibility on the people there. Just think of the elections. And I think we to do everything in order to maintain pressure by the international community and to make it very clear to all of those in the country itself who want to shed the responsibility that we shall not allow this.

Let me at this point take up what the President said on the German contribution, and let me thank him for what he said on this. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm not complaining about the money that we have earmarked for this purpose, but in Germany right now we have 350,000 refugees from that civil war in former Yugoslavia, which is more than double the number that any other European country has absorbed. And the German taxpayer has paid about 10 billion deutsche mark over these few years in order to assist those refugees.

Now, I'm not talking about us wanting to have this money back, not at all. I only think it doesn't really make sense that this money that we have to spend for caring for these refugees should be spent in Germany. We should take it, I think, and use it in those villages and towns that have been deserted by the refugees, these villages and towns that are partly destroyed. And I think we should use this money in order to give them—to allow them to buy materials for construction, timber, bricks, cement, and give some of it also for free, so as to enable people to rebuild their home.

I must say I see it with great concern, every year, that these refugees are not able to return to their home. There is a certain degree of uprootedness that is spreading, particularly among the children of those refugees. And those people who, after all, have launched this terrible war and this terrible campaign and have waged a war of ethnic cleansing, that they should be proved right, that their achievements should, so to speak, come true in the end, that is an intolerable thought for me. And this is why I support the President and others in us trying to keep within the timetable and trying to achieve what we wanted to.

President Clinton. Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President's 123d news conference began at 11:45 a.m. at City Hall. Chancellor Kohl spoke in German, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks to the Community in Milwaukee

May 23, 1996

Whoa! Thank you, Jasmine, and thank you, J.P. Weren't they great? [*Applause*] Those kids were great. Thank you. Governor Thompson, County Executive Ament, Mayor Norquist, Attorney General Doyle, ladies and gentlemen. Chancellor Kohl and I are delighted to be here. We thank the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin for a wonderful, wonderful welcome.

I want to also say a special word of thanks to the Rufus King High School Marching Band that played our national anthem and those who performed before us, the Alta Kameraden Band, the choir Mosbach, from Mosbach, Germany, and the Milwaukee High School for the Arts Jazz Ensemble. Thank you all.

I was asked to say that Senator Feingold and Senator Kohl wanted to be here, but they had to stay in Washington to vote on the budget. Chancellor Kohl is trying to find some way of being related to Senator Kohl; he thinks he will inherit half of the basketball team if he does. [*Laughter*] We are researching the records even as I speak. [*Laughter*] Congressman Barrett and Representative Kleczka also had to stay behind because they wanted a chance to vote on an increase in the minimum wage for the people of Milwaukee.

I want to say also a special word of thanks to the people who run the German immersion school. It's the only public elementary school in our country where the entire curriculum is taught in German. They won a blue ribbon award from the Department of Education and, as you can see, my German is a little rustier than theirs is, but I thought the children were *wirklich wunderbar.* They were terrific, and I believe we should congratulate them.

Just 2 years ago, when Hillary and I were in Germany, Helmut and Hannelore Kohl opened their home to us. World leaders don't often get to visit in each other's homes, and I thought that there ought to be something I could do to kind of repay his extraordinary hospitality. So I thought he ought to have a chance, after 23 trips to Washington, DC, to come to a place where he could get some really great bratwurst, where everywhere he turns around there's a sign with a German name on it, and where he could feel at home in America's most German-American city. So thank you, Milwaukee, for making him feel so welcome.

My fellow Americans, we stand on the verge of the greatest age of possibility in all human history. Because of the advances in technology, the arrival of the information age, the end of the cold war, the emergence of a global society, there are enormous opportunities for people to live in peace and prosperity, for Americans, for Germans, for people all around the world.

But if we want to seize those opportunities, we must decide that we are going to be united with our friends all around the world, with friends like Germany—and America has no better friend than Germany—and we have to decide that amidst all of our diversities in the United States we're going to be united here, too, one Nation under God, reaching across the lines of race and region and income to grow and go forward together as one American family.

As I look out on this vast crowd today, I see a picture of America, all different kinds of people, different races, different religions, bound together by the American creed. And I thank you for that. I want my fellow Americans to know that the United States has no better friend anywhere in the world than Germany and especially the Chancellor of Germany, Helmut Kohl. I am grateful to him, and all of us should be.

And I want the German Chancellor to know that America has no better example of a State committed to reach out to the rest of the world than the State of Wisconsin, a State which is making the new global economy work for its citizens. You know, J.P. Tucker and Jasmine, they reminded me, with their German, that a century ago—listen to this—a century ago half a million American children learned German in their elementary schools. New York, which had the second largest population of any city in the world, and Chicago had the eighth largest, and Milwaukee was, even then, the most German city in our Nation. There, every third citizen here was born on the other side of the ocean.

So when you hear Jasmine Brantley and J.P. Tucker, remember that they are recapturing a sense of our being involved with other countries, which we once took for granted. A hundred years ago we knew we were a nation of immigrants. And a hundred years later, we dare not forget it.

The German immigrants who helped to build cities across our land, founded our Nation's businesses, including some that made Milwaukee famous: Pabst and Blatz and Schlitz. More importantly, they made our communities successful with their strong families and their hard work. But it's important to remember that when the Germans and the other immigrants came here a hundred years ago, they faced new, enormous challenges. They arrived at a time of dramatic change, when our country was just moving from an age of agriculture to an age of industry; when more people, finally, were living in cities than were living in the rural areas; when instead of rising to the sun, they woke to a factory whistle. That was a very different time, the time that our grandparents and our great-grandparents brought to America. But it led to the enormous prosperity that the American people enjoyed in the 20th century.

I ask you to think about this time, at the dawn of another new century, just as we now know a century ago Americans thought about it. Yes, we have a lot of challenges. Yes, we have economic challenges. Yes, we have social challenges. Yes, we have challenges around the world. But this country is stronger economically. It is facing its social problems. It is trying to come together around the basic ideas of work and family and community. And this is a safer world than it was just a few years ago.

And one reason is, we have enjoyed a remarkable alliance with Germany for 50 long years, achieving unparalleled security and prosperity.

And let me say that Helmut Kohl, as the first Chancellor of a free and unified Germany, is a symbol of that success.

With Germany and our other allies in NATO, we are working to let peace take hold in the former Yugoslavia; to give the Muslims, the Croats, and the Serbs the chance to try to come together in the way we Americans are trying to come together; to say to each other, "You cannot define your life by who you hate; you must be willing to lay down your hatreds and work together for a better, brighter future." That is the future we have fought for at home. That is the future Germany and the United States are fighting for in Bosnia.

Thanks to the support of Germany and the United States for freedom and for free economic systems in Russia, we have taken a giant step back from the nuclear precipice. We are destroying two-thirds of all the nuclear weapons that existed at the height of the cold war. And today, for the first time since the drawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian nuclear weapons pointed at the people of the United States or American weapons pointed at the people of Russia.

Thanks to the efforts of the United States and Germany, as much as any other two nations in the world, we are creating a system of global trading opportunities where trade will be not only free but fair. And I congratulate and thank the Chancellor today for signing an open skies agreement with the United States. We will be the first two great nations to have completely open freedom in the air routes between Germany and the United States. Anybody that wants to come up with a route can do so, and the American people can go back and forth more cheaply. And the German people can do so as well. So, Governor Thompson, maybe a year from now, we can have 100,000 Germans here in Milwaukee instead of just one or two.

And again I want to say to Chancellor Kohl, the people of Wisconsin deserve a lot of credit for taking advantage of these changes. Exports from Wisconsin have grown 39 percent over the last 3 years, faster than the rest of our country and the greatest export surge in our history. That is creating a 110,000 jobs in Wisconsin, including 18,000 brand new ones. Unemployment in this State is only 3.7 percent. And most important, we know that when we can tie jobs to exports, they tend to pay better and to provide a better living for the families of the people who are working there.

I want to say, too, that we thank Germany for buying Wisconsin products. Wisconsin companies with names like Harnischfeger and Miller are bringing their products to Germany, the country their founders left more than a century ago. People moved here, sending the stuff back home; the marks come back to America in the form of dollars. Sounds like a pretty good deal to me.

We also want to thank the German investors who have invested their money here and put the people of Wisconsin to work. We thank them again for building a global economy of prosperity and freedom. And finally, we thank Wisconsin for its willingness to experiment in many areas of our national life that need improvement, to find ways to put people from welfare to work, to lower the crime rate, to deal with the problem of growing the economy while preserving the incredible, beautiful natural environment that the people of Wisconsin enjoy. These are the challenges that all of us have to face in the years ahead.

Let me say again in closing my remarks that it is important that every American know that if you look ahead at the opportunities the world will bring us, we cannot seize those opportunities alone. If we want to trade with other nations, it takes two to tango. Germany and the United States are the greatest trading nations in the world, and we have to lead the fight for fair and free trade. If we want to deal with the challenges of terrorism and drug running and weapons smuggling and the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons and global environmental threats where Helmut Kohl has been very outspoken, we cannot do this alone. If you want your children to have a system in which everybody who will work can have an opportunity and a system in which we can solve the new security problems of the 21st century, we cannot do it alone. The United States has to have friends and allies, and we have no better friend and ally anywhere in the world than Helmut Kohl of Germany, my friend, and I thank him for being here today.

And thank you all. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1 p.m. in the Pere Marquette Park. In his remarks, he referred to German Immersion School students, Jasmine Brantley, who introduced the President, and John

(J.P.) Tucker, who introduced Chancellor Helmut Kohl; Gov. Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin; Thomas Ament, Milwaukee County executive; Mayor John O. Norquist of Milwaukee; Attorney General James Doyle of Wisconsin.

Statement on House of Representatives Action on Minimum Wage Legislation

May 23, 1996

I commend the House for responding to my challenge and voting to give millions of America's hardest workers a raise.

A bipartisan majority rejected the efforts of the Republican leadership and recognized that raising the minimum wage is the right thing to do. You can't raise a family on $4.25 an hour.

I am also pleased that the House rejected an effort to defraud the American people with a provision that would have eliminated the minimum wage altogether, as well as overtime protections, for workers hired at fully two-thirds of American businesses. For millions of American workers, this hoax would actually have meant lower wages and even a return to sweatshop conditions.

Senator Dole should bring the minimum wage to the Senate floor for a clean up-or-down vote before he leaves office. That is the way to honor our values of work, family, opportunity, and responsibility.

Statement on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Report on Adolescent Tobacco Use

May 23, 1996

Regarding the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Report: "Tobacco Use and Usual Source of Cigarettes Among High School Students—United States, 1995:"

Today's report is disturbing proof that more and more young teenagers are becoming lifelong smokers and too little is being done to prevent illegal tobacco sales to them. The significant increase in smoking among young African-American men is of particular concern.

Parents and communities need tough and enforceable measures to combat the easy access and appeal of cigarettes to children. My administration remains committed to preventing adolescent decisions from becoming lifelong addictions. I ask all Americans to support strong measures that will effectively address the growing problem of tobacco use by our children.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Proposed Retirement Savings Legislation

May 23, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for the consideration of the Congress the "Retirement Savings and Security Act." This legislation is designed to empower all Americans to save for their retirement by expanding pension coverage, increasing portability, and enhancing security. By using both employer and individual tax-advan-

taged retirement savings programs, Americans can benefit from the opportunities of our changing economy while assuring themselves and their families greater security for the future. A general explanation of the Act accompanies this transmittal.

Today, over 58 million American public and private sector workers are covered by employer-sponsored pension or retirement savings plans. Millions more have been able to save through Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs). The Retirement Savings and Security Act would help expand pensions to the over 51 million American private-sector workers—including over three-quarters of the workers in small businesses—who are not covered by an employer-sponsored pension or retirement savings program and need both the opportunity and encouragement to start saving. Women particularly need this expanded coverage: fewer than one-third of all women retirees who are 55 or older receive pension benefits, compared with 55 percent of male retirees.

The Act would also help the many workers who participate in pension plans to continue to save when they change jobs. It would reassure all workers who save through employer-sponsored plans that the money they have saved, as well as that put aside by employers on their behalf, will be there when they need it.

The Retirement Savings and Security Act would:

- Establish a simple new small business 401(k)-type plan—the National Employee Savings Trust (NEST)—and simplify complex pension laws. The NEST is specifically designed to ensure participation by low- and moderate-wage workers, who will be able to save up to $5,000 per year tax-deferred, plus receive employer contributions toward retirement. The Act would encourage employers of all sizes to cover employees under retirement plans, and it would enable employers to put more money into benefits and less into paying lawyers, accountants, consultants, and actuaries.
- Increase the ability of workers to save for retirement from their first day on the job by removing barriers to pension portability. In particular, employers would be encouraged no longer to require a 1-year wait before employees can contribute to their pension plans. The Federal Government would set the example for other employers by allowing its new employees to begin saving through the Thrift Savings Plan when they are hired, rather than having to wait up to a year. In addition, the Act would reduce from 10 to 5 years the time those participating in multiemployer plans—union plans where workers move from job to job—must work to receive vested benefits. It would also help ensure that returning veterans retain pension benefits and that workers receive their retirement savings even when a previous employer is no longer in existence.
- Expand eligibility for tax-deductible IRAs to 20 million more families. In addition, the Act would encourage savings by making the use of IRAs more flexible by allowing penalty-free withdrawals for education and training, purchase of a first home, catastrophic medical expenses, and long-term unemployment. It would also provide an additional IRA option that provides tax-free distributions instead of tax-deductible contributions.
- Enhance pension security by protecting the savings of millions of State and local workers from their employer's bankruptcy, as happened in Orange County, California. The Act would (1) require prompt reporting by plan administrators and accountants of any serious and egregious misuse of funds; (2) double the guaranteed benefit for participants in multiemployer plans in the unlikely event such a plan becomes insolvent; and (3) enhance benefits of a surviving spouse and dependents under the Civil Service Retirement System and the Railroad Retirement System.
- Ensure that pension raiding, such as that which drained $20 billion out of retirement funds in the 1980s, never happens again—by retaining the strong current laws preventing such abuses and by requiring periodic reports on reversions by the Secretary of Labor.

Many of the provisions of the Retirement Savings and Security Act are new. In particular, provisions facilitating saving from the first day on the job, in both the private sector and the Federal Government; the doubling of the multiemployer guarantee; and improving benefits for

surviving spouses and dependents of participants in the Civil Service Retirement System and the Railroad Retirement System deserve special consideration by the Congress. In addition, many of the provisions and concepts in this Act have been previously proposed by this Administration and have broad bipartisan support.

American workers deserve pension security—as well as a decent wage, lifelong access to high quality education and training, and health security—to take advantage of the opportunities of our growing economy.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislative proposal by the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 23, 1996.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Deployment of United States Forces in the Central African Republic

May 23, 1996

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

On May 19, 1996, heavy fighting broke out between government forces and mutinous troops in the capital city of Bangui, Central African Republic. Early reports suggested that some 200–500 renegade soldiers were firing weapons, including rockets and artillery, and that they had called for troops from outside the capital to join them in the mutiny. During the fighting, prison guards reportedly abandoned their posts and prisoners were observed loitering around the prison. Although neither the American Embassy nor American citizens have been directly targeted, heavy fighting has been reported around the American Embassy, which has sustained some damage from stray rounds. At one point, government forces indicated an intention to assault a rebel stronghold very near the Embassy, but were dissuaded by the Ambassador.

On May 20, due to the rapidly deteriorating security situation and the resultant threat to American citizens and the Embassy, I ordered the deployment of U.S. military personnel to provide enhanced security for the American Embassy in Bangui and to conduct the evacuation from the Central African Republic of private U.S. citizens and certain U.S. Government employees. Approximately 32 U.S. Marines entered the capital city in the early morning hours on May 21 and immediately took up positions in and around the American Embassy compound. They also deployed to the international airport in order to assist in processing evacuees and act as liaison with French military forces already positioned there. Evacuation operations began later that day, involving a U.S. KC–130 cargo aircraft operating into Yaounde, Cameroon. Further evacuation flights are planned. Additional U.S. forces may also be deployed in order to provide a means of safe passage for evacuees to the airport and to provide additional security at the American Embassy if required.

The marines involved in this operation are from the Marine Expeditionary Unit currently operating off Liberia. Although U.S. forces are equipped and prepared to defend American lives and property, I do not anticipate that they will become involved in hostilities. U.S. forces will redeploy as soon as evacuation operations are complete and enhanced security at the American Embassy is no longer required.

I have taken this action pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. I appreciate the support of the Congress in this action to protect American citizens and the American Embassy in Bangui.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 23, 1996.

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Sanctions Against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)
May 24, 1996

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

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), as expanded to address the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, is to continue in effect beyond May 30, 1996.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on May 30, 1992, of a national emergency and to the expansion of that emergency on October 25, 1994, have not been resolved. On November 22, 1995, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1022, immediately and indefinitely suspending economic sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) in view of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (the "Peace Agreement") initialled by the Presidents of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Republic of Croatia in Dayton, Ohio, on November 21, 1995, and signed by the parties in Paris on December 14, 1995. On December 27, 1995, I issued Presidential Determination No. 96–7, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend the application of sanctions imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). These sanctions were suspended on January 16, 1996. Sanctions imposed on the Bosnian Serbs were subsequently suspended on May 10, 1996.

These suspended sanctions will not be terminated, however, until the Peace Agreement has been fully implemented through the occurrence of free and fair elections in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and provided that the Bosnian Serb forces have continued to respect the zones of separation as provided in the Peace Agreement. Assets blocked pursuant to the sanctions also remain blocked until claims and encumbrances involving those assets can be addressed. Until the peace process is fully implemented, this situation continues to pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy interests, and the economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to reimpose economic pressure on the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control if either fail significantly to meet their obligations under the Peace Agreement.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The notice is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

The President's Radio Address
May 25, 1996

Good morning. This weekend all across our country we gather to observe Memorial Day. Over this weekend we honor Americans from all our wars who died while defending our Nation. These brave men and women gave their tomorrows so that we might live in freedom.

We must vow to uphold the ideals they died for and make our country great, an America free and strong, a force for peace and progress, a land of tolerance and opportunity for all.

Many of you will come together as families and friends to place a wreath on a grave, to proudly march in a parade, to tell tales of service and sacrifice that are so much the story of our Nation. From the Revolutionary War to the Civil War, from the World Wars to Korea, Vietnam, Desert Storm, and the other conflicts in our history, all remind us that all of our people have given a lot in the military to protect the land we love.

Now we have the responsibility to build a future worthy of their sacrifice. We must make sure that America enters the 21st century as the greatest force on Earth for peace and freedom. Today, the men and women of America's Armed Forces are the best trained, best equipped, best prepared in the world, and I am determined to keep them that way. This is the surest guarantee of our security and freedom.

Whether safeguarding the border between North and South Korea, rescuing Americans in Liberia, helping the people of Bosnia to uphold the peace they chose, all around the world our troops stand sentry on liberty's front lines. Today we salute our men and women in uniform and the families who support them. We are proud of them and grateful for their service.

Our troops are the backbone of the American leadership that is the source of strength at home and our success around the world. Whether preventing conflict in the Persian Gulf, reducing the nuclear threat as we have done in North Korea, working with other nations to fight common dangers like terrorism, drug trafficking, and organized crime, strengthening our alliances in Asia and Europe, or isolating rogue nations like Libya and Iraq, steady, strong American leadership is making our people safer and the world more secure.

We also must uphold our Nation's leadership in the powerful global movement for democracy and peace. Today, more than ever and more than any other nation, America can help to push aside obstacles and point the way to peace. From the Middle East to Northern Ireland, from Haiti to Bosnia, we are helping millions of people embrace a future of hope. If we continue to make good on their trust, we can build an even brighter future for our own people and for the world.

We owe many debts to those who gave all they had to defend America's security and values around the world. But we know that to truly fulfill our debts, we must build the American dream here at home, too. Our troops deserve an America with strong families, safe streets, good schools, clean air and water. Even as we balance our budget, my administration is working to keep our solemn commitment to America's veterans by improving the health care they receive, protecting the benefits they've earned, and making sure they have a fair shot at decent jobs and good homes.

Our commitment to our veterans must be the same as our commitment to all Americans, to give them the chance to make the most of their own lives. Generations of service men and women have fought and died for a common ideal, an America that offers opportunity for all, demands responsibility from all, that comes together as a community around the values we share.

On this Memorial Day, let us honor their sacrifice. Let us resolve to keep our America the strongest nation in the world and the world's strongest force for peace and freedom. And let us each do our part to keep the American dream alive.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. The Memorial Day proclamation of May 24 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at a Memorial Day Ceremony in Arlington, Virginia
May 27, 1996

Thank you. General Foley, Chaplain O'Keefe——

[*At this point, a car alarm sounded.*]

That's a new form of honors there. [*Laughter*] Secretary Brown, Deputy Secretary White, General Ralston, the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Let me say a special word of thanks to Mr. Jack Metzler for all the work he has done on this magnificent cemetery and for the work that he and others have done to get the amphitheater ready again this year for a reopening. It is an extraordinarily beautiful place of honor for those who have served in our Armed Forces.

To all the members of the Armed Forces who are here, to the distinguished leaders of our veterans organizations, to all of you who are veterans and your families, my fellow Americans: We come together this morning, as we do every year, to honor those who gave their lives so that future generations of Americans might live in freedom. All across our wonderful country, in crowded cities and country towns, America bows its head today in thanks to our fallen heroes. With flags at half-mast, with flowers on a grave, with colorful parades, with quiet prayers, we take this time to remember their achievements and renew our commitment to their ideals.

Here on this peaceful hillside, the silent rows of headstones tell tales of service and sacrifice that are so much the story of our Nation. Here lies the spirit that has guided our country for more than 200 years now, nurses and drummer boys, scouts and engineers, warriors and peacemakers, joined by a shared devotion to defend our Nation, protect our freedom, keep America strong and proud.

As we honor the brave sacrifices in battle that grace our Nation's history, let us also remember to honor those who served in times of peace, who preserve the peace, protect our interests, and project our values. Though they are the best trained, best equipped military in the world, they, too, face their share of dangers.

Less than 3 weeks ago, two Marine Corps helicopters collided at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. Fourteen fine young Americans were killed, one from the Army, one from the Navy, 12 from the Marine Corps. We have lost more than 200 of our service men and women in training accidents or in the course of regular duty since last Memorial Day. And though we work hard on safety, the work they do defending us has inherent dangers, and about that many Americans in uniform give their lives for our freedom every single year. These sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers, they are American heroes too, and we are all in their debt.

On this special day, we pay our respects to all who gave their lives for America. We know our country is strong and great today because of them. We know to honor their truly extraordinary sacrifice, we must all resolve to keep the United States the world's leading force for peace and security, for prosperity and freedom. And we know that now, as ever, the burden of doing this job weighs heavily upon our men and women in uniform.

All around the world, from Korea to the Central African Republic, from the shores of Liberia to the skies over Iraq, our troops are standing watch on liberty's front lines. Their strength and skill gave the people of Haiti a chance to reclaim their democracy and their dreams. They stopped the slaughter of innocents in Bosnia and now are giving people exhausted by war the chance to create a lasting peace there for themselves, to restore stability to Europe, and in so doing, to make the future more secure for all the rest of us as well.

On this Memorial Day, let us draw inspiration from the spirit that surrounds us, to give those who still defend our freedom and security in the military today the support they need and deserve to fulfill their important mission. And let us remember, as we stand on the eve of a bright new century, the origins of this commemoration. The practice of honoring America's fallen began near the close of the Civil War, the deadliest and most divisive conflict our Nation has ever known. Today is a time to remember what joins us as one America.

Consider the service of just five brave Americans who have recently been buried in this hallowed ground: Marine Corporal Erik Kirkland, who dreamed of becoming an officer and was

killed in a helicopter accident earlier this month at Camp Lejeune; a brilliant member of my staff, Air Force Colonel Nelson Drew, who perished in Bosnia last August while working to end the suffering and the slaughter; a proud Army veteran, our Commerce Secretary Ron Brown, who was taken from us last month on a foggy mountainside in Croatia as he was leading a mission of peace and hope to restore a broken land; and in that terrible crash, we also lost Tech Sergeant Cheryl Ann Turnage, a member of the Air Force crew who hoped to pursue a career in law; and just last week, we said goodbye to the Navy's fiercest champion and most beloved sailor, Admiral Mike Boorda. These five were very different in their backgrounds and in their service. But they were joined in their love for America. Their lives reflect the spirit of our democracy, the strength of our diversity, the energy and opportunity that make our country so great.

We are descendants of a common creed, one Nation, under God; partners with a common purpose, to keep our Nation free and strong, a force for peace and progress, a place where people who work hard and take responsibility have the chance to make the most of their own lives, build good, strong families, and live out their dreams in dignity and peace.

May God bless the souls of our departed and always bless the country they gave everything to serve.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:31 a.m. in the amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. Robert F. Foley, USA, Commanding General, and Lt. Col. Joseph L. O'Keefe, USA, Deputy Command Chaplain, U.S. Army Military District of Washington; Gen. Joseph W. Ralston, USAF, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and John Metzler, Superintendent, Arlington National Cemetery. The Memorial Day proclamation of May 24 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks Announcing Agent Orange-Related Disability Benefits for Vietnam Veterans and an Exchange With Reporters

May 28, 1996

Mr. Vice President, thank you very much for your very moving remarks and your support of this endeavor. Secretary Brown, thank you for your service to our country in so many ways and especially for your work at the Veterans Administration, along with Deputy Secretary Hershel Gober and the others who are here. Senator Robb, Congressman Evans, and to Members of Congress who are not here, including Senator Daschle who worked so hard on this issue; to the Vietnam veterans who are here and all others who are concerned about this matter:

This is an important day for the United States to take further steps to ease the suffering our Nation unintentionally caused its own sons and daughters by exposing them to Agent Orange in Vietnam. For over two decades Vietnam veterans made the case that exposure to Agent Orange was injuring and killing them long before they left the field of battle, even damaging their children.

For years, the Government did not listen. With steps taken since 1993, and the important step we are taking today, we are showing that America can listen and act. I'm announcing that Vietnam veterans with prostate cancer and the neurological disorder peripheral neuropathy are entitled to disability payments based upon their exposure to Agent Orange. Our administration will also propose legislation to meet the needs of veterans' children afflicted with the birth defect spina bifida—the first time the offspring of American soldiers will receive benefits for combat-related health problems.

From the outset, we have pressed hard for answers about the effects of Agent Orange and other chemicals used to kill vegetation during the war in Vietnam. Once we had those answers, we've looked for practical ways to ease the pain of Americans who have already sacrificed so much for their country.

Soon after I took office, the National Academy of Sciences completed a study on the long-

term health effects of Agent Orange. The Veterans Administration, under Secretary Brown's leadership, moved immediately to compensate and treat veterans with illnesses that the National Academy found were associated with Agent Orange.

First we added two diseases, Hodgkin's disease and a liver disorder, to the list of ailments recognized as being associated with exposure to Agent Orange. Then Secretary Brown created a full task force to look into the National Academy of Sciences report in more detail. Acting on its recommendations, I approved disability payments to Vietnam veterans suffering from respiratory cancers and multiple myeloma. Finally, we asked the National Academy of Sciences to focus on the link between Agent Orange and other conditions, including prostate cancer, peripheral neuropathy, and spina bifida in the children of Vietnam veterans. Today's actions reflect the National Academy's most recent findings.

I want to commend the National Academy of Sciences and its Institute of Medicine for their extraordinary service to our Vietnam veterans. They reached out to the best doctors and scientists in America for the answers to the hard questions about Agent Orange. Just as important, they reached out to our Vietnam veterans to give them full voice in their work.

I want to praise the determination of Secretary Brown, who time and time again has turned reports into actions. And there is no better example than his work on Agent Orange.

Finally, I want to thank my longtime friend Admiral Zumwalt. America's Vietnam veterans have had no greater champion. You heard him outline—in ways that reflected well on the President, but should have reflected well on the proselytizing of Admiral Zumwalt—[*laughter*]—over 10 years of effort to make sure that someone he never imagined would be President at least knew about the issue of Agent Orange. No one has done more to keep the spotlight on Agent Orange. No one has done more to demand that all of us do better by our veterans. No one knows more and has shown more what it means to take personal responsibility for our actions.

Admiral, every single American with a heart and a soul to love this country is in your debt today, and we thank you.

I also want to thank the Members of Congress, two of whom are here, especially those who served in Vietnam, who are strong and healthy but who have not forgotten those with whom they served, for never letting this issue go.

These actions show that our country can face up to the consequences of our actions; that we will bear responsibility for the harm we do, even when the harm is unintended; that we will continue to honor those who served our country and gave so much.

Nothing we can do will ever fully repay the Vietnam veterans for all they gave and all they lost, particularly those who have been damaged by Agent Orange. But we must never stop trying. The veterans never stopped taking every step they could for America; now it is our turn to do what we should do. We can and will go the extra step for them.

And again I say today, every person involved in this decision has served our country well and honored our veterans and their sacrifice. I thank them all. And I thank you for coming. Thank you very much.

Thank you all very much. What did you say?

Israeli Elections

Q. Are you pulling for Prime Minister Peres and the Labor Party tomorrow?

The President. I knew I shouldn't have come back. [*Laughter*] I think we all recognize—very briefly—I think we all recognize that that election tomorrow is a very important election for the future of Israel and the future of the Middle East. Israel is a great democracy and the people are fully capable of making their own judgments.

The United States supports the peace process, and we have made it clear that if further steps are taken that entail risks for peace, we will stand with the Government and the people of Israel, the leaders of Israel in minimizing those risks. We will do everything we possibly can to do it. But that is the important thing that I want the people of Israel to know.

They have to make the decision of whether they want to pursue the peace process or not; that is their decision. We believe, ultimately, it's the only way to bring peace and security, and we want both peace and security. I think that's what they all want. I think that's why the race is so close.

But I can tell you this: If they decide to stay on the path of peace, we will share the risk; we will do what we can to minimize the risk. They can make the decision. Whatever de-

cision they make, we obviously—all countries—will accept and respect. But if they decide to stay with peace, we will do what we can to make sure they can have security as well.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:22 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., USN (Ret.), former Chief of Naval Operations.

Remarks on the Verdict in the McDougal-Tucker Trial and an Exchange With Reporters

May 28, 1996

The President. I'd like to make a brief statement about the jury verdict in Arkansas today. First of all, the jury has completed its work, and they obviously worked for quite a long time and debated this thoroughly and tried to make a good decision. So I think we should all accept that.

Obviously, on a personal level, I'm very sorry for Governor Tucker and Jim and Susan McDougal. But the jury has decided. I was asked to give testimony; I did that. And for me, it's time to go back to work. That's what I intend to do.

Q. Do you think Governor Tucker should resign?

The President. I don't want to comment on that. I think those questions have to be resolved by the people involved and in terms of what their other options are. I don't want to comment on that.

I just think that this is a day for saying that these jurors worked a long time; they were out for an extended period of time; they reached their verdict. And as I said, for me it's more of a personal thing today. I'm very sorry for them personally. But I did what I was asked to do, and now I've got to go back to work. That's what I intend to do.

Q. Sir, do you think this is a repudiation of your statements?

Q. Did the jurors not believe you, sir? Did the jurors not believe you?

The President. You ought to ask them that. I doubt that; I doubt that that's what was going on. But you ought to ask them. I don't know.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:20 p.m. on the North Driveway at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to trial codefendants Gov. Jim Guy Tucker of Arkansas and James and Susan McDougal. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Honoring Blue Ribbon Schools

May 29, 1996

Thank you so much. Secretary Riley, thank you for the wonderful job that you do and your clear, strong voice for education. Mr. Vice President, thank you for the work you have done in advancing our technology initiative. I forgive you for mentioning all those Tennessee schools. [*Laughter*] We're always doing this. You know, there's a school from Arkansas here—from Bentonville, Arkansas. And I have spoken at the high school graduation there more than once. Now, have you spoken at all those Tennessee schools' graduation? [*Laughter*] We'll do this for 3 or 4 more days until—[*laughter*].

And I want to say to Jill Mahler how very much we appreciate not only the excellent work being done in your school—and I think I—they are so proud of her, I think I'd like to ask the representatives from Mainland High School in Daytona Beach to stand up here, and thank you very much. [*Applause*] Thank you.

But it also reminds us that teaching and learning are a lot more than technology. And this

fine young lady is also the captain of her cross-country team and obviously very well-spoken. And we were honored to have her here on the stage with us today to remind us about what all these endeavors are truly all about.

In Mainland High School, which is, as Jill said, a model technology school, the students can actually download images from satellites from the space shuttle, from weather satellites. I wish they had downloaded better weather for us today. [*Laughter*] But nonetheless, it's an exciting prospect to think about what young people are doing.

Let me say to all of you here in the Blue Ribbon schools, from all across America, you are, as the Secretary said, a living textbook of the best lessons American education has to offer. I am filled with hope as I look around this tent; there's not a classroom problem anywhere in America that somebody somewhere hasn't solved. In the 21st century, America must have—must have—the best-educated citizens in the world. If we keep doing what you are doing, that is exactly what we will have.

One of the things that has always perplexed me, having spent a great deal of time in public school classrooms in the 12 years I served as Governor of my State and since I've been President, going around the country, is that we don't do enough learning from each other. So Secretary Riley makes all the Blue Ribbon schools work when they come up here and learn from each other. But it is a model that I think if that were followed in every other State, every State in our country across this great land, we'd have even more rapid improvements in education.

I also want to point out that today this ceremony is honoring not just a single student or even a single teacher but entire schools and the communities that sustain them. The Blue Ribbon Awards are rooted in the belief that schools work only if everyone does his or her part, if principals set high standards, if teachers teach well, if students work and learn, if parents and other community leaders stay involved and stay supportive.

If you read through the list of the schools honored today, it is truly amazing what you have been able to accomplish by working together. In some schools, revolutionary science and math curriculums have been developed. In others, parents are volunteering in the classroom, and students are helping out in child care centers. In others, the whole community has joined together to kick gangs and drugs out of the schools, to wipe away graffiti, to restore safety to the classrooms and the learning environment.

You are literally making learning a jump off the dusty shelves of libraries and into the imaginations of our children, our leaders of tomorrow. So to every single one of you, more than anything else, we wanted you to be here today on the lawn of the White House so that I could say on behalf of all the American people, we thank you, we are proud of you, and we hope that today you'll all be very proud of yourselves. Thank you very much.

You know, I've had the chance, as I said, to be in a lot of different schools, elementary, middle, and high schools all across the country, public schools, parochial schools. I've seen science classes and English classes and history classes and economics classes. I've been in schools that were well over 100 years old in their physical facilities and schools that had been opened just a few days. I have seen in all the schools that really work, clearly, one uniform characteristic. It was the schools, every one of them, had high standards and high expectations. They actually believed that students could learn and that they would learn if given the right kind of standards, the right kind of support, the right kind of environment.

I told the country's Governors at their education summit in March that we have to have those kinds of expectations for all of our students. And somehow we have to make sure that they have those expectations of themselves. We have to make every child in this country believe in himself or herself, believe they can learn difficult things. We have to hold them accountable, but we also need to reward them and pat them on the back when they do well.

This is more important than it has been ever in our country's history, because at this peculiar moment we are moving at a rapid rate toward a new century and a new millennium. We are already into an entirely different sort of economy than that which most of us in this tent have lived most of our lives in. We are moving away from a national economy into a global economy and a global society. We are moving away from the industrial age to the information and technology age. We are moving into an era where most people will be working with their minds far more than their hands, and many of

them will be working in businesses and industries that have not even been invented yet.

I am—I suppose it's not too strong to say—literally obsessed with making sure that our country will do well in the next century, that we'll continue to be the world's strongest force for peace and freedom, that we'll continue to be a beacon within our own land of the ideals that have made this country great, and that every person will have a chance to live out his or her dreams. I believe that we can do that.

We spent a lot of time here working on things to get our economic house in order, cutting the deficit by more than half and opening trade to new countries and new products and new services and trying to get ahead of the technology curve and trying to generate more jobs from small businesses, where so many of the new jobs are being created. But nothing—nothing—is as important as preparing the American people and our young people for the 21st century world in which they will live. And that means they have to not only learn things today but be able to learn for a lifetime. And nothing—nothing—will replace that.

As long as we have a well-educated citizenry, as long as we have people who can learn whatever they need to learn whenever they need to learn it and who understand that this is related to the work of citizenship, this country will do just fine. If you succeed, America succeeds. That is the ultimate lesson of today.

You know, if you ask most citizens, "Well, what do we really need to do in our schools," they might say, "Well, we ought to get back to the basics." You've heard it a thousand times, I'm sure. And at one level it's quite true; that is, if you look at any human endeavor, it's very difficult to succeed unless you're quite good in the basic requirements of whatever the activity is.

But what I'd like to say today is that there are at least some new basics, as well as the old basics. For the better part of the last 15 years, the United States has been working hard to get back to doing a better job at the old basics. Half of all of our 4-year-olds are now in preschool. When the kids get to elementary school, they will find a much better title I program back on course, with a more focused, more rigorous curriculum that challenges our children to meet high standards. The number of young people taking core courses has jumped from just 13 percent in 1982 to 52 percent in 1984, and math and science scores have risen by one full grade.

So there's been a great emphasis on the basics, but more needs to be done. Unfortunately, the reading scores for our young children have stayed about flat. That may be because there's a higher and higher percentage of our students whose first language is not English, and we haven't factored that into account, and we need to do a better job of moving them through the bilingual programs into the mainstream. But nonetheless, by any standard, we haven't done as well as we should.

I think every American child should be able to read independently by the third grade. I believe every American middle or high schooler should be able to spend an afternoon with Mark Twain or Willa Cather or Nathaniel Hawthorne. I believe every American looking for a job should be able to read and fill out an application. And we all know the kinds of things we need to do. Here's just one of them: This summer, Secretary Riley's Read-Write-Now Challenge will encourage one million young people to keep up their reading straight through summer vacation. That's the sort of thing that would enable us to close the book on low reading scores for good. And we all need to do more of that until we can close that book once and for all.

We are also committed to educational excellence in other core academic courses, like physics and chemistry and biology and American history and geography. But we know even that is not enough in this day and time. We have to imagine what the world is like today, with its problems and its promise, and ask ourselves whether there ought not to be some new basics. I would like to mention just two that I think have to be incorporated into the fabric of every educational curriculum in America, citizenship and computer literacy, new basics that build up and strengthen our traditional educational effort, that give our young people the tools they need to succeed and to make a contribution to our country.

If you think about basic literacy and citizenship, it may be something that we think we can take for granted. But clearly it's not, especially since we are becoming once again, just as we were 100 years ago, more and more a nation of immigrants. In our largest county today, Los Angeles County, there are children from 150 different racial and ethnic groups. And

all over America, in all school districts, you see a greater and greater need for people to understand exactly what it means not only to be a learner in school but a good citizen. At this time of tremendous change, much of it but not all of it is positive, and we need to do what we can to help our children stay true to a course in a world that often seems to spin off-course.

I've done what I could. We've offered two White House conferences on character education. We've had grassroots character education programs that the Secretary of Education has funded and promoted. We've done what we could to clarify the confusion that existed about the role of religion and people's religious convictions in the schools. We have provided our schools with guidelines that tell them how they can protect the religious rights of their students without turning their schools into religion-free zones. We have worked with those schools who are trying experiments like school uniforms. We have done the things that we could do. But in the end, the magic of citizenship is a learned—a learned characteristic. And you have to help your students to do that. I know you do, or you wouldn't be successful in other ways. But every school should, without apology, teach its students to be responsible for themselves, to respect other people and be concerned about them, to love our country and be willing to do what it takes to contribute to our country.

Schools can help parents teach children right from wrong through good rules, teach the value of hard work through homework, teach the importance of resolving conflicts peacefully by having zero tolerance for all forms of violence. We have to teach these young people to turn away from that.

We have to teach our young people to define themselves in terms of what they are and what is good about them, not what is bad about someone else. We have to be able to do that. We can teach our young people to become voters and good neighbors and good citizens and good advocates and good servants. We have to be able to do that. I will say again, without that, the learning cannot occur.

I look around at all these bright-eyed students behind me; right before I got up here I tried to look at every one of them and think, you know, I feel pretty good about my country's future. It would be hard not to feel good about your country's future looking at them. Every one of you can think about the work you do in your schools. But there's something wrong with an America where we have all these wonderful things going on, but violence among children under 18 is still going up. There's still too many of these kids out here raising themselves. There are too many of these kids that don't have support.

And I know that too many of you have been asked to do too much in the past. And sometimes you are judged by someone else's failure—the people at home, the people in the church, the people in the community that might have done more—but you are sometimes the only thing that stands between these young people and the opportunity to have a good, wholesome, constructive life. And we have got to turn around these trends of violence and destructive conduct. The number of young people coming into our schools is going up again. Soon the schools will be full of people, so full that the years will be even larger—the classes will be even larger than they were in the peak baby-boom years. By the time that happens, we must have turned around this trend toward destructive behavior and violence among our young people. And we can only do it by teaching them to live in an affirmative way, as good responsible citizens.

We need you on this. This is something that cannot be done unless it can be done by our teachers and our schools, with the support of caring parents and a community. And we're pulling for you. You have to understand that we must not let the largest group of schoolchildren in the history of the United States come into our classes without doing something about the violence and the other destructive behavior. We can build a generation of good citizens, and I'm determined to see us do it.

The other thing I'd like to talk about very briefly is the issue the Vice President discussed, our technology literacy challenge, to bring information and technology to every classroom in this country by the year 2000. We got off to a good start. Many of you—many of you—are part of that. And when we had NetDay in California and hooked up 20 percent of the classrooms in the State in one day, it started off a chain reaction of a lot of things like that happening in other places throughout the country. Much has already been done. But there is more that has to be done.

One of the things that we know—I was just talking to the Governor of West Virginia, where

they have done a lot of work in bringing computers into the schools. He said he was very proud of the fact that they spent one-third of their money on teacher training—one-third, one full third—because no computer, no aid in learning is worth anything without the magic of learning between the teacher and the student.

Today I am pleased to announce a remarkable initiative in our education community. Working with our administration, leading organizations in education, from the national PTA and the NEA to the AFT and the national school boards associations, have joined together to make sure America's teachers are as comfortable with computers as they are with chalkboards. They call themselves "21st Century Teachers." And to launch their effort they will do what they do best, teach. This fall these groups will mobilize 100,000 teachers to teach 500,000 other teachers how to teach using computers, software, and networks.

When they are done, we will have a half a million more teachers who are computer and technology literate and an infinite number of new learning opportunities. The teachers will have new and exciting ways to teach traditional subjects. They'll be able to exchange lesson plans with other teachers, communicate more frequently with parents, help students unfamiliar with computers, and keep up with students who already are.

Through this enormous effort, teachers will be doing what they have always done, dedicating themselves to a brighter future, joining together to say that computer and technology literacy is truly a new basic for our time, just as they continue to teach our other fundamental basics. They are helping to create opportunity, assuming responsibility, working together as a community.

To every one of these groups and the 100,000 teachers who will be involved in this, I say thank you. The rest of America is deeply in your debt. This is a very great project.

Now as we close this formal ceremony, let me say again to each and every one of you: I'm proud of you; I'm grateful to you. What you are doing is building America's future. Because of the nature of the economic and social changes going on in the world today, your work is more important to America's success than ever before.

I ask you to leave here with one idea in mind. I ask you to do what you can back in your hometowns, back in your home districts, back in your home States to make sure that every single school in America works to be a Blue Ribbon school.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:54 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Jill Mahler, a student at Mainland High School in Daytona Beach, FL.

Statement on the Appointment of the Special Representative for Civilian Implementation in Bosnia

May 29, 1996

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Richard Sklar as Special Representative of the President and the Secretary of State for Civilian Implementation in Bosnia. This appointment underscores that, with success in meeting the principal military tasks under the Dayton accords, we must give high priority now to making the peace irreversible by accelerating efforts to rebuild the political and economic fabric of Bosnian society.

Mr. Sklar will be the senior U.S. official resident in Bosnia responsible for coordinating the work of all U.S. civilian agencies involved in the reconstruction effort, under the authority of the U.S. Ambassador to Bosnia. His responsibilities will encompass humanitarian assistance, economic revitalization and reconstruction, the resettlement of refugees, the conduct of elections, and strengthening of public security. He will also serve as liaison to his counterparts from other countries and the heads and staffs of all the international institutions engaged in civilian implementation activities.

I can think of no one more qualified to spearhead this critically important endeavor than Richard Sklar. Mr. Sklar has had a distinguished 35 year career in private and public sector management. Prior to accepting this appointment, he has served as president and chief operating officer of O'Brien-Kreizberg Inc. (OK), the oldest and largest "pure" project and construction management firm in the United States. OK is now managing over 100 major construction projects in the United States and abroad, from airports and rail systems to facilities for the Atlanta Olympics. Mr. Sklar served on the administration's transition team for the Agency for International Development during the administration's first 3 months, and then became a member of the Board of Directors of the Russian-American Enterprise Fund. He has continued to serve as an adviser to AID Administrator Brian Atwood and to Richard Morningstar, Coordinator for Assistance to the New Independent States. Mr. Sklar has built and led two businesses, both world leaders in the construction industry. In addition, he served in major public management roles for the city of San Francisco. Mr. Sklar was an officer in the U.S. Army artillery following his graduation as a mechanical engineer from Cornell University in 1956.

I am deeply grateful that Mr. Sklar has accepted this appointment, and for his willingness to serve our Nation in helping to build an enduring peace in Bosnia.

Remarks on the Israeli Elections and an Exchange With Reporters

May 30, 1996

The President. Good morning. My goodness, the sun is out. I'd like to make just a couple of brief comments about the election in Israel last night.

First of all, it was a cliffhanger. A lot of us were up late waiting for the returns, but I want to just make a couple of points. The United States—first, we don't know how—we don't have final returns. We have to wait for the postal ballots to be cast, counted.

Whatever the results, the United States will continue its policy of support for the people of Israel, for the democratic process there, and for the process of peace. And our policy will be the same. If Israel is prepared to take risks for peace, we are determined to do our best to reduce the risks and increase the security of those who do that.

I was especially encouraged in the closing days of the campaign that both parties and both candidates expressed, in different ways, but still a clear commitment to continue the peace process. So that is my hope; that's what I hope will come out of this election. And we'll all just have to sit now and wait until the final ballots are counted.

Q. Do you believe Mr. Netanyahu would not restart settlements in the West Bank, would not go ahead with negotiations with Syria? There's a dramatic difference in his approach.

The President. Well, there's been a difference in what they say their approaches are, but I was actually quite interested in the comments that he made about this, particularly in the last days of the election. I think we have to wait and see.

I would first of all say, let's wait until all the ballots are in, until we see who voted how and what the final outcome is. But the first big leg of the whole process of peace in the Middle East was completed by one of Mr. Netanyahu's Likud predecessors. So we just have to wait and see.

They certainly have a lively, interesting democracy. And they showed it again yesterday, and the rest of us should support that. And I would hope that we would have that kind of turnout in our country this November. I hope that percentage of our voters shows up. I think they had over two-thirds of the overall voters turn out. And I hope that—and maybe even higher.

They have made their decision. Now we have to wait for a while to see what it is. And then afterward they will have to chart a course, and then we'll see where we go from there.

Q. Do you want results that close?

The President. No. I hope they won't be that close, but I hope that we'll have that many people voting. I like the turnout. And I like

the vigorous involvement. I like the debate. I thought it—you know, it was a very stimulating thing for them and, you know, it was a difficult, challenging election for the people of Israel and, you know, we'll see. I think all of us who watched the returns last night and watched the reports coming in were impressed by the vigor of the democracy and by the determination to participate. And now, you know, they have a very diverse society, and they're trying to find ways to integrate all the various elements of their society. It was very impressive to me what happened.

And so I'm going to wait for the votes to come in and a winner to be declared and the government to be announced, and then we'll see where we go from there.

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, does the closeness of the vote make it difficult for anyone to lead? What is the message?

The President. Let's wait a while. Let's see what the vote is, and we'll see what the message is. I don't want to be an instantaneous commentator, but I'll think some more about it and see if I can answer that question.

Q. How late were you up?

The President. Until I found out what all the counted votes were last night, about 1 o'clock.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:20 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to his departure for New Orleans, LA. In his remarks, he referred to Binyamin Netanyahu, Likud Party candidate for Prime Minister in Israel.

Remarks to the Women's International Convention of the Church of God in Christ in New Orleans, Louisiana

May 30, 1996

The President. I'm having such a good time, I hate to interrupt it. [*Laughter*] Please be seated.

Audience member. We love you, Mr. President!

The President. Thank you. Thank you.

Bishop Owens, you don't have to calm this crowd for me. I like it the other way. Mother Crouch, thank you for letting me come to your meeting. Now, I know whose meeting this is. And I know that this is supposed to be about the spirit, but if you will forgive me, this is also one fine-looking crowd today.

Last night my wife called me to check in, as we always do when one of us is away from home, and she was on her way to California. And Hillary said, "Well, what are you doing tomorrow?" And I said "Well, I'm going to the Women's Convention of the Church of God in Christ." And she said, "Well, you finally figured out where the power is."

The bishops will find a way to make me pay for that, I think, but I had a good time. [*Laughter*]

I'm glad to be here with some other friends today. I brought two of Louisiana's Congressmen down here with me, Congressman Bill Jefferson and Congressman Cleo Fields. I'm honored to be here with them. Many of these bishops here have had me in their churches—Bishop Brooks, Bishop Patterson, Bishop Blake, Bishop Quick. I've been in their churches. My friend Bishop Clark from Pennsylvania; Bishop Winbush. Bishop Hamilton gave us a good prayer and got us started off well. I thank Bishop Clemons, Bishop Haynes, Bishop Anderson, all the distinguished leaders of this great church.

I thank that Women's Mass Choir and Natalie Green. It's too bad she has no range to her voice, isn't it? [*Laughter*] Let's give them another hand. She was wonderful, and they were wonderful. [*Applause*]

And I thank Bernard Johnson for coming out here on no notice to play. Bishop Owens and I were sitting there, and I said, "Bishop, I love all this music, but where's that man that played the saxophone for me in 1993 in Memphis? I want to hear him again."

I want to say a special word of thanks, if I might claim a personal privilege, to the two bishops here from my native State of Arkansas, without whom I might well not be here today.

Bishop L.T. Walker and Bishop D.L. Lindsey, thank you for your friendship for so many years, and God bless you. Thank you.

I'm glad to be back in New Orleans. The last time I was here, I was riding in that pretty Presidential limousine on Tchoupitoulas Street, and we lost our hubcap. [*Laughter*] And budget cutting got so bad in Washington, I was sent here to fetch it back. [*Laughter*]

I think all of you who were there know that not only one of my best days as President but one of the most memorable days in my life was when I met with you in 1993 at the 86th annual convocation in Memphis. I will never forget that as long as I live. Our good friend Bishop Ford was still living then, and he was my friend and my confidant.

Back in 1993, in that magnificent church where Martin Luther King spoke his last sermon, I asked that we honor his memory by remembering what he lived and died for and by working to tackle the crushing problems of our young people. Since then, I am more certain than ever that there is not a problem in America, and certainly not the problems our young people face, that cannot be solved if we will take responsibility for them and work together to make things better.

As I have said so many times, when we Americans take responsibility and we work together, we always seem to succeed. But when we deny our responsibility and when we are divided, we defeat ourselves. Long before Abraham Lincoln said it, our Saviour reminded us that a city or a house divided cannot stand. Today I'd like to take up where I left off back in 1993 and talk about what we can do to help our children build better lives.

We stand on the threshold of a new century, indeed, a new millennium. It will be an age of great possibility and enormous challenge. I have worked hard to see that all our children enter that century with the opportunities they need to make the most of their God-given abilities, to stand against the forces of division and destruction, to stand for rewarding work and honoring families, reducing crime and protecting our environment, celebrating our diversity, not running away from it, and building a strong, secure, vital democracy that is still a model for the world.

I am pleased at the progress which has been made. Compared to 4 years ago, we have 8½ million more jobs. We have the lowest unemployment rate among African-Americans since the 1970's. We have 1.3 million families going from welfare to work, 1 million families moving from food stamps to self-sufficiency. The crime rate has gone down for 4 years. We are fighting for the minimum wage, and we've fought for other things to help families like the family and medical leave law and a tax program that would reduce the taxes of our hardest pressed working families so they would have more money to raise their children on. Those things are making a difference.

And we've fought against some things as well. We've fought against budget cuts that were too harsh on Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment, that would have raised taxes on working people and given people like me a tax cut. I was against that, but I'm for balancing the budget; we just ought to do it in the right way.

We have fought to mend affirmative action, but not to end it. It should not be ended until there is no need for it anymore, and I'm sorry to say there's still some need for it.

We have fought to define religious freedom and the Constitution's requirement that the state should not impose any religious views on anybody. We have fought to make it clear that our public schools don't have to be religion-free zones as long as nobody's imposing their view on anybody else.

We've fought against racial discrimination in all its forms. And I tell you today, we are fighting hard to get to the bottom of this rash of black church burnings and to find out who is responsible and to prosecute them to the full extent of the law. We cannot let people of faith be persecuted by people of hate again in America.

That's all good, but it's not enough. We know we have to do more, and we know we have to do it together. All around us, we see evidence of our society's need for renewed commitment, for the moral leadership you provide. Yes, we do need more economic advancement, but that may not be our biggest need, for it is said in the Scriptures, and we must remember, that man does not live by bread alone.

Every day our children are bombarded by influences that would turn them from a positive, good path. You are here this week to talk in real terms about what you can do to build better homes and better communities and better schools and better tomorrows for our children.

You are here to reach out—not to curse the darkness but to light a candle, put it on a candlestick, and give that light to all of America's house.

And you are, for you are working every hour and every day to keep our children free from harm, free to grow up, free to make the most of their own lives; laying the spiritual foundation that is now, because of this church's efforts, helping thousands of young boys develop into men of courage and character with programs like Rights of Passage and God's Male Choice; teaching young boys and girls how to say no to sex and yes to the rest of their lives through the purity classes that you run in your churches; strengthening families and futures by your efforts to increase the involvement of parents in their children's schools and education.

I thank you for this, more than any of you can imagine. I want the rest of America to know what you are doing, and I want the rest of America to do what you are doing. That is what we have to do together. I want our country to reject the voices of division and hatred that would weaken our nation, to walk away from the cynicism which is the chief excuse for inaction, to work together for solutions. There is no more powerful force in this country than the force of conscience and commitment. And that is the force we all feel in this room today.

All of us must step up to the challenges our children face. As I said, I have worked hard to help them where Government can help. I am glad that African-American unemployment is in single digits for the first time since the Vietnam war, that during the past 4 years more than 100,000 African-American businesses have been created. I am proud that homeownership is at a 15-year high, with record increases in homeownership among African-Americans. But all of the homes in the world don't mean a thing if the children can't play outside in the yard or on the street in front of them.

I'm glad that more of our children are taking more challenging courses and that we are seeing at long last some improvement in the performance across the country in many of our educational areas. But all the schools in the world don't mean a thing if children are afraid to walk to and from those schools. All of the opportunity and hope that comes from a job, that doesn't mean much if our children are raised in fear, seduced by the false allure of drugs or crime or gangs into a world of distorted values and diminished hope and ultimate disappointment.

We simply cannot go into the 21st century with children having children, children killing children, children being raised by other children or raising themselves on the streets alone. That is not the America I grew up in, not the America you grew up in, not the America we can pass on to our children and their children.

Let me say again what I have said many times to my country men and women across this land. Sometimes I think people just give up on these problems. You haven't given up. So if we send one message out today, let's tell America: We refuse to accept that crime and drugs and rampant teen pregnancy and children being killed and dragged down and destroyed are things that we can't do anything about. We can do something about it. You are doing something about it. Our country must do more about it.

In Washington, that's why I worked so hard to pass the crime bill, to put 100,000 police officers on the streets. The sheriff here of Jefferson Parish is pointing out how much the crime rate in New Orleans had gone down because they use these people not just to catch criminals but to prevent crime, to work with neighbors, to work with children, to find things that will help us to identify people who are problems and not only catch criminals but stop it from happening in the first place. And that's why I am committed to keeping on until we have every one of those 100,000 police officers in a uniform walking the street, getting the crime rate down, making people feel safe.

That's why we took on the interest in Washington that was so powerful in the gun lobby, to try to take guns out of the hands of criminals, taking 19 kinds of assault weapons off our streets, passing the Brady bill that requires a waiting period to buy a handgun.

You know, some people in our country were told that if those bills passed, they would lose their hunting weapons. Well, we now had quite a few seasons and we've hunted everything you can imagine in America, and everybody that wanted to is still hunting with the weapon they had the day I signed those bills. There's only one group of people that don't have the weapons they wanted, 60,000 people with criminal records who couldn't get handguns because the Brady bill passed. And it's a good thing.

That's why I supported zero tolerance for weapons in our schools and community-based

programs not only to punish criminals but to prevent crime in the first place, to help our kids stay out of trouble, to give them something to say yes to as well as something to say no to. I think people ought to be able to say yes to jobs in the summertime, yes to staying in schools after hours if they don't want to be on the street, yes to adult supervised recreation, yes to things that will enrich their lives and give them a good group to hang out with. I think that is important.

And yes, I am pleased with the progress. I'm glad that the crime rate is down. I'm glad the welfare rolls and the food stamp rolls are down. I'm glad the teen pregnancy rate is finally coming down. But the truth is, it's not good enough. Because even though the crime rate's coming down in America as a whole, random violence among people under 18 is going up. Even though drug use is coming down, random careless use of marijuana among people under 18 is going up. And, unbelievably enough, after 20 years of working at it, smoking among teenagers is going up as 3,000 young people a day take up a habit that will end 1,000 of their lives earlier than would otherwise have happened.

So there are a lot of challenges still out there. And we need you. We also need you to reach them. How many mothers, I wonder, in this country hold their breaths in fear when their kids leave home? How many wonder whether their kids will be shot by a gang or pressured to buy drugs or robbed of their money or beat up because of their clothes? This is no way to live.

It has not always been this way. We have shown we can make progress. It does not have to be this way. We do not have to tolerate it. But we all have to be willing to do something about it.

There are some more things we can do in Washington. We ought to ban those cop-killer bullets that pierce the bulletproof vests our law enforcement officers wear. They're not needed to shoot anything in the woods. We ought to do more to preserve the safe and drug-free school program so that every school will be able to do things like stay open later or open earlier, or bring in the D.A.R.E. officers or others that are helping our children and supporting the work our parents are trying to do.

We ought to have welfare reform that moves people from welfare to work, but there ought to be enough child care support in there so that the kids aren't hurt and supervision of children is not sacrificed. And we have to do more to inspire every community to protect our children.

I challenged one million citizens the other day across America to join the anticrime patrols in their community. There are 20,000 anticrime groups in America today. If every one of them could just get 50 more folks to show up and help prevent crime, that would be a million Americans, and it would change the future and increase the safety of our children. They deserve that.

We are taking steps to give parents more control over the things that influence their children. We've passed legislation that requires parents be given in new television sets something called the V-chip so that you can screen out TV programs you think are inappropriate for your young children to watch, and the entertainment industry is helping by providing a rating system.

We're taking steps to prohibit advertising being specifically directed toward young people with cigarettes because of the dangers that that is causing that I mentioned. We're trying to help communities do what they can to bring more order and discipline and structure into their children's lives. One of the things that we have supported is giving every community in America the option, not the requirement but the option, to consider whether schools ought to have a uniform dress policy and have uniforms for the students.

Let me tell you, I was out in Long Beach, California, the other day, the third largest school district in California, where they adopted a uniform policy and they let the kids and the teachers pick what their uniform was going to be in every school. They got up a little fund for the children who couldn't afford their own uniforms. And I listened to the children talk about what had happened. I listened to one young man say that his school picked a green and white uniform because that would clearly show to everybody that they weren't in any of the gangs around since none of them used those colors, and now the children were walking to and from school in safety. I listened to a young girl say that the uniform policy had not just been good for the poor children in school, it had been good for the wealthier children and the middle class children because they stopped judging each other by what they had on and instead by what was inside. And nobody gets

rolled anymore because of their jacket or their shoes. Now, people ought to have the option to see if that works. All I know is there, there is more order, more learning, less violence, and the kids feel better.

Today, as the summer approaches, I want to talk to you about another idea that New Orleans has made the most of, and that's community-based curfews to keep young people off the street. These are just like the old-fashioned rules most of us had when we were kids. "When the lights come on, be home, Bill." [*Laughter*] How many of you were told that? "When the lights come on, be home." They're designed to help people be better parents. They help keep our children out of harm's way. They give parents a tool to impart discipline, respect, and rules at an awkward and difficult time in children's lives.

Different cities have different ways of enforcing their curfews. Some of them take a kind of a punitive approach. Some of them—even a few have gone so far as to fine parents if the kids aren't home. But some have done much to go the other way, to say that the parents can decide whether they want the curfews to apply to their children; they just have to tell the police and decide.

But the evidence shows that wherever these curfews are in place, they are working. The Justice Department in Washington has just completed a study of seven of these programs that are up and running, in Dallas, in Phoenix, in Chicago, in Denver, in Jacksonville, and in North Little Rock, Arkansas. They also looked at one that works perhaps the best, right here in New Orleans. And I want to thank Mayor Morial and law enforcement officers who are here today. Where's the mayor? Stand up, Mayor—our host mayor.

He is here with his police chief, Richard Pennington, and Deputy Chief Ronald Docette, who is in charge of juvenile enforcement; with two pastors I want to talk about in a moment, Reverend Harold Mayberry and Reverend Kenneth Thompson; with the sheriff of this parish, Harry Lee, and the FBI special agent James De Sarno. And the most important thing of all is he brought two of the young people that have been in his program. I'd like to ask them to stand if they're still here, Shelita Smith and Anthony Anderson. I think they're here. Where are they? Right over there. Let's give these young people a hand here. [*Applause*] And the pastors, stand up. Let's give the pastors a hand. Thank you. [*Applause*] And the law enforcement officers. [*Applause*]

Now, let me tell you what all these folks are part of here. New Orleans, when I became President, had one of the highest crime rates in the country, very high rates of violence of all kinds. They were worried about the rampant increase in juvenile crime. But this mayor and an army of concerned parents said, "Enough is enough; we have to do something about this."

They put in place, in this city that is famous for its nightlife, a dusk-to-dawn curfew, 8 o'clock on school weeks, 9 o'clock in the summertime, 11 o'clock on the weekends for people under 17. Now, it basically says, if you're young, after a certain amount of time you ought to be home and not on the street where you can get shot or fall in with a bad crowd.

Now, you want to know if it works? During the very first year, youth crime dropped by 27 percent during the curfew hours; armed robberies dropped by a third; auto thefts fell by 42 percent. This is working.

But I want to tell you the most important thing about it, because this is consistent with your mission in the Church of God in Christ. Maybe the most important thing is, what do they do with people who they find out after curfew? Dozens of police officers hit the street to enforce the curfew, but they picked up children and didn't send them to jail. Instead, they took them to a central curfew center staffed with counselors, doctors and nurses, and police officers and, most important, an energetic and committed local religious community represented by those two fine pastors I just introduced. A local group of ministers called—listen to the name—All Congregations Together has several ministers at the curfew center to counsel young people and their parents or guardians. And I met with these folks earlier, as I said. I'm very grateful to them.

I also was told the story of the one city council member who worked in the curfew center who found a 7-year-old child picked up from the streets shivering from fear. He was having trouble walking up the stairs, so she just picked him up and carried him up. She said, "Do you want to sit down?" And the boy said, "No." "Well, what do you want?" she said. "I want you to hold me," he replied. That's what a lot of these kids need, somebody to care, somebody to hold on.

I'm sure that a lot of the teenagers think this curfew is too strict. It was a long time ago, but I can still dimly remember what it was like to be that age. But they must also know that it's a dangerous world out there, and these rules are being set by people who love them and care about them and desperately want them to have good lives.

And there is one thread that seems to run through all of these curfew programs across the country, and that is, once they are put in, the most intense supporters of the curfews are young people who know that they are too often at risk of being victims of violent crime. They want our protection, and we ought to give it to them.

So today I directed the Attorney General to distribute this report we did on curfews that are working to mayors and community leaders all across this great country. We want to share what is working, not to tell every place they need it—maybe they don't—but at least to let them know that it's out there, that it's a tool, that people have made it work, that children's lives have been saved and their futures have been rescued.

We've read enough of the other kind of stories; it's time to read some of the good stories. I want everybody to know about the school uniforms in Long Beach and the curfew in New Orleans. I want people to know that if we work together and we put our children first, we can make a difference and rescue their lives. That's what I want people to know.

This past January, I had the great honor of speaking at the funeral of my friend and one of this country's most eloquent women, the great Barbara Jordan. She devoted her entire life to making sure this country lived up to its promise, and she once said, and I quote, "We must address and master the future together. It can be done if we restore the belief that we share a sense of national community, that we share a common national endeavor. It can be done."

Ladies and gentlemen of this great church, my fellow Americans, can there be any greater national endeavor than saving our children, saving all of our children? Don't we have to remember—you know, a lot of people in public life love to quote the Scripture, and all of us probably do it selectively. But there are hundreds of admonitions in the Bible, hundreds, to take care of the children, especially the poor children. "Even as you have done it unto the least of these, you have also done it unto me." If that was true for Jesus, surely it must be true of America.

So I say to you, I honor your commitment; I honor your actions. We must honor these actions I have cited today, but most of all, we must believe that if we will take responsibility for these children and if we will work together, it can be done.

God bless you all, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:55 a.m. at the Ernest N. Morial Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Bishop Chandler D. Owens, presiding bishop, Atlanta, GA; Mother Emma Crouch, convention president; Bishop P.A. Brooks, secretary, general board, Detroit, MI; Bishop Gilbert E. Patterson, Memphis, TN; Bishop Charles E. Blake, Los Angeles, CA; Bishop Norman Quick, Bronx, NY; Bishop Melvin E. Clark, Aliquippa, PA; Bishop R.H. Winbush, Lafayette, LA; Bishop W.W. Hamilton, Salinas, CA; Bishop Ithiel Clemons, Hollis, NY; Bishop Neaul J. Haynes, DeSoto, TX; Bishop C.L. Anderson, first assistant presiding bishop; and Mayor Marc Morial of New Orleans.

Statement on Drought Relief for Southern Plains States

May 30, 1996

I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to take action to provide relief for producers suffering from drought. Specifically, small grain producers with Federal crop insurance who have suffered major small grain and forage crop losses will be eligible for assistance under both the Nominated Crop Disaster Assistance Program (NAP) as well as crop insurance.

Millions of acres of seeded small grain forage have been lost due to drought. Even though all acreage is recognized as grain, some producers intended more than one use from a single

planting: forage for livestock and grain for harvest.

While crop insurance compensates for grain losses, it does not compensate for the forage or grazing values of those crops. To alleviate the extreme hardships the drought caused, NAP provisions are being extended to cover small grain forage and grazing losses, even though the final intended use is grain. This action will provide an estimated $70 million in assistance, primarily to producers in Texas and Oklahoma, many of whom are facing the worst drought in 100 years.

Secretary Glickman made this recommendation to me after visiting the Southern Plains region last month, and having extensive discussions with Congressmen de la Garza, Stenholm, Richardson, Skeen, and Senator Bingaman. Their hard work helped us to recognize that if we do not make full use of the tools we have, a lot of farmers may not be in business by the time we finally see adequate rain.

USDA's NAP program provides crop loss protection for growers of many crops for which Federal crop insurance is not available. Funding for NAP payments is assured, and State offices of USDA's Farm Service Agency have flexibility to define eligible areas. To be eligible, producers must have a previously established record at their local Farm Service Agency office of both grazing and cropping their small grain acreage.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

May 30, 1996

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

On May 30, 1992, by Executive Order 12808, President Bush declared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the actions and policies of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, blocking all property and interests in property of those Governments. President Bush took additional measures to prohibit trade and other transactions with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) by Executive Orders 12810 and 12831, issued on June 5, 1992, and January 15, 1993, respectively.

On April 25, 1993, I issued Executive Order 12846, blocking the property and interests in property of all commercial, industrial, or public utility undertakings or entities organized or located in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (the "FRY (S&M)"), and prohibiting trade-related transactions by United States persons involving those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina controlled by the Bosnian Serb forces and the United Nations Protected Areas in the Republic of Croatia. On October 25, 1994, because of the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serbs, I expanded the scope of the national emergency by issuance of Executive Order 12934 to block the property of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the property of any entity organized or located in, or controlled by any person in, or resident in, those areas.

On December 27, 1995, I issued Presidential Determination No. 96–7, directing the Secretary of the Treasury, *inter alia,* to suspend the application of sanctions imposed on the FRY (S&M) pursuant to the above-referenced Executive orders and to continue to block property previously blocked until provision is made to address claims or encumbrances, including the claims of the other successor states of the former Yugoslavia. This sanctions relief, in conformity with United Nations Security Council Resolution ("UNSCR") 1022 of November 22, 1995, was an essential factor motivating Serbia and Montenegro's acceptance of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina initialed by the parties in Dayton, Ohio, on November 21, 1995 (the "Peace Agreement"), and signed in Paris on December 14, 1995. The sanctions imposed on the FRY (S&M) and on the United Nations Protected Areas in

the Republic of Croatia were accordingly suspended prospectively, effective January 16, 1996. Sanctions imposed on the Bosnian Serb forces and authorities and on the territory that they control within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina were subsequently suspended prospectively, effective May 13, 1996, in conformity with UNSCR 1022.

The present report is submitted pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 1703(c) and covers the period from November 30, 1995, to May 29, 1996. It discusses Administration actions and expenses directly related to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order 12808 of May 30, 1992 (57 *FR* 23299) and Executive Order 12934 (59 *FR* 54117) and to expanded sanctions against the FRY (S&M) and the Bosnian Serbs contained in Executive Order 12810 of June 5, 1992 (57 *FR* 24347, June 9, 1992), Executive Order 12831 of January 15, 1993 (58 *FR* 5253, January 21, 1993), Executive Order 12846 of April 25, 1993 (58 *FR* 25771, April 27, 1993), and Executive Order 12934 of October 25, 1994 (59 *FR* 54117, October 27, 1994).

1. The declaration of the national emergency on May 30, 1992, was made pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. The emergency declaration was reported to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and the expansion of that National Emergency under the same authorities was reported to the Congress on October 25, 1994. The additional sanctions set forth in related Executive orders were imposed pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the statutes cited above, section 1114 of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. App. 1514), and section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287c).

2. Since the declaration of the national emergency with respect to the FRY (S&M) on May 30, 1992, the Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury has implemented the sanctions imposed under the foregoing statutes. Effective January 16, 1996, FAC amended the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and Bosnian Serb-Controlled Areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 585 (the "Regulations"), to implement in the United States provisions of the Peace Agreement and UNSCR 1022 (61 FR 1282, January 19, 1996). The amended Regulations authorize prospectively all transactions with respect to the FRY (S&M) otherwise prohibited. Property and interests in property of the FRY (S&M) previously blocked within the jurisdiction of the United States remain blocked, in conformity with the Peace Agreement and UNSCR 1022, until provision is made to address claims or encumbrances, including the claims of the other successor states of the former Yugoslavia. A copy of the amended Regulations is attached.

3. Section 2 of UNSCR 1022 of November 22, 1995, provides that sanctions remain in force against the Bosnian Serbs until the day after the High Representative described in the Peace Agreement or the Commander of the International Force deployed in accordance with that Agreement has informed the United Nations Security Council via the Secretary General that all Bosnian Serb forces had withdrawn behind the zones of separation established by the Peace Agreement. Finally, UNSCR 1022 provides for the reimposition of sanctions against the Bosnian Serbs and the FRY (S&M) if either the Bosnian Serbs or the FRY (S&M) fail significantly to meet their obligations under the Peace Agreement.

In light of the Resolution, and the transmittal of the Commander's report to the Security Council by the U.N. Secretary General on February 26, 1996, FAC amended the Regulations effective May 13, 1996, to authorize prospectively those transactions previously prohibited with respect to the Bosnian Serb forces and authorities; entities organized or located in those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under their control; entities owned or controlled directly or indirectly by any person in, or resident in, those areas; and any person acting for or on behalf of any of the foregoing. United States persons are also authorized to engage in transactions involving the areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of the Bosnian Serb forces, and services may be exported either from the United States or by United States persons to those areas. Prop-

erty and interests in property previously blocked because of an interest of any of the above persons remains blocked (61 FR 24696, May 16, 1996). A copy of the amended Regulations is attached.

4. Over the past 6 months, the Departments of State and the Treasury have worked closely with European Union (the "EU") member states and other U.N. member nations to implement the provisions of UNSCR 1022. In the United States, retention of blocking authority pursuant to the extension of the national emergency provides a framework for administration of an orderly claims settlement. This accords with past policy and practice with respect to the suspension of sanctions regimes.

5. Subsequent to the suspension of sanctions imposed on the FRY (S&M), effective January 16, 1996, FAC has issued 20 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to the FRY (S&M) or assets it owns or controls. As of May 14, 1996, specific licenses have been issued (1) to authorize the unblocking of certain funds and other financial assets previously blocked; (2) for the payment of crews' wages, vessel maintenance, and emergency supplies for FRY (S&M)-controlled ships blocked in the United States; and (3) to authorize performance of certain transactions under presanctions contracts.

During the past 6 months, FAC has continued to oversee the maintenance of blocked accounts and records with respect to: (1) liquidated tangible assets and personalty of the 15 blocked U.S. subsidiaries of entities organized in the FRY (S&M); (2) the blocked personalty, files, and records of the 2 Serbian banking institutions in New York previously placed in secure storage; (3) remaining tangible property, including real estate; and (4) the 5 Yugoslav-owned vessels still blocked in the United States.

6. Despite the suspension of sanctions imposed on the FRY (S&M), FAC has continued to work closely with the U.S. Customs Service and other cooperating agencies to investigate alleged violations that occurred while sanctions were in force. On January 31, 1996, a Federal grand jury in San Jose, California, handed down a three-count indictment against the owner of a Santa Clara, California-based electronics firm. The indictment charges that the defendant made three separate shipments of computer equipment to Macedonia with knowledge that the equipment would be transshipped to Serbia.

Since the last report, FAC has collected eight civil penalties totaling nearly $33,000. Of these, three were paid by U.S. financial institutions for violative funds transfers involving the Government of the FRY (S&M), persons in the FRY (S&M), or entities located or organized in or controlled from the FRY (S&M). One U.S. company paid a penalty related to the unlicensed sale of equipment to a FRY (S&M) entity, another for the unauthorized import of goods originating in the FRY (S&M). A third company settled a penalty for the performance of a contract in the FRY (S&M). A law firm and a company remitted penalties relating to unlicensed payments to the Government of the FRY (S&M) for intellectual property registrations.

7. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from November 30, 1995, through May 29, 1996, that are directly attributable to the declaration of a national emergency with respect to the FRY (S&M) and the Bosnian Serb forces and authorities are estimated at about $1.3 million, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in FAC and its Chief Counsel's Office, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, the National Security Council, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Department of Commerce.

8. In the last year, substantial progress has been achieved to bring about a settlement of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia acceptable to the parties. Before agreeing to the sanctions suspension, the United States insisted on a credible reimposition mechanism to ensure the full implementation of the Peace Agreement. Thus, UNSCR 1022 provides a mechanism to reimpose the sanctions if the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or the Bosnian Serb authorities fail significantly to meet their obligations under the Peace Agreement. It also provides that sanctions will not be terminated until after the first free and fair elections occur in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as provided for in the Peace Agreement, and provided that the Bosnian Serb forces have continued to respect the zones of separation as provided in the Peace Agreement. The Resolution also contemplates the continued blocking of assets potentially subject to conflicting claims and encumbrances until provision is made to address them, including

claims of the other successor states of the former Yugoslavia.

The resolution of the crisis and conflict in the former Yugoslavia that has resulted from the actions and policies of the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control, will not be complete until such time as the Peace Agreement is implemented fully and the terms of UNSCR 1022 have been met. Therefore, I have continued the national emergency declared on May 30, 1992, as expanded in scope on October 25, 1994, and will continue to enforce the measures adopted pursuant thereto.

I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal with respect to the measures against the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and the Bosnian Serb forces, civil authorities, and entities, as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

Remarks to the Louisiana State Legislature in Baton Rouge

May 30, 1996

Thank you very much. I always enjoy coming to Louisiana and coming to this capitol building. I keep thinking I will somehow capture the secret of how you do it here. I thank you for that warm welcome. Governor Foster, thank you for your introduction. Mrs. Foster, Mr. Speaker, Senator Ewing, to your statewide elected officials, Senator Breaux and Congressman Jefferson, Congressman Fields, members of the Supreme Court, members of the State House and Senate, and all the guests who are here: I am very honored to be invited to speak to the Louisiana Legislature.

I thank the Governor for coming up here with me. It's nice to see Republicans and Democrats standing together on the same little piece of ground here. [*Laughter*] I hope somebody got a picture of this. We're going to show it in Washington, DC.

Somebody asked me if this was a good idea. I said, "I don't know if it's a good idea for him, but anybody that comes to work in a camouflage hunting outfit is my kind of guy." I like it. [*Laughter*]

I do want you to know that I have not been in Baton Rouge all day; I started the morning in New Orleans. And we all went to lunch there, and I paid some good sales tax in Louisiana—[*laughter*]—had a wonderful meal, ate too much food. And what I ate was Louisiana crawfish, not Chinese crawfish.

I'm happy to be here in a State I've spent a lot of time in, my neighboring State, a State that has shared so many of the challenges that we faced in the dozen years I was Governor of Arkansas and in the last 20 years that I've been in public life. Indeed, you could argue that we've made a conscious effort, ever since the end of World War II, in our States and in other States throughout the South to catch up to the rest of America in providing opportunity in terms of jobs and education and working together to get beyond the divisions of race, to go to a time when we could ask everybody to be more responsible and everybody to work together more and put their divisions aside.

And it's very interesting that now I think you can make a serious case that the whole country has to be on the mission that those of us in Southern States have been on for the last 50 years, because we know we've moved from the cold war to the global village; we know we've moved from an information age to one dominated by—I mean from an industrial age to one in which industry, agriculture, and all forms of human endeavor are dominated by information and technology. We know that the world is changing economically as much as it has in 100 years. And Bill Gates, the founder of Microsoft,

in his recent book says that in terms of how we communicate with one another and share information, we're going through the biggest period of change in 500 years, since Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Europe.

And that means that if we want to preserve the American dream for our children and our grandchildren, that the whole country now has to work on the mission that arguably has been the mission of those who have been in the South for the last 50 years. We've got to have a system of education that is second to none in the world if we want our people to be able to compete and win in the global economy. And we have to find ways to create jobs in a competitive way. And we have to find ways for everyone to assume more responsibility for our common future and to do it together. We can't afford to be divided by race or gender or income or party or anything else anymore if it undermines the fundamental American mission of preserving the American dream for all of our people in a new world.

And I see that so clearly as I travel around the world. I see that Americans are still looked up to by people around the world who think that we don't want to control their lives and we want to use our power to help everybody live in peace, who think that we are struggling to find ways for all of our folks to live together instead of defining our lives by who we're against and who we're not.

In the South, you know, we see it in pretty stark racial terms, but it's gotten a lot more complicated than that. Our largest county in America, Los Angeles County, now has over 150 different racial and ethnic groups represented in one county in the United States. And the only way we're going to do well is if we all tack the same Constitution up on the wall, the same Bill of Rights on the wall, and say that's what we're going to live by; and if you will stand up and work hard and obey the law and share the same constitutional values and say we're all going to be responsible and do our best and work together, this country is going to do fine. We're going to do fine, but we have to do that.

I do believe that the most important thing we can be doing today as a nation to create opportunity for our people is to give them the tools they need to succeed. In a global economy, the Government cannot give anybody a guaranteed success story, but you can give people the tools to make the most of their own lives. And education is the most important of all those tools.

I'd like to talk just a few minutes about how education fits into building a structure of opportunity for the 21st century and what I believe the Nation's role is to the National Government, what I believe we should be doing through State and local government instead, and what we ought to leave to the private sector, both to groups like business and labor and just to individual citizens on their own. Because I think we need—in addition to a commitment to education, about which I want to say a little more in a minute—we need a system which will produce a growing economy, safe streets, a clean environment, and a Government in Washington that talks a lot more about what we need to do and a lot less about how we need to do it, that is leaner and more effective and focuses on those things which only we can do at the national level, and then does everything we can do to make it possible for people to do what should be done properly at the State level or the local level or in the private sector.

Now, I think it's clear that we're moving in that direction. If you look at where we are now compared to 3½ years ago, the country was mired in a recession, the slowest job growth since the Great Depression; we had quadrupled the national debt in 12 years; the deficit was projected to be about $300 billion a year. Now it is less than half of what it was when I took office. And I know you all see us fighting all the time over the balanced budget, but let me tell you something: We've now had 4 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. We're going to balance the budget.

We have these big differences about how we should do it, and we might still get an agreement this year. We can still do that. But whatever happens, with or without an agreement, that deficit is going to keep coming down. And we're going to take the burden of debt off of you and off of our children. And we're going to stop taking so much money out of the capital accounts of the country, so interest rates will stay down, and we can grow this economy. It is terribly important.

The second thing we've been committed to doing is expanding our exports. And I know the Chinese crawfish story is a sore story, and I can tell you, I'll do what I can to address

it. I wasn't just whistling "Dixie" when I said that. But if you look at the big picture, our exports have gone up more than a third in the last 3 years. They're at an all-time high. The jobs we have tied to exports on balance tend to pay more.

If you go down to the Port of New Orleans and just look at what's happened there, just in the last couple of years, it is obvious that our ability to trade with other countries is critical to our future. We've had more than 200 separate trade agreements, 21 with Japan alone. We're selling everything from United States rice in Japan to telecommunications equipment and cars, and in the 21 areas where we've made deals with them, our exports are up 85 percent in 3 years.

So America can compete with anybody anywhere in the world if we get not only freer trade but fair trade. That has to be our goal. That ought to be our goal with China. That's our goal with Japan. That's our goal with our neighbors in Latin America. That's our goal with everybody. We ask for no special treatment, but we do want fair rules that everybody follows. And we want to keep expanding America's ability to sell its products and services around the world.

The third thing I believe we have to do is to continue to invest in the technologies of the future. You read a lot about the partisan squabbling in Washington, but I'd like to give the Congress credit for doing something almost unanimously in a completely bipartisan way in passing the telecommunications bill that we worked on for 3 years just a couple of months ago. That bill will literally create hundreds of thousands of jobs in the United States, good jobs, over the next few years, by making sure that we stay ahead of the curve in the technologies of the future. And we have to continue to do that.

In Washington, one of our particular responsibilities, I believe, is in the whole area of biotechnology and how that relates to the whole communications and information revolution. We have to continue to invest in medical research, for example. We know that the 21st century, in large measure, will be the age of biology. We have people seriously telling us that we can raise the average life expectancy of people within a matter of a few decades to 100 years or more if we do it in the proper way. And we know that a lot of private enterprise cannot afford to do that unless we lead the way.

So we have to keep doing that, looking to the future, expanding frontiers. Just as we went into space, we can't stop before we have explored the full frontiers of our ability to heal people and restore life and the capacity of people to do well and live out the fullest measure of their days. So we have to keep doing these things. And if we do, they'll have good results.

We've got 8½ million more jobs than we had 3½ years ago, and we need more. But I say to you, this proves that we can move forward and do it together. And that's a responsibility in Washington, to keep interest rates low, to keep the deficit coming down, to balance the budget, and then to target the money we do have in the best possible way.

The other thing we've got to do, as I said, is to kind of reform the way the Government works. One of the things that all of the Governors wanted us to do, and the State legislators, was to pass the unfunded mandates law, which I signed a year or so ago, which says that we can't pass laws anymore in Washington and tell you what to do and, by the way, we want you to pay for it. Now, I hope that you will feel that in the—I hope you're feeling it now; I hope you'll feel it in the years ahead. I think it's a very important bill. I do not believe, having served 12 years as a Governor, longer than I can legally serve as President, I will never forget what it was like to put my budget together every year and have to start with the bill I was getting from Washington, first.

So we say if Washington wants to ask the States to do something, we need to help you pay for it. We need to pay for our own mandates and not ask you to pick up the tab. I think that's important.

Perhaps more important, we're also reducing the size and the way the Government operates. The Government in Washington is 237,000, to be exact, 237,000 people smaller today than it was the day I took the oath of office. It's now the smallest Federal Government in 30 years. As a percentage of the national work force, the Federal Government is the smallest it's been since 1933, before the New Deal.

The era of big Government has been ended. We are reducing the size of Government. We are eliminating 16,000 of the 80,000 pages of Federal regulations outright, getting rid of them. We are changing a lot of the other regulations

in ways that make it easier for people in the private sector to live with. We're cutting by 25 percent the total amount of hours businesses are going to have to spend complying with EPA paperwork requirements without lowering any environmental standards whatever. We have given now about 80 different businesses and State governments permission to throw out the EPA rulebook if they can prove they're meeting the same clean air and clean water standards that the rules require. These are the kinds of things that we need to look at. How can we preserve our environment and grow our economy and be more efficient? And if there are ways to do it, Washington ought to be willing to let people do it.

Let me just give you the agency that I'm proudest of. We know that most new jobs are going to be created by small and middle-sized businesses. We have cut the budget of the Small Business Administration by 25 percent and doubled the loan volume. We have dramatically increased loans to women and minorities with no requirements in advance and without making a single loan to a single unqualified person and without undermining loans available for other people who would get them in the ordinary course of business, just by aggressively reaching out and saying to everybody we have to create more small businesses. That's the way we ought to grow this country: Put the programs where the needs are, let people meet the needs, and do it in a way that is most efficient.

I'm very proud of what the SBA is doing, and I think 10 years from now we're going to have hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs because people, like the people who have gotten these loans, had a chance to get their start. That's how Federal Express got started, Intel, and a lot of other places.

Let me give you a few more examples. If you look at the crime bill, we're committed to a national goal of putting 100,000 police on the street, but we don't tell the police—the law enforcement officers how to do it. New Orleans has had a big drop in their crime rate. Jefferson Parish has had a big drop in their crime rate, a huge drop.

I was with Sheriff Lee today; he said that he had gotten, I think, 28 new officers the first go-around and 21 the second. I don't have any idea who they are, how they were trained, or how they were deployed. That's not the business of the Federal Government. We just knew that we tripled violent crime in 30 years and only increased by 10 percent the number of law enforcement officials. So police officers were having to drive around in cars more when what we really needed to do was walk on the streets more, to be in the neighborhoods more, to work with people, to stop crime from happening in the first place, to deal with the community crime watch groups and the children and try to give them good, positive role models.

So we said, "Here's our goal; now you figure out how to meet it and see if it will work." And we've had 3 years in a row now of declining crime rates all across America because we had the right kind of partnership: a national goal of 100,000 more police officers; let the people at the local level decide how to do it. It is working. That is the sort of thing we need more doing. And I can't help but say if we can't provide safe streets in this country, no one will ever trust Government to do anything else. People have to feel secure in their homes and on their streets and in their schools.

So these are the sort of things that I think we need to be doing. I want to make just one remark about the whole issue of welfare reform and how we're going to change the Medicare and the Medicaid programs. Our administration has also given more freedom from Federal rules for States to experiment in the health care area than previous ones have. A lot of States have wanted to go, for example, to managed care programs for all their low-income folks on Medicaid, and we approved a number of those experiments.

I have not been for a block grant program for Medicaid because I believe it is in the national interest to provide health care to seniors who have to go into nursing homes, to families with children with disabilities who might be cut out in hard economic times if we didn't have a national guarantee for them along with the national money, to pregnant women, and to poor children. And if something happens and we can't do that, I think it would be problem. As a person who was Governor of a State with economic challenges not unlike yours, I can tell you that it would give me a headache if I had had to go through the awful economic years of the 1980's with Medicaid as a block grant. I just don't think it's a good idea.

But I do think it is a good idea for us not to micromanage the program to death. And whatever comes out of this, you will see there

is an enormous willingness to let the States have much more control over how the program is run but to maintain, from my point of view, a Federal guarantee that the populations should be covered and a guarantee that when times are getting tough you will get the money from Washington you need. Because if we block grant it and a big recession comes along and there's not enough money in the so-called reserve fund, then it will amount to an unfunded mandate, or you will be in a position of having to walk away from some of your folks that need it worse or having a mandated tax increase. And I just don't think it's right, and I don't think we ought to do it.

In the area of welfare reform I do think we can, and I hope we will, get a Federal bill through that will give States much more flexibility in the area of how to move people from welfare to work. We all know what we believe in: We think there ought to be strict time limits, stiffer child support enforcement, requirements to work, and help to give parents the child care and health care they need so they can leave welfare behind without worrying that they're leaving their kids in a tight spot.

You want people on welfare to do what you want the rest of society to do, to succeed as parents and as workers. And if you talk to any group of working people today, you find that that's what they're often worried about. If they're working hard and doing well but they're working longer hours at work, are they spending enough time with their kids, are their kids going to be okay?

And that's what we want in America, I think, is for everybody to be able to succeed at home and at work, because if we have to choose one over the other we're in a terrible fix. If we don't succeed at work, we won't be competing and winning and keeping the American dream alive. But if we blow it at home, it's all for nothing anyway.

I often say, you know, if we're lucky enough to know when we lay our head on the pillow for the last time before we leave this Earth, most of us won't say, "Gee, I wish I had spent more time at the office." But we might say, "I wish I had spent more time with my children; I wish there had been just a little more time to try to do this, that, or the other thing right. I could have been a better father. I could have been a better mother. I could have done this better."

So when you think about this welfare reform issue, I ask you only to think about this: What we want for every American family is success at work and success at home, and our policies ought to be designed to promote responsibility, work, and good parenting. If we do that, we're going to do the right things, and we'll get a better country out of it.

I want to compliment Senator Breaux for the plan that he and the Republican Senator from Rhode Island, John Chafee, have introduced. If Congress would send me a bill like that, that is tough on work and fair to our children, then I'd be happy to sign it. And if we get a welfare reform bill, it will probably be because John Breaux has stayed after it and has been determined to get the Republicans and Democrats together when it seems so often that there's a determination to fight. And I thank him for that and you should be grateful for that, as well.

Meanwhile, we'll just keep on telling States that they can have permission to get around cumbersome Federal rules to fashion their own welfare reform. Since I've been President we've given 38 States a total of 62 separate waivers from the Federal rules. Louisiana got permission to impose a 2-year time limit and to require minor welfare mothers to stay in school and to have their children immunized, two good requirements that I hope every State in the country will follow, because that means success at home and success at work. That's good for America.

These 62 waivers—let me just give you an idea of what that means—that compares with a total of 24 in the previous two administrations, and there's more on the way. We have—75 percent of the families in America today are living under welfare reform experiments. And that's one reason, along with the improving economy, that there are 1.3 million fewer people on welfare today than there were in 1993 and one million people fewer on food stamps today. The poverty rolls are down. And that is because of welfare reform and the improving economy. So I urge you to continue to work on welfare reform and to continue to do it in a bipartisan fashion.

Now, let me again say that we don't always do things in a partisan fashion in Washington. We passed the bipartisan budget for this year that brings down the deficit, continues to invest in education, in the environment, in Medicare

and Medicaid. We passed a tough antiterrorism bill. We passed that unfunded mandates bill. We passed the line item veto, thank goodness, after talking about it for 15 years.

So we are doing some things up there in a bipartisan fashion, and I will continue to try that, and I hope welfare reform is one of them. But meanwhile, you keep after it, because it is the symbol in America of what is wrong with Government but also what could be right about Government. And I think you can make a real difference at the State level. We'll do all we can to help you.

Let me just say a couple of words about education. The magic of education obviously is what occurs in the classroom between the teacher and the child, supported by the family. You need, for it to work, a good principal; you need, for it to work, a good school district; you need, for it to work, a strong State system that has not only adequate funding but high standards, high expectations.

And then I believe that the National Government has a responsibility to help States deal with the populations that are especially troublesome, which we do through programs like the Chapter 1 program to help you if you have a disproportionate number of poor children, for example; through the Head Start program to get more of our kids in preschool programs; through the college loan programs, the college scholarship programs which we've expanded to make college more readily available; and through the Department of Education's efforts to promote reform.

I appointed a Governor to head the Department of Education, Dick Riley, the former Governor of South Carolina. And he has designed an approach that I think is the proper one, where we try to encourage and facilitate school reforms, but we don't mandate them. The Goals 2000 program, for example, only requires that States have a plan to meet high national standards, and that they decide how they're going to do it and how they're going to implement it. And in return for that, they get some help and freedom from a lot of hassle that used to be in Federal rules and regulations.

The school-to-work program, about which I want to say just a little more in a moment, is in some ways the most important thing you can be focused on in the short run of your economy, because it recognizes that we are one of the few advanced countries in the world that has no system in every State in America to move people who don't go to 4-year colleges into the work force with enough skills to get jobs where the incomes will grow instead of going down. And every State has got to figure out how to do that.

The school-to-work program is just a device in which you can get people together who represent the technical schools, the community colleges, the private sector, people who are interested in this, to find a way to deal with it. But let me say, as I told the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate earlier this afternoon, if you just look at the 1990 census you will see this issue screaming at you from the 1990 census, because it shows you that in the 10 years between 1980 and 1990 the people with a high school degree or less who were younger workers got jobs where their incomes went down. The people with 4 years of college or more get jobs where their incomes went up.

But you didn't have to have a 4-year degree. What you had to have was the equivalent of 2 years further training after high school. So people who went to a vo-tech school, a community college, into the United States military, or got training on the job that amounted to adding to the skill levels by 2 years got jobs that were more solid, more predictable, where they had a better path to the future and rising incomes.

So our school-to-work program doesn't tell you to do anything, it just provides a framework in which you can bring all the people in Louisiana to the table and a little bit of money so that you can increase the number of young people who don't just get out of high school and drop through the cracks.

One of the things we have got to do is to show these young people who are dropping out of the system, who aren't voting, who feel cynical about it, that they can have a positive future if they won't give up on themselves after high school and they'll put themselves in a position where they can get skills and they can continue to learn for a lifetime.

The last thing I'd like to say about that is that I believe that we at the national level should do more to increase access to education after high school, not to shrink it. That's why I think the most important tax cut we could give the American people is a tax deduction for the cost of all education after high school, whether it's by the parent or the child, whether

it's in a 2-year program or a 1-year program or a 4-year program, because we need to set up a system where people can keep learning for a lifetime. That is a way that we don't make any decisions; the people make all the decisions.

The second thing I propose is, we take all these Federal training programs, 70 or 80 of them, and collapse them all and put them in a big pot of money, and when somebody loses their job, just send them a voucher and let them do what they want to with it—go to the local technical college; go to the local community college; get in whatever program is certified and approved—and then send some money to the States for the people that aren't in driving distance of a high-class program where you can make a decision on how to deal with those people if they're isolated in rural areas or whatever.

But these are the kind of things, it seems to me, that we can do together. Meanwhile, I just want to commend you for what you're trying to do on teacher salaries; I want to commend you for what you're trying to do on the whole issue of higher education. I know some people say—I was proud to hear the Governor say what he said about the regional average—some people say, you know, this education is not a money problem, and to some extent it's not. But one of Clinton's laws of politics is, I'll bet you anything when somebody tells you it's not a money problem, they're talking about somebody else's problem, not theirs. Money is not a sufficient condition to improve education, but it is necessary. It is nowhere near enough, but it's important, and I applaud you for what you're trying to do.

I also will say again, I think this whole issue of high expectations is important. And if I might just return for one moment to my Governor's days, I spent I don't know how many hours in hundreds of schools as a Governor, most of them in my own State but some of them in States all over the country. I got to where I could get the feel of a school within 10 minutes after walking in. I've talked and listened to principals and teachers and students and parents, and we did something yesterday that I just wanted to mention, because Louisiana ought to be really proud. We honored the Blue Ribbon Schools of 1996 yesterday, and there were eight Louisiana schools on that list—which is higher than your population—eight. They were from Gretna, Metairie, Shreveport, Abbeville, New Orleans, St. Joseph's Academy right here in Baton Rouge. What I was going to say about these schools is, they all have some things in common. They all have high standards, and they all have high expectations. They have systems of accountability and they reward people, and they deserve credit for that.

But the thing that I have been most frustrated about when I was Governor and still as President is that we don't seem to have a system in education that you see in other forms of human endeavor, where people are dying to learn from the folks that are doing it in a way that works. And anything you can do, whether it's setting up charter schools or permitting parents to have more judgment about their schools—we've passed a broad public school choice plan in Arkansas, we're trying to help 3,000 of these charter schools to be set up within public school districts, but groups of teachers can establish it on their own—anything you can do that will help these schools that work get copied by others, I think that's one of the most important things that any State government could do in America, because every problem in public education has been solved by somebody somewhere.

We could all sit here and tell each other stories until 3 a.m. tomorrow morning about it, and some of these stories will bring tears to your eyes. I was in a junior high school in—I'll never forget as long as I live—in Chicago in the highest crime rate area in the city before they started bringing the crime rate down. The principal of the junior high school was from my home State, from the Mississippi Delta. They had a school dress code. They had a mandatory attendance policy. They had an absolute zero tolerance for weapons. They had 150 mothers and 75 fathers volunteering in that school every week. They had attendance rates, graduation rates, and test scores above the State average, and they had no violence in the toughest neighborhood in the whole city.

We could all tell stories about that. Why can't—if that can be done in one place or 2 places or 100 places or in these 8 schools in Louisiana or in all the Blue Ribbon Schools, why can't we do that everywhere? That cannot be done by the Federal Government. But if you wanted to do something that would revolutionize Louisiana forever, if you can figure out how to take what those eight schools we awarded yesterday those blue ribbons are doing, and get it done everywhere, you will do something

that no State has figured out how to do that I think would make a difference that is profound in the future of the children of this State.

Finally, let me say I think that there is one other thing that we ought to help do, and that is to add to the basics for the 21st century computer literacy and access to the information superhighway. I have asked the Congress to give me a small amount of money, $2 billion, to help us work with the private sector in school districts all across America to make sure that by the year 2000, every classroom and every library in every school in America is connected to the information superhighway, and I think that is very, very important.

If you just think about what that would mean, and if we do it in a way that guarantees the good software and properly trained teachers—the State of West Virginia has been hooking up a grade a year, for 6 years now. They're going into junior high school; they just got out of grade school. But one-third of all the money they've spent on computers and wiring and connections, one-third of all the money they spent on teacher training. So it's important that whatever we do to help put the rest of this together, the teachers are properly trained.

That could also do more for our poor States and our poor school districts than anything else. Think about it. If you've got good equipment, good software, trained teachers in the remotest, most rural school district in the mountains of the Arkansas Ozarks or in the backwaters of Louisiana, you could have children doing research papers out of libraries in Australia on volcanoes anywhere in the world. You could have the quality of instruction coming to people that they could never get any other way, that today may be available only to people who go to the fanciest, most rigorous private and public schools in America.

So I think that—I want you to all think about that. We ought not to start this new century without every classroom and every library hooked up to the Internet, without adequate software for these kids, without adequate computers for these kids, and without enough teachers being trained to make sure they can do it. We can leapfrog a whole generation of economic advancements in our public schools if we do this right. And there's no excuse for us in the South—we have waited too long for this—there is no excuse for us to walk away from this, especially in the Southern States.

So I ask you to think about those things. And again, I say in closing, I saw my job when I became President to create a structure of opportunity for the 21st century, so that every American would be able to make the most of their own lives, and to find a way for us to work together with responsibility and a united community, instead of being divided.

The results, I think, have not always satisfied me in Washington. But we are in better shape than we were 3½ years ago. And even in Washington—you look at it—every time we work together, we produce something that's good for America. When we work together, we do something that is good for America. When you work together, you will do something that is good for Louisiana.

And I will say again, I believe that having a world-class education system that is available to all of our children is now the single most important thing we can do, not just for the South to catch up to America but for America to remain the strongest, most prosperous country in the world in the next century. And we owe that to our children.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:15 p.m. at the State Capitol. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Mike Foster and his wife, Alice; H.B. Downer, Jr., speaker, Louisiana House of Delegates; and Randy Ewing, president, Louisiana State Senate.

Remarks to the Community in Baton Rouge

May 30, 1996

Thank you very much. I want to thank Senator Breaux, and I want to thank Keith, Frank, and the Soileau Zydeco Band. Let's give them a hand; they were great. [*Applause*]

I've had a wonderful day in Louisiana. I started off in New Orleans and met with 20,000 people there at the Church of God in Christ women's conference. And then I had a big lunch, and I came up here. I enjoyed speaking to the legislature. I emerged unscathed; as you can see, I'm still standing here. And I think you heard the speech, didn't you? So you shouldn't have to go through another one.

Let me just briefly make a couple of points. First of all, I want to thank all the young people in this audience today for coming out here. And I want you to know that, more than anything else, day-in and day-out, I try to imagine what this country will look like when you're my age. I try to think about what we can do to make this country what it ought to be when you raise your children and when you raise your grandchildren.

I want this country to be a place where everybody can live out their dreams if they're willing to work for it. I want it to be a place where we come together and we cherish and we respect the differences among us, instead of looking for ways to keep being divided in the same old way. That's a paralyzing, frustrating, ultimately self-defeating way to live.

I want your country to be the strongest force in the world for peace and freedom and prosperity. I want to be able to say when I leave this office that—not that we solved all the problems in the world but that America has a way to solve its problems at home by coming together and a way to lead the world to make the place safer for everybody.

I want you to be able to look at your country and say, "You know, I believe that we're going to do fine. I believe we're going to grow together. I believe we're going to go forward together. And I don't have any doubt that the 21st century will be the greatest years this country ever had." That's what I want you to believe. That is the test of what we will do.

Now, I know we're going into an election season and, frankly, we're going into it a little sooner than I think we ought to. [*Laughter*] I'd like to see everybody in Washington just settle down and keep on passing bills that the people need. We need to raise the minimum wage and pass the health care reform. We need to pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy health care reform bill so you don't lose your health insurance if you change jobs and somebody in your family is sick. We need to pass the right kind of balanced budget amendment that protects Medicare and Medicaid and environmental programs and educational programs, including the AmeriCorps program that is represented here. That's what we need to do.

So I wish we could put it off awhile. But the main thing I want you to know is that I'm going to try to give this year back to you. And when this year is over, I want you to feel that American democracy has flourished. But that means you have to do your part. Don't let your friends and neighbors say it doesn't make any difference. Don't let your friends and neighbors be cynical. It makes a huge difference.

You have here a great debate going on in our country about how we're going to march into the 21st century, two very, very different visions of change, two honestly different visions of what we should be doing in Washington and what we should be doing at the grassroots. And they are honest and forthright. For all of the things that may not seem right, there are real differences between the way I believe we should reach the next century and the way the leaders of the other party believe we should reach the next century.

Now, we can make a lot of agreements, and if we just do things that we agree on, we can get a lot done for America. But the election will be a discussion about where the disagreements are, and what I want to do is to give it back to you. I want you to feel that you are participating in it, that you're shaping the election, that your questions are being answered, that your hopes are being nourished, not that it's just some sort of couch potato mud fight. [*Laughter*]

But to do it, you've got to do your part. I'm encouraged by seeing you out here today in large numbers. I'm encouraged by your good spirits. I'm encouraged by your enthusiasm. I'm encouraged by your energy. But you just remember: This country has been around for more than 200 years because more than half the time, more than half the people have understood enough to know what the right thing to do was to move our country into the future, to keep it growing and going and coming together instead of being divided and diverted and distracted.

So I say to you, if we can create opportunity, if we can act responsibly in a way that comes together instead of letting our country be driven apart, the best days of this country lie ahead

of us. That is my dedication. That is your dedication. That's what we ought to together give to the United States in 1996.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:26 p.m. at the Pentagon Barracks. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for China

May 31, 1996

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

I hereby transmit the document referred to in subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act"), with respect to the continuation of a waiver of application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act to the People's Republic of China. This document constitutes my recommendation to continue in effect this waiver for a further 12-month period and includes my reasons for determining that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act, and my determination to that effect.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The Presidential determination is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

The President's Radio Address and an Exchange With Reporters

June 1, 1996

The President. Good morning. This week the people of Israel, in a vigorous, very close election, voted to elect a new Prime Minister. Yesterday I called Prime Minister-elect Netanyahu to congratulate him on his victory and to discuss America's enduring friendship with Israel, our commitment to its strength and security and to a lasting peace in the Middle East. I also spoke with outgoing Prime Minister Peres. I told him to take comfort in history's judgment. Decades from now people will look back and see in Shimon Peres one of the great peacemakers of our time. Now the partnership between Israel and the United States will be the foundation from which our two countries together continue to build a comprehensive, lasting, and secure peace in the Middle East.

Now I'd like to turn to the homefront and to some of our most important citizens, our children. Some of them have joined with me today along with their parents here in the Oval Office. And later today they'll join tens of thousands of people to show their support for America's young people at the Stand for Children at the Lincoln Memorial.

This is an important time for America's children. They're growing up in a world that is changing rapidly. They need our help more than any generation before them. As Hillary says, children are not rugged individualists; they depend upon us—their parents and others in the community who love them—to give them love and guidance and discipline, to provide for them, and to defend them. That's as it should be. Their future and ours depends upon how well we do our job.

If our society sends our children the wrong signals, we should work together to change that. That's why I have proposed strict limits on tobacco advertising directed toward children. That's why we're giving parents the V-chip and why we worked to persuade the TV networks to develop a rating system so parents can control the shows their children watch. That's why I

support parents and communities who want to cut crime and improve discipline by adopting things like school uniforms and community curfews.

We are also working in other ways to strengthen our families and childrearing. We've enacted the family and medical leave law so parents can now take time away from their jobs to be with a newborn or an ill child without losing those jobs. We're immunizing our children more than ever. We've increased Head Start funding. We're making sure that teen mothers stay in school and turn their lives around. We've preserved the Federal school lunch program, which this week turns 50 years old and every schoolday helps 25 million of our children get the nutrition they need.

All of this makes a difference, but none of it matters as much as the most basic protection of all for our young people, their health care. Without medical care, a child who needs it cannot have a full life. That's why I deeply oppose the Republican plan to repeal the guarantee of quality health care for our children.

For three decades through the Medicaid program, we have had a national commitment that poor children, pregnant women, people with disabilities, and older Americans will not be denied health care simply because they can't afford it. That means today that working parents know in the awful event their child is disabled and their insurance and income won't cover the care, they'll get some help to keep their children at home. They know if their child becomes seriously ill and their savings are gone, they'll get some help so that they can hold the family together and keep working and going on.

Now, under the Republican congressional plan, hundreds of thousands of our children with disabilities could lose help for their home care. Children that are seriously ill could lose some of their coverage from what is now available. In effect, this plan says to millions of our children, if you can't afford care, well, it's an option whether your State gives it or not, and they don't have to contribute as much as they used to. It says to people with disabilities, if you don't have insurance, I'm sorry if you don't happen to be able to get care from your State anymore. This could amount to child neglect for a whole generation.

Now, I vetoed this plan last year when the Republican Congress shut down the Government in an effort to force me to sign it. If they send it to me again, I will veto it again. In an attempt to force me to sign it, the Republicans are threatening to attach this proposal to welfare reform.

For nearly two decades, I've worked to end welfare as we know it. I want us to require more work, impose strict time limits, to crack down on child support enforcement. In the last 3½ years, without any congressional action, we have worked with 38 States to change old Federal rules so that we can move people from welfare to work. The rolls are down 1.3 million people, and child support collections are up nearly 40 percent.

Of course, we should do more. And we can reach agreement on sweeping bipartisan welfare reform legislation. But I will never accept the repeal of guaranteed health care for poor children or people with disabilities or older Americans or pregnant women. I don't care what bill they attach that to, I will not accept it.

These young people with me today and their families will take part in the stand for all our children that is unprecedented. Where our children are concerned, we should all stand together, and we should not be small. Our children are counting on us.

Thanks for listening.

[*At this point, the radio address ended, and the President took questions from reporters.*]

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, following the Israeli election, is there a message you'd like to send to the Arab world?

The President. Yes. Our policy hasn't changed. We still want an honorable peace in the Middle East. And we want all peace-loving people, especially those who have been our friends and allies in the Arab world, to continue to work for that. I was very encouraged by what King Hussein said in his most recent reported remarks. And I hope that the friends of peace in the Arab world and the Middle East will continue to support it, and we will continue to work with them.

Q. Do you think there's undue concern in some of the Arab world? You know, this election, which was decided by less than 30,000 votes is out of—was at 3 million. It's being viewed as some kind of massive mandate and message. I mean, do you think there's a rush to judgment?

The President. I think we ought to give the new Prime Minister a chance to put his government together and develop a policy. We have—we've been pushing all over the world for democracy. And democracy means the people who vote get to determine who governs. That's what democracy means. Now, he said some very encouraging things to me on the phone and indeed in the election—in the 2 weeks leading up to the election.

I think it's obvious—if you look how closely divided the people of Israel are, I think that you could say an enormous number of the supporters of Prime Minister Peres wanted security as well as peace, and an enormous number of the supporters of Prime Minister-elect Netanyahu wanted peace as well as security. I think that that's what that close election means. It's a difficult environment, a tough neighborhood. There's a lot of history there. But he says he wants to continue the process. And I think that—I hope that the friends of peace in the Arab world will continue to be committed to that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister-elect of Israel, and King Hussein I of Jordan.

Statement on Arms Reduction Agreements With Russia and Ukraine
June 1, 1996

Ukrainian President Kuchma has announced that all nuclear warheads have been removed from the territory of Ukraine. This is a remarkable achievement. In 1991, there were more than 4,000 strategic and tactical nuclear warheads in Ukraine. Today there are none. I applaud the Ukrainian Government for its historic contribution in reducing the nuclear threat. When the Presidents of Ukraine, Russia, and I signed the January 1994 Trilateral Statement on this issue, we looked forward to a day that has now arrived.

The trust and cooperation the United States and Ukraine have established in resolving this issue are a cornerstone of a broad and productive relationship. Ukraine has embarked on a bold course of political and economic reform, laying the foundations for democracy and a market economy. We remain committed to supporting Ukraine through its ambitious and farsighted reforms and to working with Ukraine and our European partners to promote Ukraine's integration into the European community.

I also want to note the fact that both the United States and Russia are ahead of the reduction schedule provided for in the START I Treaty. To date, the United States has eliminated 750 strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, and about 800 strategic nuclear delivery vehicles in the former Soviet Union have been eliminated, including more than 700 in Russia. The Cooperative Threat Reduction (Nunn-Lugar) program has played a major role in the elimination of these weapons in the former Soviet Union and in the denuclearization of Ukraine.

I have asked Secretary Perry to meet next week with his Ukrainian and Russian counterparts, Ministers Shmarov and Grachev, and mark the successful implementation of the Trilateral Statement by visiting a destroyed ICBM silo and a former nuclear weapons storage facility in Ukraine. In doing so, they will celebrate another important step in making the world safer for us all.

On this day of important milestones, I also welcome the agreement that was reached today in Vienna by the 30 nations party to the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty. This agreement resolves a difficult problem that had arisen concerning the level of Russian and Ukrainian military equipment allowed on the northern and southern flank of the CFE region.

This agreement is the culmination of 2 years of negotiations led by the United States. I congratulate all parties, including our NATO allies, Russia, Ukraine, and the states of the Caucasus and Central and Eastern Europe, for their hard work, cooperation, and dedication to preserving the integrity and effectiveness of this crucial treaty.

The CFE Treaty is a key element of a new, more stable Europe. The treaty has resulted in

the destruction of over 50,000 tanks, armored combat vehicles, artillery pieces, combat aircraft, and attack helicopters. It has also established a system of transparency measures which will increase confidence through on-site inspections, notifications, and information exchanges.

Statement on the Tornado in Kentucky
June 1, 1996

Last Tuesday many of you felt the real-life trauma caused by a powerful tornado. Many of your homes were damaged or destroyed. We have already begun to help you as you recover from this terrible storm. I have declared that a major disaster exists in portions of Kentucky, and I have directed the head of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), James Lee Witt, to make sure that Federal assistance is available immediately. FEMA will work with State and local efforts to make sure that help continues with speed and efficiency.

The good people of Kentucky have already begun to help their neighbors recover from this tornado, and I want to assure you that we will do everything we can to continue to do our part to help rebuild the affected communities.

Our hearts and prayers are with you.

Exchange With Reporters
June 3, 1996

Balanced Budget Amendment

Q. Mr. President, Bob Dole is challenging you today to support a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. What do you say to Bob Dole?

The President. That he ought to come back to the budget negotiations and let's balance the budget.

Q. What's wrong with a constitutional amendment, though?

The President. He's pushed off the decision. Why don't we do it right now? We've got all the money we need. We can balance the budget tomorrow; all he has to do is come back to the negotiations. They walked out months ago. They should come back, take the savings we have in common, put it in the grill and, presto, we've got a balanced budget. We still have to make these decisions. That's what we ought to do.

Q. Do you think he's going to propose cutting taxes, and how would you respond to that?

The President. I don't know about that. I'm just going to work.

President's Health

Q. How are you feeling, and have you picked a new Chief of Naval Operations?

Q. How do you feel?

The President. Great.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:32 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House, prior to discussions with Lech Walesa, former President of Poland. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for Former Eastern Bloc States

June 3, 1996

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

I hereby transmit the document referred to in subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act"), with respect to a further 12-month extension of the authority to waive subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act. This document constitutes my recommendation to continue in effect this waiver authority for a further 12-month period, and includes my reasons for determining that continuation of the waiver authority and waivers currently in effect for Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act. I have submitted a separate report with respect to the People's Republic of China.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The Presidential determination is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Statement on Signing the Coastal Zone Protection Act of 1996

June 3, 1996

I have today signed into law H.R. 1965, the "Coastal Zone Protection Act of 1996." This legislation will continue support for programs under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA) that balance coastal development with resource conservation.

The CZMA's voluntary Federal-State coastal management programs protect natural resources, stimulate coastal economic development, and help save lives and property. The programs also provide for monitoring of coastal conditions and research to address resource management issues.

Through their balanced approach and focus on Federal-State partnerships, CZMA programs have enjoyed bipartisan support throughout their 24-year history. The enactment of H.R. 1965 demonstrates our Nation's resolve to keep our coasts clean, healthy, and productive for generations to come.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 3, 1996.

NOTE: H.R. 1965, approved June 3, was assigned Public Law No. 104–150. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 4.

Remarks at the Princeton University Commencement Ceremony in Princeton, New Jersey

June 4, 1996

Thank you very much. President Shapiro, members of the faculty, alumni, to parents and friends of this graduating class, especially to the graduates of the class of 1996. Let me thank your copresidents, George Whitesides and Susan Suh, who came to say hello to me this morning, and compliment your valedictory address by Bryan Duff and the Latin address by Charles Stowell. I actually took 4 years of Latin in high school. [*Laughter*] And even without being

prompted, I knew I was supposed to laugh when he was digging me about going to Yale. [*Laughter*]

I want to also thank Princeton for honoring the high school teachers and the faculty members here for teaching, for today we celebrate the learning of the graduates, and we should be honoring the teachers who made their learning possible. I thank you for that.

It's a great honor to be here in celebrating Princeton's 250 years. I understand that Presidents are only invited to speak here once every 50 years. President Truman and President Cleveland—you've got to say one thing, for all the troubles the Democrats have had in the 20th century, we've had pretty good timing when it comes to Princeton over the last 100 years. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank President Shapiro for his distinguished service to higher education in our country. I thank Princeton for its long and noble service to our Nation.

I also am deeply indebted to Princeton for the contributions it has made to our administration and to my Presidency. My Press Secretary, Mike McCurry, sat in these seats in 1976. I'm sure that Princeton had something to do with the fact that he not only thinks but talks so fast. The Chair of our National Economic Council, Laura Tyson, was a Princeton professor then, and Mike McCurry's thesis adviser. And you got back from me Professor Alan Blinder, who was a distinguished member of the Council of Economic Advisers and the Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and a brilliant contributor to our efforts to improve the economy. I want to thank Alan Blinder here among his colleagues and his students for what he has done. I thank Tony Lake and Bruce Reed and John Hilley and Peter Bass, all members of our staff who graduated from Princeton.

Two Princeton graduates who are no longer living, Vic Raiser and his son, Monty, were great friends of mine. Vic's wife, Molly, is here, our protocol chief. And if it hadn't been for him I might not be here today, and I want to recognize their contributions to Princeton and Princeton's gifts to them.

I also want to say that one of my youngest staff members is a classmate here, Jon Orszag. And when the ceremony is over, I'd like to have you back at work, please. [*Laughter*]

I would like to talk to the senior class today about not only the importance of your education but the importance of everyone else's education to your future. At every pivotal moment in American history, Princeton, its leadership, its students have played a crucial role. Many of our Founding Fathers were among your first sons. A president of Princeton was the only university president to sign the Declaration of Independence. This hall was occupied by the British in 1776, liberated by Washington's army in 1777, and as the president said, sanctified forever to American history by the deliberations of the Continental Congress in 1783.

In 1896, the last time there was a class of '96, when Princeton celebrated its 150th anniversary and, as has been said, Grover Cleveland was President, Professor Woodrow Wilson gave his very famous speech "Princeton in the Nation's Service." I read that speech before I came here today. And I'd like to read just a brief quote from it: "Today we must stand as those who would count their force for the future. Those who made Princeton are dead, those who shall keep it and better it still live. They are even ourselves." What he said about Princeton 100 years ago applied then to America and applies to America even more today.

At the time of that speech 100 years ago, America was living as it is living today, through a period of enormous change. The industrial age brought incredible new opportunities and great new challenges to our people. Princeton, through Wilson and his contemporaries, was at the center of efforts to master these powerful forces of change in a way that would enable all Americans to benefit from them and protect our time-honored values.

Less than 3 years after he left this campus, Woodrow Wilson became President of the United States. He followed Theodore Roosevelt as the leader of America's response to that time of change. We now know it as the progressive era.

Today, on the edge of a new century, all of you, our class of '96, are living through another time of great change, standing on the threshold of a new progressive era. Powerful forces are changing forever our jobs, our neighborhoods, the institutions which shape our lives. For many Americans this is a time of enormous opportunity, but for others it's a time of profound insecurity. They wonder whether their old skills and their enduring values will be enough to keep up with the challenges of this new age.

In 1996, like 1896, we really do stand at the dawn of a profoundly new era. I have called it the age of possibility because of the revolution in information and technology and market capitalism sweeping the globe, a world no longer divided by the cold war. Just consider this: There's more computer power in a Ford Taurus every one of you can buy and drive to the supermarket than there was in *Apollo 11* when Neil Armstrong took it to the moon. Nobody who wasn't a high-energy physicist had even heard of the World Wide Web when I became President. And now even my cat, Socks, has his own page. [*Laughter*] By the time a child born today is old enough to read, over 100 million people will be on the Internet.

This age of possibility means that more Americans than ever before will be able to live out their dreams. Indeed, for all of you in the class of '96, this age of possibility is actually an age of high probability, in large measure because of the excellent education you celebrate today.

But we know that not all Americans see the future that way. We know that about half of our people in this increasingly global economy are working harder and harder without making any more money; that about half of the people who lose their jobs today don't ever find another job doing as well as they were doing in their previous one. We know that, therefore, our mission today must be to ensure that all of our people have the opportunity to live out their dreams in a nation that remains the world's strongest force for peace and freedom, for prosperity, for our commitment that we can respect our diversity and still find unity.

This is about more than money. Opportunity is what defines this country. For 220 years, the idea of opportunity for all and the freedom to seize it have literally been the defining elements of America. They were always ideals never perfectly realized, but always our history has been a steady march of striving to live up to them. Having these ideals achievable, imaginable for all is an important part of maintaining our sense of democracy and our ability to forge an American community with such disparate elements of race and religion and ethnicity across so many borders that could so easily divide this country. And so I say to you, creating opportunity for all, the opportunity that everyone has, that many of you are now exercising, dreaming about your future, that is what you must do in order to make sure that this age of possibility is really that for all Americans.

When I took office, I was concerned about the uncertain steps our country was taking toward that future. We'd let our deficit get out of hand; unemployment had exploded; job growth was the slowest since the Great Depression. The country seemed to be coming apart when we needed desperately to be coming together.

I wanted to chart a new course, rooted first in growth and opportunity: first, to put our economic house in order so that our businesses could prosper and create jobs; second, to tap the full potential of the new global economy; third, to invest in our people so that they would have the capacity to meet the demands of this new age and to improve their own lives.

This strategy is in place, and it is working. The deficit is half of what it was. The Government is now the smallest it's been in 30 years. As a percentage of the Federal work force, the Federal Government is the smallest it's been since 1933, before the beginning of the New Deal. We signed over 200 trade agreements. Our exports are at an all-time high. Fifteen million of our hardest pressed people have gotten tax cuts. Most of the small businesses have as well.

We've invested in research and defense transformations, we've invested in new technologies, and we've invested in environmental protection and sustainable development. And I will say, parenthetically, the great challenge of your age will be to prove that we can bring prosperity and opportunity to people all across the globe without destroying the environment, which is the precondition of our successful existence. And all of you will have to meet that challenge, and I challenge you to do it.

Our economy, while most of the rest of the world was in recession, has produced 8½ million new jobs, the lowest combined rates of inflation, unemployment, and home mortgages in three decades, the lowest deficit as a percentage of our income of any advanced economy in the world, 3.7 million more American homeowners, and record numbers of new small businesses in each of the last 3 years.

We are doing well, but we must do better if we are going to make the promise of this new age real to all Americans. That means we have to grow faster. How fast can we grow? No one knows the exact answer to that. But

if we look at the long term, if we believe in our people and invest in them and their opportunities and our people take responsibility, the sky is the limit.

We must look with the greatest skepticism toward those who promise easy and quick solutions. We know that the course that leads to long-term growth is in the minds and spirits and ideas and discipline and effort of people like those of you who graduate here today. We are on the right course; we must accelerate it, not veer from it.

We have to finish the job we started in 1993 and balance the budget, not only because we want to free you and your children of the legacy of debt but because that will keep interest rates down, increase savings, expand companies, start new small businesses, help more families buy homes and more parents send their children to college.

We know we have to continue to fight for fair and open trade because we proved now if other markets are as open to our products and services as we are to theirs, we'll do just fine. We know we have to do more to help all Americans deal with the economic changes of the present day in a more positive way by investing in the future and targeting tax cuts to help Americans deal with their own problems and build strong families. We know we have to continue to invest in the things that a Government needs to invest in, including research and development and technology and environmental protection. We know that since so many people will have to change jobs more often than in the past, we have to give families the security to know if they change jobs they can still carry with them access to health care and pensions and education for a lifetime.

But finally and most importantly, if we really want Americans—all Americans—to participate in the future that is now at your fingertips, we have got to increase the quality and the level of education not just for the graduates of Princeton and Georgetown and Yale and the State universities of this country but for all the American people. It is the only way to achieve that goal.

The very fact that we have been here—or our forebears have—for 250 years is testimony to the elemental truth that education has always been important to individual Americans. And for quite a long time, education has been quite important to our whole country. Fifty years ago when the class of '46 was here, coming in after World War II, the GI bill helped to build a great American middle class and a great American economy. But today, more than ever before in the history of the United States, education is the faultline, the great Continental Divide between those who will prosper and those who will not in the new economy.

If you look at the census data, you can see what happens to hard-working people who have a high school diploma or who drop out of high school and try to keep up in the job market but fall further and further behind. You can also see that if all Americans have access to education, it is no longer a faultline, it is a sturdy bridge that will lead us all together from the old economy to the new.

Now, we have to work to give every American that kind of opportunity. And we've worked hard to do it, from increasing preschool opportunities, to improving the public school years, to increasing technology in our schools. And this spring the Vice President and I helped to kick off a NetDay in California where schools and businesses and civic leaders hooked up nearly 50 percent of the schools to the Internet in a single weekend. What I want to see is every schoolroom and every library in every school in America hooked up to the Internet by the end of the year 2000. We can do that.

And I am very proud that I was asked to announce today that a coalition of high-tech companies, parents, teachers, and students are launching NetDay New Jersey this week to connect over a thousand schools in New Jersey to the Internet by this time next year. That will make a huge difference in making learning more democratic and information more accessible in this country. I thank them for that, every single person in New Jersey who will be a part of that.

But we have to face the fact that that is not enough. We have to do more. Just consider the last hundred years. At the turn of the century, the progressives made it the law of the land for every child to be in school. Before then there was no such requirement. After World War II, we said 10 years are not enough; public schools should extend to 12 years. And then, as I said, the GI bill and college loans threw open the doors of college to the sons and daughters of farmers and factory workers, and they have powered our economy ever since.

America knows that higher education is the key to the growth we need to lift our country. And today that is more true than ever. Just listen to these facts. Over half the new jobs created in the last 3 years have been managerial and professional jobs. The new jobs require higher level skills. Fifteen years ago the typical worker with a college degree made 38 percent more than a worker with a high school diploma. Today that figure is 73 percent more. Two years of college means a 20 percent increase in annual earnings. People who finish 2 years of college earn a quarter of a million dollars more than their high school counterparts over a lifetime.

Now, it is clear that America has the best higher education system in the world and that it is a key to a successful future in the 21st century. It is also clear that because of cost and other factors, not all Americans have access to higher education.

I want to say today that I believe the clear facts of this time make it imperative that our goal must be nothing less than to make the 13th and 14th years of education as universal to all Americans as the first 12 are today. We have put in place an unprecedented college opportunity strategy. Student loans can now be given directly to people who need them, with a provision to repay them based on the ability of the graduate to pay, based on income. This is a dramatic change which is making loans more accessible to young people who did not have them before. AmeriCorps, which by next year will have given over 65,000 young people the chance to earn their way through college by serving their country and their communities. More Pell grants, scholarships for deserving students, every year.

Now we want to go further. We want to expand work-study so that a million students can work their way through college by the year 2000. We want to let people use money from their individual retirement accounts to help pay for college. We want every honor student in the top 5 percent of every high school class in America to get a $1,000 scholarship.

And we also want to do some other things that I believe we must do to make 14 years of education the standard for every American. First, I have asked Congress to pass a $10,000 tax deduction to help families pay for the cost of all education after high school, $10,000 a year.

Today I announce one more element to complete our college strategy and make those 2 years of college as universal as 4 years of high school, a way to do it by giving families a tax credit targeted to achieve that goal and making clear that this opportunity requires responsibility to receive it.

We should say to Americans who want to go to college, we will give you a tax credit to pay the cost of tuition at the average community college for your first year, or you can apply the same amount to the first year in a 4-year university or college. We will give you the exact same cut for the second year but only if you earn it by getting a B average the first year, a tax deduction for families to help them pay for education after high school, a tax credit for individuals to guarantee their first year of college and the second year if they earn it.

This is not just for those individuals, this is for America. Your America will be stronger if all Americans have at least 2 years of higher education.

Think of it: We're not only saying to children from very poor families who think they would never be able to go to college, people who may not have stellar academic records in high school, if you're willing to work hard and take a chance, you can at least go to your local community college, and we'll pay for the first year. If you're in your twenties and you're already working but you can't move ahead on a high school diploma, now you can go back to college. If you're a mother planning to go to work but you're afraid you don't have the skills to get a good job, you can go to college. If you're 40 and you're worried that you need more education to support your family, now you can go part time, you can go at night. By all means, go to college, and we'll pay the tuition.

I know this will work. When I was the Governor of my home State, we created academic challenge scholarships that helped people who had good grades and who had good behavior to go to college. But my proposal today builds mostly on the enormously successful HOPE scholarships in Georgia, which guaranteed any student in the State of Georgia free college as long as they had a B average. This year those scholarships are helping 80,000 students in the State of Georgia alone, including 70 percent of the freshman class at the University of Georgia.

In recognition of Georgia's leadership, I have decided to call this proposal America's HOPE

scholarships. And I want to thank the Governor of Georgia, Zell Miller, who developed this idea. I also would like to recognize him—he came up here with me today—and thank him for the contribution that he is now going to make to all of America's future. Governor Miller, where are you? Would you please stand up? Here he is. Thank you. [*Applause*]

Let me say, as all of you know, money doesn't grow on trees in Washington, and we're not financing deficits anymore. I'm proud to say, as a matter of fact, for the last 2 years our budget has been in surplus, except for the interest necessary to pay the debt run up in the several years before I became President. So we are doing our best to pay for these programs. And this program will be paid for by budgeted savings in the balanced budget plan. We cannot go back to the days of something for nothing, or pretend that in order to invest in education we have to sacrifice fiscal responsibility.

Now, this program will do three things. It will open the doors of college opportunity to every American, regardless of their ability to pay. Education at the typical community college will now be free. And the very few States that have tuition above the amount that we can afford to credit, I would challenge those States to close the gap. We're going to take care of most of the States. The rest of them should help us the last little way.

Second, it will offer free tuition and training to every adult willing to work for it. Nobody now needs to be stuck in a dead-end job or in unemployment.

And finally, this plan will work because it will go to people who, by definition, are willing to work for it. It's America's most basic bargain. We'll help create opportunity if you'll take responsibility. This is the basic bargain that has made us a great nation.

I know that here at the reunion weekend the class of '46 has celebrated its 50th reunion. And I want to just mention them one more time. Many members of the class of '46 fought in the Second World War. And they came home and laid down their arms and took up the responsibility of the future with the help of the GI bill. That's when our Nation did its part simply by giving them the opportunity to make the most of their own lives. And in doing that, they made America's most golden years.

The ultimate lesson of the class of 1946 will also apply to the class of 1996 in the 21st century. Because of the education you have, if America does well, you will do very well. If America is a good country to live in you will be able to build a very good life.

So I ask you never to be satisfied with an age of probability for only the sons and daughters of Princeton. You could go your own way in a society that, after all, seems so often to be coming apart instead of coming together. You will, of course, have the ability to succeed in the global economy, even if you have to secede from those Americans trapped in the old economy. But you should not walk away from our common purpose.

Again I will say this is about far more than economics and money. It is about preserving the quality of our democracy, the integrity of every person standing as an equal citizen before the law, the ability of our country to prove that no matter how diverse we get, we can still come together in shared community values to make each of our lives and our family's lives stronger and richer and better. This is about more than money.

The older I get and the more I become aware that I have more yesterdays than tomorrows, the more I think that in our final hours, which all of us have to face, very rarely will we say, "Gosh, I wish I'd spent more time at the office," or, "If only I'd just made a little more money." But we will think about the dreams we lived out, the wonders we knew when we were most fully alive. This is about giving every single, solitary soul in this country the chance to be most fully alive. And if we do that, those of you who have this brilliant education, who have been gifted by God with great minds and strong bodies and hearts, you will do very well, and you will be very happy.

In 1914 Woodrow Wilson wrote as President, "The future is clear and bright with the promise of the best things. We are all in the same boat. We shall advance and advance together with a new spirit." I wish you well, and I pray that you will advance and advance together with a new spirit.

God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the courtyard of Nassau Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Harold Shapiro, president of the university.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979
June 4, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order No. 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 4, 1996.

Remarks at the Small Business Week Dinner
June 4, 1996

Thank you very much. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I don't know who spoke before or what happened, but whoever got you in such a good humor, I'd like to have them do more of it. I like that. Thank you very much. I'm delighted to be here.

I want to begin by thanking Phil Lader and Ginger Lew and Jere Glover and all the people who work at the Small Business Administration for their efforts on your behalf, their constant lobbying the White House, and the work that they do every day to try to help create more jobs through America's small businesses.

I'm also glad to see—I see some of you out there who were at the White House Conference on Small Business. That was one of the highlights of my Presidency when I got to read the Federal regulation on grits. Remember that? [*Laughter*] That conference nearly made a liar out of me. I told you we were getting rid of 16,000 pages of Federal regulations, and we are, but it turned out the regulation on grits was one of the hardest ones to get rid of. [*Laughter*]

We got one letter from a businessman—I read it, actually—pleading with me not to get rid of the regulation on grits, saying that people would just be desperate trying to sort out the different kinds of corn necessary to make grits. If I hadn't been living on grits since I was an infant, I might not have had the sense to resist the intrigue to keep the regulation. [*Laughter*] But somebody over at the Agriculture Department wanted to resist. It took me a year to get rid of that regulation. But anyway, I'm here to announce it's over. Goodbye. [*Laughter*] But anyway, we got rid of the regulation.

I also want to begin by congratulating the honorees in the Small Business Person of the Year contest, all of you who won at the various State levels. And I just had a chance to meet with Phyllis Hannan and with Terry Anderson and with Robert and Laurie Lozano and to hear a little bit about the businesses they run and the work that they do.

But I want to say to all of you, one of the proudest achievements to me that America has had in the last 3 years is that in each of the last 3 years there have been more new small businesses started than in any previous year in American history. And I'm very proud of that. That means that this country is moving in the right direction, that we're becoming a more diverse, more solid, more balanced economy. And that's a very good thing.

I was very concerned 4 years ago when I became President that our economy seemed to be in drift and that the job growth rate was very slow, the economy was stagnant, the deficit was staggering. And we put in place a strategy that we believed would turn it around.

The first thing we did was to make a commitment to dramatically cut the deficit. We knew we had to cut it in half in 4 years, and we thought if we did we could get interest rates way down.

Then we wanted to try to open large numbers of new markets to American products and services and to try to get more American businesses into those markets. And that's a lot of the work that Mickey Kantor did when he was trade ambassador and the late Ron Brown when he was our previous Secretary of Commerce.

I just left a business meeting in which a man came up to me and told me that he was a member of the other party, but he said, "Nobody ever helped us—ever—overseas like Ron Brown did. And we appreciate it." We really tried to do that. We've had Mickey Kantor negotiate 200 separate trade agreements. And these things, we thought, would make a difference.

The third thing we tried to do was to take the money that we had left after we started trying to squeeze the budget and target the investment. We tried to shrink the size of the Federal Government and target more investments to education, research, technology, defense conversion in the States that had been really hurt by cutbacks in defense, the things that would grow the economy over the long run.

Now, after 3½ years, we see now that the deficit is less than half of what it was. Four years ago it was $290 billion, and it's projected to be $130 billion this year. For 2 years in a row we have run an operating surplus with your Federal budget. If it had not been for the interest rates—interest payments we make on the debt run up in the previous 12 years, we'd have been in surplus the last 2 years. So we are going to keep going.

Contrary to what you read about all the fights we're having with Congress whether we have this agreement or not, because we can't agree on what the structure of Medicare and Medicaid and what the investment levels in education and the environment should be, whatever, without that agreement, we're still going to keep bringing that deficit down every year until we balance the budget. We have to do it. It's the right thing to do. But we've already seen a dramatic decline in interest rates from where they were 4 years ago, and as a result of that—plus an all-time high in exports, plus the investments that have been made—we have now at least 8½ million more jobs. It's going to be recalculated later this week. There may be even more than that.

As I said, record numbers of new small-business people, 3.7 million new American homeowners, the lowest combined rates of unemployment, inflation, and home mortgage rates in 30 years. Our deficit is the lowest as a percentage of our income of any advanced economy in the world, any big economy, and the lowest it's been in America since 1979. And business investment is the highest it's been since 30 years. And I think that is a pretty good record for the American people to be proud of, and a lot of it has been generated by you.

We have—because we know there are some things that we can't do anything about until we want to make something good happen—we've tried to change the emphasis of American policy a little bit. I want to just mention one because it affects you. It is obvious that if you look at the numbers, I believe it's every year since 1980, the aggregate employment of the Fortune 500 in the United States has gone down, I believe going all the way back to 1980. And the aggregate employment of small- and medium-sized businesses has gone up.

So if we want to grow jobs more rapidly, if we want to keep the unemployment rate at 5.4 percent or lower, and if we want to pierce the areas of high unemployment in America, the inner cities, the isolated rural areas, where no new jobs have come yet in this economic recovery, the only way to do it is to make those areas more attractive for small business, to make it easier for people to pierce those areas who are prepared to be there, to make a commitment, to try to relate to the people who live there.

Now, we've tried to do five specific things for the SBA, and I just want to go over them very quickly because I think the Small Business Administration under Phil Lader and under his predecessor, Erskine Bowles, has really done a very, very good job at trying to reach out and support the small-business community.

The first thing we want to do is improve access to capital. The SBA has doubled the loan volume over the last 3 years while cutting its budget by nearly a third. I know of no other Government agency that ever did anything like that, but that's exactly what they have done.

There is—more private capital has entered the SBIC program in the last 18 months than in the last 15 years combined. The 7(a) guaranteed business loan program has some 7,000 lending partners working with the agency to provide almost $8 billion to small-business owners last year. That's a 52 percent increase over the

year before, including an 86 percent increase to women business owners and a 53 percent increase to minority-owned businesses. No quotas, no preferences, no nothing—everybody who is qualified had a chance to compete and get what they were entitled to. And I think you should all be proud of the record that American small businesses have made in that program.

The second thing we've tried to do in SBA was to set a better example than I did with taking a whole year to get rid of the grits regulation. And so the SBA has cut the number of its regulations in half, simplified the rest. A lot of you are very familiar with the one-page LowDoc loan program and the quick turnaround for loans of up to $100,000. I'm very proud of that. But you should also know that we do have the SBA now working very hard with EPA, with OSHA, and with other agencies trying to get improvements in their regulatory pattern, especially with regard to small businesses.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration now is working on measuring their performance of their own inspectors based on the safety results of the plants and the businesses that are measured, not based on how many citations they write or how many people they write up but on the safety records of the people involved.

We're working on cutting the total compliance time the EPA takes out of the private sector by 25 percent. And we're on track to make it by the end of this year. I hope we will, and I believe we will.

The third thing we've tried to do is to reinvent the SBA. We've had to cut everything nearly in Federal Government to try to reach our budget totals. There are now 237,000 fewer people working for the United States of America than there were the day I became President. We've had a reduction of 237,000. The Federal Government is now the smallest it's been since 1965. By the end of this year, it will be the smallest—as small as it was when John Kennedy was President of the United States in 1963. And by the way, as a percentage of the civilian work force, which is probably a better way to measure it, the Federal Government is now the same size it was in 1933 before the New Deal. And interestingly enough, one reason not very many people know that is that we only had to involuntarily separate 1,750 of those 237,000 people. We managed down the rest with early retirement, with people finding other jobs, with other things. We didn't have to—we only had to involuntarily separate because of budget cuts 1,750 out of those 237,000 people.

But as a result of that, every agency had to take its cut. SBA employment has been reduced by more than a third. And yet they've still been able to double the loan volume. So we're working on doing that in a way that doesn't cut the services to the small-business community.

We've also, fourthly, tried to improve small business education, counseling, and information through our development center program, our business information centers. I think that they are working better with the one-stop approach to business counseling.

And finally, we've tried to let the SBA serve as my eyes and ears, to try to get better policy changes. That's one of the things that the White House Conference on Small Business was designed to do.

Recently I signed one piece of legislation that was recommended by the conference. The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, which allows small businesses to challenge Federal regulations in court and is one of the most significant regulatory actions taken for small businesses in the last decade, came right out of the White House conference. So if you were a part of that, you should be proud of it because even though we supported it and the Congress passed it, it was actually your doing.

We also got some very important recommendations out of the White House conference on making retirement more accessible to small business. And one of the things that the Congress and the White House clearly agree on—and I hope we can get it passed, notwithstanding all the other budget fights—is a whole package of retirement simplification and access legislation, about five different bills that, as far as I know, has the unanimous support of the Republican leadership, the Democratic leadership, and the White House that would make pensions much easier for small businesses to access and make them much more portable for people who have to change jobs.

Now, I don't know how many—I got a letter the other day from a guy I grew up with complaining that it took him 9 or 10 months to transfer his 401(k) plan when he moved from one small business to another and a lot of those kind of problems would just go away if this

legislation would pass. As I said, as far as I know, there is no opposition to this package of legislation, again, not because of me or because of the leaders of Congress, but because it came out of the White House Conference on Small Business, and we are all trying to listen. I hope we can do more of that.

As far as I know, there is also very little opposition to an appropriate reduction in the estate tax burden, to expanding the expensing allowance—you know, we took it from 10 to 17.5 and I think it's going to go up to 25 under all the proposed new plans, budget plans—and to increasing the health insurance, the deductions for self-employed people, again, largely because of what you have been doing.

Now, finally, we had a White House Conference on Corporate Citizenship the other day at which your Small Business Person of the Year was present—we were just talking about it—in which a lot of the bigger businesses were saying that one of the things that we needed to do in this budget was to re-enact the tax deduction that employers get for helping provide for the education of their employees which historically has been a deduction of up to $5,250.

In addition to that, I am going to recommend again in our budget plans when we get down to this, that we provide a 10 percent tax credit for small businesses who are willing to undertake some of the expense of helping their employees improve their education and training because we know it's a bigger burden for small businesses. It's more difficult for them, and very often you don't know if you're going to have the employees for as long as some of the bigger companies can guarantee that they'll have theirs. But since we know that one of the biggest problems with stagnant wages in America and growing inequality is the lack of skills among our already adult work force, we want to provide whatever incentives we can to help you if you're so inclined to support the education and training of your employees. So I hope also that that will be successful.

Now, finally, I'd just like to tell you about a proposal I made up at Princeton University today. I went up there and gave the commencement speech, and I learned that I was only the third commencement speaker in 100 years. It sort of embarrassed me. I was afraid nobody would ever get asked back if I did a bad job. And then I learned that they only asked the President to speak every 50 years and then they didn't have commencement speakers the rest of the time. So I relaxed and said what I intended to. [*Laughter*]

I recommended at Princeton that we change the Tax Code in a way that would make available to every single American 2 years of education after high school because I believe—if you go back and look at the whole 20th century, when we started this century with a new industrial era was the first time we ever had States requiring people to go to school at all, any kind of required public attendance at education. And then after a few decades we required people to go to school for 10 years. Then after a couple more, we said, well, everybody needs a high school diploma.

Well, if you look at the 1990 census now, we know that on balance younger workers who have high school diplomas don't keep up with inflation in their earnings. But younger workers that have at least a community college degree of some kind do, and do quite well. We also know that nearly every American is within driving distance of a community college and that by and large they are more affordable than the 4-year schools.

So I had previously in my budget plan that we give everybody—and this would be good for a lot of your children—but we give everybody a $10,000 deduction for the cost of education after high school, for tuition cost, up to $10,000 a year as a tax deduction. Today I recommended that on the bottom of that, if you will, anybody who wanted to would be instead able to take a credit of up to $1,500 which covers most of the community college tuitions in this country for a community college tuition for one year, no questions asked, and then, if they maintained a B average, to get it for a second year, which literally would make, instead of 12 years, 14 years of education accessible to every single American in the country. It could revolutionize opportunities for people, and I hope you will support that.

Let me just make one final point. I know we're going into an election season, and we have that every 4 years—really, every 2 years. And on the whole that's a good thing. If it's done right, it gives us a chance to reassess where we are, to debate the differences between us, to have an honest discussion. And it's a very positive thing. But what I'd like to point out is that when we work together up here and do agree on what we have in common and leave

our differences to the side, we can do a lot of good things for this country.

We adopted a budget, 6 months late, but we adopted a budget which continued to reduce the deficit and continued to meet what I think are our fundamental obligations to the people. We adopted a telecommunications bill which gave small-business people in the telecommunications area a chance to compete in this brave, new world we are going into and still will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs in the telecommunications area. We adopted a tough antiterrorism bill to deal with one of the biggest law enforcement problems not only the United States but people all over the world have. Just because we said, look, here's what we agree on. So we don't agree on everything. I gave up what I couldn't get. They gave up what they couldn't get. We passed the bill; we signed it. That's the way the American system is supposed to work.

So I would say to you, I am still committed to getting a balanced budget act. I'm still committed to getting campaign finance reform. And I'm still committed to getting the kinds of targeted tax relief we talked about here tonight that I believe would help to create more small businesses and help more small businesses stay in business and help generate more jobs.

I believe this country is in as good a shape to seize the future as any great country in the world. And I believe the best days of this country are still before us. What we have got to do is to recognize that with all of our diversity—you just look around here. Just imagine what the difference in the way this crowd looks today and the way it would look 30 or 40 years ago. Just look around this room. And there is no country in the world as well-positioned for the global economy as we are, managing its diversity as well, giving different people opportunities, and all we've got to do is to figure out that we've just got to keep working together, keep pulling together, and keep going forward. Our best days are still ahead of us, and you and small business are going to lead the way.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:12 p.m. in the Presidential Ballroom at the Capital Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Small Business Person of the Year Phyllis Hannan, first runner-up Terry Anderson, and second runners-up Robert and Laurie Lozano. The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 was title II of the Contract with America Advancement Act of 1996, approved March 29 and assigned Public Law No. 104–121.

Remarks on Health Care Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters
June 5, 1996

The President. Good afternoon. Let me say that I'm looking forward to this opportunity to meet with the House Democratic caucus to talk about the work that we have ahead of us. But before I do, I would like to make one particular point. Of all the issues before us, I would very much like to see the Congress take up and pass a good, clean version of the Kennedy-Kassebaum health care reform bill in the next few days.

Senator Dole has said that he will be leaving the Senate soon, and I respect that decision. But this is one issue that he and I agree on. He very much wants this bill to pass in a good form that I can sign. And I just want to say to him and to all of you that I'm prepared to do whatever it takes in the next few days to meet with him, do whatever I can, and meet with other Republicans to try to get the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill passed before he leaves the Senate. I think that is something we ought to do for the American people. I know it would mean a lot to him. It would certainly mean a lot to me. And I'm very hopeful that we can prevail in getting that done.

Medicare

Q. Mr. President, the Medicare trustees are reporting today that there was one less year of solvency than originally expected. You have said in the past this should be put off until after the election. Do you still feel it should be put off?

The President. No, no, no. No, I haven't said—I'm sorry. Our plan—and by the way, the savings that have been agreed on already by the Republicans and the Democrats in the balanced budget negotiations would put another decade on the Medicare Trust Fund. And I think we ought to do that right away. I have always felt that way. The plan that I detailed last year included Medicare reductions of $270 billion, $170 billion more than the trust fund—the trustees said was necessary to go into the trust fund to stabilize it.

But the differences in our numbers now are not that dramatic, and the amount that we have agreed on in common would add—would take it out to 10 years, and I think we ought to do that now. I've always said we should go on and pass the right kind of balanced budget and do that. We can do that now with no trouble. We have agreed on those things. Providers know they're coming. Everybody understands how they would be managed. And I think we ought to do that. We should not wait.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—you all can get together on those. Is that the problem?

The President. What?

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Well, yes. The problems are, I think, far more than the money involved, is the structure of Medicare. I don't favor breaking the structure of Medicare. I think putting the medical savings account for Medicare payments in would be a particularly bad idea. You know, Medicare has the lowest administrative cost of any health insurance plan in America, private or public. It has done a basically good job. There are more seniors now on the plan than ever before. We have to deal with the population problems that exist now and the ones that are going to exist in the future.

But we have the ability right now to put 10 years into the life of the Medicare Trust Fund, and we ought to just do it. We ought to just go on and do that. We can do that with no problem, and we can do it in the context of a balanced budget plan.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:50 p.m. at the Longworth House Office Building on Capitol Hill prior to a meeting with the House Democratic caucus. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the Nomination for Chief of Naval Operations

June 5, 1996

I am pleased to nominate Admiral Jay L. Johnson, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Johnson currently serves as the Vice Chief of Naval Operations. He brings to the job of Chief of Naval Operations a dynamic vision of the Navy's future, a wealth of operational experience, a decisive leadership style, and a deep regard for America's sailors.

During his distinguished career, Admiral Johnson completed two combat cruises in Vietnam and served as the Deputy Commander of Operation Restore Democracy and Uphold Democracy in Haiti. As Commander Second Fleet, he significantly improved the effectiveness of our forces in both multiservice and multinational operations. As Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel, he oversaw the career development of the officer and enlisted community during the challenging post-cold war drawdown.

Admiral Johnson assumes the post of Chief of Naval Operations with the full trust and confidence of the Navy community at a crucial time in its history. I will depend upon him to continue Admiral Mike Boorda's high standards and demanding goals for the Navy. With Admiral Johnson at the helm, I am confident that our Navy will continue to protect and advance our Nation's freedom and security.

Statement on the Report on Substance Abuse and Women
June 5, 1996

The report by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA) on "Substance Abuse and the American Woman" reveals the distinctive characteristics of alcohol, tobacco, and drug abuse by women. The report, based on a 2-year study, provides valuable new insights into this pressing problem and documents long-term trends that show young women closing the gender gap with young men in substance abuse.

The report also points out a unique consequence of substance abuse among women, the effect of alcohol, tobacco, and drug use on newborn children. My administration is determined to do all we can to curb alcohol, tobacco, and drug abuse by young Americans, and this report will contribute to that effort. I congratulate Joe Califano, the president of CASA, and the center for their fine work in combating substance abuse. I especially salute Betty Ford for her courage and commitment in devoting her life to helping America deal with drug and alcohol abuse and addiction.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report on Small Business
June 5, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to you my annual report on the state of small business, and to report that small businesses are doing exceptionally well. In the year covered by this report, a record 807,000 new firms reported initial employment. Firms in industries dominated by small businesses created almost 60 percent of the nearly 3.3 million new jobs. Business failures and bankruptcies declined at some of the sharpest rates in a decade.

Small businesses have both contributed to and benefited from the recent strength of the economy. The deficit reduction plan I initiated in 1993 has cut the budget deficit in half. The economy has created 8.5 million new jobs since January 1993—almost all of them in the private sector. The combined rate of unemployment and inflation is at its lowest level in more than 25 years.

A major success story has been in the women-owned business sector. Women are creating new businesses and new jobs at double the national rate. Today, women own one-third of all businesses in the United States. Clearly, there is no stopping this fast-growing segment of the economy.

Last June I met in Washington with nearly 2,000 small business owners—participants in the national White House Conference on Small Business. They took precious time away from their businesses to tell us about their problems and their ideas for resolving them, turning over a list of 60 recommendations for Government action. Their ideas are reflected in many of the recent initiatives of my Administration.

Improving Access to Capital

One of the keys to a healthy small business sector is access to adequate start-up and working capital. The Small Business Lending Enhancement Act of 1995, which I signed last October, helped to increase access to capital through the Small Business Administration's (SBA) section 7(a) loan guarantee program. Last year, the SBA provided nearly $11 billion in long-term credit and other financial assistance to more than 67,000 small businesses, bringing SBA's total loan portfolio to $26 billion. The number of 7(a) guaranteed loans has increased dramatically, up 52 percent from fiscal year 1994 to fiscal year 1995—and that's with a smaller budget and fewer employees at the SBA. Moreover, during that same period, the number of 7(a) guaranteed loans to women-owned businesses grew by 86 percent; loans to minority-owned businesses increased by 53 percent; and loans to businesses owned by U.S. veterans grew by 43 percent.

Other initiatives are under way. My Administration has been working with banks and bank-

ing regulators to remove impediments to small business lending by financial institutions. The Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 amended the banking and securities laws to promote the growth of a secondary market for small business loans. And my Administration is looking to reduce small business securities filing and disclosure burdens. In June 1995, the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed regulations that would further this small business goal.

Easing the Tax Burden

The Federal Government should reward rather than discourage entrepreneurs who take risks and create jobs. To that end, we have worked to simplify the tax code and make it more equitable for small firms.

In April 1995, I signed legislation to increase to 30 percent the share of health insurance premiums that self-employed individuals can deduct on their tax returns beginning this tax year—and we're working to increase that amount.

Small firms are less likely than their larger counterparts to be able to provide retirement plans. While 75 percent of workers in businesses with more than 1,000 employees have pension plans, only 24 percent of workers in businesses with fewer than 100 employees have them. I have proposed a new pension plan targeted to the needs of small businesses—the National Employee Savings Trust (NEST). The NEST would provide benefits similar to those of a 401(k) pension plan and would be simple to create and operate.

My Administration has endorsed other improvements that make existing pension plans safer and more beneficial for business owners and employees alike. For example, we have proposed to eliminate the "family aggregation" restrictions on pensions for family members, so that spouses or children who work in the same or related businesses can earn their own retirement benefits.

Our 1993 economic plan made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief. It established a targeted tax preference for capital gains, reduced the record-keeping requirements for the meals and entertainment deduction, and raised the small business expensing limit for equipment by 75 percent, to $17,500. We have proposed to increase further the value of equipment that can be directly expensed to $25,000.

My Administration is also taking steps to ensure that tax regulations are as simple and understandable as possible. For example, administrative guidance has been published to provide tax relief to S corporations and partnerships, simplify depreciation computations, and ease inventory capitalization for small businesses.

We are pursuing tax form simplification through our Simplified Tax and Wage Reporting System (STAWRS). This joint effort among Federal and State agencies will simplify, unify, and streamline tax reporting so that taxpayers will eventually be able to file their State and Federal tax and wage returns at one location, electronically. All these efforts will bring tax reporting into the modern age while reducing the paperwork burden for small business.

Shrinking the Regulatory and Paperwork Burden

Regulation and paperwork continue to be a key concern of America's small business owners, and I am proud of the progress my Administration has made in addressing this concern. For example, the SBA is streamlining all its regulations and converting them to plain English. An application form for the most common SBA loans used to be an inch thick and take 5 to 6 weeks to approve. We've reduced the form to one page and cut turn-around time to 3 days.

I've said it before: the era of big Government is over. We have been working hard to give the American people a Government that works better and costs less. We are eliminating 16,000 pages of unnecessary regulations and streamlining 31,000 more—shifting decision-making out of Washington and back to States and local communities. In addition, we are directing Federal agencies, where possible, to cut by half the frequency of reports the public is required to provide to the Government.

More broadly, much of our National Performance Review effort to reinvent Government has been pointed specifically at helping small business. The U.S. Business Advisor, which provides Internet access to information from all Federal agencies, and the U.S. General Store for Small Business, which offers business owners one location for dealing with the Federal government, illustrate our commitment to reinventing how Government serves the small business community.

In March 1995, I announced a new approach to lessening the regulatory burden on small

firms. Under this commonsense approach, small businesses can now avoid paying penalties for violations if they correct the problem within an appropriate period of time. And for those violations that may take longer to correct, a small business may get up to 100 percent of its fine waived if that same money is used to correct the violation.

I'm proud to have succeeded in putting more teeth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA). Under the 1980 Act, Federal Government agencies must analyze their proposed regulations for their effects on small firms—and revise them if they will create an unfair burden. In the past, however, because the agencies' analyses could not be reviewed in the courts, small businesses had no meaningful recourse if an agency made a poor decision. On March 29, I signed into law the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, which allows for judicial review of Federal agency RFA analyses. The Act also emphasizes compliance assistance and requires agencies to provide small businesses with simple and clear guidelines to assist them in complying with the regulations that affect them.

As small business owners have told us, they care about environmental protection and occupational safety; after all, they drink the same water, breathe the same air, and share the same workplace hazards as everyone else. My Administration has challenged small businesses and regulatory agencies to find cheaper, more efficient ways than government regulation to meet the high environmental and workplace standards Americans want.

Opening Markets and Expanding Trade

Every year the Federal Government spends $200 billion on goods and services, and small businesses receive a substantial share of that market. I am committed to expanding further the opportunities for small businesses to win Federal contracts. I fought for the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 and the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1996, which have simplified the procurement process and made it easier for small firms to do business with the Federal Government.

The 1994 law also created a new Government-wide electronic commerce system, FACNET, which will eventually permit electronic submission of bids and proposals. I encourage small businesses to take advantage of these new procurement procedures to provide more goods and services to the Government.

In addition to the Federal marketplace, foreign markets offer significant opportunities for small business owners to compete and win. While the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) are opening markets abroad, my Administration's National Export Strategy has made it easier here at home for small businesses to export. Among other things, we've opened 14 U.S. Export Assistance Centers to provide one-stop access to export information, marketing assistance, and finance.

Technology and Innovation

Technological innovation by small firms is a major reason for America's leadership in the world economy. Through the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs, the Federal Government taps into the brain power of small businesses to meet its own research needs. In the process, these programs help spur technological innovation to foster new businesses and jobs.

The Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program alone has nearly doubled awards to small businesses during my Administration—up from $508 million in 1992 to more than $900 million in 1995. And the quality of SBIR research proposals has kept pace with the program's expansion.

We've also dramatically expanded the Manufacturing Extension Partnership to help America's 380,000 smaller manufacturers become more competitive in world markets. Sixty locally managed manufacturing extension centers—up from seven in 1993—are delivering much-needed services to this important small business sector.

As this report documents, changes are coming at lightning speed. Small business owners recognize that they will need all the technological skill and "connectivity" they can muster just to keep up. Through manufacturing extension centers, FACNET, the U.S. Business Advisor, and other information networks, we can help make available the information small businesses need to start up and succeed.

The Human Factor

If the heart of our entrepreneurial economy is small business, then the heart of small business is its people—small business owners and

their employees. We need to work with small businesses to strengthen and support this dynamic human resource.

We've seen what business growth can do for communities, and we hope to encourage more business formation in empowerment zones and enterprise communities: legislation before the Congress would provide more tax incentives and waivers of some regulatory requirements in these areas. SBA's one-stop capital shops specifically target empowerment zones and enterprise communities.

As I mentioned earlier, we're taking steps to modify the tax code in ways that will make it easier for small businesses to offer health care and retirement plans to their employees. We also want to make sure that workers and their families can keep their health insurance even when they change jobs. I have urged the Congress to enact the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, which would make health insurance coverage more "portable" for our Nation's workers.

We want to make better use of our work force training dollars by consolidating and streamlining many of our Federal work force training programs. Under our proposal, States and localities would have more flexibility to administer these programs in the way that will do the most good for our workers and small business owners.

I'm pleased that young entrepreneurs were represented at the White House Conference on Small Business and that the conference looked to our economic future by endorsing more mentorships and workplace educational opportunities for young people. These private-sector-led efforts form an essential part of the work-based learning program I envisioned when I signed into law the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994.

It takes a great deal of courage to start something new, to carve a reality out of a dream, often with few resources, sometimes in adverse surroundings, and in an economy that demands much of its participants. That is why we celebrate and listen to America's small business owners and why we will continue to look for ways to nurture and support this powerful economic engine—the small business sector.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 5, 1996.

Remarks at the Fulbright Scholarship Program 50th Anniversary Dinner
June 5, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, let me say a special welcome to all of you, especially to our distinguished guests from overseas, to the Members of Congress, and of course, particularly to the members of the Fulbright family, to Harriet and to Betsey and Bosey and Tad. We're delighted to have all of you here tonight.

Hillary and I have looked forward for some time to celebrating this 50th anniversary of the Fulbright program, to honor the dream and legacy of a great American, a citizen of the world, a native of my home State, and my mentor and friend, Senator Fulbright—a man who understood, long before others did, that the only way we could ever have peace in the world was by increasing understanding among people, by the open trading of ideas and knowledge and world views and friendships as well as goods and services.

Those of us who shared his roots in the Arkansas Ozarks owe him a special debt of gratitude. His vision and brilliance and the power of his example said to a whole generation of us who were landlocked—and most of us had never been very far from home by the time we were nearly grown—that we could still imagine a world beyond the borders of our State and relate to it, to participate in it, that we needed to understand that world, and that perhaps we had something to give to it. To all Americans, Senator Fulbright gave the gift of understanding that the only way to lasting peace is for people to understand one another, the simple act of giving and receiving the best that each of us has to offer.

Now for five decades, the Fulbright program has stood as a proud symbol of our Nation's fundamental commitment to that ideal. For hun-

dreds of thousands of scholars here and abroad, it has cemented America's mission as a nation that cares about and is engaged in the world community. Many of our world's finest leaders and artists have benefited from this special experience. Some of them are here tonight, and I thank them for their presence. No matter their native tongue, all of them are now known by the proud name of Fulbrights.

Senator Fulbright once said, "The essence of intercultural education is the acquisition of empathy, the ability to see the world as others see it and to allow for the possibility that others may see something we have failed to see." Parenthetically, we might need a interparty Fulbright program in Washington these days. [*Laughter*] He went on to say that "the simple purpose of the exchange program is to erode the culturally rooted mistrust that sets our nations against one another. It is not a panacea but an avenue of hope."

Tonight, as we celebrate 50 years of bipartisan support for the Fulbright program, let us all rededicate ourselves to this ideal; let us pledge to do all we can to give the Fulbright program to future generations of aspiring young people across the globe.

And let us close as we offer a toast to the Fulbright scholarship program, to the Fulbright scholars, and to the memory of Senator Fulbright.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:27 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Fulbright's widow, Harriet Mayor Fulbright; daughters Betsey Fulbright Winnacker and Roberta (Bosey) Foote; and son-in-law Edward Thaddeus Foote.

Exchange With Reporters Following a Meeting With First-Time Homeowners

June 6, 1996

FHA Closing Costs

Q. Mr. President, don't you think the Republicans will say that reducing the FHA closing costs is just an election year gimmick?

The President. I don't know what they'll say. But we've been working on this for quite some time now, and it's a part of an ongoing strategy. And we started in 1993 by driving the interest rates down, and in that year alone, something like 5½ million people refinanced their home mortgages. So many American middle class working people, starting with young people like the Kastens, have all their savings in a home. And we just feel that anything we can do to facilitate people buying their own homes and to speed the process along will increase savings in America, increase security, and support families.

So that's what we're trying to do. We're trying to get—we have, I think, about 3.7 million new homeowners since I became President, and we're working on a target of 8 million by the year 2000. If we can get to 8 million, then we'll have homeownership at two-thirds of the American people; it will be the highest it's ever been in American history. That's what we're trying to do.

[*At this point, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Henry Cisneros explained administration actions to reduce closing costs for home buyers.*]

Balanced Budget Amendment

Q. Mr. President, does the Senate vote today on a balanced budget amendment give Senator Dole ammunition against you? Are you standing in the way of a balanced budget?

The President. No. Look at what Senator Exon said, probably the strongest balanced budget advocate over a longer period of time than anybody in the Senate, of either party. And he's actually changing his vote, as I understand it, today because he doesn't want the gimmick of saying we're going to have a balanced budget amendment which will take forever and a day to take impact and get in the way of the fact that there are now—there are on the table, there's a Republican plan and my plan that existed when they walked away from the negotiations several months ago. Both of them

would balance the budget by 2002; both of them have savings in common to do it.

And I would say again, whatever happens in that vote today—and the President doesn't sign or veto amendments—whatever happens in that vote today, the Congress ought to come back, pass the savings we have in common, give the American people a balanced budget, take the differences between them, and then take that to the voters in November. Let the voters resolve the differences; let us do what we have in common. That's the way our system is supposed to work. Representative government is supposed to take what we have in common and make progress and let the voters resolve the differences. That's how the system is supposed to work.

So I would say that however this vote comes out, it's not an excuse not to go on and balance the budget. If we did that, we'd get interest rates down some more, and we'd have more people like the Kastens buying homes next year.

President's Home

Q. When are you going to buy a home? How come you don't get one?

The President. You know how much my first home cost? About $20,500—1,000 square feet, 1,100 square feet. Same sort of deal.

Q. Time to get a new one, isn't it?

The President. I hope not. [*Laughter*] I hope I've got a little time on that. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:20 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to first-time home buyers Spencer and Lisa Kasten.

Remarks at the National Homeownership Summit
June 6, 1996

Thank you very much. When Lisa was up here talking and she said, "When we bought our home, I didn't realize this went along with it," I thought I would—[*laughter*]. But her husband and I agree that she did so well, she may have a future at this line of work. Don't you think she did? [*Applause*]

I want to thank all of you for being here—the other families who are here. I'm sure they could have given a testimonial much like the one that Lisa and Spencer gave. I want to thank the public officials who are here: Congressman Chaka Fattah from Pennsylvania; and Mayor and Mrs. Lanier; Mayor Albano; Mayor Yunits; Prince George's County executive, my neighbor, Wayne Curry; and Jefferson County commissioner David Armstrong, who shares my common roots and home. I want to thank all of you in the private sector who worked for a year with our national homeownership strategy and those of you who worked for a lifetime to help people realize the dream of owning their own home.

When I became President, I saw this mission of expanding homeownership as part of our larger goal of restoring economic opportunity and a sense of security to Americans who are working hard and trying to build families and raise children. The fact that homeownership had stagnated for several years, to me, was just another indication of why we needed to get our economy moving and working for ordinary people again.

I think everybody here, of whatever age, remembers the first home you bought. Actually, I was thinking how much more persuasive Spencer was than I was; he got married first and then bought a home. [*Laughter*] Some of you heard me tell this story before, but I had to buy a home to get married. [*Laughter*]

Hillary and I had been going together for several years and we were living in Fayetteville, Arkansas, and we were both teaching at the university law school. And she was going away on some trip—she was always getting trips to go away on—and she—I took her to the airport one day. We passed this old house. She said, "Boy, that's a pretty house." I said, "It really is." So I took her to the airport. I went back and checked on the house. It was 1,100 square feet; it cost $20,500; and it was a beautiful little house, no air conditioning, attic fan, hardwood floors. And I bought the house. And I made whatever the downpayment was. I remember my mortgage payment was $174 a month. And

so 3 or 4 days later, she came back from her trip. And I said, "You remember that house you like so well?" I said, "I bought that house. Now, don't you think you'll have to marry me so I won't have to live there by myself?" [*Laughter*] I am a living example of the power of homeownership to strengthen families and build better futures.

I am very proud of what has been done in the last year. I want to thank Secretary Cisneros, all of the team at HUD. They have done a wonderful job. I don't believe we've ever had a HUD Secretary as energetic, as full of good ideas, as able to build bridges, as able to achieve things as Henry Cisneros.

We knew if we could get the economy going again, something would happen to homeownership. And in 1993 we began to work on a strategy that would do three things. First of all, it would drive the deficit down and therefore get interest rates down; second, one that would open the world's markets to our products and services so we could get our exports up and create more jobs that were high-wage jobs; and third, one that would invest in the areas that are critical to our long-term growth, the education and training of our people, technology, research, development, our infrastructure.

And after 3½ years we've got over 8½ million new jobs. The deficit has gone down now for 4 years in a row. The deficit was $290 billion when I took office. It's projected to be about $130 billion this year, and it's come down a long way. We've had 3 years of record numbers of new small businesses starting, which is something that's very important to our long-term health and well-being. And now we have, in the last 3 years, 3.7 million people, like the Kastens, new homeowners in America. And I think that's something we can all be proud of.

Homeownership is now at a 15-year high, and last year the increase was the highest rate of increase in homeownership in almost 30 years. And one of the things that I also want to point out that I'm very proud of is that homeownership is more broadly distributed now in America than it has been in a long time. There's been a very rapid increase in the number of African-American first-time homeowners, very rapid increase in the number of Hispanic homeowners, an increase in the number of working women with children who own their own homes now.

So we are working hard to broaden the benefits of that. And so many of you are a big part of that. Sixty-five percent of the American people now own their own homes. Our goal is to go from 3.7 million new homeowners to 8 million new homeowners by the year 2000, bringing us to over 67 percent of the American people, or two-thirds of the American people, that own homes by the year 2000, the first time that has ever been achieved in the history of this country. Together, you and I, all of us working together, we can achieve that goal. And I think we ought to recommit ourselves to it today.

I'd like to talk a little bit about what we're trying to do to increase further our role and do our part to work with the private sector on homeownership in the larger context of our obligation to create more opportunities for Americans who are willing to assume the responsibility of working for it to achieve those opportunities.

A couple of days ago at Princeton, I went to talk about the idea of making education more accessible to all Americans and reaffirmed my commitment to giving families a $10,000 deduction for the cost of education after high school and then said, in addition to that, I believe we know enough about the world economy to know that a high school education is not a guarantee of a good job with a growing income, and therefore we should make 2 more years of education available to every American by giving a tax credit of $1,500 for the 13th and 14th year for people who need it. So that will take every American—and open the doors of community college to every single American who needs it. And I think we ought to do that. I think it's very important.

I recommend, because I think it's good policy and because it's consistent with what we can afford and still balance the budget, that anybody be able to get the $1,500 the first year to go back to community college and then they get it the second year if they maintain a B average. I believe that if the taxpayers are going to pay for it—to in effect make it 14 years of public schooling but do it through tax credits—that we ought to give it to people who are really working hard and trying to do their part as well. So I hope all of you will support that and get behind it.

We can do the same sorts of things with homeownership. Anybody who's willing to take the risk and who can make the mortgage payments to buy their own home, it seems to me, we ought to do what we can to help. Besides

that, it's not all that easy to own your own home. Not all of us are plasterers like Mr. Kasten here. Anybody who's ever been up at 3 in the morning trying to fix a pipe sometimes probably has second thoughts about whether he did the right thing in the first place. [*Laughter*] But this country, for most of this century, has had a commitment to homeownership. And we've understood that homeownership was about more than a statistic, it was about growing the entire economy; it was about increasing the savings rates of Americans; it was about stabilizing the forces of family and childrearing and strengthening communities, that it was a big, big issue.

President Roosevelt and the Congress understood that in creating the FHA way back in 1934. They recognized that out-of-work families losing their homes because they couldn't keep up with payments was a long-term disaster for the United States, for more than the families losing their homes. They realized that letting people buy their own homes was the best way to make sure that they had a stake in our system and in our future. That's what the nationally backed mortgage system of insurance did.

And thanks to the FHA and the GI bill's VA home guarantee, for the first time—in 1948—for the very first time in the entire history of America, a majority of Americans own their own homes. And what we are doing today is simply building on a 50-year commitment to continue to enhance that.

In the 1980's what happened was our country got so concerned with short-term gains that we were willing to sacrifice a lot of long-term interests to those short-term gains. The big deficits that came about in the 1980's paid for some short-term economic growth but at the cost of very, very high interest rates, which put the brakes on homeownership. And we have been working, as I said, for 3 years to reverse those trends. It's looking pretty good.

One of the first things I noticed that came about after we announced and then enacted the deficit reduction plan in 1993 and we had a big reduction in interest rates was that people began to refinance their homes. So many people were on variable rate mortgages, they could do that. We believe that in 1993 alone 5½ million families refinanced their home loan in a way that saved them an average of more than $1,000 a year in payments. That was a stunning indicator to me that something was going right in this direction and we needed to continue to do more of it.

That is, by the way, why we will in this budget continue to bring the deficit down and why we ought to pass a balanced budget plan, because that's the best guarantee to keep the interest rates down while we grow the economy. And over the long run, keeping that kind of environment will guarantee more than anything else we can do the availability of affordable homeownership to the American people. So I hope all of you will continue to support us as we find ways to bring the deficit down and balance the budget and still meet our fundamental commitments to bring this country together and to help those who need it.

Let me also say that we tried to focus on what it would take to get from here where we are, with 3.7 million, to 8 million homeowners. And we've asked for all of your help in the partnership that you're part of with Secretary Cisneros and others in our administration. But one of the things that we focused on was, and that all of us can remember from our own experiences, I think, when we first started to buy a home, is how much it costs in front-end costs. And we found that one of the biggest barriers to young families buying homes was not the monthly mortgage payments but the upfront costs. They averaged about $4,400 a year.

And so I challenged FHA to do what it could over the next year to cut those costs by $1,000. For a lot of us who maybe have more yesterdays than tomorrows that may not seem like a lot of money. But for these folks, that's a lot of money to come up with at one time. And I want to thank the FHA for the work they've done to meet the challenge I gave them to reduce the front-end costs closing on a home by $1,000.

In 1994 FHA cut its upfront mortgage insurance premiums by 25 percent. That was the first $600 on their $1,000 goal. Then over the next year or two, since 1994, FHA has been streamlining, consolidating its offices, cutting redtape, putting offices on-line, speeding up the process. Sometimes it's turned around and it's gone from as long as 60 days to as short as 2 days in the best places. And they are working very hard to implement these reforms throughout the country. As these changes go throughout the country, they will save literally, in the time, $200 per customer.

So that takes us to $800. We have one more step to make to get to $1,000. And I've directed the FHA to further reduce the upfront mortgage premiums by another 25 basis points which amounts to $200 and which can be easily funded in our balanced budget plan. It doesn't cost a lot of money. But this will enable FHA to say, okay, we did it. With the 1994 cut, with this cut, with the streamlining, we will cut average closing costs from $4,400 to $3,400 to try to make the dream of homeownership more achievable to young, hard-working people so they can get off to a good start.

Now, let me also put in one plug here on an issue that's kind of hot around town now, because I think it's the wrong way to promote homeownership. There are some people who say that we should just privatize the FHA altogether and that, by selling off an agency that's made the American dream of homeownership real for almost 25 million Americans without costing a dime, somehow that will reduce the housing costs for America's families. That's not so.

If we just ended FHA's loan guarantees we know that one thing would happen: Interest rates would go up, the mortgage rates would increase. Families now eligible for FHA loans would pay hundreds of dollars more a year in mortgage payments. That would be like a significant tax increase for people buying homes. As many as 400,000 families could be denied mortgages altogether who would otherwise be eligible to get them.

So I believe this would be a mistake. This is a—you can call it a subsidy as the critics do; I say it's a pretty good subsidy. It's a pretty good investment by the American people as a whole to get two-thirds of us into our own homes. I think it's a pretty good investment for people like me, who can afford to pay market mortgage rates, to help young people like the Kastens get started and raise their kids, afford a home, be good citizens, and build a future. I believe it's worth doing.

But let me say again, I'm committed to reducing the deficit; I'm committed to reducing the size of Government; I'm committed to getting rid of programs we don't need. We have eliminated hundreds of programs in the last 3 years. There are 237,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government than there were the day I took the oath of office, 237,000. And, I might say, we have the smallest Federal Government since 1965. By the end of the year it will be the smallest it has been since President Kennedy was in office. As a percentage of our overall civilian work force, the Federal Government today is as small as it was in 1933, before the New Deal.

We don't have to get rid of the FHA to shrink the size of the Federal Government. We can do this in the right way. I bet most of you probably didn't know that. And one reason you probably don't know it is—I'm very proud of this—of the 237,000 people who have left the Federal employment since I became President, fewer than 2,000 were separated involuntarily. We tried to take care of those folks and honor their service and recognize that they had to go on with their lives and they needed to find other jobs, they needed to do other work, or they needed to move gracefully into retirement.

So we have tried to handle this in a humane way. But I say this to make the point again: We need to keep our eyes on the major things here. The major thing is to keep the deficit coming down and go into balancing the budget, to do it in a way that enables us to honor our obligations to our children and our parents, to families with children with disabilities, and to others who need that, need help, and to do it in a way that grows the economy while preserving the environment and that helps people like the families we honor today to build a good future for themselves and their kids. We can do these things.

And I will say one more time, we've got a lot of work to do even with all these efforts to get from 3.7 million in 1996 to 8 million in 2000. But we can do it. I want to have 8 million Americans able to say two of the most beautiful words in the English language, "Welcome home," by the year 2000. And with your help, that's exactly what we're going to do.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:51 a.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to first-time home buyers Lisa and Spencer Kasten; Mayor Bob Lanier of Houston, TX, and his wife, Élyse; Mayor Michael J. Albano of Springfield, MA; and Mayor John T. Yunits of Brockton, MA.

Statement on the Northern Ireland Peace Process
June 6, 1996

Today's announcement by the British and Irish Governments on the arrangements for the June 10 negotiations on Northern Ireland marks another historic step toward a brighter future for the people. I welcome this agreement, which will enable the negotiation of a comprehensive and lasting settlement to the conflict that has plagued generations.

I commend Prime Ministers Major and Bruton for the perseverance and determination that they have shown in the cause of peace. I have just spoken with them both, and once again I am impressed by their commitment to the peace process. From the Downing Street Declaration of December 1993 to the Joint Framework Documents of February 1995 and the joint communique of February 28 of this year, the two governments have worked tirelessly to establish the foundation for successful talks. I am pleased that Senator George Mitchell has agreed to chair the plenary session of the talks. I know that he and his colleagues, General John de Chastelain and Mr. Harri Holkeri, will again make a major contribution to the peace process.

With the start of the talks on June 10, the parties have a real chance to set aside the past and negotiate a future of hope and promise, justice and peace. This is something only they can do. But I want them to know that the United States will continue to stand with them as they work to make that dream a reality. I call once again for a restoration of the IRA cease-fire which will enable the talks to be fully inclusive.

The success of these talks will depend on the vision and generosity of spirit of the elected representatives of the people. My hopes and prayers are with them as they begin to forge a bright and prosperous future for the children of both of Ireland's vibrant traditions.

Remarks on the National Economy and an Exchange With Reporters
June 7, 1996

The President. Good morning. Today we have been given fresh evidence that the American economy is growing steady and strong. What the job report today shows is that when we make tough choices, there is absolutely no limit to what the American people can do to create jobs and opportunity. This report says that in the past 2 months the American economy has created half a million jobs and that for 21 months in a row now, the unemployment rate has been under 6 percent, that real wages for hard-working Americans are finally on the rise because of their growing productivity.

When I took office our Nation faced a very different economic picture. Four years ago unemployment was 7.6 percent and rising, the deficit was skyrocketing, job growth was very, very slow. We put into place a comprehensive and tough economic package to create growth and to generate jobs. We cut the deficit in half, expanded trade to record levels, and invested in our people and their future. The result has been sustained economic growth, based on sound principles. Inflation is low; investment is up; a higher percentage of new jobs are private sector jobs than at any time since the 1920's.

When we put this strategy into place it was bitterly opposed by many people. They warned it would hurt the economy. They did everything they could to derail it, and it survived by the barest of margins in the Congress. Well, 3½ years later, it is now clear that the tough choices produced good results for the American people.

I said we would cut the deficit in half; the deficit will be cut by more than half in 4 years. I said this plan would create 8 million jobs; the latest job figures, including the annual revision of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, indicate that the economy in 3½ years has produced 9.7 million new jobs for the American people. That is growth, and growth without inflation.

We should not turn from an economic strategy that is working. We should finish the job of balancing the budget, of reforming welfare, and of extending the benefits of economic growth to all Americans by passing the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, by raising the minimum wage, by providing for the portability of pensions, and by extending guaranteed education to the 13th and 14th years. These are the things we should do, building on this strategy, not departing from it.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President——

Q. Mr. President, Willie Brown said you shouldn't come to——

Q. The markets are already dropping——

The President. Wait, wait. One at a time, one at a time. What?

Q. The markets are already dropping because of this news. What do you say to that?

The President. Well, let me remind you that the stock market is a lot better than it was when I took office. It's up about 2,000 points, I think—more than 2,000. Whenever we have really robust job numbers—and we had 348,000 this month, and then I think about 160,000 last month—there is the fear of inflation, and that always has an impact in the market.

But if you look at the conditions, I think as the market has a chance to go through this day and the days ahead, there is no evidence of inflation in this economy. These jobs are being created by the productivity of American businesses and the American work force. That's why we're finally seeing some real wage gains now for American workers. And keep in mind, the manufacturing sector has been arguing for years that we can grow more rapidly, we can create more jobs without inflation because of productivity and because of the competition to which we're subject from other countries.

So I think that this thing will work itself out. Over the long period, the market follows the strength of the economy, and that's why the market today is so much higher than it was 3½ years ago.

Go ahead, Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Q. Aren't you concerned that higher interest rates will drive——

President's Visit to San Francisco, CA

Q. Mr. President, Willie Brown says you should not come to San Francisco because of gay protests against your stand on same-sex marriage and so forth. Are you going? What do you think of that?

The President. Well, I think that Willie Brown is a great mayor, but I believe that I should not cancel my trip to San Francisco. I promised Senator Feinstein and her husband I would come to their home. I have a long-standing commitment to go by and see the Presidio and see what we've been trying to do there to help the people of California.

And on the issue, let me just say I believe the record is clear. I don't think any President has ever been more sensitive to the fundamental human concerns or the legitimate interests of gay Americans than I have. And I have been roundly criticized for it in many quarters. But from the time I ran for office in 1992, I expressed my position on the whole concept of marriage in the law. That is—it's been my position all along. I can't change that position. I have no intention of changing it. I have also said I have no intention of being a party to letting this legislation moving through Congress become an excuse for diverting and dividing the American people and getting into a round of gay-bashing. I am bitterly opposed to that. I will not participate in it. But I have no intention of canceling my travel plans.

Yes, go ahead, Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN].

Senator Bob Dole

Q. Mr. President, do you think—what do you think of Senator Dole's latest effort to finesse the Republican Party platform on the issue of abortion rights? And do you think—as a follow-up, do you think it would be right for you and Senator Dole to sit down during these final days of his in the Senate?

The President. Well, I'd be happy to do that. As I said, there is this one issue, this Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, that we both agree on, and I would do anything I could to work with him on it and to let him leave his many years in the Senate with a good, positive memory that this was something that was done for the American people.

I have always said that elections would be decided based on the honest differences between candidates, but we should not waste one single day preventing something from being done when we have areas of common agreement. And if I could do anything to work with Senator Dole to help achieve that and to leave

him with a good, positive, lasting accomplishment for the American people as he leaves the Senate, I would be more than happy to do it.

Q. What about the abortion rights platform position of Senator Dole?

The President. Oh, I'm sorry. Well, I think it is a good thing for anyone to urge that we lower the rhetoric and stop lobbing these verbal bombs at one another. But when you lower the rhetoric, the stark difference in our policies remains there. He is in favor of a constitutional amendment to ban abortion, and I am not. So there is a real difference there that I don't think can be papered over. But I think anything that restores civility to this debate is a positive thing, and I applaud him for saying that.

Economic Growth and the Federal Reserve

Q. Do you believe that today's unemployment and employment report is a sign or a signal that economic growth can be higher and faster than the Federal Reserve seems to think it should be?

The President. Well, I believe it is a sign that we can grow the economy without inflation if our workers and our businesses are productive. But I would remind you that what Chairman Greenspan has said in the past is that at least he has no preconceived notions of how fast the economy can grow. And the Fed will now have a month to evaluate this. They don't meet until next month some time. And if they see that we are producing this level of job growth with no inflation, then I would think the interest rates should stay down, not only the Fed rates but the rates that the market sets.

This is a terrific commentary not only on the actions we took early to get the interest rates down and opening markets which helps to create higher wage jobs for Americans but also in the increasing productivity of the American work force, which will only be accelerated if we can increase the education level of our workers.

Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio].

U.S. Aircraft Tragedy in Croatia

Q. Mr. President, you've been briefed, we know, on the circumstances that led up to the plane crash that killed Commerce Secretary Brown. What are your personal reflections on what you were told, and what assurances have you been given that steps are being taken to prevent this from happening again on future VIP trips?

The President. Let me say, first of all, I had an extensive briefing yesterday by the Commanding General of the Air Force and by the general whom he put in charge of the review. And as you might imagine, for me it was a very painful personal experience because of my relationship with Secretary Brown and because of the people that were on that plane that I knew and those business leaders that we relied on and that relied on us.

But I have to tell you, I felt a great sense of respect for General Fogleman that the Air Force was completely thorough and prompt and brutally honest in its evaluation of what went on. And some steps have already been taken to avert the possibility that any of these errors could be made again, and I am convinced, absolutely convinced, that others will be taken.

I also would tell you that if you had sat through the briefing as I did—I kept thinking that this peculiar mix of circumstances, if only one or two little things had happened the crash might not have occurred. That whole unit over there was working so hard to do so much different kind of work, but that this is why—because the risks are always there, this is why the procedures, the rules that the Air Force puts in place, are so important to be followed.

And so I would say that the American people should feel reassured that the top leadership of the Air Force got to the bottom of this, did it in a hurry, and was completely honest, with no back-covering at all in its straightforward report on this accident.

Church Burnings in the South

Q. Sir, there was another fire at a black Southern church last night, sir. Do you think there is a national conspiracy or a resurgence in racism in America?

The President. Well, I'm going to have more to say about that tomorrow at my radio address. All I can tell you right now is we are working very hard to get to the bottom of this. When I was in Louisiana last week, where several of these bombings—these burnings have occurred, I spoke personally to the United States Attorney about it to get a personal report on what the status was in Louisiana of those cases and to reaffirm my determination to do everything we could to get to the bottom of it. So I'll have

some more to say about it tomorrow. We will be doing everything we can.

Senator Bob Dole

Q. Mr. President, to follow up on Wolf's question, you have just a few days left before Senator Dole leaves the Senate. Would you like to invite him here at this moment?

The President. Well, we have had some indirect communication back and forth about how we ought to proceed from here on out. I don't think we should discuss it in a press conference.

I do want to say again how much I feel, along with all Americans, that I thank him for his years of service in the Senate. I do believe he is trying to pass this Kennedy-Kassebaum bill. I'd like to try to help him do it. And I would like for him to feel that he is leaving the Senate on a positive note.

I can't say that I have the same good wishes about the next 5 months, but I would like to do that. And so I hope we can work it out.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:50 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Charles H. Coolidge, Jr., USAF, who was in charge of reviewing the U.S. aircraft tragedy in Croatia.

The President's Radio Address
June 8, 1996

Good morning. This morning I want to talk with you about a recent and disturbing rash of crimes that harkens back to a dark era in our Nation's history. Just 2 days ago, when the Matthews-Murkland Presbyterian Church in Charlotte, North Carolina, was burned to the ground, it became at least the 30th African-American church destroyed or damaged by suspicious fire in the South in the past 18 months. And over the past few months, Vice President Gore has talked with me about the pain and anguish these fires in his home State of Tennessee have caused. Tennessee, sadly, has experienced more of them than any other State in the country.

We do not now have evidence of a national conspiracy, but it is clear that racial hostility is the driving force behind a number of these incidents. This must stop.

It's hard to think of a more depraved act of violence than the destruction of a place of worship. In our country, during the fifties and sixties, black churches were burned to intimidate civil rights workers. I have vivid and painful memories of black churches being burned in my own State when I was a child. In 1963 all Americans were outraged by the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham that took the lives of four precious young children. We must never allow that to happen again.

Every family has a right to expect that when they walk into a church or synagogue or mosque each week they will find a house of worship, not the charred remnants of a hateful act done by cowards in the night. We must rise up as a national community to safeguard the right of every citizen to worship in safety. That is what America stands for.

As President, I am determined to do everything in my power to get to the bottom of these church burnings as quickly as possible. And no matter how long it takes, no matter where the leads take us, we will devote whatever resources are necessary to solve these crimes. Today, more than 200 Federal agents from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and the FBI are working with State and local authorities to solve these cases. Fire investigators, national response teams, polygraph examiners, and forensic chemists are combing through fire sites, interviewing witnesses, and following leads. A task force chaired by our Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Deval Patrick, and our Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement, James Johnson, is coordinating these efforts. FBI Director Louis Freeh and ATF Director John Magaw are also serving on the task force. To date there have been a number of arrests. Two of those in custody are known members of the Ku Klux Klan. So we are making progress, but we must do more.

That is why today I am announcing four steps we are taking to fight back. First, I have asked the task force to report back on their progress and to let me know if there are other actions the Federal Government can take beyond those underway to stop these crimes. Second, I have instructed the ATF to inform churches of any steps they can take to protect themselves from arsonists. Churches throughout the South will be visited by ATF special agents to answer any questions church leaders and parishioners may have. We are also making this information available to national church organizations for distribution to their members. Third, I am announcing my support for the bipartisan legislation introduced by Congressmen John Conyers and Henry Hyde to make it easier to bring Federal prosecutions against those who attack houses of worship. I look forward to working with Congress to make it even stronger. And finally, I'm announcing that we are establishing a new toll-free number that is now available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. If you have information about who is responsible for these churches fires, please call it. It's 1–888–ATF–FIRE. That's 1–888–ATF–F-I-R-E.

In the end, we must all face up to the responsibility to end this violence. We must say to those who would feed their neighbors what Martin Luther King called "the stale bread of hatred and spoiled meat of racism": That is not America; that is not our way. We must come together, black and white alike, to smother the fires of hatred that fuel this violence.

I am pleased that the National Council of Churches of Christ, one of the largest interfaith groups in the country, has spoken out against these crimes and is mobilizing to assist in the rebuilding of damaged churches. I encourage communities everywhere where churches have been burned to roll up their sleeves and help the folks there to rebuild their churches.

Religious freedom is one of the founding principles of our democracy, and the black church has historically been the center of worship, self-help, and community life for millions of families in our country. That's why it was so hard for Reverend Terrence Mackey to break the news to his daughter last June when they woke to find an ash-scarred field in the spot where only the day before stood their church home, Mount Zion AME Church in Greeleyville, South Carolina. Reverend Mackey reassured his daughter with these words—he told her, "They didn't burn down the church. They burned down the building in which we hold church. The church is still inside all of us." On June 15th, Reverend Mackey, his daughter, and his congregation will march from the site of the old church to a brand new building. And all Americans will march with them in spirit.

We must all do our part to end this rash of violence. America is a great country because for more than 200 years we have strived to honor the religious convictions, the freedom, the extraordinary religious diversity of our people. The only way we can succeed in the 21st century is if we unleash the full power of those convictions and that diversity and refuse to let anything divide or defeat us.

Thanks for listening.

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

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on Juvenile Crime in Las Vegas, Nevada

June 9, 1996

The President. Thank you very much.

[*At this point, moderator Kirby Burgess, director, Clark County Youth and Family Services Center, welcomed the President and introduced roundtable participants. Gov. Bob Miller of Nevada then reviewed steps taken in the State to deal with juvenile crime, and Clark County Undersheriff Richard Wingett described the juvenile violent crime problem in Las Vegas. Mr. Burgess introduced Shane Quick, Anthony Covarrubias, and Stanley Johnson, teenagers enrolled in alternative sentencing programs. Mr. Quick described his experience in a residential drug treatment program and concluded by saying that he was nervous.*]

The President. You're doing great. You're doing great.

Mr. Burgess. He's an honest young man, Mr. President.

[*Mr. Covarrubias described his rehabilitation through the Freedom Program, an intensive supervision program.*]

The President. How does it work, this Freedom Program?

[*Mr. Covarrubias said he was under house arrest and had to check in with the program twice a day, but could earn privileges for good behavior.*]

The President. Why do you think it's helped you?

Mr. Covarrubias. Because now I'm going to counseling. I'm getting along with my parents. It's keeping me out of trouble, keeping me off the streets.

The President. Is that your mother out there?

Mr. Covarrubias. Yes.

The President. Give her a hand, and your family there. [*Applause*]

Mr. Burgess. Tony, what I'd like for you guys to do is speak up because the press is here and all the audience is here and these microphones are a little——

The President. What's the difference in the program Tony's in and the one Shane's in? Shane, what's your program called?

[*Mr. Quick said that he had completed the West Care residential treatment and was required to report to a probation officer once a week.*]

The President. Mr. Wingett, do you know how many—do either of you know, maybe Kirby knows it—how many young people does your probation officer work with? Do you know? Do you know how many people?

Mr. Burgess. Yes, sir, I do, Mr. President.

The President. How many?

[*Mr. Burgess said the average caseload for community supervision was 60 to 80 children.*]

The President. So you check in once a week. And you check in twice a day. You have to do random drug tests?

Mr. Quick. No. I did; I did do random drug tests.

The President. For how long?

Mr. Quick. Three months.

The President. Okay.

[*Mr. Burgess asked Mr. Covarrubias how he would behave differently when he returned to his neighborhood. Mr. Covarrubias responded that he would not hang around with his friends as much and would walk away from them if they asked him to commit crimes.*]

Mr. Burgess. Mr. President, Stanley Johnson, who is to your left, is 13 years old—[*laughter*]—he is involved——

The President. You did pretty good today.

[*Mr. Burgess described the New Directions program of 24-hour supervision in which Mr. Johnson was enrolled. Mr. Johnson explained that his probation officer, Mr. Garcia, helped him improve his grades. Mr. Burgess then asked the teen to describe how his mother was involved in the program.*]

Mr. Johnson. What?

The President. About your mother.

[*Mr. Burgess invited parent Joy Gladwin to comment, and she described the New Directions parent support group in which she participated because her son was enrolled in the program.*]

The President. Do you work with Stan?

Ms. Gladwin. No, I'm just a friend.

The President. And how did you find this program? How did you get involved with it?

[*Ms. Gladwin explained her son's enrollment in the program.*]

The President. Stan, do you like doing this program every day? Do you think these folks are helping you?

Mr. Johnson. Yes.

The President. Do you think it's going to help you stay in school?

Mr. Johnson. Yes.

The President. Do you have a feeling—do you think they really care about you?

Mr. Johnson. Mm-hmm. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Gladwin. Mr. Garcia does care very, very much for all of these kids.

The President. Is Mr. Garcia here?

Ms. Gladwin. Yeah, he is.

The President. Where is he? Stand up there, Mr. Garcia. [*Applause*]

Ms. Gladwin. He's really been a large benefit to these kids. He knows when to push them and when not to, and it helps tremendously.

[*Mr. Burgess noted that many of the children were from single-parent homes, and Ms.*

Gladwin described the importance of the program to her family.]

The President. How much of the problems that young people have—I mean that they're so much greater today than they have been in previous generations. How much of it do you think is due to the fact that children are alone so much more than they used to be?

Ms. Gladwin. A lot. Unfortunately, there's a lot more single parents. And it's very difficult for us.

Governor Miller. We have the highest percentage of single mothers in the United States here in Nevada, Mr. President.

The President. You know, a phenomenal percentage of single parents are spending more than 20 percent of their income on child care when their children are very young. And then when they don't need literal, physical child care anymore it becomes almost impossible for them to do anything. That's one of the reasons that these programs are so important.

Ms. Gladwin. Yes, they are. The question I have to ask is why isn't there more programs like the New Directions?

The President. Well, maybe I can talk a little about that.

First, let me say what the good news is. The bad news is that the country has figured out how to reduce the crime rate, but the crime rate among children under 18 is still going up. For 3 years in the country as a whole the crime rate has gone down now, and that's good, but juvenile crime still continues to rise. Now, there are, however, some things that seem to be working. Every one of them seems to be related to giving young people an organized, positive way to spend their time.

And I could give you just a lot of examples. We've worked hard, for example, to help communities that wanted to set up a curfew set up curfews. But the ones—the curfew programs that really work are ones where the kids also have something to do. I was in New Orleans last week, and they've got a curfew center there so that if a young person violates the curfew, they don't put them in jail, fine them, or just drop them back off at home and let them go out and get in trouble again. They take them to the curfew center, and they try to come up with a plan to help the kids with their lives.

Long Beach, California, has a school uniform policy because they had such a gang problem there. And the kids designed their own uniform, school by school. But it's reduced violence and other kinds of problems there.

There are different ways that are dealing with this. A lot of schools are trying to stay open later, and a lot of places are trying to develop programs like you've got here, where you try to get parents as well as the young people involved in community restitution and rehabilitation efforts.

But the main thing I want to say, to get back to answering your question, is our country has got to make a commitment to understand that normally when we see a serious crime, that's the end of years of difficulties that a lot of people have, and that we simply cannot jail our way out of America's crime problem. We are going to have to invest some more money in prevention. And I say that as somebody who started out in law enforcement as attorney general over 20 years ago—almost 20 years ago. And when I was Governor, I built a lot of prison cells, and I passed a lot of laws toughening penalties, and you know, we had a very tough approach. But these young people—somebody has got to do something to give them a chance to live an organized, positive life.

And when we wrote the crime bill—it's very interesting. We passed the crime bill in 1994. I'm proud of the fact that it's putting 100,000 more police officers on the street. But I said then and I say again, I'm sure you would corroborate this, a lot of these police officers—and a lot of the good they're doing is they're stopping crime from happening in the first place, not just catching criminals more quickly. And we have—all I can tell you is we need to build more support nationally and in every State legislature in the country and every local government in the country for these kind of programs, because the social and economic realities in which a lot of these young folks are growing up in put them under a lot of pressure that people our age didn't face when we were their age. It's just a plain truth. And we have to find an organized, disciplined, caring environment that we—we need to help their parents and support them. There's so many—so many single parents out there doing the best they can.

And I was sitting there—I was looking at Shane and Tony and Stan and thinking, you know, one way or the other these three kids are our future. They're our future, and we've

got to take responsibility at least to give them the best chance they can to make a good future for themselves and for the rest of us. And I want to thank you, Kirby, for spending your life on this.

Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you for doing it.

Another point. I just want to make one more point and then I'd like to go back and let anybody else talk who wants to talk. For it is amazing to me how much some of these community programs can do on a modest budget. We're not talking about spending a fortune here. A lot of these community-based programs are so much less expensive than a lot of the more expensive things that happen later on.

If the program Shane was in works and he never develops a serious drug habit, then it's a lot less expensive than treating somebody for a serious drug problem later on. That's just one example, you know. Whatever it costs for Tony to have somebody to check in twice a day with, gives him a chance to graduate from high school, maybe go on to college, get a good job, have a good, successful life. Whatever it costs will be a pittance of what we would all pay if his life took a different turn.

And the same thing is true for every young person. So I want to say that I was so impressed when I read about these programs, and I have been almost obsessed with this juvenile crime problem, not only because it makes our people feel less safe but because of what's happening to all these kids we're losing.

And I just also want to say one other thing, to urge you to support the Governor, and you've got your county commissioner and the mayor here; the two Senators are here. Just now coming into our schools there is another baby boom generation. A lot of people don't know this and haven't focused on this yet. I'm the oldest of the children born right after World War II, and we're the biggest—the people of my age and down, about 15 or 16 years younger than me, are the biggest group of Americans ever born into this country. There is now a group, just now starting into grade school, that when they get in their school years will be slightly bigger than we are as a generation. And if we don't turn this juvenile crime problem around by the time they're 13 to 16, you cannot imagine what we're going to be grappling with.

These young people are actually in a group of Americans that aren't particularly numerous. Their parents were of a generation where people had relatively fewer children, and there weren't so many people in their child-bearing years. I don't want to use this—this will sound wrong, but these kids have, in a way, by going through this, have given us a chance to figure out for future generations how to rescue young people and support mothers like Joy. And we better take advantage of them and we better do it now, because if we wait another 5 or 6 years, the dimensions of the problem will be roughly 2 to 3 times greater than they are now. And it will be unmanageable.

So I still—my own view is the right thing for the National Government to do is to provide the resources and the legal and other support necessary to let communities pick those programs that are most likely to work best for them, because not every program works the same in every place. And the truth is that every one of these programs, you've got to have some caring adult and some system that works, somebody who can stand up like this gentleman down here and get a round of applause because the kids relate to him or her, as the case may be.

So I don't think that we should be prescribing what works. What we have tried to do in our administration is go around and find things that are working, and if people are having some trouble spreading it, like the uniform policy, the curfews, or whatever, we try to help them do that. And otherwise, we try to provide what money we could pass in the Congress to let the communities decide what works best. And that's what I think we should do.

Senator Harry Reid. Mr. President.

The President. Senator Reid.

[*Senator Reid said the President's leadership had protected Federal programs such as the drug-free schools and school-to-work efforts.*]

The President. Well, to be explicit, when we fought the crime bill in 1994, there were people who basically said all Washington should do is pass penalties and build prisons; that we shouldn't put the police out there, we shouldn't ban assault weapons, we shouldn't have a waiting period for handguns, and that it was a waste of money to give funds to communities for these prevention programs. You remember the debate very well.

And the most important thing I want to focus on today, I mean, I think the evidence is clear now on what we did on the others, that we

were right. But the most important thing is we didn't win the whole fight on the prevention programs, as you know, although both of you tried to help me. But when you see programs like this, you just have to say that every one of these—every young person in the country—every person like Stanley Johnson in the country ought to be in one of these programs who needs it. And until that happens, it shouldn't be a—that ought to be a test.

But maybe we'll turn it around now, thanks to all of you.

[*Mr. Burgess asked the teens for suggestions on improving prevention services. Mr. Quick suggested social events for teens where speakers would talk about the dangers of drugs and gangs.*]

Mr. Burgess. Any final comments, Mr. President?

The President. Well, let's see if anybody—Tony?

Mr. Covarrubias. No, I don't.

The President. Stanley? [*Laughter*]

You're doing great. Let me ask you something. I want to ask you guys something—just one thing. If we weren't here in this big crowd of people, if we were just sitting alone in a room so you didn't have to worry about being on television and wearing a tie and suit—don't be nervous; you look good in it—[*laughter*]—and you were trying to tell me what one thing or two things you think I could do or that we could do that would make it possible for more young people to make it, either to stay out of trouble or to get out of trouble if they get in, what do you think we could do to change the way things are in America that would make you feel better about it, that would make you feel better about your future? Is there any one thing you could tell me that you think that we ought to be working on, that would make the biggest difference to the largest number of young people your age?

[*Mr. Quick said that while help was important, the individual had to be willing to change.*]

The President. So that's why you made the other suggestion you did, that at least if you got all the kids together, they would know what was there for them if they were inclined to ask for help.

What about you, Tony?

Mr. Covarrubias. I can't really think of nothing.

The President. You think the program has been a good thing for you?

Mr. Covarrubias. Yeah.

The President. Are there a lot of young people your age that need programs like this and aren't in them that you know of?

Mr. Covarrubias. Not that I can think of right now, but yeah.

The President. You think there are or there aren't? You think you're reaching most of the people?

What about you?

You have done well. Let's give the young men a hand. Let's give them a hand. They have done well. [*Applause*]

[*Mr. Burgess thanked the President for his participation and invited him to visit again.*]

The President. Thank you. I would like to, before I go, I would like to just very briefly thank Dr. Harter and the staff here at UNLV for letting us all come on a difficult day. And I want to thank Senator Reid and Senator Bryan for their support for these programs in Washington. And I want to thank all the folks here on the panel and the Governor and Mr. Wingett and especially you, Kirby.

But ladies and gentlemen, let me say again to you, I thank you for coming out today. If you look at these—when we leave here now, you look at these three boys sitting up here with me and remember what I told you. If I had told you 3½ years ago when I was inaugurated President that we would have 3 years of declining crime but that the crime rate among juveniles would go up, you would have a hard time believing that. We cannot let that be true 5 or 10 years from now. It will consume this country. It will change the whole way we live.

So if you really like what you have seen today, and you liked seeing these young folks up here sitting with the President, instead of being in trouble, and being nervous and doing the best they can to do something good—if you like that, then you need to support these programs, and you need to make sure every child in this State that needs it is in one. And you need to support these people that are doing it, because they are proof that we can turn this around, but we haven't gotten to everybody or the numbers wouldn't be what they are. And we have to do it.

This is a very urgent problem for our country, and we can only change it in two ways. One is, like Shane said, when people decide they are going to make a difference in their own lives, and secondly, when adults like you take responsibility in every community. We will keep trying to do our part, but remember, we need you. And if you liked this today, when you go out of here, make sure you're going to do something to turn this situation around.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:05 a.m. in the student union ballroom at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas. In his remarks, he referred to Yvonne Atkinson-Gates, chairwoman, Clark County Commission; Mayor Jan Laverty Jones of Las Vegas, NV; and Carol Harter, president, University of Nevada at Las Vegas.

Remarks to the Community in Las Vegas
June 9, 1996

Thank you. Thank you for being outside. All those people in the heat out there, thank you very much. I want to thank the Green Valley High School band. Thank you for playing; you did a great job. I thank those who were here before: Thank you, Mayor Jones; thank you, County Commission Chair Yvonne Gates; thank you, Senator Titus; thank you, Representative Perkins. And most of all, thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being here. I want to thank your fine Senators, Harry Reid and Dick Bryan, for representing you, standing up for you, and standing up for America in the United States Senate. They do a wonderful job.

And I want to thank Governor Bob Miller. You know, he has been the best sort of friend to me because he always tells me when he thinks I'm wrong. [*Laughter*] And he's been the best sort of Governor for you because even though he's my friend, he's first and foremost somebody who's always fighting for Nevada's interests. And every time he hears anything that might be even potentially bad for Nevada, I know the first call I'm going to get is from Bob Miller. He's made a lot of calls in the last 3½ years for you, and I thank him for that.

I also met someone earlier today, and I think he's in the crowd today—he's supposed to be up here with us—State Senator Bob Coffin, who's running for Congress here. I don't know if he's here, but I thought I would—is he back there? Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm glad to be back in Nevada. I like it here. I'm glad to be back in Las Vegas, which as all of you know was my mother's favorite place on Earth. I've had a wonderful day already. I went out and visited one of your juvenile justice programs, where young people were doing community service and making restitution for mistakes they've made. And I met with some of the young people in the program and some of the adults who were working with them and some of the parents. And I want to compliment you for that.

And I want to ask everybody in this room to support people who are out there working with these young kids, trying to get them out of trouble, keep them out of trouble, give them something to do with their lives. We cannot—we cannot—tolerate the situation which now exists in the United States where the crime rate is going down overall but going up among people under 18. And it's because we don't have enough adults that are out there helping these kids to build good lives for themselves. And you've got some good programs here. I want you to support the people that are out there on the front lines in Las Vegas and Nevada working with those kids.

Four years ago when I came here and asked you to support me, I had an idea about what I wanted our country to look like as we move into this new century—a very different world. The world I grew up in was dominated by heavy industry and mass production. The world these children will grow up in will be dominated by computers, technology, and information. The world I grew up in had an America that was totally self-contained. We didn't sell much overseas; we didn't buy much from overseas. The cold war was the most important thing and the

fight we were having with the communists. The world these kids will grow up in will be dominated by a global society in which children will actually get on computers and do research in libraries in other countries, in which people will be able to move across the world as easily as they used to go across town, and in which we will have to fight those who will seek to take advantage of that through drug running, organized crime, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, preying on open societies and free people. This is a different world.

And I had three simple objectives. I wanted America in the 21st century more than anything else still to be a place where every child has the opportunity to make the most of his or her own life, no matter what racial or ethnic or income background they come from. Secondly, I wanted America to be a community of responsible citizens, where we are coming together instead of drifting apart. I am tired of seeing people at election time try to find ways to get us to look down our noses at one another and be divided. When we are together, when we reach across the lines that divide us, when we say our diversity is a great and good thing that makes us stronger in the global society of the 21st century, that's when America's strong; when we're working together, not being driven apart. And finally, I wanted to make sure that when I left office, our country would still be the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity. And I can tell you that on all three fronts we still have a lot of challenges, but this country is in better shape than it was 4 years ago, and we're moving in the right direction.

Harry Reid and Dick Bryan will tell you, when I presented my economic plan to the Congress and I said, "We've got to do something about this terrible deficit; we've got to bring it down, but we cannot—we cannot—do it in a way that undermines our commitment to education or to the environment or protecting the health care of the elderly, the Americans with disabilities, the poorest children in this country," there were those on the other side who said, "If Clinton's economic plan passes, it will be a disaster for America; we'll be thrown into recession; it will cripple the economy." Well, you've got 3½ years now to decide. When I took office, the deficit was $290 billion a year, projected to go over $300 billion the next year. It's now going to be $130 billion this year, less than half of what it was. When we came into office, we had the slowest job growth rate since the Great Depression. Three and a half years later, we have 9.7 million new jobs for the American people. We are better off than we were 4 years ago.

We also passed a crime bill to put more police officers on the street, some of them right here in Las Vegas to prevent crime. We began to work with States to reform welfare and move people from welfare to work. Today there are 1.3 million fewer families on welfare than there were the day I became President of the United States. We made efforts to help families struggling to make the most of their own lives—the family and medical leave law that says you don't lose your job if you have to take a little time off when there's a baby born or somebody in your family who's sick.

I was just out at UNLV today. We've reformed the college loan program so that people could borrow their money directly from the United States Government, get it quicker, less hassle, better repayment terms, and that no one would ever have to not go to college because they couldn't afford to borrow the money, because now they can pay it back as a percentage of their income so the loans will never bankrupt anybody. We passed the national service program, AmeriCorps, to give young people a chance to work in their communities and solve problems and help people and work their way through college. That is what we have done.

And then when the Congress changed hands in the last 2 years and the Republicans said, "We want to balance the budget," I said, "So do I. We cut the deficit in half already. We've done half the job, and you wouldn't help us; we'll help you. We won't do you the way you did us; we'll help you. But I will not balance the budget by cutting education, by destroying the environment, by undermining our commitment to Medicare and Medicaid. I won't do that." Because that gets into that second issue I was telling you about. We need to come together, not come apart. In the world of the 21st century, education will be the key to opportunity. You know it as well as I do. We cannot walk away from our commitment to give every American the opportunity to get a good education.

Look at what you're dealing with here in Nevada with all your growth. You need water here. I'm going to do everything I can to make sure

you have it. We can't walk away from our commitment to preserve the environment for all Americans. We have obligations here. We have to do this together.

And so I say again to you, I want to balance the budget. I will keep working to do that. We have to do that. When you bring the deficit down, it gets interest rates down; it makes it easier for you to make a home payment, to borrow money for a car, to borrow money for a new business, to create jobs. It is critical. But we can do it. Don't let anybody tell you otherwise. We can do it and preserve our environment, invest in education, and protect Medicare and Medicaid for our seniors. We can do that.

And let me say we still have work to do. We still have work to do. If you renew the contract of Bill Clinton and Al Gore, there are other things that we have to do to make sure that all the American people can take advantage of these new opportunities, because you know as well as I do that not everybody in our country, even everybody with a job, is having the same chance to get ahead.

What do we need to do? Let me just give you three or four things. First of all—if the Congress doesn't pass it now, we'll do it first thing next year—we need to change the health insurance laws of this country so you don't lose your health insurance when you change jobs or when somebody in your family has been sick. Secondly, we need to change the law so that young people starting out, even if they work for small businesses, can begin to save for their retirement, and they don't lose it if they change jobs; they can keep it all through their lives and they can maintain that. And most important—most important of all, we ought to give every American a tax deduction for the cost of college tuition and a tax credit for 2 years of community college in this country. Every single American ought to be able to go, you know as well as I do.

The biggest institution of higher education in Nevada now is the community college here. Why? Because older people have figured out that if they want to be able to get new jobs and raise their incomes, they have to have more education. I was born at a time when the vast majority of Americans did not have a high school education, when many places did not even require them to do it. Now we know that in the world we're living in, you need more. And I think we ought to make it an article of national faith that every single American citizen should have access to at least 2 years of education after high school. And we'll provide it for those families.

So I say to you, my fellow Americans, I'm glad to be back here. I appreciate what the Governor said about the issues that are specific to Nevada. What I said about the interim storage was pretty simple: The people that wanted to pass the interim bill wanted to pass it so they could make it permanent. And I don't believe that that should be done. I believe somebody—we're going to have to put this nuclear waste somewhere, but I want to know it was done based on the best science, not the worst politics. That's all I want. And I don't know what the answer to that is.

But I want you to think about the future that we've got here. I want you to think about what it's going to take to make sure that all these little kids that are in this house today, in this hangar, every one of them, every one of them—and you look at them. We've got kids in this room whose roots come from every continent on this globe. Just look around here. I want to make sure that every one of them has a chance to live out their dreams if they're willing to be responsible, law-abiding, hard-working American citizens. That's what I want. And that's what you want.

That's really what this is all about. You know, politics is not the most important thing in anybody's life. When we all get our lives lived, we look back and we think about the children we raised, the things we loved and cared about. The purpose of politics is to make it possible for more and more and more people to live together in peace and harmony and to live out their dreams and to find their personal greatness and their families' depth and strength and character. That's what this is about. And that's what this election is about. Don't you ever forget it.

And remember this: We're all here; we're all happy; we're all feeling good today. It's 5 months between now and the election. That is a very long time. So I say to you, if you believe what brought you here today and you understand how important this is, then I want to ask you to leave here today with a commitment every day between now and November to talk to your friends and your neighbors about what is genuinely at stake. America is deciding on

the future of the greatest country in human history for a new century. You can help make the decision the right one.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:03 p.m. in the executive terminal at McCarran International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Nevada State Senator Dina Titus and Nevada State Representative Richard Perkins.

Remarks at the Presidio in San Francisco, California
June 9, 1996

Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Chandler, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Mayor, it's wonderful to be back in San Francisco. Congresswoman Pelosi, Senator Boxer, Senator Feinstein, thank you all for your work on this magnificent project.

You know, I always love coming here, but I especially love coming right here because that's my jogging route right there. [*Laughter*] Whenever I come to San Francisco I always go down there and run to the Golden Gate Bridge and back, so—and I didn't know exactly where we were going to do this on the Presidio today. I got driven around a little bit, so I got to see some other things that are being done here. When I finally realized that we were going to do this here, I didn't know whether I could actually sit still long enough for the program to unfold, instead of just racing away down there—or, as the case may be, kind of stumbling away down there—toward the bridge.

I want to talk to you today about three little simple ideas that this magnificent place embodies, ideas that are easy to say but have a great deal to do with what kind of country we are and what kind of country we're going to be. When I think of the Presidio, I think of, first and foremost, preserving our incredible natural heritage and our important history. Second, I think about the obligation that the rest of the country has for defense conversion. And thirdly, I think about partnership, the kind of partnership that Jim Harvey's life embodied and that all the things that Mr. Chandler just mentioned represent.

And I want you to think about all that today because in my opinion if this country is going to be what we all want it to be as we move into the next century, we have to keep going until every place that lost a lot because of the end of the cold war—which was a happy and wonderful event—has been fully restored to economic prosperity through a real commitment of all the American people to defense conversion. Because we cannot, over the long run, sustain an American economy in this new world unless we have a theory of sustainable development that puts the environment first, not last, and recognizes that we can grow the economy and still preserve our natural heritage. And because we cannot do a lot of what we need to do publicly and still continue to bring the deficit down unless we have partners: business partners, citizen partners, like the young people in the conservation corps, and others who are committed to making the most of our national potential.

It was a brilliant thing that the late Congressman Burton did to provide for the fact that this would become a national park if ever the military should leave. But all over California you see now what can happen if there's a real commitment not to leave the people who fought the cold war for us behind; in Monterey, where Fort Ord is now the California State University at Monterey Bay; in Alameda, where machinists who once built Bradley fighting vehicles are now building electric cars for the 21st century; in Sacramento, where Packard Bell has now hired 3,600 people to assemble personal computers in a former Army depot. And now, of course, this newest of our national parks is showing the rest of our national parks the way to the future.

I have to tell you that—the previous speaker sort of alluded to this, and with greater specificity when Senator Feinstein mentioned the California Desert Protection Act and how we got it and then we very nearly lost it last year. But all of our national parks are at risk. Too many of them have fallen into disrepair. We're working hard to protect them. There were some people who wanted to sell off a lot of them

or privatize them or just let them continue to fall into disrepair. We have resisted that, and I think it's clear now that there is an overwhelming bipartisan consensus in the United States that our national parks are a part of our national treasure; that we have to nourish them, we have to maintain them, we have to improve them. And the last thing in the wide world we need to do is to get rid of any of them. We need to make them better, instead.

But I will say again, in order to do this right, we're going to have to have a lot of support from citizens. The businesses now in this park are thriving, already helping to offset taxpayer costs. Here at Crissy Field, where de Havilland biplanes once touched down, this land will soon become the great common ground for all Americans: historic buildings, wide open areas for kids to play in, restored natural habitat. All the design and planning here have been undertaken through private, nonprofit campaigns. And as we have learned today from their smiling faces and strong voices, much of the work has been done by volunteers who are just as dedicated to this country's future as those who drilled with the 6th Army outside these hangars a generation ago.

The Presidio bill now in the Congress that Congresswoman Pelosi worked so hard for and that Senator Boxer talked about and she and Senator Feinstein are working hard for has virtually no opposition. It calls for a public-private trust to oversee the Presidio's economic future, to preserve the park for future generations, to create a national park that will sustain itself without Government funds. So let me say again, I urge Congress to send me this bill in a clean and straightforward way. We simply cannot continue to have lawmaking paralyzed by the attempts to add to every single good bill that comes along in the Congress some objectionable provision. We need the Presidio bill. We need it now; we need it clean; we need it unhampered.

Let me just say one other thing. I was thinking about my jogging and looking at Senator Cranston, and I remember in my earlier years, back when I had a private life when I was Governor, sometimes Senator Cranston and I would jog in Washington together. I was thinking about all the years that he devoted to public service here in California. When you look at something like the Presidio, when you see at least the natural beauty of it, forgetting about the buildings, you may think that it has been this way forever and that it would always be this way. But that is far from true. The trees above us, the eucalyptus, the Monterey cypress, believe it or not, were only planted 100 years ago. The Americans who planted them knew that they would never see them full grown. They would never walk under their shade, but they planted them anyway.

We are now being asked to deal with a different sort of planning. Our country is going through a lot of changes. We have proved that we can come to grips with the challenges of the modern economy. The American people have produced almost 10 million jobs in the last 3½ years. And after a long dry spell, a lot of them are being produced here in California. But we cannot forget that what ought to animate us is a vision of what we want this place to be like 20 or 30 or 50 years from now.

I know what I want it to be. I want the Presidio to exist in a country and a State where everybody who is willing to work for it can live up to their dreams; where people have good jobs, yes, but also children have safe streets and good schools; where everybody has access to a clean environment and natural beauty; where our country is still a force for peace and freedom and decency in the world; and where instead of being divided by all these incredible differences that make up the American people, we are united by them and our respect for our diversity and our shared values. It all begins, in a fundamental way, with preserving what God has given us, and there has been no richer gift than the Presidio. I'll do my part, and I want you to keep doing yours.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:25 p.m. at Crissy Field. In his remarks, he referred to Robert Chandler, National Park Service project manager, the Presidio; Brian O'Neill, superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area; Mayor Willie Brown of San Francisco, CA; James R. Harvey, former chief executive officer, Transamerica, and former chairman, Presidio Council, Golden Gate National Park Association; former Representative Philip Burton; and former Senator Alan Cranston.

Remarks to the Community in San Diego, California
June 10, 1996

Thank you so much. Thank you, Chief Emerson, Sheriff Kolender, District Attorney Phingst. Chief Sanders, thank you very much for the tour of your activities this morning and your statements. Thank you, Congressman Filner. Thank you, Madam Attorney General, for all the great work you do. I'd like to also say a word of appreciation for some others who are here who have not spoken today: our United States Attorney, Alan Bersin; the Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner, Doris Meissner; the person who was very active in helping me pass the crime bill which put these police officers on our streets, former Congresswoman Lynn Schenk, I'm delighted to see you here.

I want to thank all the officers who are here from the Customs, the Border Patrol, Immigration, from Chula Vista, from San Diego. I especially want to thank these uniformed officers who give their lives to make our lives safer and all the community citizens groups who work with them. Thank you all very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I came to California and to San Diego 4 years ago and I listened and attempted to learn what was going on here, I saw an enormous amount of potential and a lot of stress. Mostly what people talked to me about then were two problems, the economy and the problem of crime and illegal immigration. I spent a lot of time here 4 years ago and had the opportunity to come back often since. If you'll forgive me just one personal note, this is the first time I've come back to San Diego since the death of my friend Larry Lawrence, who served this country so well as our Ambassador to Switzerland, and I miss him now, coming back here, and I want to thank him for what he did for me here. Anyway, what we tried to do was to develop a serious approach, to work with you, to help you seize control of your destiny, and to help you do more of what you were already inclined to do.

On the economy, I'd like to make just a couple of comments. Because we're building two new ships for our national defense, the San Diego shipyards are busy, securing another 4,000 jobs until the year 2000. I think that's a good and positive step. Because in 1993 and 1994 the Congress agreed to invest in defense conversion, in high technology research and development and new environmental technologies and biotechnology, jobs are being created here that have a real future to grow in number and to strengthen and diversify the economy of this area. Because we've started work on a new sewage treatment plant and we're proposing to step up our sand reclamation efforts, thanks in no small measure to the relentless efforts of Congressman Filner, we're ensuring that the San Diego beaches will be enjoyed by children and their children for generations to come.

But we all know that America has had, building over years and years and years, a serious problem of illegal immigration which has aggravated the crime problem along our borders. The Attorney General talked about some of the progress we've made. She gave me a report today which reviews where we are and what we've done. So as we have worked hard to bring the crime rate down all over America, we've made special efforts in our border communities, because we know that we have special responsibilities there. Immigration laws are national laws, not State laws. They have to be enforced, and the consequences of their enforcement or their failure to be enforced have to be borne primarily by the National Government. I have done what I could to get more money into California in very difficult fiscal circumstances in Washington to help you deal with the costs of illegal immigration—more than ever before—and I will continue to work on that.

But the most important thing is we have to be able to work together to prove that we can do better. I agreed with what the district attorney said when he said there's a difference in being a safer community and a safe community. I agreed with what the sheriff said when he said that we'd never fully solve this problem until both the United States and our friends in Mexico are working together in a long-term and consistent way.

But think about how far we have come in the last 3½ years. Three and a half years ago, many people believed that these problems were totally intractable, that drugs would always flow freely, that illegal immigration would always be

rampant, that criminal immigrants deported for crimes they committed here in America would return the very next day to commit crimes again.

For a lot of years people in public life at election time talked tough about immigration, but didn't do much about it. We tried to change that. We tried to substitute deeds for words. It's a pretty good practice in a lot of areas of life, and I think it's worked pretty well here. Our message has been simple: We will work with you to give you the tools you need to patrol your streets, protect your children, secure our common border. And you have to do what you can to help the police to bring the crime rate down and make your community safe.

Well, you heard what the prosecutor said: San Diego has the 5th lowest crime rate in the country of the 75 biggest urban areas. I actually believe when the numbers come out this year, you'll be even lower than that. And it's a great tribute to the work that you have done together.

Let me say, again, while the job is far from over—and we have a lot of work to do—the report I got from the Justice Department makes clear that we have begun to turn border communities under siege into communities where law and order and safety and security are once again the order of the day. I want to say too, again, I'm glad that we're working to put 100,000 police officers on the streets of America, that we're putting community policing in every community in the country that's willing to receive it. But what really makes it work are law enforcement officers committed to it and citizens groups working on it.

Today I had a very impressive briefing from people involved in the San Diego citizens patrol in the Safe Streets Now program. They are also helping your communities to be safer. The RSVP program is helping your community to be safer. So I ask you, don't stop now. We need more citizens working with more police officers until crime is the exception, not the rule. When you're surprised when you hear about a crime, then you'll know you've got a safe community. And you need to continue to do it.

The second thing we're doing is to put criminals behind bars. And after they serve their time, if they don't belong here in the first place, they're being deported. The crime bill gave us the weapons we need to do things that had not been done before to deal with the problems of criminal activities by illegal immigrants. As of January of last year, we have arrested more than 1,700 criminal aliens and prosecuted them on Federal felony charges because they returned to America after having been deported in the first place. We are changing the policy of this country on that problem.

We are also making strides in getting control of our border. We've added Border Patrol agents, in San Diego alone increasing by 762 the number of agents who are working for you by the end of this year. In El Paso, our border guards stand so close together, they can actually all see each other. [*Laughter*]

Here in San Diego, control has been taken back of Imperial Beach from the criminals and the illegals. We deployed underground sensors, infrared night scopes, encrypted radios. We built miles of new fences, installed thousands of watts of new lighting. There is more to do. I heard what was said earlier about the threats facing San Diego residents in East County, particularly with the onset of the fire season. Today I have asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman, to send 20 more law enforcement officers to Cleveland National Forest, and they will be there by the close of business today.

Let me say one final word of appreciation here to the cooperation between the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials. What they have done here today, over the last several months—I mean, it ought to be something that we all take for granted. It ought to be the rule in every jurisdiction in America. It's a shame that it's rare, but it is rare, and we can be grateful that here there is one American law enforcement team. And I tell you, that's what we're trying to create for all the citizens of the United States, wherever they live.

And I am very proud of what they've done. They've put aside politics and put the people of this community first, their safety first, their future first. That's why there has been an 84 percent increase in felony drug prosecutions in one year. That's why murders and robberies and car thefts have dropped so much, because they're all working together and working for you, instead of protecting their turf and playing politics. And I say, God bless them, we need more like them all over this country.

Let me just say one other thing that affects Americans a long way from you, but I bet you've all identified with them in the past few months. Even as we crack down on illegal immigration and do more than has ever been done before

on that, we must never forget that we are all a nation of immigrants and, except for the Native Americans, we all came from somewhere else. I say that to make this point: Our incredible diversity is a source of our rich potential as we move into this global society. Anybody who is willing to work hard, obey the law, respect their neighbors, and follow the values inherent in the Constitution ought to have a chance in America, and that ought to be the rule here.

And because we're people and because we're imperfect, the country will always have problems. There will never be a time when there will be no problems. But we really fall into a dangerous trap when we start blaming our problems on other people just because they are different from us.

I say that because even though I'm a long way from there, my heart has been in my native South for the last several weeks as we have dealt with this incredible rash of church burnings. That's just another way of people finding a way—trying to blame somebody else or put down somebody else or put distance between them and someone else in a totally dehumanizing way, forgetting that everybody should be treated equally before the law, in the eyes of our fellow Americans, just as we are before God Almighty. And to burn a church is a terrible thing. Just 2 days ago, I reported to the American people about what we were doing to deal with the church bombings. And then barely a day later yet another congregation, this one in Greenville, Texas, found its church in flames. We have got to stop these things.

We do have a team of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials working overtime to investigate these crimes. Just this morning, Federal investigators made an arrest for the burning of the church in Charlotte, North Carolina, last Thursday. And I do want you to know that for all the partisan fights you hear about in Washington, there is a bipartisan bill before the Congress, sponsored by a Democrat from Michigan, John Conyers, and a Republican from Illinois, Henry Hyde, to make it easier to prosecute anyone who attacks any house of worship, of any religious faith, of any race in America, and I urge Congress to pass it without delay.

We need to come together as one America to rebuild our churches, restore hope, and show the forces of hatred they cannot win, just as we need to come together as one America to say we are a nation of immigrants and we're a nation of laws. If you want to be in our country, you should be here lawfully. We will protect our people. We will enforce our laws. We will secure our future. And we will do it together.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:56 a.m. at police headquarters. In his remarks, he referred to Richard Emerson, Chula Vista police chief; William Kolender, San Diego County sheriff; Paul Phingst, district attorney; and Jerry Sanders, San Diego police chief.

Remarks to the Saxophone Club in Culver City, California
June 10, 1996

The President. Thank you very much.

Audience members. Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

The President. Thank you. First of all, let me say a special thank you to Don Fowler, the chairman of the Democratic Party, for coming out here to California with me. Thank you, Don. I want to thank Alec Baldwin for his years of support and for his wonderful, loyal devotion to this country. You know, I heard Alec up here giving this speech, and I thought, if he ever gets tired of making movies, he'd be a pretty good candidate, wouldn't he? [*Laughter*] He did well. I want to thank Joe Walsh and his band. And since he played "Rocky Mountain Way"—you may not know that since you've been in here, Colorado won the Stanley Cup, the hockey championship tonight, so I thought that was good. I want to thank John Fogerty for all of his music and everything he's done over the years. Thank you, John. I thank my good friend Whoopi Goldberg for being here earlier. She had to leave, but I know she was great and did a great job for you.

And let me thank all of you who have been part of the Saxophone Club, especially the people who have been working on it. There are people here who have been working on this idea of the Saxophone Club for years now. And the whole idea was we would find a way for Americans who maybe didn't have a lot of money to participate, to contribute, to be a part of our political campaign and our movement to change America, beginning back in 1992, especially younger Americans.

And as I look out at you tonight, I know you've been having a good time, and we ought to spend most of our time just sort of listening to music and chanting, "Four more years!" It's been a hard week; I like hearing that. [*Laughter*] But I'd like for you to think just for a couple of minutes about what this election is about, because most of you are considerably younger than I am, and most of you therefore have a much bigger stake in the consequences of the election in the future than I do. And I want you to think about it.

When I was out here shaking hands during the music, one young woman over here said, "Take care of us, Mr. President." And I said, "I'm sure trying to do that." And I am. But what does that mean? What does that mean? If you think about all the things that are going on in our country today and in our world, all these incredible changes, most of them are working out pretty well for most of you. The future is going to be a time when there will be more different things for people to do to live out their dreams than at any point in human history.

And if we do the right things in America, the best days of this country are still ahead of us, because there's no country in the world that is capable of creating opportunity for so many people; no country in the world as capable of bringing together so many different peoples across all the racial and ethnic and religious and other lines that divide us, into a common family; no nation in the world so capable of leading the world toward greater peace and freedom and human dignity and prosperity. And that's really what this election is all about.

You are lucky enough to be living through the period of greatest change that our country has experienced in the way we work, the way we live, and the way we relate to the rest of the world in 100 years, since we've moved from farm to factory and from the country to the city. Now we're moving from a national economy and the cold war to a global village, away from an industrial age to one dominated by information, technology, computers. Bill Gates, the great computer genius, says that the microchip has launched the greatest revolution in communication not in 100 years but in 500 years. That's what all of you have inherited. And we have to decide what we're going to do with it. And that's what this whole debate is about.

I believe the purpose of my office and your Government is to, first and foremost, create opportunity for everybody; to give every person, without regard to where they start in life, a chance to live out their dreams. I believe that, therefore, it is worth fighting to do what we've done. We've cut the deficit by more than half. Our economy has produced almost 10 million new jobs. We're moving forward in a dramatic way. I think that's important.

But not everybody has the opportunity to participate in this, and I won't be satisfied until everybody does. That's why, if you will reelect me, I'll do everything I can to guarantee that every single American citizen has a guarantee of 2 more years of education after high school—for every single, solitary person—that every American will be able to afford to go to college, and that you will be able to deduct the cost of college tuition from your income taxes, that every American will always have access to lifetime education. Most of you will be doing things 10 or 20 years from now—or many of you will—you'll be doing work that literally has not even been invented yet. And if I could do one thing for this country as President to create a structure of opportunity that would carry us way into the next century, it would be create a seamless web of lifetime education that every American could move in and out of, just like rolling down a river—very important.

Second thing I want to say to you is, it's very fashionable for people to condemn Government and say that Government is the source of all of our problems. But Government is nothing more or less than the rest of us; it is our reflection. And there are things we have to do in common. We need safe streets in common. We need a clean environment in common. We need a commitment to maintaining our own security against terrorism and dangerous weapons and drug runners and organized crime in common. We need these things in common.

And so when people tell you that they're going to get the Government off your back, you just remember it was our administration that reduced the size of the Federal Government by 240,000 people. But when California had an earthquake, when California had a fire, when California was broken down by the cutbacks in defense, you did not need weakness. You needed people to come in and help with the emergencies, to help with defense conversion, to help to rebuild this State, to help to rebuild this country.

Audience member. Four more years!

The President. And I just want to say one other thing. Every election time we're asked to blame one another for our problems. You just think about it. Every election time, somebody comes along, they find out who is not happy, and they try to tell you some other group of Americans you can blame for your difficulties. But the truth is, we're going into the future, up or down, together. The truth is, no great democracy has ever existed with as much diversity as this one has today. This county where we are tonight, this single county, has people from 150 different racial and ethnic groups. And I say, thank God for it. It is our ticket to success in a global economy.

So if you believe with me that this election is about creating opportunity for every American, not a guarantee but an opportunity to live out your dreams; and if you believe we have to do some things in common, give our children safe streets and a clean environment, good schools and a brighter future; and if you believe that this country still has a mission to stand up for freedom and decency and honor around the world wherever we can, so that we can grow together in a world that's coming together instead of coming apart, that's what's worth fighting for in this election.

This is not an election like 1992, where it's change against the status quo. This is an election where there are two very different deeply held views of change. And you have to pick which road you're going to walk right into the next century and what your country's road will be for 20 or 30 or 50 years. That is the choice that devolves on you. And I'll say again, most of you in this crowd tonight are younger than I am. Most of you still have more tomorrows than yesterdays. Your life, your children, your grandchildren's life, that's what's really at stake.

We're having a great time. I want you to love being in the Saxophone Club. I want you to go to more rallies and scream and shout and say hallelujah and have a good time and show everybody that we like what we're doing and we believe in it and we're feeling good. I want you to do that. But I don't want you to forget that this enterprise in which we're engaged is by no means resolved. This election is 4 months and 3 weeks and 1 day away. [*Laughter*] And that is an eternity. And I'm telling you, every one of you, every day between now and then, every single one of you will come in contact with someone that you can influence, someone you can get involved in a discussion about your country, someone you can force to think about the problems and the promise of America in a different way, someone you can convince that their vote makes a difference, that they really can shape the future of this country.

So I want to ask you, if you like being here tonight, if you're proud of what you're doing, if you believe in what we are trying to do together, then promise yourself when you walk out of here you're going to be a good citizen every single day between now and election day, November, and you will have the future that you deserve and that you can dream of.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 p.m. at the Smash Box photography studios. In his remarks, he referred to Donald L. Fowler, national chairman, Democratic National Committee; actor Alec Baldwin; musicians Joe Walsh and John Fogerty; and comedienne Whoopi Goldberg.

Remarks at Glendale Community College in Glendale, California
June 11, 1996

Thank you so much. Thank you very, very much. President Davitt, thank you very much for welcoming me here and for your kind remarks. And thank you, Hazel Ramos, not only for the fine statement you made but for the power of your example. If you represent the future, I think the future is in good hands, indeed. I thought you did a very good job. Thank you.

I want to thank your mayor, Calvin Baker, and the others who came out to welcome me today, to make me feel so at home. And I want to thank all of you for coming out on this beautiful day in this beautiful community. I told President Davitt, you know, that it is true that I visit a lot of community colleges. I believe in the community college. I believe that as I look at all of you, from all different backgrounds, all walks of life, average age about probably 27—the student body—I see the future of America at its best.

And I believe that the country we have to create in the 21st century has to work more like the community colleges. It has to be less political and more personal and more human. We have to be very flexible and willing to change and move with the markets, but also be committed to the development of every single individual. And that's basically what the community colleges do. And I hope in these next few months in this election season, as we discuss the future of our country, we'll be able to do it in a civil and open and honest way that reflects the kind of strength and roots in America that we all share, as well as the honest differences of opinion we all have. And I see that in the community colleges, and I sense that here at Glendale here today. So I thank all of you for being here and for representing that for our country.

I'd also like to say, on a more personal note—and in keeping with the comments I just made—I realize that Washington is a long way away, and it's easy for all of us to become alienated from it. And I know we live in a time when it is fashionable to criticize public service and long tenure in public service. But even though I am about to begin a rather vigorous campaign with Senator Dole, I would like to ask all of you, including those of you who are my supporters, to just take a moment and wish him well. This is his last day in the Senate. He has given over 30 years of his life to serving our country in the United States Congress, and I think we ought to give him a hand today. [*Applause*]

You know, this school has been a center of learning for nearly 70 years. I learned, in preparing to come here, that when the earthquake occurred here in 1933—not 1993—the students here were so dedicated to their education that they actually met in tents after the earthquake. Over the years, the student body has changed here. Many of you were born in other countries, including the young woman who just introduced me. But what has remained unchanged is that this community college is a place where students can get the knowledge and skills they need to help to realize their dreams.

And now the community college movement indeed is sweeping the United States. There are more than a hundred community colleges in California alone. And enrollment is exploding everywhere, because community colleges fill a need to strengthen the communities, to strengthen people's individual dreams, and to help them build successful families. There are so many examples of that here, in your professional development center, in the work you do to provide low-cost babysitting services for people who have to be students and parents and workers at the same time.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Glendale for the Volunteer and Service Learning Center that AmeriCorps, our national service program, has helped to fund. I thank you for that.

When I became President and California's economy and the American economy was under such distress and there was so much division and rancor in our country, one of the things that——

[*At this point, there was a disturbance in the audience.*]

You know, we have now—wait a minute, wait, wait, wait. We have now observed her free speech rights; it will be interesting to see if she will observe ours, won't it? [*Applause*]

Thank you. Thank you. Wait, wait, wait, wait. Folks, you cannot blame this poor woman. They have nothing to run on. We have a good record, so they have to try these kind of radical, crazy attacks. She can't help it. It's just like when you take a cookie away from the kid and they're mad about it. You know, they can't help it. [*Laughter*] Just be patient. Some people think they own the public institutions of this country and they have a right to terrify you to get them back. They don't. Just relax. We'll have a good time and talk about the real issues. Thank you.

Now, where was I? [*Laughter*]

When I ran for this job, what concerned me most was that this was a country of enormous strength. I mean, look around here. You would be here; you're doing this. You would be here regardless of who's President or what was happening. That's not quite true when it comes to student aid, but I'll get back to that. But we did not seem to have any sense of how we were going to deal with all these challenges as we moved into the 21st century.

The world is changing very dramatically. Now the difference in the world today and when I was the age of those of you who are in this community college is breathtaking. I mean, we have moved from a world dominated by the cold war and big blocs into a global economy. We have moved from an economy dominated by heavy industry into one dominated by information and technology in every form of human endeavor, whether it's industry or agriculture or the services. We have moved into a world where knowledge, which has always been a key to individual opportunity, is now the key to the success of the whole society and is literally the dividing line between those who can continue to do well for a lifetime and those who risk being left behind.

Now the question we face is, how are we going to meet these challenges of the 21st century and preserve the values which have made it possible for America to be the world's greatest multiracial, multiethnic democracy in human history? How are we going to do both?

I strongly believe that the mission of this country must be to offer every American citizen an opportunity and demand that every American take responsibility—that that is the basic bargain. And that's the bargain you signed onto at this community college. I think if we do that, we can create a strong America that's based on strong communities and rooted in strong families.

Today I want to talk just a moment to all of you because people in community colleges are on average just a little older than the typical undergraduates that go right from high school into college, about how success for individual Americans relates to success for American families, because we cannot succeed in this country unless we work together in communities across the lines that divide us. And the ability to work together begins with the ability to build strong families.

When I gave the State of the Union Address, that's the first challenge that I attempted to deal with. Cardinal Bernardin of Chicago said once that families are the smallest democracies across the heart of society. I believe that that is clearly true. And one of the things that concerns me most about the world we live in today is that, contrary to what a lot of people think, we don't have more lazy people in America. The average American is working a longer workweek today than he or she was 25 years ago. People are working hard out there. And there are a lot of people in this community college today who are very busy every week. They're working as students, they're working at jobs, and they're working with their children. That is hard, hard work.

And it seems to me that one way to think about how we're all going to live 5, 10, 20 years from now in this exciting global economy, with all the opportunities that are open to you, one way to think about it is to think about how we can create a country in which people can succeed at work and at home. How can you be successful in your job or in a series of jobs over a lifetime and be successful in building a family? How can you do well raising children as well as going to work every day and, if necessary, going back to school over and over again for a lifetime?

And if you think about it, any great society that forces people to make a choice in the end is going to fail. If you have to fail at home in order to succeed at work, we're in trouble. But if the only way you can succeed at home is to fail at work, we're in trouble. So when I think about the kind of world we're trying to create, I often ask myself, how can I create an America so that when I leave office every American who is willing to work for it can get up every day and do well at home and do well

at work and do well at school? That is what I want.

The first thing we have to do, obviously, is to give people economic opportunity. I'm proud of the fact that in the last 3½ years we've cut the deficit by more than 50 percent. It's wrong to leave you with a legacy of debt. We've got interest rates down so we can grow the economy. I'm proud of the fact that we are now seeing an all-time record in the products and services we're exporting, more than ever before, to the Asian-Pacific region here out of the West Coast. I'm proud of the fact that in each of the last 3 years we've had a record number of new small businesses and that there have been 3.7 million more Americans move into their own homes in the last 3½ years. I am very proud of that.

And I'm proud of the fact that when we passed our economic program by one vote in both Houses—the Vice President had to break the tie—and some of the people who were against it said it would bring on a recession and crash the economy. We said it would bring 8 million jobs in 4 years. Well, they were wrong, but so were we. It brought 9.7 million jobs in 3½ years and 600,000 of them in California and a lot more to come, after 4 years of losing jobs. And so we're moving in the right direction.

But it's not enough. We also have to think about, what about all those working people? How are they going to succeed at home? We passed the family and medical leave law to say that if you have to take a little time off, you won't lose your job because your child is sick. And I think that's important. We strengthened child support enforcement—40 percent increase in 3 years in child support enforcement. We worked with States all over America to help people who were on welfare move into school, move into work. There are 1.3 million fewer families on welfare today than there were the day I became President, and I'm proud of that. We have worked hard to reduce the welfare rolls.

We also recognize what you recognize every day when you come to this community college, that we simply cannot create the kind of America we're working for until every single American has access to a higher level of education. And we cannot allow this country to become a more divided society. One of the most disturbing things that has happened in America in the last 15 years is that after spending almost 40 years after World War II in which we were growing together—in which the poorest Americans who were working were increasing their incomes at roughly the same rate as the wealthiest of Americans—for the last 15 years we have become a more divided society, and about half of our people are working harder and harder without getting raises. Almost entirely, the division is due to the lack of skills that are marketable in the global economy.

This community college and community colleges like it all around American can turn that around. That's why I said it is time to guarantee every single American not 12 but 14 years of education. We should guarantee it for every American. The specific proposal that President Davitt referred to that I made at Princeton the other day is that we do two things to increase college education availability.

Let me back up and say, what we have done for the last 3 years is to try to give more options to young people on college loans, to cut the cost, cut the hassle, and give people easier terms to repay, including letting people pay their loans back as a percentage of their income, so that people that don't make a lot of money when they get out of school won't be bankrupt by the repayment. And I think that's important. We have tried to increase the Pell grant program every year. It is impossible to overstate how important the Pell grant program is to a lot of people from working families who need it for education purposes. But I have proposed two more things.

Number one, for students at 2-year, 4-year colleges, any post-high school education, I think we should give people a tax deduction for the cost of tuition of up to $10,000 a year, all the way. However, if—when we studied this for a year—we were out there advocating this for a year, it occurred to me that that would not necessarily do students a great deal of good if they were in community colleges where the tuition was, let's say, $500, $600 a year. The average in America is $1200. It's less than that in California still, thank goodness. But if you were in a situation where the tuition was that amount, and your tax rate was, let's say, 15 percent, which is what most of American taxpayers are, then the tax deduction doesn't do you very much good. Which is why we said, if we wanted to guarantee access to education to everybody for 2 years after high school, we should give a tax credit, an actual credit up to $1,500 a

year for the first year, refundable for the second year if you maintain a B average or better, so everybody can have access to 2 years of community college everywhere. And I think that is very important. Again I say that if we do this, this will make it possible for people to succeed at home and at work.

We need some help in other areas. I have challenged the corporations of America to be more family friendly. We had a wonderful meeting in Washington a few weeks ago in which we asked a couple of hundred corporate executives and members of labor organizations and others, what do you think our obligations are to each other as we move into the 21st century? How can we help people succeed at home and at work? I urged businesses to give people more time off so that kids could go to teacher conferences at school, to experiment with flex times, to open satellite offices to reduce commuting, which is a huge problem out here, to help workers with computers and faxes if they can do more work at home—just to do things to try to figure out how to merge work and family as we move into the future.

All of this is very important for its own sake, but it's especially important if you think about all the problems and challenges our children are facing today. When I leave you, I'm going to Albuquerque to talk about some things that I tried to do to help people raise their children more safely. Albuquerque, like Long Beach, California, has adopted a school uniform program. And that's reducing violence and increasing learning, an important discipline in a lot of schools. There will be people there from Las Cruces, New Mexico, which, like New Orleans and a lot of other cities, has adopted a curfew policy which has dramatically reduced violence and crime among juveniles and helped parents to support their children. These are the kinds of things that I think we have to be alert to.

I also think there's some more things that Washington has to do. This was not very popular when I started it, and it's still unpopular in some places—when we became the first administration ever to ask the tobacco industry to undergo regulation in terms of the advertising targeted at children. But you need to know that it is illegal in every State in America for children under the age of 18 to smoke. Every day—every single day—3,000 kids start smoking, and 1,000 of them will die sooner because of cancer, emphysema, heart disease or some other smoking-related problem. That is a stunning thing. That's the biggest single health problem in America. So I believe we have to keep working on it.

Now, California, way back in 1988, passed something called Proposition 99, which emphasized educating children about the danger of tobacco. I hope you will stay in the forefront of that, and I hope you will support me. We should not be spending hundreds of millions—maybe billions—of dollars a year to advertise to children to do something that's illegal, that's going to take a third of them out of this life sooner than they ought to leave. It is wrong. It is not right.

One other thing I want to mention that I think affects a lot of parents who are particularly busy is that more and more of our children are spending more and more of their time in front of the television instead of with their parents or in other places. Now, I've worked hard with the entertainment industry, and I want to compliment them for agreeing to develop a system of voluntary ratings for television programs to help parents in dealing with the exposure that their young children might have to programs with excessive violence or other improper content. And the entertainment industry, much of which is here in California, deserves a lot of credit for doing this. They did it entirely voluntarily. We got the Congress to pass something called the V-chip, which will go into television sets which will enable parents to control that. And I think that's a positive thing.

But there's one other issue that I want to mention, which is that I have been trying now, for some time, to get a few hours a week—keep in mind, kids watch about 4 hours a day of television on average—I've been trying to get the Federal Communications Commission for a year to just say that 3 hours a week ought to be devoted to children's educational programming by every network in the country. I believe that. I think it would be a good thing.

And today I want to formally reissue an invitation to the people from the entertainment industry involved in television to come back to the White House before the end of July to discuss that. If we can control, by ratings, give parents the power to deal with what their children are watching on television, surely—surely—we can agree to increase the content of children's television that goes to education. If you're here in school, going to community college for 4

hours a day, and your kids are back home watching television, it wouldn't hurt to have at least 3 hours a week devoted to their education while you're here pursuing yours. And I think that is something that we ought to watch and work for.

Well, let me say again, I view these things together. And when I leave here today, I hope you will all have a conversation about the things that I mentioned. I hope you will talk among yourselves and with your family and friends who aren't here about these great questions. This is an incredible time we are moving into. Those of you who are students here will have more opportunities to live out your dreams than any generation of Americans before you. Some of you who are students here, within 10 years, will be working at jobs that have not even been invented yet, that we cannot even imagine.

The best days of this country are still ahead of us if we can figure out how to make opportunity available to every person who will exercise the responsibility to seize it and if we can figure out how to come together, with all of our diversity. If we can respect each other and share the basic values of America, we're going to do fine. You are going to have a great, great future. But we have to be willing to have an honest discussion about this: How do you create opportunity for everybody? How can people succeed at home and at work? How can you build strong families and a strong community? That's the way to a strong America. It all starts here with your education and with making sure that every single, solitary American who is willing to work for an education has a chance to get it, not just when they're young but for an entire lifetime. We can do it together.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m in the courtyard at the college. In his remarks, he referred to John Davitt, president, and Hazel Ramos, student, Glendale Community College; Mayor Sheldon Baker of Glendale, CA; and Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, Archbishop of Chicago.

Remarks at Grover Cleveland Middle School in Albuquerque, New Mexico
June 11, 1996

Thank you so much. Thank you. Let me say, first of all, Tomas did a terrific job. Let's give him another hand. I thought he was wonderful. [*Applause*] Let me also say I am delighted to be back in New Mexico and delighted to be here to celebrate the commitment of your people across party lines, ethnic lines, and income lines to secure the future of the children of this State, and I thank you for that.

I thank our principal here, Mary Lou Anderson, for welcoming me at Grover Cleveland. I thank Superintendent Gonzalez for what he said about Las Cruces, and I'll say more about that in a minute. I thank Mayor Chavez for doing a wonderful job as your mayor and for all the things that he talked about here. I thank Senator Bingaman and Congressman Schiff for being here with me. I thank Governor and Mrs. Johnson and the leaders of the legislature and former Governor and Mrs. King.

I want to thank the law enforcement officials who are here; I want to say a little more about them in a moment. And I see some leaders in the Native American community from New Mexico here; I thank them for coming. I'm glad to see all of you here as one people today.

You know, as I have said many times to the American people, I believe that the best days of this country are ahead of us. I believe we are moving into a period of possibility for people all across this country to live out their dreams, unlike anything we have ever known. But we have to find a way to meet the challenges of this new era and to preserve the basic values that made America great.

Now, there are some things that we can do in Washington and a lot of things that you have to do out here. If you think about what you want your children's future to be like, what you want your grandchildren's future to be like, you have to think of these programs and these efforts that were discussed today. You have to think you want every child to have the same chances that young Mr. Sanchez talked about today.

Now, when I think about that, I think, well—and I've given this a great deal of thought; indeed, I think of little else as President. I want everybody to have a chance to have gainful work. I want all people to have a chance to get a good education. I want the American people to be able to raise their children on safe streets in safe neighborhoods. And those things we can make a contribution to.

When we invest, for example, in your laboratories here in New Mexico as they move from the cold war to the new global economy to try to preserve new technologies, to create new high-wage jobs, that's a way of creating a new economy. When we cut the deficit by more than 50 percent and get interest rates down and expand exports so that our economy produces 9.7 million new jobs in 3½ years, those things help to create a structure of opportunity for children in the future. And that's very, very important.

If you look at education, we have tried to expand educational opportunities, everything from providing more funds for more kids to be in Head Start programs to helping States to set higher standards for their schools, to a commitment to connect every single classroom and library in every school in America to the Internet by the year 2000, which will help all the children here, to giving every family in this country on a modest income a deduction for the cost of college education and a tax credit for the first 2 years of community college after high school. These things are important.

But safety is also important. Let me tell you what plagues me. In this country in the last 3½ years, the crime rate is down, but violence among young people under 18 is up. That is a very troubling thing. You heard this fine student talk about the gang problem. Let me tell you, the young people who are coming into our schools today are coming in in record numbers. There will soon be classes in the elementary schools of America that are larger in numbers than any of the classes of the baby boom years. And if we don't do something to turn this problem of gang violence and youth violence around, it can threaten to wreck all the progress we have made together in strengthening the economy and expanding educational opportunity and helping America to grow and go forward together.

We cannot create opportunity in this country unless the American people are willing to take responsibility for giving our children safe childhoods and a safe future. And you are doing that in New Mexico. That's why I came here today.

You heard the mayor talk about some of the things the National Government can do: more police officers, the Brady bill, the other initiatives. They're important. But it's also important to try to help local communities seize control of their destiny. I don't know how many times I've heard my daughter's friends tell Hillary or me how they'll never forget the D.A.R.E. officer that came to them when they were in grade school to talk to them about the importance of staying away from drugs and living a drug-free life. I don't know how many schoolteachers I've had come up to me and talk to me about the importance of the safe and drug-free schools program and the zero tolerance for guns and violence that we're trying to enforce all across America. If kids cannot be safe in school so they can learn and feel secure, where can they be safe? These things are all important.

But the most important thing perhaps we can do here is to do what I'm trying to do today, and that's to find ways to support you in taking local initiatives. And again, I say that this is something that ought to transcend politics. When I heard the mayor up here talking about the middle school cluster initiative, when I heard your principal, when I heard young Tomas talking about the program that he lauded and he thanked all the people who were involved in it, I realized that that is really the magic of what we have to do. Somehow all these kids that we're losing have to know that someone cares about them, have to know that there are not only things they have to say no to in life but things that they can say yes to, have to realize that they can have a future. Even if they come from difficult family backgrounds, even if they live on tough streets, even if they live in a tough neighborhood, they have to know that there's something they can say yes to.

The community curfew program you have instituted here, I know it's controversial when you start it. I know a lot of young people think, "Well, why should I go in?" But I can tell you, I have been in communities that have had these curfews for a couple of years. Crime goes down. Kids are safer on the street; they're better off at home 99 times out of 100. And after they've been there a couple of years they become popular with young people, as well as

with the parents, because everybody wants a safer community to live in and a better and brighter future in which to live it.

And so I want to applaud you for doing that. And let me say that I heard some of you expressing your reservations when Superintendent Gonzalez talked about the school uniform program in Las Cruces. But let me tell you, no one says that you should do it. What we say is that you should have the right to do it.

But let me tell you a story about the biggest school district in the country to adopt a school uniform policy, Long Beach, California. It's the third biggest school district in California. Now, their problems are not the problems of every school district in America, but they had some terrible problems. They had kids that had to walk to school through neighborhoods that were infested by gangs, and they had to wonder every day whether the clothes they had on were going to get them rolled, either because the jackets or the shoes were too nice or inadvertently they'd worn the wrong colors. They had to really worry about that. They had to worry about people coming on the school grounds during recess, during lunchtime and rolling the students and not even being identified as non-students until it was too late.

And so they permitted every school to make up their own mind about what kind of uniform they were going to have. They let the students design what they would wear and pick the colors. And it just had to be inexpensive enough for everybody to afford. And then they raised a little money for the people whose families were too poor to afford the uniforms. So that the uniforms, since they weren't the same for the whole district, they were different for every school. Sometimes the teachers wore them, too, and sometimes they didn't. It was all about the school's identity. It was almost like being on one big team, being in one good gang.

And guess what? The crime rate went down; the violence went down; attendance went up; school learning went up. And even upper income students said, "This is a better deal," because they were no longer identified by what they wore but by what kind of people they were, what kind of values they had and what kind of—[*inaudible*]—they had.

So I say to you, we don't say that you should do this. We say if you have a problem with young people and gangs, it's one thing you should consider. And you sure ought to be free to do it, free of any worries about lawsuits or hassles if you decide to do it.

There are all kinds of other things that schools are doing. A lot of schools are doing more work in character education, and we've tried to help schools deal with that. There are all kinds of initiatives that will work only if people at the local level believe it. So I say to you, I came here today to say I want America to look at New Mexico and say, "Well, maybe we should consider a curfew policy. Maybe we ought to consider a middle school initiative like the one they have in Albuquerque. Maybe we ought to consider a uniform policy like the one they have in Las Cruces."

I'm dry—I can't do this today—[*laughter*].

And some of the times, the best thing the Government can do in Washington is just to help you do this. The only thing we have done on all these issues is to make sure that the Justice Department and the Department of Education can give every school district in America guidance if they want to do these things, so there are no legal problems, no legal hassles, and people are free to put our children first and their future first.

So I say to all of you, again, I thank the people of New Mexico for being here today. I thank the political leaders for being here today. Two members of your congressional delegation called me before I came because they couldn't come, Senator Domenici and my good friend Congressman Bill Richardson, and I thank them for calling expressing their support for these endeavors.

This is something we have to do together. And when you go home tonight, if you have any friends in other States or other communities in New Mexico, the next time they get in touch with you, I want you to talk to them about this, because we don't have any more important responsibility than to give every child in this country, no matter where they are, where they grow up, how tough their circumstances are, the opportunity to live out their dreams.

We are going to be able to construct an economy that will permit them to live out their dreams. We know—we know that we can expand educational opportunity so that every single child who's willing to work for it will have access to go beyond high school to 2 years of community college and on to college if they want to do it—every child. We know we can do that. But we will never, ever seize the prom-

ise of the 21st century in New Mexico or anywhere else in the United States until every child can live in a safe neighborhood and go to a safe school and belong to good, positive, constructive groups that reinforce the kind of values and the kind of imagination and the kind of character that our young speaker who introduced me evidenced today.

That is a dream that you have to pursue and that every American family, every American community, and every American school has to pursue child by child by child. We'll do what we can to support you, but you need to do what you can to make sure every person you know is committed to that goal.

Thank you, and God bless you. And I hope you get rain tonight. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:08 p.m in the auditorium. In his remarks, he referred to Tomas Sanchez, Grover Cleveland Middle School student who introduced the President; Jesse Gonzalez, superintendent, Las Cruces Public Schools; Mayor Martin Chavez of Albuquerque, NM; Gov. Gary E. Johnson of New Mexico and his wife, Dee; and Bruce King, former New Mexico Governor, and his wife, Alice.

Remarks at the Dedication of Mount Zion A.M.E. Church in Greeleyville, South Carolina

June 12, 1996

Thank you very much, Bishop and Reverend Mackey. Let me begin by thanking you all for being here and making us all feel so welcome. And before I—and thank you for that—[*laughter*]—before I go into my remarks, I want to present the Reverend Mackey a little plaque I brought that is dedicated to the congregation of this church, Mount Zion A.M.E. It says, "We must come together as one America to rebuild our churches, restore hope, and show the forces of hatred they cannot win." I hope you will put this up in your church, Reverend Mackey, and remember this day always. I'm honored to be here with you.

You know, first of all, let me say I'm honored to be here with so many distinguished Americans. I thank Senator Hollings and Congressman Clyburn for coming down here with me today. I thank Congressman Inglis for being here. And our good friend John Conyers, from Michigan, is either here or on his way here—Congressman Conyers, I thank him. I want to thank all the dignitaries who have come to join us: Reverend Jesse Jackson for coming back home to South Carolina, and thank you for being here. And I want to thank Reverend Joseph Lowery, the very first person who wrote me to say that our National Government needed to do more about these church burnings. Thank you, Reverend Lowery, for doing that. And I thank my old friend Bishop James for coming back here, and Reverend Joan Campbell, Mayor Riley, Mayor Coble, Mayor Kellahan, and others who are here.

And of course, I want to thank the mayor of Greeleyville, who met me at the airport and rode in with me and talked to me about this little community and its challenges and its promise. I thank the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury for coming down with me here today to demonstrate just how important we think it is to get to the bottom of these church burnings, and all of us are going to be working together on that. I thank my good friend Millard Fuller, from Habitat for Humanity, for being here; and Randall Osborne, the SCLC administrator. Reverend Mac Jones, the NCCC; Reverend Ed Johnson; R.A. Leonard; Reverend Patricia Lowman.

And I'd like to make a special recognition and ask him to raise his hand, the Reverend Larry Hill, of the Matthews Murkland Presbyterian Church in Charlotte, North Carolina, which burned just last week. Reverend Hill, would you raise your hand? Where are you, sir? Here he is. Let's give him a hand. [*Applause*] Good to see you again, sir. Thank you.

First of all, I think it's important to note that we're celebrating a little something today. When the pastor came here, he told me this church had 42 members, and now it has 200 members. This church is like Shadrach,

Meshach, and Abednego; they can burn the building down, but they couldn't burn the faith out. And so we celebrate the triumph of the faith of the members of this church. We celebrate those who have walked from the fire unharmed, guarded by God's faith. We see in the rebuilding of this church that the false idols of hatred and division did not win.

The church that burned here, just down the road, was built a long time ago. And when I was driving down that little country road to look at that site, I told Reverend Mackey it was like going down memory lane for me. There's a little road like that off a little highway in southwest Arkansas where my great-grandparents are buried in a country churchyard next to a church that is about exactly the same size that little church was. And I went down there just a few years ago to kind of revisit my past, and I felt like I was doing it all over again today.

Then when we came out here and I saw where this church is, I thought, you know, in just a few weeks this will be one of the few churches in America where everybody can have a fresh ear of corn on the way in or out of church—[*laughter*]—sort of strengthen their bodies as well as their faith as they go along.

You think about what happened 90 years ago when the other church was built; people might have expected things like a church bombing. That was the time of Jim Crow, and there were evening lynchings in the South. It was a time of abject poverty, worse than anything we call poverty today. It was, 90 years ago, an expression of faith and courage for people to get together and build a church.

But it was the church that saved the people until the civil rights revolution came along. And it is, therefore, I think, doubly troubling to people—some of whom are over here on this platform today, who spent their entire lives working for equal opportunity among our people, working for an end to the hatred that divided us for too long—to see our native South engulfed in a rash of church burnings over the last year and a half. We have to say to all of you who have been afflicted by this, we know that we're not going back to those dark days, but we are now reminded that our job is not done. Dr. King once said, "What self-centered men have torn down, other-centered men can build up."

The men and women of Mount Zion have shown us the meaning of these words by refusing to be defeated and by building up this new church. Others have come together with you. The pastor told me he got contributions from all over the world to help to rebuild this church. In just a few days we'll have a joyful noise coming out of this church. But today, just as you have come together, I want to ask the people of America to come together. I want to ask every citizen, as we stand on this hallowed ground together, to help to rebuild our churches, to restore hope, to show the forces of hatred they cannot win.

I want to ask every citizen in America to say we are not going back, we are not slipping back to those dark days. Every time you hear somebody use race or religion as an instrument of division and hatred, speak up against it—every time you hear somebody do that. If you have the inclination, any evidence of anything you have seen or heard that somebody else might be planning to do something like this, tell the local authorities, and let's stop this before it gets started. If you know anything about any of the unsolved cases, come help us solve them. This is wrong.

The American people are the most religious, church-going people of any great democracy. We cannot let someone come into our democratic home, the home of our faith, and start torching our houses of worship. It doesn't matter whether it's this Christian church or the mosque that was burned in South Carolina. People have a right to worship God any way they please. That's what the first amendment of the Constitution is about. We cannot ever let this happen in our country again.

Long before President Lincoln said it, the Lord spoke to us in the Scripture and said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." It was always true. What a price we paid down here when we forgot it. What a benefit we have gained down here when we let it go. We cannot go back to those days.

But if you look all over the world you see how easy it is for people slowly, step by step, to fall into the patterns of blaming other people who are different from them for the difficulties of the moment. Now we know, as we see these fires of racial and ethnic hatred sweeping the world, as we see Africans from different tribes slaughter each other, as we see the ethnic hatred that consumed Bosnia, as we see it place after place all over the globe, we know how easy it is for the heart of human beings to

be hardened against one another just because of superficial differences.

I pledge to you I will do everything I can to prosecute those responsible for the rash of church burnings, to prevent future incidents, to help communities to rebuild. But Americans must lead the way, for this is first and foremost an affair of the heart. And our heart must be purged of any temptation to go back to the kinds of divisions that cost us so dearly, especially here in the southern part of our country.

For months, more than 200 Federal agents have been working on these church burnings. There are now 33 active cases. We've closed 10 cases already through investigations, arrests, and prosecutions. Let me say again how profoundly grateful I am for the work done by the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury and all those people who work with them. We will continue to probe these crimes. We will continue to use our top law enforcement officers. We will continue to see that these investigations meet a strict code of professional and personal conduct. I expect to get a report on this every week until the job is done. And I want you to help us finish the job.

I also want to say that we must keep this out of politics. This is about America. This is about what it means to be American. I want to say a special word of thanks to a Republican Congressman from Illinois, Henry Hyde, and a Democratic Congressman from Michigan, John Conyers, who have together sponsored legislation that will make it easier for us to punish those who burn houses of worship. And I hope Congress will pass the legislation very, very quickly.

We also must work together to rebuild all these churches. We will work with Congress to give HUD the resources they need to guarantee loans by private lending institutions. And I want to applaud the business and community leaders who provide money and folks to assist in rebuilding these churches all across our country.

Already these burnings have sparked an outpouring of concern. The Alabama association of Habitat for Humanity is recruiting volunteers to rebuild several of the churches in Alabama. Today Habitat for Humanity International has made a commitment to help all the communities that have lost churches in these arson attacks to rebuild. And I want to thank the founder of Habitat, Millard Fuller, who's here, for what his commitment is today. Thank you, sir. Thank you.

I applaud the National Council of Churches—and I thank Reverend Campbell for being here—for their financial commitment to rebuilding. I thank NationsBank for stepping up to the challenge and issuing a $500,000 reward for the arrest of those responsible for church burnings.

But in the end, let me say again, we must recognize that this is everybody's problem. Every citizen, every minister, and religious leader in this country should be speaking out against this violence. Every house of worship in America must be a sacred place, not just Christian churches for those of us who are Christian but our synagogues and our mosques. Any place where people gather to worship according to the dictates of their conscience should be protected from violence.

Reverend Billy Graham wanted to be here today and sent me these words for all of us to reflect on. He said, "The problem between various ethnic groups is worldwide; it is a problem of the heart. It seems that much of the world is affected by this terrible disease, which should be called by its right name: sin."

So I ask you today, my fellow Americans, to celebrate the triumph of the rebuilding of this church, to express gratitude for the fact that the huge vast majority of our people of all races deplore what has been done and revere the right of every American to worship God in his or her own way. But I ask you to reaffirm our responsibility to keep working, working together, not to ever let America fall back into those patterns of hatred and division, which can so easily consume any civilized people.

We have to sing a song full of the faith that the dark past has brought us, full of the hope that the present has brought us. Let's face the rising sun of this new day begun. But let us remember we have to march on until victory is won.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:40 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Bishop John Hurst Adams, A.M.E. Bishop for South Carolina; Rev. Terrence Mackey, pastor, Mount Zion A.M.E. Church; civil rights leader Rev. Jesse Jackson; Rev. Joseph Lowery, president, and Randall Osborne, administrator, Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Bishop Fred James, A.M.E. Bishop for

Washington, DC; Rev. Joan Campbell, general secretary, and Rev. Mac Charles Jones, associate to the general secretary for racial justice, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; Mayor Joseph P. Riley, Jr., of Charleston, SC; Mayor Robert D. Coble of Columbia, SC; Mayor Russell Kellahan of Kingstree, SC; Mayor Michael Mahoney of Greeleyville, SC; Millard Fuller, founder, Habitat for Humanity; Rev. Ed Johnson, pastor, Friendship Church of God in Christ, Lincolnville, SC; R.A. Leonard, presiding elder, Kingstree District A.M.E. Churches; Rev. Patricia Lowman, assistant pastor, St. John's Baptist Church, Dixiana, SC; and evangelist Rev. Billy Graham.

The President's News Conference With European Union Leaders
June 12, 1996

President Clinton. I'm pleased to welcome Prime Minister Prodi of Italy and President Santer of the European Commission to the White House. This is the Prime Minister's first visit here since his election in May, and I'd like to congratulate him on his fast start in office. Let me also thank President Santer, who has worked with us so productively since he took office a year and a half ago.

Last year the United States and our European partners agreed to work together to reap the benefits of this new era. Already we have seen some significant progress in our partnership in the last year. Most importantly, working with our NATO allies, we have helped to end the carnage in Bosnia.

Friday marks the 6-month anniversary of the signing of the Dayton accords. Much remains to be done, but much has been done. There is peace; businesses are slowly starting again; and some refugees are returning home.

I salute the European Union and its member states for their commitment to civilian reconstruction and for the $718 million they are devoting to this effort. Today we discussed Bosnia's recovery, and we agreed that for progress to continue, elections should take place in September as agreed at Dayton.

The United States and the European Union are determined to carry forward this kind of leadership to seize other opportunities in the post-cold-war era. At our last meeting in Madrid 6 months ago, we took a step to achieve these goals by creating the new transatlantic agenda to address our common problems, including our continuing efforts to get a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, working more closely than ever to fight international crime and drug trafficking.

In the next few months, in this area, let me say we expect to sign an agreement on controlling the chemicals used to make a broad range of illegal drugs. And this could be a very significant step if we can reach a good agreement and enforce it.

Today we are announcing an ambitious new effort to fight infectious diseases. Recently, diseases that were disappearing have made a dangerous comeback. Diseases know no boundaries; they threaten us all. And now we'll work together to create a global early warning and response network so that we can move decisively against the health threats of the future. Just this morning the Vice President announced our initiative to make this a reality.

The Transatlantic Business Dialogue is a forum of business leaders from both sides of the Atlantic devoting itself to helping bring down barriers and increase trade between the United States and European Union nations. Today let me especially thank two representatives of the Transatlantic Dialogue, Mr. Juergen Schrempp, the chairman of Daimler Benz, and Mr. John Luke, the chairman of Westvaco, for what they are doing and what the TABD has done. Thank you very much to both of you.

We also are going to expand on this with a transatlantic labor dialog between unions from the United States and Europe who will begin work soon on issues concerning working men and women on both sides of the Atlantic.

We can take pride that this transatlantic agenda has made a strong start. When we work together, we know we can meet the challenges of this time, and I am very much looking for-

ward to continuing to work with the Prime Minister and with President Santer. So I'd like to open the floor for a few comments by them, and then we'll answer your questions.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Prodi. Thank you. I thank you very much, Mr. President, for receiving us in the end of the semester chaired by Italy of the European Union.

This has been a very effective semester. I don't want to repeat what you have already told concerning the deep and fruitful cooperation between the European Union and the United States. I want only to recall the example given in Bosnia. I think that we never had such a deep, strong, and fruitful cooperation in such a difficult job. And we have to go on in the field, and so the past must be linked with the future.

You mentioned the problem of reconstruction. The European Union has already given more than $1.5 billion, and we need to collect more money and more help for reconstructing the former Yugoslavia area. Then we have to go on in the field of cooperation in the health, as you mentioned, and in the environment, with the example of working together in the Ukraine environmental program, and I think that this is an example why to work together.

In the Transatlantic Business Dialogue, we are just harmonizing a lot of problems in order to decrease the nontariff barriers and to increase the trade between Europe and the United States. But the most important field of cooperation will be now in the Middle East policy. This is a chapter that needs not only political and military cooperation but needs a lot of help, mutual help, in economic terms. We can't solve the Middle East problems without a strong economic effort in the area.

These are the main chapters of U.S.-European cooperation. And then I have to mention that this cooperation has never been so good, and I think it is a cornerstone of the world equilibrium. We have to stick together in the future because the challenge that comes from changing and the globalization of the economy is a challenge that must be won by strict cooperation between us.

President Santer. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, today's summit has convinced me that we have a new, deeper, and more robust relationship between Europe and America than in the past. Today marks the first milestone in this new relationship.

Last December we promised to act together, rather than just consult each other, in order to tackle crime, poverty, disease, and other global issues that concern ordinary people on both sides of the Atlantic. We have now started to turn these good intentions into concrete action.

So how far have we got? You would not expect miracles in just 6 months, but since December we have made a solid start. For example, we have set up a joint task force on communicable diseases. We are working on a deal that will help control trade in dangerous chemicals and illegal drugs. We have begun studying ways of cutting trade barriers, just as businessmen have asked us to do. And we have sent a joint mission to Rwanda and Burundi to assess the needs of the refugees there.

The progress we can show today demonstrates that the highly visible disagreements we have had in the recent months over Cuba, Iran, Libya, and over trade policy represent a fraction of our overall relationship.

This was not a Helms-Burton summit that some said it would be. But we did raise our concerns about the legislation in no uncertain terms with our American colleagues. The extraterritorial elements of this law have received worldwide condemnation. We are every bit as concerned about rogue states as the United States is. The European nations have fought terrorism at every opportunity, and will continue to do so. But this is a different issue. We do not believe it is justifiable or effective for one country to impose its tactics on others and to threaten to its friends while targeting its adversaries. If that is done, it is bound to lead to reactions which it is in the interest of us both to avoid.

But despite these disagreements, today's proceedings have shown there is much more that binds us together than pulls us apart. And I am now convinced that we have a strong, strong enough relationship to speak our minds on issues which bother us without jeopardizing the vast range of things where we can and must work together to promote peace, freedom, and prosperity around the world.

We must not be complacent. The relationship needs to be worked at. Let us never forget that Europe will always need America, and the world needs us to work together on its behalf.

Look at Bosnia, the Middle East, Russia, Rwanda, and Burundi, to name a few countries. And look at the global fight against crime, drugs, pollution, poverty, and disease. Look, too, at the world trading system, at the future of the NATO Alliance. All of these issues need transatlantic leadership. And the new transatlantic agenda has given us a solid framework on which to build this strong leadership. We have made a good start, but we need to go much further.

Thank you.

President Clinton. Thank you very much.

Mr. Fournier [Ron Fournier, Associated Press].

FBI Files of White House Passholders

Q. On the domestic front, sir, three quick questions on the FBI file controversy, which Bob Dole has compared to Watergate tricks. Number one, when did you learn that the FBI files of Republicans had been requested and obtained by your White House? Two, who in the administration knew that they were requested and obtained? And lastly, how can you be so sure that this was just a bureaucratic snafu when the White House is not investigating it and Ken Starr is not finished?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, you should have answers to some of your questions by the end of the week. The White House Counsel and the FBI are working together to review the process and to see what should be done to make sure it can't happen again, both in the White House and in the FBI. And I expect to get a report by the end of the week.

I will say again, it appears to be nothing more than a bureaucratic snafu based on all of the evidence that I have seen. There is no evidence to the contrary. The first time I had learned about it was when there was a newspaper article about it, when it broke in the press. I knew nothing about it beforehand.

Q. Who else in the White House knew about it before——

President Clinton. I don't know that anyone did. I don't know anything other than what has been said to you by Mr. Panetta. He looked into it. He has all of the facts that any of us know. And so I—I would never condone or tolerate any kind of enemies list or anything of that kind. I think this is really an honest bureaucratic mess-up. There was a lot of—if you will remember going back to that time, there was a lot of interest in whether we had the right sort of credentialing here for access to the White House, and I think trying to review that is what gave rise to this whole thing.

I do believe, based on the evidence that we know, it was just an innocent bureaucratic snafu, which is what I've said all along. And I'm sorry that it occurred, and I believe that we will correct it. And I think the FBI will correct it on their end as well so that nothing like this will happen again.

I'd like now to recognize a European journalist. I'll try to alternate between the Americans and the Europeans.

International Trade

Q. Thank you. Mr. President, the Export Administration Act of 1979 seems to contradict the Helms-Burton law because it does criticize secondary boycotts as a procedure. And that law was established to criticize Arab countries that were adopting secondary boycotts against Israel. So how do you reconcile this contradiction that seems to be happening with the United States at this point?

And for Mr. Santer, China seems to be a strong target of trade sanctions from the United States. They are being considered now, and there is a complaint from the United States side that Europe has not done enough to help the United States in controlling China. What do you have to say to that? There was, yesterday, testimony in Congress criticizing directly and strongly Europe for this behavior.

And finally, Mr. Prodi—[*laughter*]—STET is under direct attack—it is an Italian company—because of the Helms-Burton act. What are you doing to protect this Italian company?

The President. Let me answer first. First of all, there's quite a difference between the generalized Arab boycott of Israel, which we have worked to bring to an end, simply because Israel existed, and the Helms-Burton bill, which provides the President some flexibility in its administration and which is directed against the only country remaining in our hemisphere which is not a democracy and which passed in the aftermath of Cuba's flagrant shooting-down of two airplanes, American airplanes, in international airspace and killing innocent civilians, most of whom were American citizens. And so the two things are entirely different.

I'm very sensitive to the whole question of extraterritoriality. We are reviewing that. But we think that the Cuban—the persistent refusal of

Cuba to move toward democracy or openness and the particular problems that causes for countries in our hemisphere, and for the United States especially, justified the passage of the bill, which I signed into law.

Now, they were asked questions, too. I hope they can remember.

President Santer. The question about China—we have trade relations with China. That is not the normal way to go ahead—but I am not aware that there could be from our side some questioning about—that's incrimination on the European side. I do not know what are the causes for this incrimination. We are establishing our trading relation with China, as with other countries, on behalf of negotiations. And these negotiations have to come to an end, but otherwise, I do not see that there would be any harm done through the negotiation to the United States in this case.

Prime Minister Prodi. Concerning the STET case, STET is an Italian telephone company who bought shares of a Mexican company owning shares of—having Cuban interest. And so they didn't even know about the Cuban interest. And so I limited myself to collect news and knowledge about the problem, and I think that in due time we shall try to defend our interest, because it is a very indirect involvement with Cuba. So I didn't even know about that.

President Clinton. Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]?

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, you agreed on an election to go forward in Bosnia in September. Did you also agree on the pullout date, to stick with December as the pullout date for the troops? And why is it that the troops don't go after Karadzic and Mladic and bring them before the world court? What's the holdup?

I'd like also the other leaders——

President Clinton. You might want to ask them that question, but let me say, we did not discuss the military operation today. We discussed basically the elections and the reconstruction effort.

I believe that we should stick with our timetable. We believe that IFOR can complete its mission in about a year. We believe that it has to be in full force during the time of the elections. We believe that it has to be an effective military force certainly until December 20th, and then some drawdown can begin after that, below the level we think is necessary to maintain what we believe clearly is required for the election.

On the other question you asked, I would remind you that when the IFOR mission went in, they went in with a certain very strict mission, and it did not include running down people who were suspected of war crimes, but it did include apprehending those with whom our forces came in contact. Now, I expect that in the—particularly in some regions where there's a lot of movement that has to occur back and forth between people trying to return home, visit their homes, visit their relatives, there will be more and more vigorous enforcement of that. And I expect that if the IFOR troops came in contact with Mr. Karadzic, they would do what they would do to anybody else suspected of being a war criminal.

But there's never been part of their mission to go into specific communities with the mandate to arrest particular people. That was not part of the IFOR mission in the first place.

Q. But who would be the culprits in this case? I mean, are you going to arrest the people who simply carried out orders?

President Clinton. The IFOR troops can arrest anybody that's been charged with a war crime with whom they come in contact. But they are not charged with, in effect, being the domestic or the international police force and targeting people and going after them. That was not part of the agreement of Dayton, and it's a very delicate balance. I understand that. But they have arrested some people with whom they have come in contact, some people that they have found in the ordinary course of doing their jobs. And if that should happen in this case, I would expect them to do their duty.

Do you want to add anything to that?

President Santer. Mr. President, I have nothing to add to what you have said. After tomorrow there will be a conference, a Florence conference as implementation of the Dayton peace agreement. We have to stick to all of the parts of the Dayton peace agreement, as the President said. And I'm coming back from a journey to former Yugoslavia with Vice Prime Minister Dini, and to all our partners—we met the Presidents of all of the republics—we stated also that they have to stick to the implementation of the Dayton peace agreement in all the parts. And I think that the conference, the implemen-

tation conference of tomorrow in Florence would deal also with these subjects.

NATO and Greece-Turkey Relations

Q. Mr. President, two questions. One is, how do you see the U.S. role in the new defense NATO structure as it was agreed in Brussels? And secondly, there seems to be some heightened tension between Greece and Turkey. I wonder whether this was part of your discussion and whether you're personally concerned and whether you are going to take any initiative into this matter.

President Clinton. First of all, I am strongly supportive of the general direction taken at the last conversations—at the last meeting in Brussels about the evolution of NATO and the possibility of a European security unit within NATO.

I believe the United States should remain as a security partner, a political partner, and an economic partner of Europe. I believe that we need each other, and I believe the world needs our partnership. And I think NATO is a very important part of that. And how we manage the development of European security within NATO, how we manage the expansion of NATO—all of these are questions that we must resolve by working together in good faith. So I'm basically encouraged by what has been done so far.

As to Greece and Turkey, we did not have the opportunity to discuss it, but I can tell you that I am very concerned about it. Both those nations are our allies and Europe's allies through NATO, and I believe that the future of the region which they both occupy will be immeasurably brighter if they can resolve their problems and immeasurably darker if they cannot.

And so it's a source of great concern to me, and we have invested quite a bit of time on it in the last few months, and I expect to invest even more time on it in the months and, if the people decide, in the years ahead. I think it's very important—the resolution of the difficulties between Greece and Turkey is central to having the kind of future for Europe and particularly for the Mediterranean region that we want.

Yes, Brian [Brian Williams, NBC News]?

Church Burnings in the South

Q. Dick Armey criticized the trip you took today to talk about the church burnings in the South, and late today Haley Barbour criticized it as well, saying that at best your motives were political. I wonder if you have a reaction to that.

President Clinton. I think you ought to ask those people that were out on that country road in South Carolina today, the people that rebuilt their church, or that pastor that came up from North Carolina who just lost his church. I don't believe they think this is a political issue, and I don't think that our country is well served by turning into politics what is a very important matter. We should be united together across political and racial and religious lines in our determination not only to find the people responsible for burning these churches—and one mosque also, I might add—but also in sort of pushing back on this extremist impulse, this racist impulse which seems to be at least manifesting itself among some people who are involved in these church burnings.

So I think that's what we ought to be talking about: what, as Americans, our responsibilities are to stand up against racism, to stand up against the desecration of houses of worship. And we should not turn this into a political issue; it isn't political, and it isn't partisan.

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. This will be the last question.

Italian Separatist Movement

Q. Mr. President, you've often mentioned that you like Italy very much, and perhaps you are going to repeat the same thing to Mr. Prodi afterwards in your bilateral. What about if there were not one but two Italys, and I'm referring specifically to this possibility of a——

Prime Minister Prodi. One is enough. [*Laughter*]

Q. ——of a secession, you know, the one in Canada, whatever.

President Clinton. Well, I took a position on the one in Canada, and I don't think I had much to do with the outcome. It was a very close race there. But we take no position about the internal affairs of other nations. But I thought what the Prime Minister said made a lot of sense: One seems to be enough.

In America, we've tolerated a North and a South for quite a long time now. And we tried to split up once, and it didn't work out so well, and I wouldn't recommend it to anybody. I think, you know, you just—[*laughter*]—it's better to try to just resolve your difficulties and go on.

Thank you very much.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott

Q. What do you think of Trent Lott taking over?

President Clinton. Congratulations to him.

NOTE: The President's 124th news conference began at 4:05 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. The President met with Prime Minister Romano Prodi of Italy, President of the European Council, and Jacques Santer, President of the European Commission. During the news conference, the following persons were referred to: Bosnian Serb leaders Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic; and Vice Prime Minister Lamberto Dini of Italy. A reporter referred to the Societa Finanziaria Telefonica, S.p.A. (STET), an Italian telephone company.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the National Endowment for the Arts

June 12, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my pleasure to transmit herewith the Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Arts for the fiscal year 1995.

On September 29, 1995, at the close of the fiscal year, the Arts Endowment celebrated its 30th anniversary. A young man or woman born at the same time as this Federal agency's establishment has enjoyed access to the arts and culture unparalleled in the history of the country. The National Endowment for the Arts has helped bring tens of thousands of artists into schools, teaching tens of millions of students about the power of the creative imagination. This small Federal agency has helped launch a national cultural network that has grown in size and quality these past 30 years.

This Annual Report is another chapter in a great success story. In these pages, you will find projects that bring the arts to people in every State and in thousands of communities from Putney, Vermont, to Mammoth Lakes, California. The difference art makes in our lives is profound; we see more clearly, listen more intently, and respond to our fellow man with deeper understanding and empathy.

In these challenging times, when some question the value of public support for the arts, we should reflect upon our obligation to the common good. The arts are not a luxury, but a vital part of our national character and our individual human spirit. The poet Langston Hughes said, "Bring me all of your dreams, you dreamers. Bring me all of your heart melodies. . ." For 30 years, the Arts Endowment has helped keep those dreams alive for our artists and our audiences. May it long continue to do so.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 12, 1996.

Statement on the Court Decision on the Communications Decency Act

June 12, 1996

The Justice Department is reviewing today's three-judge panel court decision on the Communications Decency Act. The opinion just came down today, and the statute says we have 20 days to make an appeal.

I remain convinced, as I was when I signed the bill, that our Constitution allows us to help parents by enforcing this act to prevent children from being exposed to objectionable material transmitted through computer networks. I will continue to do everything I can in my administration to give families every available tool to protect their children from these materials. For example, we vigorously support the development

and widespread availability of products that allow both parents and schools to block objectionable materials from reaching computers that children use. And we also support the industry's accelerating efforts to rate Internet sites so that they are compatible with these blocking techniques.

Remarks Welcoming President Mary Robinson of Ireland at Fort Myer, Virginia

June 13, 1996

President Robinson, Mr. Robinson, members of the Irish delegation. On behalf of the American people, let me begin by saying to President Robinson, *Ceade mile failte,* a hundred thousand welcomes.

It is a pleasure for me to return the tremendous hospitality that greeted Hillary and me and our American delegation on our visit to Ireland last fall. It is difficult to imagine being better received anywhere in the world than I was on Dublin's Green. It was a day that I will never forget. And I hope that President Robinson and the Irish delegation will feel just as welcome here in America today.

Since its first appearance in the annals of world history, Ireland has been a light unto nations. When darkness shrouded Europe 1,500 years ago, the learning of the Irish pierced the gloom. And Irish wisdom has continued to illuminate Western thought throughout the ages, from Saint Patrick to Swift to Yeats to Heaney.

In recent centuries, Ireland has sent the most brilliant gift of all to the world, the gift of its children. No nation has gained more than ours from the energy and determination these immigrants have carried with them when they departed Ireland's shores. Today, one of every six Americans claims Irish heritage. And even the awareness our Nation owes to the unwavering spirit of the Irish has brought to our country more than we can ever calculate.

President Robinson, you have spoken so eloquently about the extended Irish family abroad and of an Irishness that transcends territory. It gives us all great joy that today this Irish family is one.

In our time, Ireland's beacon shines as brightly as ever and, as in the beginning, it shines to the highest values of civilization. Ireland's devotion to building peace has made a small nation a great example for all the world. In its steadfast search for a just settlement in the North, Ireland has spared no effort and never faltered before taking a risk for peace.

The road to peace is almost never straight, and we've all felt the setbacks along the way. But just as Ireland has responded to the voices of hope in the North, so has America. Today I reaffirm my pledge to the people of Ireland: We will do all we can to help to realize the bright future of peace that is the birthright of every child of Ireland, North and South.

As they do at home, the Irish stand for peace in many distant lands. Every single day for almost four decades, Irish troops have been stationed abroad to preserve the peace in such places as the Congo and Somalia. At this moment they serve in nine different peacekeeping missions. And in Bosnia, members of the Irish Garda are training police so that that nation can rebuild itself and, by itself, maintain its peace growing now within the borders.

The United States and Ireland are bound by ties of kinship and friendship, commerce and culture. Above all, we share the bonds of belief, the determination to see peace take root and freedom prevail all around the world. Today we celebrate these ties. We resolve to strengthen them and to work together to see our common hopes realized and the lives of our citizens improved.

This is a happy day for America because in the hearts of so many Americans we have a special place for Ireland, and because we know that when we work with Ireland, we can make the world a better place.

President Robinson, welcome to the United States.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:28 a.m. at Summerall Field. In his remarks, he referred to President Robinson's husband, Nicholas Robinson.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Mary Robinson of Ireland

June 13, 1996

President Clinton. Let me begin by saying how delighted I am to welcome President Robinson to the United States, along with the delegation from the Irish Government. The United States is very proud to have been a partner with Ireland in so many ways. We appreciate the work that they have done for peace in Northern Ireland and for peace around the world. And I look forward to this discussion today and our continued common efforts.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned about the rocky start the peace talks have gotten off to and the kind of cool relationship or cool welcoming George Mitchell got there?

President Clinton. Well, it seems to be working itself out. And I believe that talks are going to go forward, and I'll do everything I can to support the process. And I hope very much that somehow the cease-fire can be reestablished so that everybody will participate and there will be a successful resolution of it.

President Ernesto Samper of Colombia

Q. Mr. President, what do you plan to do about the exoneration of Samper yesterday by the Colombian Legislature?

President Clinton. Well, the United States judges its relationships with Colombia on one standard, whether they're cooperating with us in the fight against narcotics. And we will judge our relationship with Colombia based on that standard. And we—however the—they have a democratically elected parliament; they have to vote on matters as they see fit. But we will judge our relationship with a country based on their level of cooperation with us in the fight against narcotics.

Church Burnings in the South

Q. Mr. President, another church fire this morning. Are you concerned that all the attention, including what you've brought to it, is causing copycats?

President Clinton. Well, it was getting quite a lot of attention before. We, after all, had had a huge number of them. All I can tell you is that the United States will never accept burning churches. It is wrong, and it's evil, and it has to stop. We have to continue to do whatever we can to stop it. And I may have more to say about it later today.

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

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Mrs. President, you said that you thought that some words of reconciliation would be helpful. Do you think that words of reconciliation from the White House would be helpful for the people of Ireland?

President Robinson. I think the whole approach of the United States has been very helpful, not just today or yesterday but for the last number of years. It has been a very evenhanded, nurturing approach. It has been both words and practical help. And it's, I think, evidenced by the presence of Senator Mitchell in the very sensitive negotiations at the moment.

There are so many different ways in which the United States is being truly helpful. And I have the opportunity during this state visit to express the appreciation of the people of Ireland, and I think it's timely to do that. I think this has been a very special friendship, reflecting the very long links between our two countries, but very, very thoughtful, very helpful, very nurturing, very evenhanded, very sensitive, and very patient. And it's not easy at the moment. Nobody believes it is. And so it needs that true friend who's with you during those times of difficulty. And that is how we view the United States.

Q. Mr. President, did you feel in any way sad at the way Senator Mitchell seemed to have

been treated in the early days of the talks process?

President Clinton. Well, I don't think that Senator Mitchell feels sad about it. I think that we knew, all of us, from the beginning that these would be difficult talks and that there would be some rocky places in the road, especially in the beginning. We hope very much that the talks will proceed successfully now. Some of the procedural issues appear to have been resolved in a satisfactory manner to all parties. I also very much hope that the cease-fire can be reestablished so that everybody will be participating in the talks and they will actually produce what they were meant to produce. And we'll be further along the road to peace.

But I actually feel pretty good about the way things have happened so far. We're still going; it's still rocking along in the right direction.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Mr. President, that the IRA might call another cease-fire?

President Clinton. Well, I have no inside information about that. All I can tell you is what I hope will happen. We need everybody involved to have a resolution of this that will, at the other end of it, involve everyone in a system that will lead to permanent peace and reconciliation and participation in the affairs of Northern Ireland.

Q. You said when you came to Ireland that you told the men of violence, "Your day is done. Your day is over." Do you still feel that's the case after the Sinn Fein vote in the Northern Ireland elections? How would you interpret that vote?

President Clinton. I don't think it's a vote for violence. That's not the way I interpreted the vote at all. And I think the—I think every voice that represents a substantial element of the people of Northern Ireland needs to be heard in the talks. But if the purpose of the talks is to produce a lasting and enduring peace, you can't have the talks with a gun to your head.

Q. If you were talking directly to Gerry Adams today, what exactly would you say to him about restoration of the cease-fire?

President Clinton. Probably the same thing I've always said—say, first of all, congratulations on the vote, and secondly, I would say I hope that a cease-fire can be secured so that everyone can participate.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:19 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President's News Conference With President Mary Robinson of Ireland

June 13, 1996

President Clinton. Please be seated. Good afternoon.

Let me begin as I did this morning, by thanking President Robinson for the extraordinary hospitality that Hillary and I and our entire delegation received in Ireland late last year. I don't know whether it's possible to actually equal Irish hospitality, but we're determined to try. I hope that the President of Ireland feels very much at home and very much admired in America because she certainly is.

Once again, I thank President Robinson for the extraordinary contributions of Irish-Americans to our country and for the extraordinary contributions of the Irish people not just to their neighbors but to strangers in need all around the globe.

Over the past 40 years, every single day there has been an Irish citizen working for peace somewhere in the world. More than 40,000 military personnel have worked in U.N. peacekeeping operations. Great sums of money have been expended by a poor country for humanitarian relief. At this very moment, hundreds of Garda and defense forces are serving in nine different countries, from Lebanon and Cyprus to the Western Sahara and Bosnia. As Ireland has grown and progressed and become more prosperous, the generosity and vision of the Irish people have found a wider and wider range of avenues for their expression. We are very

grateful for the thousands of Irish volunteers who are working in places of crisis and suffering all over the world but especially in Rwanda, where President Robinson has shown special concern and special leadership.

President Robinson and I agreed that so many of the problems we face today—terrorism, international organized crime, drugs, environmental decay—have no respect for national borders, and to effectively meet them we have to work together. We discussed our determination especially to work closely with Ireland as it assumes the European Presidency so that we can increase our cooperation in the international fight against drugs.

Let me also say I am encouraged at the beginning of the historic negotiations in Belfast toward a just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland. I know how much the people of Northern Ireland want peace. I saw it and felt it for myself last year. I know how hard the people of Ireland have worked to support the peace process in Northern Ireland and the Government of Ireland has worked to support the peace process in Northern Ireland. And I reaffirmed to President Robinson that the United States will continue to do everything we possibly can to help the negotiations along.

Madam President, we're glad to have you in America. We're grateful for you and your country. And the microphone is yours.

President Robinson. Thank you.

Well, I very much welcomed the opportunity to say in more detail to President Clinton how much the support of the United States and the thoughtful friendship that is expressed in so many practical ways and over the past few years has meant to Ireland. I say the past few years because I think it's important to recognize that this is building on a great bond of friendship between our two countries.

But this is a very significant time on the Island of Ireland, and we have a window of opportunity. And the way in which the United States has been supportive and helpful in nurturing peace and reconciliation on the Island of Ireland is of crucial significance.

I look forward to meeting the majority and minority leaders of Congress in order to express, on behalf of the people of Ireland, how much we appreciate the real friendship and concern. And I was glad to be able to refer to the tangible ways in which that has been manifested. If one looks back even over a span of 18 months, the importance of the Washington Conference in May 1995, following the cessation of violence, that there would be a peace dividend, the people would have hope, something to look forward to, the very practical way in which the United States has helped in that regard, the sense of being very much in touch with the complexity but also the way things are moving forward. And that was so evident during the extremely memorable and historic visit of President Clinton and the First Lady to Ireland at the end of November, beginning of December.

In a relatively short time in Belfast and Derry and Dublin, not only did President Clinton and the First Lady express in very important ways the focus on peace and reconciliation, you in fact gave an opportunity to ordinary people to come out into the street and to demonstrate from the heart how much they wanted sustainable peace. That was part of the huge crowds that came out because you represented somebody who was informed, who was balanced in approach, who was thoughtful, who came from a very powerful country that is engaged in helping us. And we very much appreciate that.

And so, I think this state visit is timely in affording an opportunity to acknowledge and show appreciation on behalf of the people of Ireland. And I do so, of course, in the context of very sensitive and difficult negotiations at the moment. And Senator George Mitchell and his two colleagues are engaged in the process of helping, helping to try to move forward step by step to bring about that peace and reconciliation.

And as you have mentioned, President Clinton, it's also a year in which Ireland takes on responsibilities: responsibility for chairmanship of the European Union, which begins on the first of July; responsibility for continuing the chairmanship of the Intergovernmental Conference, which is very important not just for the European Union but for the wider Europe. It will talk about issues of efficiency at the European level but also the consideration of a further enlargement of the European Union, which is of such importance to stability and to the future of the democracies of Central and Eastern Europe.

And it was, therefore, a welcome opportunity with the *Tanaiste*, Dick Spring—who will, in fact, in his role as Irish Foreign Minister, have a great responsibility—I think it was very wel-

come that there was the opportunity to share ideas and discussion. And we did touch on a lot of matters, but I think it was a very fruitful discussion.

And most of all, I will take every opportunity I have to say from the heart not only how much I appreciate coming here as President of Ireland but also the way in which I can express the heartfelt appreciation of the people of Ireland and the importance of your engagement with us in seeking and indeed, hopefully, bringing about the sustainable peace and reconciliation on the Island of Ireland.

Thank you.

President Clinton. Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International.]

Russian and Israeli Elections

Q. Mr. President, the United States has been interested in two foreign elections and especially the outcomes, and your preferences are pretty well-known: Israel and Russia. Do you think the election in Russia—do you think it would be disastrous if the Communists won? And what assurances do you have from the Israeli Government, the new government regime, that the peace process will continue, that there will be no building of settlements on the West Bank, and all of the other issues?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, the new Israeli government is just being formed, and I think we have to leave the Prime Minister-designate, Mr. Netanyahu, his elbow room to put his government together and to go forward.

I think in the meantime we can rely on his own statements, which have been quite encouraging about continuing the peace process and respecting the work that has been done to date. And so, I feel very good about that. And that, in a way, it seems to me, bears out the position the United States has taken, that we support the peace process and those who take risks for peace.

With regard to Russia, let me say, I think—I wouldn't underestimate the importance of the fundamental fact that they're about to have an election. And it is consistent with their Constitution, and it's going to be an extraordinary thing. I believe it was President—former President Aristide of Haiti who once said that when a country becomes a democracy, the second election is the most important.

And I think that all the parties and all the interests would have to say a word of support to those who are in authority now, who are respecting the Constitution or promoting this election. And I think that gives a chance for reform in Russia to succeed and endure. That has not been the case, literally, for centuries because when the czars attempted to reform things in Russia, they had no way of making the system bigger than themselves, no way of making the Constitution the rule of law such that people could have elections and make decisions on their own about who their leaders should be.

So I want to applaud those who are responsible for that and the people of Russia and encourage them all to participate. Now, you know what our position is. Our position is that we support democracy; we support reform; we support cooperation; we support partnership. I've made my feelings about all these issues perfectly clear. And I think that I should. And you know that I've had a very good, positive relationship with President Yeltsin. But we support the democratic process in Russia, and we will support the right of the people of Russia to pick their own leaders. And then we will deal with the decision that they make.

United Nations

Q. President Robinson, did you get a chance to speak to President Clinton about the United States being in arrears with the U.N.? And President Clinton, do you think that President Robinson would be a good candidate for the U.N. General Secretary?

President Robinson. We did discuss the whole area of reform of the United Nations, which is so important, and the role of the United Nations in the context of the post-cold-war world. I had an opportunity to give a sense of the need to have a better sense of the importance of the United Nations. And I think that was really what we focused on, that somehow that story is underappreciated.

People see bits of the involvement of the United Nations in certain ways, and there are criticisms. And understandably, in some areas there are criticisms. But there is a lack of awareness of the rounded story of how important what has been built up for the last 50 years is. And this we certainly did discuss. And we did it also in the context, for example, of issues in Africa and also in the new South Africa. But I think it was more a focus on the philosophical

and broader sense of the United Nations and not specifically on the issues that you asked.

President Clinton. I brought up the arrearages. She didn't raise it, but I did—[*laughter*]—because I think it's wrong, and I believe we should pay our arrearages. And I have been trying to correct that since I became President. But I also pointed out there is a very strong and bipartisan opinion in our Congress that we need some reforms in the United Nations, and we're working very hard to achieve those reforms. And I want to see the United States pay its fair share. I think the American people expect us to pay our fair share. But we want a U.N. that's even more effective in the way we raise and spend our money. And I do agree that the United Nations is often underappreciated in terms of all the things that it does that are important.

Obviously there was no discussion of the other question you asked me. But you know, I have very high regard for President Robinson. I think she would do a good job in any position that she might be considered for. But there's been no discussion of that particular issue. But I have a very high regard for her.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press]?

Supreme Court Decision on Redistricting

Q. Mr. President, the Supreme Court today struck down congressional redistricting plans in Texas and North Carolina that would have given blacks and Hispanics more political clout. Does this hurt Democrats' chances of reclaiming Congress and your chances of holding on to the White House?

President Clinton. Well, I was disappointed by the decision for the reasons that you said. But I think the answer to that is no. I think the answer to that is no. I think the affected voters will see that they need to work even harder to make sure their voices are heard.

Extraterritorial Impact of Sanctions

Q. Mr. President, you said yesterday that you're reviewing the claims of extraterritoriality of the Helms-Burton law. What do you mean by that? And are you considering waivering it?

President Clinton. What I said yesterday was there are provisions in the Helms-Burton law which give the President some flexibility, and I am reviewing what the facts are and trying to determine what the best and most proper way to implement the law is. But I have made no decision and I have nothing else to add.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN]?

FBI Files of White House Passholders

Q. Mr. President, a former FBI agent has an article he has written in the Wall Street Journal today in which he says he worked at the White House until '95—in which he says he warned specifically the FBI and White House officials about the potential for abusing these FBI files that were sent over here to the White House, but nobody seemed to be paying attention, and he thought it was part of a systematic effort to look for dirt on potential enemies, which obviously is a very serious accusation. A, are you familiar with this article that was written today? And B, do you have anything else to say that can clarify what is obviously a very explosive accusation if true?

President Clinton. No, I did not read it and don't know if he named any names of any particular people he warned.

Q. He says—he did name his supervisor at the FBI as well as Craig Livingstone here at the White House.

President Clinton. Well, you would have to ask them then. I don't know. I can just tell you that I do not believe there was any systematic effort to do that. I believe this happened just the way the person who had the file said it happened. I believe that until there is evidence to the contrary, that is what you should assume is the truth.

I mean, it's not—it doesn't make any sense. There is no—there would be no reason to do it, and it's inconsistent with the clear instructions that I have given and the way we have operated this White House.

So I would just say until I have evidence to the contrary—and I mean evidence—I'm glad to be open to evidence, but we need evidence before we draw any conclusion like that. There is just—there is no—and I never saw any indication of it for 3½ years that anybody was trying to do anything of that kind. And if I had I would not have tolerated if for a split second.

President Robinson. That's the Irish television coming.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. What would you say to members of the Unionist community in Northern Ireland who

are still skeptical and may be suspicious of American involvement in the peace process?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, look at what—what has the American involvement been? I would say look at what the American involvement has been. What we have tried to do is to do whatever we could to facilitate an end to violence and the participation of those parties that would be necessary to effect a just and lasting peace. We have not tried to prejudge any of the specific issues for anyone. And all we have offered to do is to do what we could to help in the peace process, to maximize the rewards and minimize the risks of peace, as interested outsiders. We are not insiders; we are not trying to determine the details of this in any way, shape, or form.

So I don't think we've had a destructive impact there. And we certainly would not want to.

Q. Mr. President——

President Clinton. Yes, Jim [Jim Miklaszewski, NBC News]. Go ahead.

Church Burnings in the South

Q. Mr. President, despite your bully pulpit appeals, there was another church burning in Oklahoma overnight. Is it going to take something stronger from the Federal Government? And what kind of measures along that line are you considering today?

President Clinton. Well, we have, as I announced yesterday in South Carolina, we have substantially increased the number of Federal officials working on the investigation of each of these incidents. And we are examining, even as you and I are talking here, some other possible options for what else can be done. I may have more to say about it later. I don't have anything else to add today, except we're going to get to the bottom of every one of these cases. We're going to do everything we can.

And again, I want to issue a strong plea to the American people—this is not what this country is all about. This is a deeply religious country where we—we were founded in a commitment to respect the right of every single person to religious freedom. And what appear to be a number of racially motivated instances are just—they're not only illegal, they're morally unacceptable and reprehensible, and Americans need to stand up against it. And we're looking at other ways that we can do better and do more.

Any other questions on the Irish side?

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, if the negotiations in Belfast go ahead, but without Sinn Fein because there's no IRA cease-fire, do you think they have any possibility of succeeding under those conditions?

President Clinton. Well, let's see what happens. They just got started. I don't want to get into a lot of speculation. All I can tell you is that I'm encouraged that they've begun and not discouraged that there was some procedural wrangling in the beginning. And this is a complex matter. There will be a lot of turns in the road before it's over, but I'm hopeful. And on balance, I feel quite hopeful today.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 125th news conference began at 1 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.

Remarks on Receiving a Report on Teen Pregnancy
June 13, 1996

This is one of those moments when I have the feeling if I would stop now I'd be way ahead [*Laughter*] Thank you, Blessing Tate, for that wonderful statement. And thank you, Blessing and Salvador, both of you, for the powerful example of your lives.

Thank you, Michael Carrera, for the work you've done and for sticking with it over so many years. I want to thank Rebecca Maynard for this remarkable study, which I believe will have a significant impact on our United States. I thank my friend Paul Tudor Jones and Robin Hood Foundation for funding it, and also for being a personal evangelist for the cause of reducing the problem of teen pregnancy in America. The first time I ever met him, it was about the second sentence out of his mouth: "We've

got to do something about this. What are you doing about it?" [*Laughter*]

I thank Isabel Sawhill and my longtime friend Governor Tom Kean for being willing to organize and lead this national campaign against teen pregnancy. I thank you especially, Governor Kean, for being concerned about this over so many years. Ten years ago, we were on a Carnegie commission on middle schools, and Tom Kean was asking questions about this problem then, worrying about our young people. And I thank you for that.

Thank you, Senator Kassebaum, for your leadership and your willingness to serve. We'll miss you in the Senate, but I'm glad you're going to do this. I thank you. And thank you, Congresswoman Lowey, for always being there. Congressman Barrett was here a moment ago and had to leave. But I thank you all very, very much.

There is one other person I would like to thank who is not here today, Dr. Henry Foster, who is in Hartford meeting with local officials about their teen pregnancy programs but who has been willing to work very hard on this endeavor for so many years.

I have a few remarks I want to make about this whole endeavor, but before I do, if you will forgive me since this is my last opportunity to make a public statement of the day, I want to also make a few comments about what happened last night in Enid, Oklahoma, where another predominantly African-American church was burned.

Federal agents are now on the scene. We're doing what we can to find out what happened. But it is clear that we now have a rash of church burnings over the last year and a half. All of us who have any responsibility in this area have to work overtime to get to the bottom of the crimes and to help the churches and the communities rebuild.

Today our top Federal law enforcement officials are meeting with our United States Attorneys from all over America who are here and the heads of the FBI and the ATF offices from the affected States to work together and plot a strategy about where to go from here. The State attorneys general from the affected States will be meeting to coordinate their efforts in the next 2 weeks. In advance of that meeting, I am inviting the Governors from all the affected States to come to the White House next week to work together with us to prevent future incidents, to unite our communities, to rebuild the churches that have been burned.

I do want to say one more time, this must be an affair of the heart and the mind for America. This country was founded on the premise of religious liberty. That's how we got started. It's in the first amendment to the Constitution. And we have worked hard for more than 200 years to purge ourselves of racism. It is the cruelest of all ironies that an expression of bigotry in America that would sweep this country is one that involves trashing religious liberty. We have had over 30 churches burned. We have also had one mosque burned. This is wrong, and we must stop it.

We are here today because of what you've already heard. We know that strong families are the building block of our society. We know that millions of children that are born to mothers who aren't ready to be parents are robbed of their full potential.

When you see these two young people up here and you imagine what their lives are now going to be like, what their children will be like, what their contributions will be 10, 20, 30, 40 years from now, they say more than I ever could about what is truly at stake in dealing with this problem of teen pregnancy. I appreciate the fact that Governor Kean said that this is a uniquely American dilemma. It is really true. There is no advanced country in the world that has anything like the teen pregnancy problem that we do, the out-of-wedlock pregnancy problem that we do, and we have got to do something about it. We have to give these young people opportunity. We have to insist that they take more responsibility. But we must also come together as a community to help them to make the most of their own lives and to make good choices.

You heard Dr. Maynard talk about the costs of teen pregnancy. There's no point in my reiterating them now. But if you just think about all the bad things that can happen to kids, they're more likely for teen mothers. And if you think about the good things that can happen to kids, they're less likely for teen mothers. And sure, some of them make it, and we have to do the best we can to make sure more of them do very well. But the most important thing we can do is to dramatically, dramatically reduce the incidence of premature pregnancy and childbirth in this country. Let me thank again the

Robin Hood Foundation for what they have done and Paul Tudor Jones, especially.

But let me ask you again to think about this. If a million teenagers become pregnant each year, we face the prospect of dramatic social decay. If next year we will begin a period of several years when the classes of schoolchildren starting in grade school are going to be bigger than the classes of the baby boom generation for the first time since I became the oldest of the baby boomers and people about 18 years younger than me were the youngest, we are now going to have schoolchildren in numbers bigger than the baby boom generation. If we have not done something about this critical matter by the time they are biologically capable of bearing children even though they should not do so, we will pay an even greater price than Dr. Maynard's study calculates that we are paying today. And it will involve far more than money.

So I say to you, I believe there is a community responsibility. As Hillary said in her book, this is one of those problems that it really does take a village to deal with. No one has a right to say we're not responsible for these children. And all of us will be better off if there are more children like Blessing and Sal. We all have a responsibility to do that.

I do want to compliment Secretary Shalala for her work on these subjects not just as the Secretary of HHS but, as you heard, going back for years and years and years before she ever came to this post. I want to thank her and the Governors who have worked together on the cause of welfare reform. We have put in place about 62 welfare reform experiments now with 39 States, many of them designed to help young people come to grips with this issue.

Ohio's LEAP program, for example, is having a significant impact on helping teen mothers stay in school and get jobs and get off welfare. And I was so impressed with the consequences of it that we issued an Executive order ruling that that should be the policy in every State in the country. Stay in school; stay at home or in an appropriate supervised setting; follow a personal responsibility contract; turn your life around: That is what we expect from people who receive these benefits.

The other thing we have to do is to take seriously the role in this problem of older men. It's a sad fact that half of all the underage mothers in this country were made pregnant by a man who was in his twenties or even older, someone who has no business taking advantage of an underage girl. Statutory rape is still a crime in this country. The young women are victims. Yet these laws are almost never enforced, even in the most egregious of circumstances. It is time for them to be enforced so that older men who prey on underage women and bring children into the world they have no intention of taking responsibility for are held accountable.

There are other things we have to do, too. We've come a long way in the area of child support enforcement. Child support enforcement collections have increased by 40 percent in the last 3 years from roughly $8 billion to just a little over $11 billion. The Federal Government working with the States have played a role in that. But we can do more.

One of the things that there is, as far as I know, absolutely totally unanimous agreement on in the Congress among all Republicans and all Democrats are the provisions that are now in every welfare reform bill to strengthen child support enforcement. If for some reason we cannot reach agreement on welfare reform this year—and I still hope we can—I believe we ought to pass these provisions that 100 percent of us agree on so that we can do more to hold people accountable for the children they bring in the world and help these kids get the money they need and help their parents get the money they need to do a good job in raising the children.

These are things that the Government can do. But we all know that the Government cannot solve this problem. The more I dealt with these issues as a Governor, the more I became convinced that the only way to deal with them was in a comprehensive way, the way that the New York Children's Aid Society has dealt with them, the way that the national campaign is attempting with them. That's why I asked leaders from our society, from every walk of life, to pull together and form a national campaign to prevent teen pregnancy.

Now, Tom Kean said they have an audacious goal to reduce teen pregnancy by a third in the next 10 years, but I believe that's an achievable goal. I believe if every child in America had access to the kind of guidance and support that these two children did, we would achieve that goal and perhaps better it.

The work of the national campaign to prevent teen pregnancy is just beginning. I think we should all make a personal commitment to support them, each of us in our own communities. They're going to be doing what all of us should be doing. They'll learn what works, spread the word, and work to replicate it through the country.

Today the Department of Health and Human Services is taking a step in that direction by releasing a guidebook called "Promoting Promising Strategies." It describes successful programs and outlines five important principles that are embodied in every single successful teen pregnancy program that we have evaluated, including, obviously, the one supported by the Children's Aid Society that produced these two fine young people here today.

First and foremost, community programs must stress abstinence and personal responsibility. A program cannot be successful unless it gives our children the moral leadership they need to say no to the wrong choices and yes to the right ones.

Second, programs must help teenagers establish clear strategies about how they are going to move their lives forward. Both these young people have strategies for what they're going to do with their tomorrows. They have dreams. They have a reason to work and look for the long run.

Third—and let me just say one other thing—that's saying that it's necessary to have strategies. Let me just follow this through. That means that we have an obligation to help all these kids go to college, among other things. Now, one of the most important proposals that I have made, from my point of view, is giving families a tax deduction for up to $10,000 for the cost of college tuition and guaranteeing a credit of up to $1,500 for 2 years of education after high school. But that may not be enough for some of these kids that are in trouble and don't have enough money to get from one week to the next.

So it's one thing to say that they should have a strategy for their future; the rest of us have obligations to help them live up to their dreams. If they're doing the right things, if they're being responsible, if they're making the right choices, we've got to see to it that these children can go to college or go to training school or otherwise pursue their dreams. And all of us have responsibilities to make sure that their decisions have a chance of being carried out.

The third thing we have to do is to make sure that parents and other adult mentors are constantly involved in children's lives.

And fourth, the program has to bring together many parts of the community, schools, businesses, religious organizations. The chances of success dramatically increase when not just one group is left to carry the whole load.

Finally, the programs have to maintain a commitment to the young people over an extended period of time. You heard what Blessing said about 4 years. We can't expect young people to hear a sermon a time or two and turn their lives around. They need action and support and consistency over a long period of time.

Now, these five principles we know work: abstinence, adult and community involvement, a clear strategy to a good education and a good job, a long-term commitment. Government should support these things because they work, and we should not be supporting strategies that do not work. That's why I want to announce today that the $30 million that I included in next year's budget to fund local teen pregnancy prevention programs will go only to programs that inculcate these five principles.

I want programs like that in every community in the country. That's what the Government can do to help the national commission meet their goal of reducing teen pregnancy by a third over the next decade. We know that we can do it.

Again, let me say that this is really about Blessing Tate, Salvador Ayala. It's about all the kids like them all across America. It's about people in the New York Children's Aid Society and people like them all across America, who were out here working on this when they never could get a headline and nobody ever notice them and they did it just because they thought it was right, the humane, the decent thing to do.

We know that we have to create a new culture, a new mind-set in our country, in which young people take greater responsibility for themselves but they understand that in so doing they have more opportunities for themselves, and in which the rest of us take responsibility for the welfare of all of our children, doing that together.

No one is too young to be told that the decision to bring a child into the world is the gravest choice they will ever make. No one is too young

to be told that there are consequences to decisions and that one way or the other, people always wind up being held accountable.

The basic bargain of our country should be, however, that if you are responsible, there will be opportunity for you. You will be party of a community of people who care about you, who believe that we must go forward together.

Pearl Buck once said, "If our American way of life fails the child, it fails us all." For too many children every year, the American way of life fails the child, and one of the ways we see it most gravely is in the epidemic of teen pregnancy. We now have people all over America that are working to turn it around. We have a national campaign committed to it. And we will do everything we can to support all of you good people who are trying to make this country a better place for these two young people on this stage and all the young people in America they represent.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:10 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Blessing Tate and Salvador Ayala, teen pregnancy prevention program participants, and Michael A. Carrera, national training center director, Children's Aid Society; Rebecca Maynard, editor of the report, entitled "Kids Having Kids"; Paul Tudor Jones II, chair, Robin Hood Foundation; Isabel Sawhill, president, National Campaign To Reduce Teen Pregnancy; former Gov. Tom Kean of New Jersey; and Henry W. Foster, Jr., Senior Adviser to the President on Teen Pregnancy and Youth Issues.

Remarks at a State Dinner Honoring President Mary Robinson of Ireland

June 13, 1996

Ladies and gentlemen, President Robinson, Mr. Robinson, members of the Irish delegation, Ambassador Jean Kennedy Smith, distinguished guests. Welcome to the largest gathering of Irish-Americans since the last Notre Dame football game. [*Laughter*]

Hillary and I were hoping that we might with this wonderful dinner tonight in some small way repay President Robinson and the people of Ireland for the wonderful reception that we and our American delegation received there late last year. It was, I think it's fair to say, two of the most extraordinary days in the lives of all of us who went. And we hope now to give a similar honor to the extraordinary President of Ireland.

From the beginning of her career in public life—and she was elected to the Seanad at the age of 25—Mary Robinson has stood unfailingly for those on the margins of society, for those without a voice in public affairs, for those most in need, for the rights of women and the care of the children at home and around the world. She said, "You have a voice; I will make it heard." And she has. And Ireland has heeded her strong and compassionate call, and indeed the entire world has applauded her leadership.

We are truly glad you are here, Madam President, especially at this moment when Ireland is thriving, stronger, more prosperous, and prouder than at any time in its rich history. Modern Ireland has stepped forward as a nation whose goods are traded around the world and whose music, movies, and literature are treasures of global culture. And Ireland is playing an even greater role on the world stage to the benefit of nations everywhere. Indeed, every day for the last 40 years, somewhere in the world an Irish citizen has worked for peace and humanity.

In the North, though the way is not always easy, a lasting and peaceful settlement is closer than at any time in memory, in good measure because Ireland has worked so steadfastly for every chance for peace.

The friendship between the United States is stronger than ever. Indeed, friendship is an inadequate word for the relationship between two nations as intertwined as ours. From the earliest times of our history, the Irish have been at the heart of our striving to be a better nation. By supporting Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, Irish immigrants helped to prod America to improve and broaden the reach of our democracy. They stood unflinchingly for free-

dom all the way. Two hundred thousand Irish-Americans fought in our Civil War, the most costly part of our journey toward a more perfect Union.

While the Irish made their presence felt in America, we like to believe America's presence was felt in Ireland as well. Ideas about self-government that developed here were carried across the ocean and espoused by leaders like Wolfe Tone, Daniel O'Connell, and Charles Stewart Parnell. The devotion of Irish-Americans to the cause of Irish liberty and their support of the Irish state is renowned here at home and around the world.

Today we celebrate all these ties and others that go to the deepest part of our life and character as a nation. But we cannot imagine America without the Irish-Americans. Whether in business or politics, the arts or entertainment, or making the life of every community in this country a little stronger, they have graced our country in immeasurable ways.

President Robinson, in 1916 Patrick Pearse, the Irish poet and patriot, described Irish-Americans as the "sea-divided Gael." It was a haunting phrase from a year of bloodshed. Tonight we see that on both sides of the sea the Irish are flourishing. The love and joy that unites us is far, far broader and stronger than the sea which divides us.

So ladies and gentlemen, let us all raise a glass to the partnership of Ireland and America, to the extraordinary community of Irish-Americans for which we are so grateful, and to the President of Ireland and her health, well-being, and the future of her beloved country.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:25 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks Following the Entertainment at the State Dinner Honoring President Mary Robinson of Ireland

June 13, 1996

Weren't they wonderful tonight? They made us all so happy. [*Applause*]

I also want to say to President Robinson that she brought America a little of the luck of the Irish. I am pleased to announce to you that while we were here at dinner the long standoff with the freemen in Montana ended peacefully tonight. I want to thank the FBI and the local law enforcement officials and say I am very, very proud of them. I know I speak for all of our people, when we say we'll all say a little prayer tonight of gratitude for this peaceful resolution of a difficult situation.

Finally, you heard President Robinson say this is an Irish event and it can't end early, so after we break up, the Air Force Airmen of Note will be playing here. We urge you to stay and dance to your heart's content or till the angry neighbors run us off. [*Laughter*] My experience is that will be quite some time. You can make it until dawn. [*Laughter*]

Again, I thank you, Mary Chapin Carpenter; thank you, Mary Black; thank you, gentlemen. It was a wonderful, wonderful evening. And most of all, thank you, President Robinson. Thank you, Nick. It's been wonderful for Hillary and me to have you here. Bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to singers Mary Chapin Carpenter and Mary Black; and Nick Robinson, husband of President Robinson.

The President's Radio Address
June 15, 1996

Good morning. Tomorrow millions of Americans will reach out to their fathers in thanks. I believe being a father is the most important job a man can do. Today I want to talk with you about what our Nation can do to help fathers as they try to raise good children.

A good, strong father can make the difference between a lifetime of disappointment and anger and a lifetime of fulfillment and good parenting in turn. Children from single-parent families are twice as likely to drop out of high school, to have a child before they're 20, to live in poverty. Children who don't have a dad at home are more likely to do worse in school than those who do, regardless of their household income.

Yet in so many ways, being a father today is harder than it was when our own dads were young. Most fathers are working longer hours to help support their families. At the same time, as many women move into the workplace, many, many American fathers find themselves taking on even greater responsibilities at home.

So if we want to keep the American family strong in the 21st century, we have to support America's fathers in doing their best by their children. That's why we worked hard to pass the family and medical leave law, to cut taxes for our hardest pressed working families, why we're fighting to raise the minimum wage and to make it easier for parents to pay for their children's college education, why we're fighting to protect the Medicaid that helps working parents with children with disabilities to keep working and support their children.

In addition to supporting fathers, we should expect basic responsibilities from them. That's why we worked so hard to strengthen child support enforcement. And I'm proud that child support collections are up by 40 percent in the last 3 years.

We are also urging fathers to get more involved, along with mothers, in their children's education. In fact, this summer Education Secretary Dick Riley is enlisting fathers and mothers to keep reading to their children and reading with their children through vacation. While math and science scores have gone up in recent years, our reading scores have remained just about flat. And reading ability drops off when children are out of school. Secretary Riley's Read-Write-Now initiative will encourage one million children to keep reading, even after the school doors close. Fathers can help to build a lifetime of memories for themselves and their children by reading with them every day. I know. On this Father's Day, all those books that I read with Chelsea together are among my most precious memories.

We also have to help parents protect their children from bad influences that come from outside the home. American parents are working overtime to keep their homes safe, to set good examples, only to have popular culture make their hard work even harder. That's why we worked hard to give parents the V-chip, so they can keep excessive violence and other inappropriate material out of their young children's TV viewing, and why we have encouraged the entertainment industry to rate their TV programs. It's why we're supporting antidrug strategies to help parents keep their children drug free.

Parents also know that, aside from television and drugs, alcohol and tobacco are two of the biggest dangers to our children. Our administration is working hard, along with tens of thousands of citizens, including so many young people in antismoking groups, to keep our children away from tobacco. Every day 3,000 kids start to smoke in this country illegally, and 1,000 of them will have their lives shortened as a result. Our administration has proposed strong rules to prevent the advertising, marketing, and sales of tobacco to children.

Now, some political leaders who oppose our efforts to restrict advertising and sales to children are saying that cigarettes are not necessarily addictive, even going so far as to compare the dangers of kids smoking to the dangers of some children drinking milk. Well, that's certainly the tobacco company line. But it was the Surgeon General, Dr. C. Everett Koop, under President Reagan who concluded nearly a decade ago that cigarettes are addictive, highly addictive. In fact, next week 130 of the Nation's top doctors and scientists are meeting to discuss how people can break free from tobacco addiction, not whether it's addictive.

So when political leaders parrot the tobacco company line, say cigarettes are not necessarily

addictive, and oppose our efforts to keep tobacco away from our children, they continue to cater to powerful interests, but they're not standing up for parents and children. In fact, they're making the job of being a parent even harder. So on the eve of this Father's Day, I say to the tobacco industry, support our efforts to keep tobacco away from our kids. And I say to others in public life, stop fighting those efforts; you should be supporting them too.

One thing parents haven't had to worry about is their kids being exposed on television and radio to liquor advertisements. For half a century liquor companies have voluntarily kept their ads off the air for the simple reason that it was the right thing to do. So I was disappointed this week when a major company announced it would break the ban and put liquor ads on TV, exposing our children to liquor before they know how to handle it or can legally do so. After voluntarily staying away from this for 50 years, being good corporate citizens, companies are now considering changing plans. I ask the companies to get back to the ban. Pull those ads. We appreciate your good corporate citizenship, and our parents need it to continue. Let's all resolve to make the job of being a father easier.

Tomorrow we celebrate our fathers, who every day, without fanfare or recognition, are doing the hard work it takes to be good fathers, good husbands, good citizens of our country. To all of you I say thank you, God bless you, Happy Father's Day, and thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:25 p.m. on June 14 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 15.

Statement on the Terrorist Attack in Manchester, United Kingdom
June 15, 1996

I am deeply outraged by the bomb explosion today at a shopping center in Manchester, England, which injured scores of innocent people, some very seriously. I join Prime Minister Major and Prime Minister Bruton in utterly condemning this brutal and cowardly act of terrorism. Such viciousness deserves universal condemnation. I wish the British Government every success in finding and bringing to justice those responsible.

On behalf of the American people, Hillary and I extend our deepest sympathies to the victims and their families. Our prayers are with them. We have known the shock and pain of terrorism in our country, the horror of the sudden shattering of daily life. The bombing today underscores the need for all of us to join together to fight terrorism and violence in all parts of the world.

Last week, historic talks aimed at finding a lasting settlement to the conflict in Northern Ireland began in Belfast. The people of Northern Ireland voted to send their representatives to those talks, expressing their deep desire for peace and their commitment to democratic means of resolving their differences. The men of violence have once again tried to dash their hopes. I want the people who have so much at stake in those talks to know that the United States will stand with them in their continuing search for peace.

Statement on the Death of Ella Fitzgerald
June 15, 1996

I am deeply saddened by the death of Ella Fitzgerald. The jazz world and the Nation have suffered a tremendous loss in the passing of someone with so much talent, grace, and class. Ella's phenomenal voice and wonderful phrasing will remain close to the hearts of Americans for generations to come. Hillary and I extend our deepest condolences to her family.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Glafcos Clerides of Cyprus and an Exchange With Reporters

June 17, 1996

Russian Elections, Trade With China, and Church Burnings in the South

President Clinton. Let me begin by saying how pleased I am that President Clerides is here. We want to discuss how the United States can help to promote a settlement that is fair and peaceful in Cyprus and what we can do in that regard. I intend to ask my Special Emissary, Richard Beattie, to go back to the region soon to explore further actions that the United States can take.

With regard to the elections in Russia, first, the United States applauds the fact that there was an election that, as far as we can tell, not only had a substantially high turnout but was a free and fairly conducted one. We now look forward to the next stage, the runoff between President Yeltsin and Mr. Zyuganov. We reaffirm our support for democracy and for market reforms. And we will be watching the development of events with great interest.

But this is a very significant thing for Russia to have this election. This had never happened before in a thousand years, where they elected a leader, and then they're going to have another election. And the Russian people are to be complimented, and the Russian leadership is to be complimented for supporting their Constitution and the electoral process. And we very much hope that Russia will continue to support democracy and reform.

With regard to China, as all of you know, we have been involved in an intellectual property rights dispute with China which has cost a lot of money and jobs to the United States. I am pleased that a good agreement has been reached with the Chinese which will protect intellectual property rights and avoid sanctions and allow us to go forward in ways that will be good for the relationship between the United States and China and good for the interest of American jobs and American businesses. I think this proves that staying involved and engaged with the Chinese through the difficult times as well as the good ones is the right course of action, and I am pleased with what's happened.

I'd like to make one final comment if I might. I'm appalled, along with all Americans, that this wave of church burnings has continued. My heart goes out to the people in North Carolina and Georgia who are affected. I am very much looking forward to the meeting on Wednesday with the Governors and the attorneys general and some other officials from the States affected, and I intend to continue to work to involve more people in this and to search for all the options at our disposal to try to resolve this matter.

But the—we need every person from every walk of life and all faiths in America to speak up against this. And the American people need to search their hearts about this. This has got to stop. This has got to stop. There is not a country in the history of the world that has valued religious liberty and valued religious expression more than the United States. This tears at the very heart of what it means to be an American. And I intend to keep working on it until we get some resolution of it.

Russian Elections

Q. Mr. President, are you surprised that the vote in Russia was as close as it was? Do you find that threatening in any way the course of U.S.-Russian relations?

President Clinton. No. President Yeltsin got about the vote he was predicted to get in the polls, and Mr. Zyuganov got more than he was predicted to get in the polls. But polling is inexact. And I think the main thing is there seems to have been a heavy majority of people who voted for the democratic process and for the path of reform. And that's good news.

Q. Have you spoken to President Yeltsin, Mr. President, or do you plan to after the voting?

President Clinton. I have not. I hope that we get a chance to talk. He's obviously got a lot of fish to fry right now, and he will be doing a number of things over the next couple of days. But I'm hopeful that we will have a chance to talk. I want to congratulate him on the election, not only on the showing, the strong showing that he made, but also on the fact that he really supported the Constitution, he supported the institution of the electoral process. And the very fact that it occurred in such a

vigorous fashion I think is a real credit to him, as much as any other single person in Russia. And probably more than any other single person, he wanted Russia to be a free country that picked its leaders by elections. So he's got two reasons to be happy today.

Senate Whitewater Report

Q. Mr. President, can we ask you about the Whitewater draft report? Could we ask you about that? The Whitewater——

President Clinton. I have no comment.

Q. ——about the leak over the weekend?

Q. Are you concerned about these leaks?

Q. ——about the report itself, sir?

President Clinton. That's just standard practice.

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

President Clerides' Visit

President Clinton. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Let me begin by saying how glad I am to have the President here and how much I look forward to a discussion with him. Our bilateral relations are in excellent shape, I believe, and I believe they'll get stronger as time goes on. I'm anxious to see if there's anything else the United States can do to support a settlement of the matters in Cyprus in a way that is fair to all concerned. I'm going to ask my Special Emissary, Richard Beattie, to go back to the region in the next few weeks to see what else we can do, and I want the President to give me some guidance about what he thinks we can do in this regard. But I'm glad that he's here, and I'm looking forward to having a chance to visit with him.

Aegean Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, do you think instability in Turkey poses trouble for the Cyprus initiative and also for the Aegean?

President Clinton. The instability?

Q. The domestic instability in Turkey.

President Clinton. Well, it's difficult for any government that's not settled to make agreements, because agreements normally require some concessions by all concerned. And we hope that Turkey will be able to resolve its internal problems and establish a strong government that can effectively enter into agreement with its neighbors.

Q. Mr. President, will you still intend to keep your promise that 1996 will be the year for Cyprus?

President Clinton. Well, we're doing what we can. But we—the United States cannot control all the events in the region. If it were up to us, we would have had a peace and resolution of this a long time ago. And we'll do what we can to be a positive force there.

Q. Mr. President, do you consider the ongoing tension between Greece and Turkey as a problem toward a Cyprus solution?

President Clinton. I think it is a problem toward the Cyprus solution, and I think it is a problem generally. And both Greece and Turkey have been allies of the United States through NATO and generally, and we would like to see the tensions between the two countries lessened. We think there would be enormous benefits not only to the Greeks and the Turks but to the solution of other problems in the area. And we will continue to do what we can in that regard. And I think as the situation clarifies itself in Turkey we may be able to do more in the years—in the months ahead. But we will use the months remaining in 1996 to do what we can to help resolve the Cyprus issue and to help resolve the tensions between the two countries.

Q. Do you take a position on the Turkish questioning of the sovereignty?

President Clinton. Do you want to say anything to your own press? I think the President should be able to talk. Come on.

President Clerides. As you all know, I'm here at the invitation of President Clinton. And I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation and thanks for the interest the President is showing in helping to promote a solution to the Cyprus problem. We have a variety of issues to discuss, and I think this discussion should be carried out without the press. So that's all I have to say.

Q. Mr. President, one last question. Do you take a position on Turkish questioning of sovereignty over Greek islands, Mr. President?

President Clinton. No more questions.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Boris Yeltsin and Presidential candidate Gennady Zyuganov of Russia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on the Appointment of the Special Envoy for Burundi Peace Negotiations
June 17, 1996

I am pleased to announce the appointment of former U.S. Representative Dr. Howard Wolpe as Special Envoy of the President and Secretary of State for Burundi Peace Negotiations. He will work closely with Ambassador Richard Bogosian who continues to serve as the Rwanda/Burundi Special Coordinator working from Washington to coordinate implementation of overall policy toward these two countries.

Dr. Wolpe will lend U.S. influence and support to efforts aimed at bringing an end to the crisis in Burundi, which has claimed more than 100,000 lives in the last 2½ years. Dr. Wolpe brings to this mission a wealth of experience gained during 14 years as a Member of Congress from Michigan, including 10 years as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, and recently as a visiting fellow at the Brookings Institution. Dr. Wolpe received his Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in political science, focusing on Africa.

Remarks to the American Nurses Association
June 18, 1996

Thank you so much. You've made me feel welcome today. You've got my day off to a great start. And you have been a wonderful, wonderful friend and supporter of this administration in all the things we've tried to do to improve the health and welfare of the American people.

I want to begin by saying a special word of thanks to your president, Ginna Trotter Betts, for her 4 wonderful years as president of the American Nurses Association. [*Applause*] Thank you. I'll never forget the first time we met and talked about this. Al Gore said, you know, the president of the American Nurses Association is from Tennessee. He's shameless about things like that. [*Laughter*] And then we met, and I thought it was especially wonderful because she did not speak with an accent. [*Laughter*]

I want every American today to join with me in saluting your leadership on this 100th anniversary celebration. Our country has the finest health care system in the world, and nurses are the heart of that system.

As Ginna said, because of my dear mother, I know the hard work and the sacrifice that goes into your work. I want to thank you again for honoring my mother in 1994 with a special award in her name and for everything that you do. I learned from her, and America learns from nurses every day, the basic values that make this a great country. We know that the mission of our country should be to offer opportunity to every American, to demand in turn that every American take responsibility for making the most of that opportunity. That's the basic bargain of this democracy.

We know, too, that all of us have an obligation to see that we treat all responsible Americans with respect and with tolerance, to build a community out of all of our diversity. Today I ask for your prayers for the people who go to church in those churches that have been burned in the last year and a half and for your support for their right to worship and live.

I also want to thank you for the support you've given us in our attempt to change the course of affairs here in America and to deal with the real issues that affect the lives of real people. I sometimes wonder when people like you, who work and live every day all across America in the heartland and get up and try to make something good happen every day, when you come to Washington, it must be like visiting a foreign country from time to time. [*Laughter*] I think it would do more good if the people who work and write here in Washington had to go out and visit you more often. I think it would change their attitude about what really matters in life.

We've been at this business of trying to create opportunity and increase responsibility and

strengthen our national community for 3½ years now. There was a lot to be done 3½ years ago. We had to get our economic house in order. We had to reduce this terrible deficit and do it in a way that continued to invest in our people and their future. And when we passed that economic plan in 1993, there are those who said, "Well, this is a terrible thing. It will plunge the economy into recession. It's the worst thing in the world." It was a bitterly partisan fight; we prevailed by the narrowest of margins.

Well, 3½ years later we now can see whether they were right or we were right. In 3½ years our economy has produced 9.7 million new jobs, 3.7 million new homeowners, 3 years of record increases in the number of small businesses, and the lowest combined rate of inflation and unemployment in 28 years. I believe we were right.

In 1994 we asked the Congress to take a serious approach to the crime problem, to get beyond rhetoric and partisan division and tough talk and to do something smart as well as tough on crime. We put 100,000 police on the streets, passed the Brady bill, passed the assault weapon ban, passed the Violence Against Women Act. There was a lot of bitter partisan rancor about it all, but we've now had a chance to see whether it works.

We are halfway through, almost, putting the police on the street. Almost 60,000 people with criminal records have been denied the right to buy handguns under the Brady bill, which is a health issue, by the way, and an emergency room issue. We're enforcing the Violence Against Women Act, the "three strikes and you're out" act. We see that the assault weapon ban has worked to ban assault weapons but not take any sporting weapons away from the hunters and other sportsmen who were told that they were going to lose their weapons. We can see it now. We have had 3 years of declining crime in a row. We were right, and they were wrong. We did the right thing to pass the crime bill in 1994.

We have had 3 years now to evaluate the work of expanding Head Start and making college loans more affordable and passing the national service program. And we know that the more people we educate in America, the stronger our country will be and the more people will be able to find good jobs and find other good jobs if they lose the ones they have. And we know enough now to say that we ought to do more. We ought to give families a tax deduction for the cost of college education. And we ought to make 2 years of education free after high school, through tax credits for every American to go to community college.

Today I want to talk with you about two other issues, about how we can reward opportunities—increase opportunities and reward responsibility and build a stronger country by improving health care and by strengthening the requirements that parents be responsible in the support of their children. For 3½ years we have worked on these things as well. And even though we did not prevail in doing everything we've tried to do, I want you to know that I will never forget as long as I live the way the American nurses worked with the First Lady to try to give health care to all Americans. She is grateful for it, and so am I. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I thank you for standing with us when this administration became the first in American history to take on the tough issue of tobacco and the marketing of tobacco to young people. But we know—we know—notwithstanding some political voices who say this is no big deal and some people can deal with it and some can't—we know it is illegal to sell cigarettes to children in every State in the country. But every day 3,000 underage Americans start to smoke, and 1,000 of them will have their lives ended prematurely because of it. That is something we know.

If we want to improve health care in America, why don't all those people who say that's what they want to do stand up and be counted and do what we need to do to restrict the advertising and marketing and sales of tobacco products to young people in this country? That's what we ought to do.

Let's not forget what has been done. As Ginna said, we did pass the Family and Medical Leave Act to say if you take a little time off to care for a sick child or a sick parent, you won't lose your job. It's amazing to me there are still some of the people who voted against the family and medical leave law defending their vote and saying they did the right thing to oppose it. Well, I think it was right to pass it, and a lot of American families think so too. I never go into a big crowd of families very rarely that somebody doesn't come up to me and say, "I took advantage of the family and medical leave law."

The other day we had in the White House 50 families from 50 States who are participating in the Children's Miracle television network with all the children's hospitals in the country, these desperately ill children and their hard-working parents, almost all of them middle class people. And two families came up to me on the way out of the room and said, "I do not know what I would have done if the family and medical leave law had not been passed. I kept my job and took care of my child."

There's also some things that we have stopped from happening that you deserve a lot of credit for. I sometimes think that the majority in this Congress has forgotten the first rule of health care: first, do no harm. We have fought to slow the rate of inflation in Medicaid while preserving its fundamental guarantees. For three decades the United States has guaranteed that poor children and pregnant women, people with disabilities, and older Americans will not be denied health care simply because they cannot afford it. That is the right thing to do. The majority in Congress is actually insisting that we repeal this guarantee. I have said and I believe this would amount to child neglect for a whole generation. That's why I vetoed that plan last year. If they send it to me again, I will veto it again.

Working with you, we have fought to balance the budget in a way that protects Medicare and honors our duty to our parents. Let me remind you that we have cut the deficit by more than half. We added time to the Medicare Trust Fund, and we're attacked by the now congressional majority for doing it. But their proposal for Medicare would undermine our ability to hire and train nurses, would close down more hospital wings in cities and rural communities. Of course, we have to slow the rate of inflation in Medicare. My plan will secure the Medicare Trust Fund for a decade without imposing unduly high premiums on low-income seniors and without wrecking the delivery system. That is, after all, what we have to preserve if we want people to have good health care in the first place.

And while we're doing no harm, why don't we do a little good? [*Laughter*] We are working with you to improve health care access to as many as 25 million Americans by fighting for the Kassebaum-Kennedy health care bill. No worker should have to worry about losing health care if he or she loses a job. And no one should be denied health care simply because they or someone in their family has a preexisting condition. I am working hard with the Congress, and I do want to say that I am encouraged that there are people in both parties who support the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill. In its purest form, it passed the Senate 100 to 0. All we have to do now is to get together and pass the bill, pass a good bill. I believe we can do it. I am working with the leadership in both parties to do it. But I want you to leave this town only after you have given a clear signal to Congress: Pass this bill now. [*Applause*] Thank you.

And while we're at it, one other thing we could do that would really help millions of working families is to raise the minimum wage now. And I hope we will do that. I am doing everything I can to increase opportunity for the American people, but as I said, we all know that the basic bargain in America is opportunity in return for responsibility.

We also know that where our children are concerned, the most important of America's building blocks is not a strong Government but a strong family. It is parents who must love their children and take responsibility for them. That has been the driving principle behind my efforts to reform welfare as we know it. I believe the present system perpetuates a cycle of dependency and irresponsible behavior. But I also know, having spent time in welfare offices as a Governor, that nobody wants to reform this system more than the people who are trapped in it. I want a system that promotes work, strengthens families, and encourages independence. That's why I have proposed time limits and work requirements but also child care and health care to help people move from welfare to work.

The majority in Congress often criticizes me for vetoing a bill they called welfare reform. Well, I did. I did it because it was too tough on kids and too light on work. I asked them to do better. And if they'll do better, I'll be happy to sign welfare reform legislation.

Meanwhile, we will continue to reform welfare with or without congressional action. We have worked to cut redtape for 40 of the 50 States by approving 63 welfare reform experiments. Just today we approved a waiver for a welfare reform effort in New Hampshire which combines strong work requirements with incentives to move people from welfare to work. I have received an intriguing proposal from Wisconsin which has tough time limits but actually

gives assurances—assurances—of a job and health care and child care to people on welfare. And I expect to approve that request soon.

What you need to know, all of you, is that for three out of four Americans on welfare, the rules have already changed. Seventy-five percent of the families in this country on welfare are already under welfare reform experiments approved by our administration and devised at the State and local level. That is one big reason that today there are 1.3 million fewer people on welfare than the day I took the oath of office as President of the United States.

The food stamp rolls are also down. The poverty rate is down. Teen pregnancy rates have leveled off and are actually dropping some. Work and training among welfare recipients are up. Child support collections have reached a record high. But we must do more to insist on more parental responsibility. Our proposals are about giving people more opportunity and demanding more responsibility.

And I reject the idea that when it comes to welfare it is only the mother who has to act responsibly. That is a false statement. For too long we have let the men off the hook. We must insist that they do their part to support the children that they help to bring into this world. I wonder how many times nurses in this audience have seen a frightened young girl give birth to a baby alone in a hospital with the father nowhere to be seen. How many times has the hospital and the Government been left to pay the cost not only for the delivery but for the continuing care of the child? Well, two people are required to bring a child into this world, and two should help to raise the child.

Last year I signed an Executive order that cracked down on the requirements for Federal employees to pay their child support. Three years ago I signed a law requiring States to establish hospital-based programs to determine the father of a newborn child. Based on our first reports, more than 200,000 fathers have been identified through these voluntary hospital paternity identification programs. That's 200,000 children whose fathers can't just up and walk away. And child support collections and paternity establishments have increased by 40 percent since 1992. I am proud of that, and you should be as well.

But we have to do more. That's why earlier today I took executive action to strengthen child support enforcement and promote parental responsibility. First, we're putting in place a new national program to help States track parents who owe child support across State lines. Today, too many parents get out of paying child support by moving from job to job, from State to State. This must stop.

Currently, 25 of our States require that when a person is hired for a job a check be made to see if he owes child support. Under this new program, we will check that information against our national database to catch deadbeats who have crossed State lines. I want every State in the country, the other 25, to give us this information so that these people who do not pay their child support have nowhere to hide.

Today I also directed the Department of Health and Human Services to require mothers who apply for welfare to provide the name of the father and other identifying information when they apply for assistance and before they get the benefits. Of course, there must be good-cause exceptions, such as those required to protect mothers from the dangers of violence against women. And we will require the welfare office to contact child support authorities within 2 days, once we get this information, to begin legal proceedings to hold fathers responsible for support.

This is important. Our system should say to mothers, if you want our help, help us to identify and locate the father so he can be held accountable as well. And it should say to fathers, we're not going to let you just walk away from your children and stick the taxpayers with the tab. The Government did not bring the child into the world, you did. Our people will help to take responsibility for those children, but you have to do your part as well. We have to make responsibility a way of life, not an option, when it comes to raising children in the United States.

So let me say again to you, I thank you for the giving, nurturing work you do. We would not have a health care system without you. America wouldn't be what it is without you. I thank you for demonstrating responsibility at work and, for most of you, at home as well throughout your lifetime. I ask for your continued support as we try to not only protect but to advance the cause of health care in this country. We must not rest until we have made health care accessible and affordable to every single American citizen. But we must also say to every American citizen, you ought to be as responsible

in your life every day as the nurses of America are in their lives.

This country works with opportunity and responsibility; we cannot have one without the other. And if we're going to build an America that will be the world's leading source of peace and freedom and prosperity in the 21st century, if we're going to keep the American dream alive for all of us, we have to have both those things. You embody it in your life. We're trying to embody it in the policies we advocate. And I ask for your continued support. You've made me very happy, personally, here today, but you make me very proud to be President of an America with people like you. Let's keep fighting to make it better.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon at the Washington Convention Center.

Memorandum on the Child Support Initiative

June 18, 1996

Memorandum for the Secretary of Health and Human Services

Subject: Child Support Initiative

I hereby direct you to implement the plan I am announcing today to strengthen the child support system and promote parental responsibility.

I direct you to exercise your legal authority to take the following steps to implement that plan:

1) issue proposed regulations relating to paternity establishment that:

(a) clarify the definition, under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, of "cooperation" with paternity establishment by requiring that a mother provide both the name of the father and other identifying information deemed appropriate by the State (except when there is good cause, such as being in danger of domestic violence, for not cooperating);

(b) require all applicants for assistance under the AFDC program to cooperate with paternity establishment efforts prior to the receipt of assistance; and

(c) require that applicants for assistance under the AFDC program be referred to the State child support agency within 2 days of application, so that the agency can initiate a legal paternity action; and

2) implement a pilot program matching new-hire data collected by participating States with Federal Parent Locator Service data in order to better track parents owing child support obligations who have taken a job in another State.

The plan I have outlined will help strengthen child support operations by toughening the paternity establishment requirements for applicants for welfare and by enabling States to locate, and withhold wages from, child support obligors who have taken a job in another State. Its prompt implementation is integral to achieving our goal of promoting the American value of parental responsibility.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Memorandum on the Child Support Initiative
June 18, 1996

Memorandum for the Secretary of Labor

Subject: Child Support Initiative

I hereby direct you to assist in the implementation of the plan I am announcing today to strengthen the child support system and promote parental responsibility.

I direct you to exercise your legal authority in a manner that will assist the implementation of the plan by encouraging those State employment security agencies that collect new-hire information for use in child support enforcement to report such information to the Department of Health and Human Service's pilot program for matching new-hire data with Federal Parent Locator Service data in order to better track parents owing child support who have taken a job in another State.

The plan I have outlined will help strengthen child support operations by toughening the paternity establishment requirements for applicants for welfare and by enabling States to locate, and withhold wages from, child support obligors who have taken a job in another State. Its prompt implementation is integral to achieving our goal of promoting the American value of parental responsibility.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Statement on the Russian Presidential Election
June 18, 1996

I spoke with President Yeltsin this morning and conveyed through him to the Russian people my warm congratulations on the election, which is a success for Russia as a whole.

On Sunday, more than 70 million Russian citizens—representing about 70 percent of the eligible voters—voted in the first round of the Presidential election that will determine who will lead the Russian Federation for the next 4 years. They were able to choose among 10 candidates representing a wide range of political views in a contested election. Russian and international observers have reported nothing thus far to indicate any significant irregularities in the voting process.

This is an important milestone in Russia's history as a democracy and a welcome sign of just how far that country has come in a few short years. The runoff round will allow the Russian people to complete the process of electing their President.

A critical element of our post-cold-war relationship with Russia is its continuing development as a democracy. The United States will remain steady in its policy of active engagement with Russia to support political and economic reform and Russia's integration with the West.

Remarks on Church Burnings in the South and an Exchange With Reporters
June 19, 1996

The President. I would like to welcome the Governors, the other State elected officials who are here, the commissioners of public safety who are here, the Members of Congress who have come together to discuss the problem of church burnings, which has troubled so much of our country. I expect that for our part we will cover three areas today. We want to talk about the efforts to prosecute those who are responsible for these crimes, and we want to give a report

on that. We want to talk a little about the rebuilding efforts. And I compliment the National Council of Churches and the other religious organizations and citizens that are involved there. And I think we all know we need to try to do more to prevent these burnings from occurring in the first place. So we're going to talk about some initiatives that we might be able to take together to work with communities to do more prevention work. And we may have more to say about that in the days ahead.

The most important thing to me is that as Americans we consistently and passionately come together to say this crosses racial lines, this crosses party lines, and this crosses religious lines. The first freedom in the Constitution, the first amendment, enshrines the freedom of religion in America. And whether they're black churches or white churches or synagogues or the mosque that was burned in South Carolina, we cannot tolerate any of it.

I thank all these people for coming together, particularly the Governors, to work with us to see what we can do together to stem this tide and turn it around. The American people do not support this, they are passionately opposed to it, and we need to do what we can to end it.

Q. Do you think it's a conspiracy, Mr. President, in the country against black churches per se?

The President. No. I do not believe that based on the evidence I have seen it is a conspiracy. On the other hand, I do believe a lot of these instances are racially motivated, and they tend to play off of one another. I think that, you know, just because they're not connected doesn't mean there's not a feeling there that we need to all reject together. And I must say I've been very moved by the range of religious and political organizations that have come out to speak out against this, offered to contribute to rebuild these churches. I think that this is a place where nearly 100 percent of Americans are in accord. And I think we just need to make our voices heard, and we need to do the right things. And if we can do that, I think we'll get the results that we want.

Q. Given the number of church burnings that have taken place since you spoke out about it, are you concerned that the publicity being given to the issue has perhaps had the opposite effect of what you've intended?

The President. Well, I don't think it will over the long run because the people will see that we're being effective in prosecuting these cases. And more and more people will rally in their own communities and even across community lines. We see people even across State lines volunteering to send church groups into other States to help rebuild churches and things of that kind. And I think if we develop a prevention strategy, it won't.

It was quite a sizable problem before there was a lot of national attention to it. In the last 18 months—I've monitored the numbers over the last several years—the last 18 months it's gotten quite a lot worse. So, I think we just—we have to focus on it, and we have to speak out as a country about it. And I think as we speak out together and as people see there is no politics in this—we have Republicans and Democrats here, we have people—we have African-Americans, Hispanics, and WASP's and Jews in this room together and in this country. We're all going to work together on it. We can do that.

Bruce Lindsey

Q. Mr. President, Bruce Lindsey has been named an unindicted co-conspirator by Whitewater investigators. Do you still have complete faith in him?

The President. Absolutely.

Q. Will this change his status at the White House in any way?

Q. Does this hit close to home to you, sir, with Mr. Lindsey being named in this way?

The President. No. He was thoroughly investigated and not charged, with ample opportunities. I've got lots of confidence in him. I'm confident he didn't do anything wrong.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:52 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House prior to a meeting with a group of Southern Governors and law enforcement officials.

Remarks on the 35th Anniversary of the Peace Corps
June 19, 1996

Thank you. Mandy, where are your family? Stand up there. Let's give them a hand. [*Applause*] Thank you very much. You did a good job there. Thank you very much.

To Sargent and Eunice Shriver, thank you so much for the Peace Corps, for the Special Olympics, for everything you have done for America and for the world. Senator Wofford, thank you for the Peace Corps and for national service and for everything that happened in between. Thank you, Mark Gearan, for proving that there is life after the White House. [*Laughter*] To all the former volunteers who are here, to the distinguished Members of Congress, to Ambassador Spio-Garbrah, thank you, sir, we're honored by your presence and by our friendship with your country.

The Peace Corps for 35 years has shown America at its best. In the summer of 1961, as has been said, there were 80 young Americans standing where these Americans stand today. Wearing their Sunday best, they waited excitedly to meet President Kennedy, and I understand they were chatting occasionally among themselves in Twi, the language they would have to use more frequently as they moved along. [*Laughter*] More than half of them were preparing to leave for Ghana, about to launch one of the greatest experiments in service to humanity in all human history. They would live as the people of Ghana lived and be active as a part of the communities they served. They were trained to teach, but they were going to learn and to bridge the gaps of development and custom with sturdy bonds of friendship and compassion.

On that day, President Kennedy said, "The future of the Peace Corps really rests with you. If you do well, then the Peace Corps will be developed, and more and more Americans will go abroad, and we will find a greater and greater response to serving our country." The men and women of "Ghana I" did the President, the Peace Corps, and America proud. I am very grateful to all of you, and I'm glad to have you back in the Rose Garden today, 35 years later.

When President Kennedy created the Peace Corps 35 years ago with the extraordinary support of Sargent Shriver, Harris Wofford, Ted Sorenson, and many others, he tapped an overflowing reservoir of energy and idealism. Thousands of young people answered the call to serve at the vanguard of the New Frontier. Among the first was the Vice President's beloved sister, Nancy Gore Hunger. They gave of themselves to help others around the world to become the best they could be and to bring to them the message by the example of their lives that our Nation is a great country standing for great ideals, a country that cares about human progress everywhere in the world.

The Peace Corps symbolized everything that inspired my generation to service. It was based on a simple yet powerful idea, that none of us alone will ever be as strong as we can all be if we'll all work together. None of us can reach our fullest potential while others are left behind. Community counts, and every member of our community matters at home and on this increasingly small planet we share.

Since 1961, as Mark said, more than 140,000 Americans have served as Peace Corps volunteers. Today the Peace Corps' towering task is just as vital as ever. I am very grateful for those who serve today. And their mission is just as important today as it was 35 years ago. Even as we meet, the Peace Corps is hard at work in countries few could have imagined going to back in 1961. Indeed, the Peace Corps is hard at work today in countries that did not exist in 1961. It has traced the rising tide of freedom to meet new needs around the globe from Central America to Central Europe to Central Asia, sharing the skills of private enterprise in nations struggling to build a market economy, empowering women, protecting the environment, and always showing others the path to help themselves.

I'm proud to say that in April, after an absence of nearly 5 years, Peace Corps volunteers returned to Haiti to help the Haitian people make the most of their hard-won freedom. Just a couple of days ago, the First Lady and I had the honor to welcome to the White House for a brief visit former President Aristide and his wife. And he talked in glowing terms about the citizenship of the Americans who have come

to help Haiti, from those who came in uniform, including 200 Haitian-Americans who could speak Creole to the people of Haiti, to the Peace Corps volunteers who labor there today.

With the agreement that the Vice President signed last December, as has already been said, our Peace Corps volunteers will go this year to serve in South Africa for the first time. They must be so excited. So many others have gone before them, but they can prove—they can prove—that South Africa can make its dreams and its promise real.

I'm also proud to announce the establishment of a Crisis Corps within the Peace Corps to help the relief community to cope with international emergencies. It will draw on the Peace Corps' recent successful experience in helping people affected by disasters, such as rebuilding homes in Antigua that were destroyed by Hurricane Luis and helping Rwandan refugees to grow their own food.

The dedicated service of Peace Corps volunteers does not end when their 2-year tour is over. Today, returned Peace Corps volunteers, as has been said, are making a difference in our administration, in the Cabinet, like Secretary Shalala, or those on Capitol Hill who have already been introduced. And I want to thank them all, Republicans and Democrats alike. I wish we had them up here explaining what the role of their service in the Peace Corps was in animating their future careers in public service. There are many leaders in journalism, in business, in education, including many who are here today. Thousands of volunteers just serve in their communities today or offer their time to teach schoolchildren about the world in which they live, in which they, the volunteers, were fortunate enough to explore at an earlier time in their lives.

Their spirit of service is the spirit of America. In that sense, it's more than 35 years old; it's as old as our country itself. And I can't help but note that not all our 140,000 Peace Corps volunteers have been so young. They just had to be young at heart, young in spirit, young in imagination. And thank you, sir, for making me feel that I might have a future in the Peace Corps. [*Laughter*] I'm glad to see you. Thank you.

We all remember the legendary mother of former President Carter and her wonderful stories of how the Peace Corps changed her life. The Peace Corps is for all Americans who wish to serve.

When I became President we challenged America to rekindle that spirit of service. I thank Senator Wofford for working to support the creation of AmeriCorps in 1993, to give young people a chance to serve their country here at home, and for doing more by running the Corporation for National Service today. Americans now—in addition to the 140,000 who have worked in the Peace Corps, we've had 40,000 young Americans lifting their own lives by giving comfort and support to dealing with problems here in the United States.

Last month when I spoke at Penn State, I asked our people to further spread the ethic of service throughout our Nation. I asked America's institutions of higher education to use more of their work-study money to promote community service here at home. And I challenge every community to get our students to answer the call of service. With our help, a year from now we want service scholars to be honored at every high school graduation in America. We have to take the spirit of the Peace Corps into the lives of every young person in this country. Every citizen needs to know that we give and we get, that we grow by giving and serving.

So let us always remember that the truest measure of the Peace Corps' greatness has been more than its impact on development. The real gift of the Peace Corps is the gift of the human heart, pulsing with the spirit of civic responsibility that is the core of America's character. It is forever an antidote to cynicism, a living challenge to intolerance, an enduring promise that the future can be better and that people can live richer lives if we have the faith and strength and compassion and good sense to work together.

Thank you all for making that live in our country, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:14 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Amanda Jackson, volunteer, and Mark Gearan, Director, Peace Corps; R. Sargent Shriver, first Peace Corps Director, and his wife, Eunice, founder, Special Olympics; Ambassador Ekwow Spio-Garbrah of Ghana; Theodore C. Sorenson, Special Counsel to President John F. Kennedy; and Jean-Bertrand Aristide, former President of Haiti, and his wife, Mildred.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the International Natural Rubber Agreement
June 19, 1996

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the International Natural Rubber Agreement, 1995, done at Geneva on February 17, 1995. The Agreement was signed on behalf of the United States on April 23, 1996. The report of the Department of State setting forth more fully the Administration's position is also transmitted, for the information of the Senate.

As did its predecessors, the International Natural Rubber Agreement, 1995 (INRA), seeks to stabilize natural rubber prices without distorting long-term market trends and to assure adequate natural rubber supplies at reasonable prices. The U.S. participation in INRA, 1995, will also respond to concerns expressed by U.S. rubber companies that a transition period is needed to allow industry time to prepare for a free market in natural rubber and to allow for the further development of alternative institutions to manage market risk. The new Agreement incorporates improvements sought by the United States to help ensure that it fully reflects market trends and is operated in an effective and financially sound manner.

The Agreement is consistent with our broad foreign policy objectives. It demonstrates our willingness to engage in a continuing dialogue with developing countries on issues of mutual concern and embodies our belief that long-run market forces are the appropriate determinants of prices and resource allocations. It will also strengthen our relations with the ASEAN countries, since three of them—Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand—account collectively for approximately 80 percent of world production of natural rubber.

Therefore, I urge the Senate to give this Agreement prompt consideration and its advice and consent to ratification to enable the United States to deposit its instrument of ratification as soon as possible.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 19, 1996.

Remarks at the Women's Legal Defense Fund Luncheon
June 20, 1996

Thank you very much. If I had any sense, I would quit while I'm ahead. [*Laughter*]

Thank you for that wonderful warm welcome. I thank those here at the head table for their work, Ellen Malcolm and Pauline Schneider. John Bryan, thanks for sitting up here with me and upholding gender equality. [*Laughter*] I appreciate that. And thank you for proving as, I believe, one of America's truly outstanding chief executive officers, that it is possible to do well and to do good in one's life. Thank you for what you have done. [*Applause*] Thank you.

And thank you, Judy Lichtman. You know, she was saying all that about constancy and always being there. And the truth is, I just could never bear to disappoint her. [*Laughter*] You are a remarkable national treasure for what you have done here, and we are very grateful to you. Thank you. Thank you.

You were kind enough to mention the women who hold prominent positions in our administration and who fill the judgeships of this country, and the U.S. attorneys positions and others. There are two who came with me today who have a lot to do with the work we do on women's issues, and I would like to acknowledge them in particular, Alexis Herman and Betsy Myers. I thank them for what they have done in—[*applause*].

I note with some satisfaction and pride that in the last 2 years you have had the Vice President speak here, and then you had Hillary speak here. And I am glad you finally got around

to me. [*Laughter*] I appreciate being given the chance to come.

I also appreciate, and I know Congresswoman Jane Harman, who's here with me, appreciates what you said about the Congress and the budget. John heard me say this yesterday, but about 10 days ago or so I was at one of these fundraisers, you know, that you do a lot of at this time of year. And there was a gentleman there at the fundraiser who had brought his son. His son was his companion at the fundraiser. And this young man was 10 years old. I asked him after this interchange how old he was because he was so amazing. This young man comes up to me, shakes my hand, says, "You know, Mr. President," he said, "I imagine it's difficult for you to hear a funny joke that you can actually retell in public, isn't it?" [*Laughter*] A 10-year-old boy. And I said, "Well, now that you mention it, it kind of is. When I was a Governor, I used to keep people laughing all the time. Then they told me it wasn't Presidential."

And he said, "Well, I heard one that I think you can use. I think it's appropriate." [*Laughter*] I said, "All right, what is it?" He said, "Well, you should tell people that your being President with this Congress is sort of like a man standing in a cemetery. There are a lot of people under you, but nobody's listening." [*Laughter*] In case you'd like to meet that young man, he's now the youngest member of the White House speechwriting staff—[*laughter*]—and intending to support his parents in their old age.

I am very honored to be here, especially on your 25th anniversary, to thank you more than anything else for the work that you have done for opportunities for women, for stronger families, and a brighter future for America. As many of you have heard me say so many times, I am convinced that we are moving into an age of enormous possibility for our people as we move from the industrial age to the information age, as we leave the cold war behind for a new global society that is full of its own problems but still provides people more opportunities to live out their dreams in different ways than any previous period in human history.

I ran for President because I wanted to move our country into the 21st century, meeting the challenges of this new era, protecting our values, and guaranteeing that every American who would be responsible should have the chance to pursue opportunities that would give every person, without regard to their race, their gender, their background, the chance to live out their dreams, because I wanted to see this country coming together instead of being divided. And I was very tired, and I'm even more tired today, of seeing the political process used to take this incredible kaleidoscopic, diverse society to divide the American people when we ought to be working for ways to unite the American people, and because I felt very strongly that our country at the end of the cold war could not revert to its historic impulse to withdraw into our borders, that this is a time when we have to stay involved in the world, when only America can be the world's greatest source of inspiration for peace and freedom and for prosperity.

So those were the things that I wanted to do when I ran for this job, that I was determined to do when I got this job. And you have helped in that mission. You know, preserving the basic values of America and making us live up to them, that's really what the Women's Legal Defense Fund is all about. The opportunity for people to live out their own personal dreams and to build strong families and forge strong communities, that's really what the Women's Legal Defense Fund is all about.

We are still working on those things, and we are still bedeviled by some old problems. Yesterday, you may have seen in the press reports, I spent a lot of time working with Governors and other officials to try to come up with even more effective strategies to not only find the people who are burning these religious institutions—most of them African-American churches, at least one of them a mosque and, I might add, some white churches that have burned in our country in the last 18 months. There has been a big upsurge in overall burnings of religious institutions in the last 18 months. But we were also searching for ways to reach the heart of America to prevent these things from occurring, because they are a stark reminder that while we value religious liberty more deeply than any other nation in human history, the demons that haunt the human spirit in every land are not absent from America. And you have to stamp them out whenever they rear their ugly head.

I will always be very grateful, as Judy said, that the first law I signed was the family and medical leave law. And I wanted it so badly. And some of you may remember, it was a hotly debated issue in the 1992 campaign because

Congress had already passed it, and it had been vetoed once, maybe even twice, I can't remember. But the thing that struck me about it is that it was the symbol of the kind of country we should be trying to build. I am the son and the grandson of working women. I never thought there was anything abnormal about it. But I also know that the most important job any man or woman has is doing a good job of raising the children that they're fortunate enough to bring into this world.

And it seems to me that if you look at the pattern of work and childrearing and the tensions between them and the troubles so many people still have finding adequate child care and the difficulties so many people still have earning a decent living, an adequate living to raise their children, and still have time left over to spend time with their children, one of the central goals of America in the 21st century should be to enable people to succeed at work and at home. If we have to choose one or the other, we're going to be in trouble. We know now that our economy needs all these people in the work force. We know that most families, even two-parent families, need both incomes to have a good, stable life. How can we even imagine a world with even more rapid changes and more unforeseen challenges that doesn't have systems in America for people succeeding at home and at work? If we have to give up succeeding at work to raise our children, our economy will surely suffer. If we have to give up successfully raising our children just to make a living, well, the money won't be worth it.

The family and medical leave law puts this country on record as saying our national goal is to enable people to be good parents and successful at work. And I'm proud to say that a recent bipartisan panel concluded that just since the law has been in effect, 12 million American workers have been able to take time off when they had a birth in the family or a sick child or a sick parent without losing their jobs. Almost 90 percent of the businesses that were surveyed said that complying with the law costs them little or nothing. This has been good for families and good for America.

The other day we had a very impressive group of people in the White House, the children who were the designated representatives of the Children's Miracle telethon in each of the States, children who had been desperately ill in children's hospitals, and they and their parents came to the White House. And I went downstairs to shake hands with all of them. And before I got out of the room, two of the parents spontaneously had come up to me and said, "We would never have made it if it hadn't been for the family leave law. I got to keep my job and try to help take care of my child. I don't know what this country was like before it."

And I can say to you it's amazing to me there are still people who say that we shouldn't have passed it. There are still people stubbornly saying, "Oh, there must be some way around this." There is no way around it. Our goal should be success at home; success at work. And that's what it's all about. And if it hadn't been for the Women's Legal Defense Fund, it might not be the law of the land. You were there a long time before I had a chance to sign it, and I thank you for that.

I've sought for other ways to give women and particularly families more power, more control. It is true that I have fought to protect the right to choose and reproductive rights. We also have dramatically expanded what I call the family tax credit, the earned-income tax credit, so that as we go forward today it's worth about $1,000 to every family in the country with an income of $28,000 or less with children in the home. Our goal is to say if we're going to preach at people to work, the tax system should not put them in poverty if they have children at home. If you work full time and you have children at home, the tax system should lift you out of poverty, not push you down into it. That's what the earned-income tax credit's all about, and I'm very proud of it. And I have opposed vociferously the attempts in the last year and a half to cut back on it in ways that would, in effect, raise taxes on the hardest pressed working families in this country. That is wrong. Success at home; success at work; don't let the Government get in the way of that. The Government should be helping that.

We also have tried to give parents more control in helping to raise their children. That's really what the crusade we've been on trying to restrict advertising of tobacco products to children is about. And it's what the V-chip was all about. And I applaud the entertainment industry for their willingness to develop these rating systems on television. I don't believe in censorship; I just believe parents ought to have some ability to raise their kids and to try to

expose them to things in the appropriate way at the appropriate time.

This is the thing that I think all of you—I think it would be helpful to all of us if we began to think in these terms. We don't have a person to waste. We need everybody's ability. We need people to have a chance to grow up and have good schools and a clean environment and safe streets and also strong families. And when I think—when I imagine what the world is going to be like 10 or 15 years from now, I know that there will be millions of people working 10 years from now in jobs that have not even been created yet. Some of them we can't even imagine.

And it will be a very exciting time if we have a system by which we can work with other freedom-loving people to fight back the security threats we face from terrorism and biological and chemical weapons and things like that and if we have a structure of community and family here at home that enables us to give people the chance to be successful at home and successful at work and children the chance to have safe streets and good schools and a clean environment. If we can do that, if we can set up that framework, there are no guarantees in life, but at least people will have the opportunities they need.

One other thing I want to say about that is that that means that this country must say that the level of crime and violence we have is simply unacceptable, and it is not unavoidable. We can do something about it.

You know, when we passed the crime bill in 1994, it embodied the central commitments I made to the American people when I ran for President. We also passed the Brady bill then. I said, "I want the Brady bill. I want the assault weapons ban. I want 100,000 police on the street. I want 'three strikes and you're out' for serious offenders, but I want funds going to communities to give young people the chance to say yes to something, to stay out of trouble before they get into trouble." That's what I think we ought to do.

And I have spent years and years going around visiting people in law enforcement and looking at these programs and trying to learn what works—first, of course, in my own State and then, when I began to travel some, around the country. And I was convinced that we can bring the crime rate down. I'd seen it happen in various communities simply by implementing these strategies. And there were those who said that the crime bill was a fraud and a fake and wouldn't have any impact. Well, I can tell you that it's 1996 now, and we're almost halfway home on putting those 100,000 police on the street. We're ahead of schedule. We are under budget.

We have passed the assault weapons ban. And there haven't been any hunters and sports men or women lose their weapons and their bullets and all that. It was all a big smokescreen. Everybody who wants to go deer hunting is still doing it. [*Laughter*] But I'll tell you something, there are 60,000—let me say it again—60,000 felons, fugitives, and stalkers who have not been able to buy handguns because of the Brady bill's checking period.

Now the Supreme Court has agreed to review a case over the constitutionality of requiring local law enforcement officials to help make sure that a person buying a handgun is legally entitled to do so. Well, I just want to make clear I am going to do everything in my power to keep the Brady bill the law of the land. It's keeping people alive. It's a good thing. Convicted felons and fugitives and people who are a threat to the community or to their own spouses and children should not be out there, if we can keep them legally from having the handguns by a simple waiting period so that we can check whether they should have it or not. Every law enforcement organization in this country has endorsed the Brady bill. And we dare not walk away from it. It is keeping people alive.

And let me point out now, the crime rate in this country is going down this year. It is going to be the 4th year in a row that it's gone down. It's because people all over this country now have figured out community policing works, because prevention strategies work, because this whole approach works. There's more to do. We need to ban these cop-killer bullets so our police are not at risk when they're out there. But this is working. And the point I want to make to you is that we can make a difference here. We can make a difference here. Don't let anybody tell you that America is just an inherently violent country, and we have to tolerate this level of violence. It is simply not true. We can do better.

There's more to do in a lot of other ways. I thank you for support of the minimum wage. Ten million people depend on it, and we need

to raise it. I'm rather tired of being told that the only people that get the minimum wage are middle and upper middle class teenagers who are living at home with their parents who don't need it. Sixty percent of the people on the minimum wage are women workers. Many of them have children they're trying to support on the minimum wage.

We have to help people adjust to the changes in the new economy. That's why I, even though—and I appreciate what Judy said about health care, and I thank—so many of you helped Hillary when we committed the unpardonable sin of trying to give every American health care that they could afford. [*Laughter*] And somehow I don't think God's going to hold it against us when our final accounting comes.

But we ought to pass the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill, and we ought to do it now. We ought to do it in an uncluttered fashion. And we ought to quite fooling around with it. It's time to stop holding these good legislative measures. That bill passed 100 to zero in the Senate. And it is now being held hostage to controversial measures inessential to the fundamental purpose of the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill. We should pass it now. People should not lose their health care because somebody in their family has been sick or because they have to change jobs. That is wrong, and we can change it and we should do it.

We ought to guarantee that whenever someone loses a job or they're grossly underemployed and they need more training, they qualify for Federal help. I believe they should get a voucher they can take to their local community college. That's the "GI bill" for American men and women workers. That has been tied up in the Congress over an ideological argument, extraneous to the merits, for a year. It is time to pass that.

The Congress has a package of pension reform legislation which would make it much easier for small businesses and self-employed people to take out pensions and then to carry it with them from job to job without ever losing their coverage. That sounds like a simple thing if you happen to work for the Government and you've got a good retirement program or you're fortunate enough to be in a big company with a good retirement program. But it is a huge deal to American men and women who do not have access to this. And as far as I know, there is no opposition in the Congress to this package of pension reform legislation. We ought to pass it, get out there, tell people you can at least save for your retirement, and you won't lose it if you lose your job for a while or you have to change jobs. These are important measures that need to pass.

And I believe that while we dare not get into some flagrant tax-cutting war until we finish the work of balancing the budget, we should give families a deduction for the cost of college tuition and a tax credit so that everybody who wants to can go to at least 2 years of education after high school, to make community college, 14 years of education, not 12, the rule in America. We need it. It would help the American economy. It would lift the incomes of millions of working women.

I also want to say that we have more to do in the area of public safety, especially on the issue of domestic violence. A lot of you were particularly active when we were working for the crime bill in passing the violence against women provisions and setting up the domestic violence operation in the Justice Department which Bonnie Campbell is doing such a good job of heading. And I thank you for that. But there is more to be done there. Violence against women is certainly no stranger in this country. It is an unwelcome intruder. And it is not a family problem, and it is not a woman problem, and let me say it is most assuredly not just a poor person's problem. This is an American problem that we have to face.

In September Federal prosecutors used that law to ensure that a man convicted of severe violence against his wife was sentenced to life in prison. The Violence Against Women Act says that victims of domestic violence should be able to seek relief in Federal court for a violation of their civil rights, and yesterday a Federal judge upheld that provision of the law as well.

Last February we launched a 24-hour, 7-day, toll-free hotline so that women in trouble can find out how to get emergency help, find shelter, or report abuse to the authority. To date, the hotline has responded to over 20,000 calls from women all across this country. Again, that's just the first 3 months; we don't have the latest up-to-date. But think of that; a lot of those people never would have even called for help before. And I'll get in my plug; the number is 1–800–799–SAFE. And I want people to keep using that number. We are working those cases and helping people.

Today we are taking the next step. I am proud to announce that our Justice Department is awarding over $46 million to help 336 different communities in America to fight domestic violence through the community policing program. The police departments who will be receiving these grants have well-established community policing programs, strong relationships with local providers of services to victims. We're coupling the power of the police forces rooted in the community with the experience of people who have been fighting domestic violence for a long time.

And again I say, this will work. I was in San Diego recently, and let me just give you one example. Their police department has one of the largest domestic violence networks in America. They formed it in 1992, and since then, domestic violence homicides have been cut by 50 percent. You must believe we can do something about these problems, otherwise all these things just become words. I'm telling you, you can make a difference if we do the right things and we do them together. The San Diego police department is getting a grant today that they will use to start an information network with the local YWCA to give victims and service providers and police officers one-stop access to all the available help in the area, to bring the domestic violence rate in San Diego down even more, and to help victims as they work to take control of their lives back.

As I said when I announced the hotline, you know, if it just saves one life it's worth it. But it's not enough. We have to keep doing this until this is the exception, not the rule. We have to keep working on all these problems until crime is the exception, not the rule. We will never rid the country of crime. We will never have no domestic violence. But you know what the test is? The test will be when you can go home at night, turn on the evening news, and if the lead story is a crime story, if the lead story is a domestic violence story, you are surprised instead of numb to it. That is the test. And we have to keep going until you are surprised again.

So I will close by echoing Judy's wonderful remarks. As you celebrate 25 years of progress in the lives of women and strength for the women and families of this country, I ask you to rededicate yourselves to the work yet to be done. I ask you to see this as an unfinished journey. I ask you to celebrate your achievements as evidence that you can make a difference.

Sometimes I think that when we think about our thorniest problems, our biggest difficulty is that we tend to get so weighed down by them we think that we can't change the fundamental fabric of this society. Two hundred twenty years-plus of American experience gives the lie to that cynicism. You can make things better. You can make progress. We can make a difference. You have a great 25 years, and you have got an agenda that will fill up the next few years. I ask you to embrace it with vigor and good humor and determination and courage, and we will prevail.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:55 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Ellen Malcolm, president, EMILY's List; Pauline Schneider, vice chair, and Judy Lichtman, president, Women's Legal Defense Fund; and John Bryan, chief executive officer, Sarah Lee Corp.

Remarks at the Presidential Scholars Awards Presentation Ceremony

June 20, 1996

Thank you very much, Rebekah. You did a terrific job. I hope you weren't nervous; you couldn't tell. [*Laughter*] And I know your parents are here, and your teachers are very proud of you and all the other Presidential scholars who are here. I want to thank Stuart Moldaw and all the members of the commission who have the difficult job of picking Presidential scholars. I want to thank Secretary Riley for the wonderful work he has done as our Secretary of Education, for our many years of personal friendship.

Rebekah did such a good job, we forgive you for your shameless South Carolina pride in men-

tioning the South Carolina scholars. [*Laughter*] You have given me leave to mention that there are two Presidential scholars here from Arkansas: Martin Beally from Sherwood and Caroline Rothert from my hometown of Hot Springs. So I congratulate them. I also want to thank Alison Tupay for singing "The Star Spangled Banner" on the spot. She did a great job, I think.

More than anything else—I'm going to see the scholars tomorrow when we send the Olympic torch off, but I love this moment. And I was jealous that the Vice President got to go to the medal ceremony yesterday. This has been sort of a crazy week around here. I was hoping maybe one of the scholars could explain the chaos theory to me, and I could apply it to what I'm trying to do. [*Laughter*]

But I love this program. I believe in it so strongly. And I wanted to have a chance just to meet with not only the scholars but to see the parents and the family members, the teachers, the mentors, the people who helped these young people come to this point. And the most important message I have I'll just say and get out of the way; I wanted to say congratulations to the scholars, but I mostly wanted to come here to thank the families and the teachers who have made these young people's lives possible and better. If every American would follow the example you have set, this country would not have many problems, and we would have an unlimited future. And I thank you so much for what you've done.

To the young people I would say this is an historic hall we are meeting in, Constitution Hall. When I was not much older than you—you'll be embarrassed that I can remember this date so long ago—on June 24, 1967, I had the highest seat up there—I couldn't afford a better one—to hear Ray Charles sing in Constitution Hall. [*Laughter*] He was so magnificent. I was so excited, I literally carried—the reason I remember the date is I carried the ticket stub in my billfold for 15 years afterward. [*Laughter*] And I never forgot the concert.

Not all that long before then, the great American singer Marian Anderson was denied the right to sing in Constitution Hall because of her race. And the father of my Deputy Chief of Staff, Harold Ickes, then the Secretary of the Interior, arranged for her to sing on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, the same place that not so many years later Martin Luther King would deliver his famous address.

So this whole area in here is full of America's history. And it reminds us—I hope all of you really get a chance to look around and sort of soak it in. It reminds us of all this country has done and meant. It reminds us of how far we have come. It reminds us of the continuing struggle we have to live up to the ideals of our Constitution. It also will remind you, if you look closely, that there are still hard-working people struggling to make ends meet within a mile of where we're now sitting or, in the case of the young people, standing. There are young people within a mile of this place who have not had the same opportunities that the young people we honor here today have had. So it is the story of America.

We celebrate our achievements, we declare our loyalty to the Constitution and the values it embodies, and we must rededicate ourselves to making sure that the American dream never dies for every person who's willing to work for it. Every person here, as I said, is indebted—the young people who have been honored—to the teachers who have helped them, the parents who supported them, to others who helped along the way. And I believe it is the job of every generation to make sure that the next generation has a chance to live out their dreams. That really is the mission of our administration.

I came to Washington at a time of profound change for this country. We were moving from an industrial age into an age dominated by information and technology. The great computer genius Bill Gates says that the digital chip is the most significant advance in communications in 500 years, since Guttenberg printed the first Bible in Europe.

We know that we have left the cold war behind, and we're moving into a global society in which we see ideas and information and money and technology and people move around the world in unimaginable speed and variation compared to just a few years ago. We know that the young people standing on this stage—many of them will actually do work that has not even been invented yet. Within 10 or 15 years, some of them will be doing things that no one has even imagined yet.

So we are moving into a period really unlike any in the history of our country before, when there will be more opportunity for people to live out their dreams than ever before. And the real challenge, I believe, is to make sure that every person has a chance, not a guarantee but

a chance, to live out those dreams, that we do it in a way that brings us together as a country instead of dividing us.

We are, today, more a nation of immigrants than at any time since the beginning of this century that we're about to leave. Just look around this room. Look at them. We see the kaleidoscope of America. And it is a constant, urgent task that we find ways to unite this country around our basic values and not let ourselves be divided.

Just yesterday I had Governor Riley's successor as the Governor of South Carolina and a number of other Governors here and other officials to talk about this recent wave of church burnings that has swept the country in the last year and a half. That is the exact opposite of what this country has always stood for. And it is an example of what is happening in much worse form around the world, where people are tempted to give into their old demons and define themselves by what they're not rather than what they are and what they can become. And we cannot afford that in this country. We must all be intolerant of that. We cannot be divided by religion or race, and we can never, never, never believe that in America it is permissible to take action against someone in their place of worship. It is wrong, and we must stand against it.

I appreciate what Rebekah said about the commitment of this administration to education. I know that one reason it's so strong is that I wouldn't be here without mine. I lived with my grandparents until I was 4. They started teaching me to read when I was 2 or 3. I still own one of the little readers they started me on. It was printed in 1946, I think. I grew up—my grandparents, my grandfather just barely got out of grade school. My stepfather, who raised me, dropped out right before he got his high school diploma. I was the first person in my direct line to graduate from college.

And if it hadn't been for my education and the gifts that others gave me along the way to help me with it, I never would have become President or had the opportunity to serve my country in the way that I have. I now know that there is something fundamentally different about the role of education in this time than in any other time. Always throughout our history, education has given individuals more opportunity. When we made a commitment to mass education after World War II, including making college education available to veterans who served through the GI bill, it helped to build an enormous middle class and to lift this country up, all of us.

Now we're in a third stage where education can either be the faultline dividing our country or the bridge by which we all walk into the 21st century. Because now it is not enough, as it was 50 years ago in the GI bill or even 30 years ago, to have a huge number of people with a college education creating economic opportunities for everybody else in a mass production, industrial society.

For at least 15 years, and actually probably more, our country has become more stratified, more unequal, divided more than anything else by the level of education of adults in the work force, so that you have this paradoxical situation where in the last 3½ years—when we've been able to cut the deficit in half and take our exports to an all-time high, create opportunities for 3.7 million new people to have their own homes, and see our country produce nearly 10 million new jobs—9.7 million new jobs—we know in spite of all, that about half of the American work force has not gotten a raise after you adjust for inflation and that, compared to 15 years ago, the people in the bottom half are basically working a longer workweek, having less time to spend with their children, and not really keeping up with inflation.

There are exceptions to all these statements, but the general rule still holds. The fundamental problem is that in a global economy, where we're all competing with everybody else, everywhere else, including people who work and live in some countries with incomes that no one could live a month on in America, that we have to raise the skill levels of our people so that education has to become more democratic, small "d" democratic, more widely available, and more advanced than ever before. It must.

And that is what has driven the work that Secretary Riley and I and others have done in this administration to try to lift the quality and standards of education but also to make it more broadly available. There are some things that we can do here. And we have tried to do them. We have tried to make available funds for States to come up with their own plans to meet the national education goals, to have high standards and high expectations, and to get free from some outdated rules and regulations. The Secretary's cut the rules of the Department of Edu-

cation by nearly 50 percent. We have put more poor children into Head Start.

Now, perhaps most important of all, over the long run, we've tried to expand the availability of college. In the last 12 years before I came here, college education was the only thing that increased in cost more rapidly than health care. And a lot of people are—a man who was laughing I assume has just educated two or three kids already in college. And he's laughing to keep from crying, probably. [*Laughter*]

This is a problem with serious implications for our country. If you look at the 1990 census—and pretty soon we'll be doing another in 2000 that will affect the lives these young people will have—you see an utterly stunning fact, that for the first time since we have been really working on the census, you can see clearly in a profile of America after the census in 1990, that American workers, particularly younger American workers that have at least 2 years of education after high school, tend to get jobs where they are pretty secure in their jobs. If they lose their job, they're pretty good about getting another one. And they tend to get jobs that have a decent income with pretty good prospects for growth. Those that have less than that tend to be stuck in jobs where they can't change jobs very easily, and they usually lose ground to inflation. And the younger you are, the more profound those trends are likely to be.

Now, that means that we have to do some things to open college to more people. We've tried to expand the Pell grant program, for example. We changed the college loan program. And I want to thank Secretary Riley for something that I believe 10, 20 years from now will be viewed as one of the most revolutionary changes we've made: We started making loans directly to the colleges so that the students could get them with less hassle, pay them back at lower cost, and then pay them back according to a whole range of options, including their ability to repay the loan. So that if, for example, if you take a job as a schoolteacher or a police officer or a nurse and you're not getting rich, and you have a big college loan burden, you still will be able to always pay those loans off because they can be limited to a percentage of your income. And it's changed a lot for people. It's made things more available.

By next year, we'll have 65,000 young people who will have helped to pay their way through college through the AmeriCorps program, earning money to go to college by doing community service. And I see one of our board members is from the State of New Hampshire, a State that has one of the most active AmeriCorps programs in the country, where they really are doing remarkable things to solve problems and pay their way through.

Now, we've got two other big initiatives here on the plate that I think are quite important, and I just want to mention them because I want to encourage all of you to support these things and to embrace them. The first is, we're determined to see every classroom and library in America hooked up to the Internet by the year 2000, every single one. And I think it will make a real difference.

We started this effort in California, where we had a lot of private-sector support. And we wired about 20 percent of the schools in one day, and they're already up to 50 percent of the schools now in California. Now, in many other States this whole movement is taking off and working like wildfire. But we also need to make sure that, in addition to being hooked up, we've got good software, available hardware for all the students and sometimes for the parents as well to participate, and trained teachers that are being given the support they need.

There is now an alliance of educational groups, teachers, parents, and administrators that have joined together to make sure that we have enough teachers to keep up with the connections. They call themselves the 21st century teachers, and this fall they're going to mobilize a voluntary effort, 100,000 teachers to help 500,000 other teachers master the technology so that they can make the most of it for our young people. This has enormous potential to make educational gains more widely available in poor rural areas, in underserved urban areas, in places where finances have been a real problem. We can use technology in a way that will lift the quality of education and the availability of it if we do it right.

The other thing I think we have to do is to make our goal a national goal, that college will be accessible to all Americans and that the norm will be that everybody would at least do 2 years after high school. That should become the rule. That should become what we all accept. We now have both economic and social evidence that we need to do that. So, in addition to the college loan and in addition to expanding

the Head Start program, I have asked the Congress to make the first $10,000 of college tuition tax deductible to every family in the country for both young people and adults.

I have asked Congress to broaden eligibility for families to invest in IRA's and then let people withdraw from their IRA tax-free if it becomes necessary to help finance their children's education or their own reeducation as the case may be. And a few weeks ago at Princeton, I asked—and by the way, I figured out a way to pay for all this in our balanced budget. This will not increase the deficit. I asked the Congress, in effect, to make access to 2 years of college universal by giving families a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of community college. The average tuition in this country at community college is $1,200 a year. So that would, in effect, make 2 years of community college available to every American family, because we would have a tax credit that you could actually see. In effect, the Government was helping to fund tuition, free for everybody the first year, given to everybody the second year that has at least a B average. I think after the second year you ought to ask people to make the most of their education if the taxpayers are going to fund it.

But it seems to me that these are the kinds of things we ought to do in Washington if we want America to grow together. And when I look at these young people behind me and I think of every young person in this country that we need to make sure that we reach them when they're young and we keep them in school and we give them something to hope for, this is a way of our being able to say to the poorest kids in this country, if you hang on you can at least do this. This is something we will give you if you hang on.

Now, the rest of it is obviously up to the rest of you and your counterparts all across America. But I really believe that if we can both raise the quality and the range and reach of education, we can make sure that we grow together as a country instead of being split apart. I cannot tell you how important this is. One of our counties, the biggest county in this country, Los Angeles County, has already, today, children in it from 150 different racial and ethnic groups, in one county. And still this county is thriving; it's doing well.

I'm just about to leave for a meeting of European leaders, and all over the world they'll ask me, "How did you have 9.7 million new jobs in America in the last 3 years?" You know how many—the largest 7 economies in the world have created a total of 10 million jobs in the last 3½ years, 9.7 in the United States. And that's something you can be proud of.

But if you want this country to grow together, if you want these children to have the kind of future when their children are this age to see America leading the world for peace and freedom, then we have got to recognize that education for everybody, more of it and better, is the central most important thing we can do to make sure that we go into the 21st century able to meet our challenges and protect our values.

And all of you, because of this experience, all these Presidential scholars, because they're now Presidential scholars, and all of you who helped them along the way, because you're their family members or you're their teacher, you can have a unique amount of influence in your communities to make sure that we all rededicate our efforts not to leave any child behind, not to leave any stone unturned in opening all the opportunity we can. There is no stopping this country in the 21st century if we do that one thing, if we give everybody who will work for it the chance to live out their dreams. If that is our shared commitment, our best days are still ahead. And 20 years from now they will be celebrating a whole new generation of Presidential scholars in a nation that is stronger and better and closer to the ideal of America than we are today.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:05 p.m. at Constitution Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Rebekah P. Close, Presidential scholar who introduced the President; Stuart Moldaw, Chairman, White House Commission on Presidential Scholars; Gov. David M. Beasley of South Carolina; and Bill Gates, chairman, Microsoft, Inc.

Remarks at the Olympic Torch Departure Ceremony
June 21, 1996

Good morning. I want to begin by thanking Lang Brown, not only for what he has done this morning in bringing the torch up here but for what he does every day. He gives his best to help troubled teenagers, to teach them how to live responsible lives and to know that they are not alone as they do their best. Today we honor that spirit, the spirit of the Olympics, as we send forth the Olympic torch to light the way to Atlanta. Thank you, Lang Brown.

This torch has seen more of America than most of us Americans will see in a lifetime, and much of America has seen the torch, cheered it and the people bearing it. The torch, burning bright and strong, stands for the joy of athletic competition and more, for the importance of international cooperation and more, for the pride we feel when our strong young Americans win the gold and more. For this Olympic flame also calls upon each of us to be our very best as individuals, to do our best to build strong families and strong communities and a strong country. It tells us that victory comes to the united, not to the divided. Every Olympian has reached within and worked hard to be the fastest, the strongest, the most graceful.

We all have hurdles to leap, to finish high school or college, to be a good parent, a good worker, a good neighbor. Every one of us must summon that spirit of responsibility and best effort in our own lives. Every Olympian stands at the starting block or at the beginning of a great game alone. But they do not win alone. They draw strength from a lifetime of support from family and friends, coaches and role models. And every one of us must summon that spirit of community to meet our challenges.

Every Olympian is proof that for all of our differences, we are one America. We cheer our athletes not because they are men or women, not because of the color of their skin, we cheer them because they are Americans. They represent us all, and they fill us with pride. And every one of us must summon that spirit of unity to embrace those things that bind us together, and never to succumb to those things that would keep us apart.

My fellow Americans, in the last several months, we have had to deal with some different kinds of flames. But it is this flame that represents the best of the United States of America. The Olympic spirit is the spirit of personal responsibility and best effort, the spirit of community, the spirit of unity. The people who carried this torch all across America show us exactly how that spirit can lift all our lives every day. This torch has been carried by a 74-year-old woman in Nevada who has cared for more than 100 abandoned children, by a New York businessman who has put thousands of disadvantaged young people through college, by a North Carolina teacher who organized students in 48 States against violence. This torch has been carried by America's best. They are everyday Olympians.

Now this torch will be carried by someone who is America's best, who is both an everyday Olympian and a member of our Olympic team. Eight years ago Carla McGhee was in a car accident. She almost died. Her body was broken, but her spirit was whole. She fought her way back to a promising basketball career that most people thought had been lost forever. She went on to return to the University of Tennessee and to help her team win a national basketball championship. The Vice President is particularly proud of that achievement. [*Laughter*] And now we hope that she will help to work the same magic for our Olympic women's team, a miraculous road back for a wonderful young woman.

May the Olympic flame always carry the ideals that burn in athletes and citizens like Carla McGhee, that burn in people like our torchbearers, the community heroes, the veterans of war and the keepers of peace, and all of those who have run with it, walked with it, wheeled with it, and set eyes on it. And may these ideals cast light on every shadow and brighten every dream on America's road to tomorrow.

May God bless America. And to Carla and all our Olympians, Godspeed.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:50 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to torchbearer Lang Brown, clinical director for independent living, Sasha Bruce Youthwork.

Remarks at the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Convention in Chicago, Illinois

June 21, 1996

The President. Thank you. Thank you. Let me say, first of all, when I was standing up here with Gerry McEntee on my right and Bill Lucey on my left, I thought the best I could do is to ask you to give Clinton/Gore the same majority you gave McEntee/Lucey in 1996. I will accept it.

I'm also proud to be joined today by two of your friends from Illinois, two Members of the House of Representatives, Congressman Bobby Rush from Chicago and Congressman and Senator-to-be Dick Durbin from Illinois.

I understand I missed a lot at this convention. I missed the formal transfer of the gavel to Speaker Gephardt. I'm sorry I missed that. I missed Senator Kennedy pleading guilty once more to wanting all Americans to have health care. And I'm sorry I missed that.

Before I go further, I want to also congratulate someone else who is very special to this union, who celebrates today her 25th anniversary with AFSCME, Gerry McEntee's tireless and indispensable right hand, Gloria Caoile. Please stand up and be recognized. [*Applause*] Thank you.

[*At this point, Ms. Caoile ran up to the President and hugged him.*]

If I had known she was going to do that, I'd have done it first thing. It was great. It was quite wonderful. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, I will never forget as long as I live——

Audience members. Down in front!

The President. You all calm down. Relax. You want everybody to sit down. They're taking pictures. We're going to have a little fun. Just relax. Be loose. Be loose.

I want to tell you that I will never forget as long as I live the fact that AFSCME stood with me early in 1992, when it was lonely and cold, and never stood back, never backed out. And I will never forget that no organization in America stood with the First Lady and with our administration more strongly when we fought to give health care to all Americans and preserve the dignity of Americans in our health care system. And I thank you for that.

I also will always be proud that when I was a State employee as the Governor of my State, I was a dues-paying member of AFSCME, because it got out of fashion for a while, but I have always believed in the dignity of public service. I believe it's important to honor people who take care of our parents and watch over our children and care for the sick, who protect the environment, and who are always there in emergencies. That's what you do. America should know it and be grateful. And I know it, and I'm grateful. I thank you for that.

I enjoyed watching the film that was shown just before I came out. It gave me a chance to reminisce a little about that campaign 4 years ago. I ran for that election because I had a vision for what I wanted America to look like in the 21st century, a vision which you shared. I wanted us to go into the next century with every American, without regard to race or gender or income, every American, having a decent opportunity—not a guarantee but an opportunity—to live up to their dreams. I wanted to see us coming together as a country, not being driven apart by cheap partisan politics designed to divide the American people. And I wanted us to continue to be the strongest force in the world for peace and freedom and prosperity.

Now, we've worked for 4 years to meet our challenges and to protect our values with a simple strategy: opportunity for all, responsibility from all, a community of Americans working together. We are all in this together. And I am tired of all the people who seek to divide us every day for their own personal advantage.

Four years ago the economy of the United States was drifting, high unemployment, an out-of-control deficit, few new jobs, a nation increasingly divided. We charted a different course with a new economic strategy: to cut the deficit; expand the sales of American products; give tax cuts to the 15 million hardest pressed American working families; invest in education, the environment, research, and new technologies, give incentives for people who live in distressed areas; and yes, pass programs like the Family

and Medical Leave Act that enable people to succeed at home and at work.

It's very fitting that I am here today because this week—tomorrow, to be exact—is the fourth anniversary of the issuance of our economic plan in 1992. We called it "Putting People First." I said that if we did that two things would happen: First of all, we'd cut the deficit in half, and second, we would create 8 million new jobs in 4 years.

Now, after leaving us with a weak economy and record deficits and quadrupling the debt, the Republicans said it couldn't be done. They said my economic plan was a disaster. They said it would bring on a recession. Let me just read you some of the things they said. Senator Dole said, "The American people know this plan doesn't tackle the deficit head on." Speaker Gingrich said, "This will lead to a recession next year." Dick Armey said, "Clearly, this is a job killer." John Kasich said, "This plan will not work. If it was to work, I'd have to become a Democrat."

Well, 3½ years later, we cut the deficit by more than half, and the economy has not produced 8 million new jobs, it's produced 9.7 million new jobs. Mr. Kasich said if this plan was to work, "I'd have to become a Democrat." I expect him to show up at the United Center in Chicago; we'll save a seat for him at the convention.

There are other ways that this strategy has helped real Americans. We've got 3.7 million new homeowners—new homeowners. We are moving toward our goal, led by Secretary Cisneros, of having more than two-thirds of the American people in their own homes by the end of this decade for the first time in the history of the United States of America.

We have an all-time high in the exports of American products and services. We've got an all-time high 3 years in a row of people starting new businesses in our country. We are moving this country in the right direction. The rates of unemployment and inflation combined are the lowest in 28 years. This country is on the move again. We've got a lot of problems out there, but we are moving in the right direction.

Maybe most important of all to me—because I think the test of the economy must always be, does it work for average Americans, does it help people build strong families, do all these numbers mean something in the lives of our people—the most important statistic of all to me, therefore, is that last year average hourly earnings for American working people started to go up again for the first time in 10 years, and it's high time.

So when it came to the economy, with all respect, I think the evidence shows that they were wrong and AFSCME, the administration, and our friends in the Congress were right.

Then came the elections in '94, and they won the Congress. And they gave us their Contract With America. Their idea was, under the guise of balancing the budget, to fundamentally alter the Medicare program to create two classes of care, turn Medicaid into a block grant and make sure that it couldn't cover the populations that it had protected for three decades, dramatically reverse education funding at a time when it's more important to educate more people for their future than at any time in the history of the United States of America, gut enforcement of the environmental laws, weaken enforcement of the occupational safety and health laws, allow employee pension funds to be raided, and raise taxes on 8 million of the most vulnerable working families in the country. That was their plan. They passed it; I vetoed it. They were wrong about that, too.

But we have more to do. It is high time we began the move on the future and forgot about the divisive and self-destructive elements in the contract. Let's do something positive to help build on the good work that's been done. Let's raise the minimum wage and not let it fall to a 40-year low and lift the American people. Let's pass the Kennedy-Kassebaum health care reform bill and guarantee that you don't lose your health insurance if you change jobs or if someone in your family gets sick. Let's do it now.

Senator Kennedy's bill passed the United States Senate 100 to 0. Why has it not passed the Senate and the House and been sent to my desk? Because we are debating matters that have nothing to do with Senator Kennedy's bill being put on that bill that would undermine our ability to improve health care for all Americans. Let's stop all the controversy. Let's make an agreement. Let's get off the dime and stop depriving the American people of something 100 Senators have already said they're entitled to. Pass the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill now, and send it to my desk.

Let's give pension security to all those people out there working in small businesses, people

that maybe have to change jobs four or five times in their lifetime. I have sent to the Congress a package of initiatives designed to make it easier for people who are self-employed or who work in small business to take out a pension plan, to keep it when they lose their jobs, to take it with them when they change their jobs. Every American who works hard ought to have pension security in this country, even in the global economy.

And let's continue to make education available to all Americans. I said the other day, and I want to reiterate, if you look at the future of America in the global economy, if you want all working people to have a chance to raise their incomes, all people have to have a chance to get more education. I have asked the Congress to do two things, and I will reiterate them here today. Number one, give every family a tax deduction for the cost of tuition up to $10,000 a year for college. And number two, make 2 more years of education after high school just as universal as high school by giving a tax credit of $1,500 a year for the next 2 years of education so that everybody can have it—everybody. [*Applause*] Thank you. Thank you.

That is what this is about. But it's about more than economics. We also need other things to keep our country strong. We need strong families, strong communities, safe streets, and a clean environment.

When I became President, I had literally talked to hundreds of Americans who despaired about the crime problem. They really didn't believe anything could ever be done to lower the crime rate. But I did, because I had seen the crime rate go down in communities where community policing had been adopted, where the police were back on the street again working in the neighborhoods, working with people to try to prevent crime and catch criminals and making things work. I have seen that happen.

And so I asked the Congress in 1994 to pass the crime bill and, earlier, to pass the Brady bill. And the leadership of the other party, they fought us on it all the way. They fought us on the 100,000 police; they fought us on the assault weapons ban; they fought us on the Brady bill. They convinced a lot of good God-fearing Americans, including some members of this union, I'll bet, that if those bills passed they were going to be weakened in their ability to pursue their hunting and sporting interests, somebody was going to come get their gun. Well, now it's been 2 years later, and guess what? Every AFSCME member in America that wants to go deer hunting is still hunting with the same rifle. Nobody lost their gun. It wasn't true. They didn't tell you the truth.

In my home State in the fall, in a good year the ducks are so thick you can hardly see the sky. Every Arkansas AFSCME member who wants to go duck hunting is still hunting with the same rifle, if that's what they want to do. They did not tell them the truth. But I'll tell you who is not having a gun. There are 60,000 people who have criminal records, who are stalkers, who had no business buying guns who couldn't get them because of the Brady bill. We were right, and they were wrong. It was the right thing to do.

In just 2 years, we have almost half of those police officers paid for. We're ahead of schedule and under budget. And in that budget last year they tried to repeal the commitment to put 100,000 police on the street with the crime rate going down and the murder rate going down.They tried to turn back on a strategy that worked. I said no then; I say no today. We're going to make the American people safer. We're not going to put them at risk again. We're going to keep working until crime is the exception, not the rule in America again.

And there is a lot of talk about welfare reform. Well, let me tell you something. There are a lot of people in this audience that know more about moving people from welfare to work than the politicians in Washington will ever know. And if you work with people on welfare, you know that most people on welfare would very much like to be off of welfare. You know that there are flaws in the system which keep people on it, but they're not often the ones that others think are there. And there are changes that ought to be made. Well, they talked about it, and they're still talking about it, but while they were talking, we were acting. We have given 40 States a total of 62 separate experiments to move people from welfare to work.

But I did veto their bill because it was tough on kids and weak on work. You cannot expect people on welfare to be different from people who aren't on welfare. We want to succeed at home and at work. We want people to succeed to home and at work. We don't want to be tough on the kids; we want to be good to the

kids. That means what we need is child care and health care for the kids. We need jobs for the people to do, then require them to go to work. It's fine. Be very tough on that. Require them to go to work.

Now, who was right in this great debate? All I know is, after 3 years child support enforcement collections are up 40 percent; there are a million fewer people on food stamps; there are 1.3 million people fewer on welfare than there were the day I took the oath of office. I believe our approach has been proved to be right, and I think we should stay with it: work; child care; support for the kids; let people succeed at work and at home.

There are other things we're doing that have been controversial, that have engendered opposition from the leadership of the other side. They didn't like it when we proposed tough restrictions on tobacco advertising, and they have been richly rewarded for their dislike of that position. All I know is, it's illegal in every State in America for kids to smoke. Three thousand of them start smoking every day, and a thousand of them are going to die sooner because of it. I think we ought to do something about it, and I'm not about to apologize for it to anybody.

Some of their leaders didn't like it when we enacted the V-chip and said that televisions ought to include this V-chip now that we've got all these cable channels, so that parents would have more control over the programming their young children watch. I'm a big believer in the first amendment, but I think it's pretty hard to raise a kid in today's society, and we ought to give parents all the help they can get to help them raise their kids free from violence and other destructive influences.

In all these debates, a clear picture comes through. We're going through a big change, folks. You all know it. You're having to change. You're dealing with it. We're moving from an economy based on big organizations in an industrial age that do mass production to an economy based on rapid transfer of information and technology in smaller, less bureaucratic, more creative organizations. It's affecting all of us in the way we work and live. We're moving way away from that cold war world where the world was sort of divided in two, into a world where there is a global society and things are happening so fast we can hardly keep up with it. And that's requiring a lot of changes.

They believe that the Government is the problem and that what everyone needs is to be told, "You're on your own. Go out there into the tender mercies of the global economy. Have a great time in cyberspace, and we'll get out of your way." I believe no great nation, at any point in human history, has ever, ever, gotten greater without extending opportunity to more and more people and having responsibility for more people to build a strong community. This is the greatest nation in human history because we have built a middle class of people, and average people have had a chance to make it if they have done the right things. And that's what I think we ought to be doing into the 21st century.

So I say to them, I want us to go into the 21st century meeting our challenges and protecting our values together. Should we have a smaller Government in Washington and give you folks more responsibility? Yes. Should we walk away from our obligations to our people? No. No. Should we balance the budget? Yes. It will get interest rates down and create more jobs. To balance the budget, do we have to wreck Medicare and Medicaid, undermine education, and destroy the environment? No.

I don't know about you, but I think this country was right 30 years ago when we said through the Medicaid program that no poor child or pregnant mother, that no elderly person, that no person with disability should be denied quality medical care just because they can't afford it. I think we've got a stronger, better America because of that. I don't think we're weaker; I think we're stronger.

The majority in Congress today insists that we repeal this guarantee. I vetoed it once; I'll do it again if I have to. I think we're right. I think we're stronger because we honor these obligations. I don't know about you, but I think this is a better country because 30 years ago we decided that through the Medicare program we would provide adequate health care to every senior citizen in this country. And you know, we now have dramatically improved circumstances as a result of it. If you live to be 65 in America, you then are in a group of seniors that have the highest life expectancy in the entire world because of Medicare and Social Security.

Now, should we give people on Medicare more options? Should we expect people to pay their fair share? Should we do everything we

can to cut inflation? Do we have to make sure that this program will survive for the next century and beyond? Of course we do. But the plan that I vetoed, and the one they still propose, would put in place a Medicare plan that would literally create two tiers of care for our seniors and put millions and millions of our poorest and sickest seniors into second-class Medicare. I don't believe in that. I think we're stronger because we treated our senior citizens in a good and dignified way without regard to their income. I believe that.

I don't believe that we ought to weaken the worker safety laws. We can find better ways to work in partnerships with employers, but do we want to go back to the time when there were no protections for worker safety?

We can find better ways to operate in the environmental sphere. We're giving 50 different companies, right now, the opportunity to throw the rulebook away if they're subjected to tests for clean air and clean water and the other environmental tests. We're not hung up on the bureaucracy. But do we want to forget about the standards for clean air and clean water and chemical right-to-know and all those things? I don't think so.

Audience member. No-o-o!

The President. I say we should stand up for the notion that America will be stronger in the global economy of the 21st century if we give our people clean air, clean water, safe streets, a solid education system, if we honor our commitment to our parents, and if we decide we are going forward together. It's always worked before. Why won't it work in the global economy of the 21st century?

I understand the other side is criticizing us because we have the support of labor unions. Well, I plead guilty to that. [*Applause*] Thank you.

Audience members. Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

The President. Thank you. Thank you.

I would put—it is true that I have done some specific things that all of you wanted that I believed in. I believe in the Executive order I signed on striker replacement. I believe in the repeal of the antiunion Executive orders from the previous administration. I believe in the appointments I've made to these Federal agencies that finally are giving a fair break to both labor and management and not being too one-sided. I believe in that. I think you're entitled to a fair break. I think you're entitled to the respect and the full protection of the laws that were out there for you. I believe in those things.

I don't believe that we should weaken the power of labor by going back to company unions. I don't believe that. But I also want to point out, and based on my experience as a Governor and my experience as a President, it is simply a myth to pretend that everybody who serves the public is antichange. I'd like to see some of these people who criticize people in public service go out and look at how the changes have been made in some of the welfare programs that you serve in and some of the health care programs that you serve in. I would like to see that.

I'd like to remind everybody in this country, if you'll let me now in my role as President, crow that Business Week last year said that the best customer service on any toll-free line in America was not given by L.L. Bean or Federal Express but by the Federal employees at the Social Security Administration. I am proud of that.

The Labor Department last month released a report by the mayor of Louisville, Jerry Abramson, and former Governor Florio of New Jersey, pointing out that when State and local governments work in real partnership with their workers and let the people on the frontline who know how things really work make decisions, then taxpayers can get better services at lower cost. You are willing to, able to, and actually effecting change. And you ought to get credit for the changes you're making to make the American people's lives better.

Now, let me say in closing, this is a very important election, because there is no status quo option here. You remember how in '92 we said the issue was change; it was change against drift and more of the same. Not true anymore. There are two very different views of change before the American people. We are going to walk straight into the 21st century on the strength of the decision we make in November. We are going to take one of those paths into the future.

And the good thing is the American people don't have to guess anymore. They know what I will do because I have done my best to do what I said I'd do in 1992. And the results have been good for the American people.

But to be fair, perfectly fair to our friends on the other side, they have also made it clear what they will do. The budget I vetoed would be the law of the land within 6 months after they had the Presidency and the White House. If the American people want it, they know how to get it. The environmental measures I stopped would be the law of the land within 6 months after they controlled the White House and the Presidency. And the worker safety weakening and all the other things.

So if you believe that the message we ought to give to Americans is, "You're on your own. Have a good time in the tender mercies of the global marketplace. Enjoy cyberspace," you have a option. But if you believe as I do, that the only way this country is going to be able to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity, the only way we're going to be able to get this country to come together with all of our diversity is to create opportunity and demand responsibility from everybody, to meet our challenges and protect our values together, then you have that choice for the future as well.

I know where you stand. I know where you're going to be working to see America stand in November. And all I can tell you is, as long as I live I'll be grateful that you stood with me.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:02 a.m. at McCormick Place East. In his remarks, he referred to Gerald W. McEntee, president, William Lucey, secretary/treasurer, and Gloria Caoile, special assistant to the president, AFSCME; and James E. Florio, former Governor of New Jersey.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Houston, Texas
June 21, 1996

Thank you. You know, after all these speeches, if I had any sense I would just quit while I'm ahead—[*laughter*]—say, "Thank you very much. Everything they said is true; please show up in November." [*Laughter*]

I am delighted to be back in Texas. I am very grateful for what Secretary—Senator Bentsen said. I told Lloyd when he was leaving the State, I said, "You know, I really miss you." It was always a delight for me to see Lloyd and B.A. They were a part of our family, and he did a magnificent job as Treasury Secretary.

I want to thank Chairman Fowler for the vigor and energy that he has brought to this job, the passion. And he is absolutely tireless, and he has done a fine job, and I am grateful to him. And I want to thank Bill White for leaving our administration—not for leaving our administration—[*laughter*]—but for coming home to Texas to be the chair of the Democratic Party. I wish he hadn't left, but he's doing the right thing now that he's here.

I want to thank Bob and Elyse Lanier who have been such good friends to me and came to the airport to meet me today. And I think, since I have said it in other States, in other places, I might as well say it in Houston: I doubt very seriously that there is a mayor anywhere in America who has made as much difference in as little time and been more effective than Bob Lanier has. And it's a real credit to him.

I thank the Members of Congress who are here, Ken Bentsen and Jim Chapman and my good friend Martin Frost, who is going to give us a Democratic House again if we can just keep everybody rocking and rolling—Gene Green and Eddie Bernice Johnson and Sheila Jackson-Lee. And I'll just say one thing: You know, Supreme Court decisions are the law of the land and all that, but it would be a real shame if we lost Sheila Jackson-Lee or Eddie Bernice Johnson or Martin Frost or anybody else who could be affected by that redistricting decision. And I hope they'll have a chance to run and win in November.

I want to thank all the former Governors who are here. I want to thank Dolph and Janie Briscoe for being so wonderful to Hillary when she came down to Uvalde to meet them. And I want you to know, Governor, I'm still wearing those socks you sent me that are made from your wool down there in Uvalde. And I'm—every time I go to the golf course I've got them

on, and I show them to the other golfers. And I'm a one-man marketing agent for you. [*Laughter*] I expect income to double for all those folks down there in no time at all.

I want to thank my good friend Mark White. Mark was making fun of me for wearing boots tonight. He gave me a pair of boots in 1984 at the Governors conference here; I've still got them, too. I thank Lieutenant Governor Ben Barnes. I want to say a special word of thanks to Ann Richards, who has been a constant source of inspiration to me and to Hillary throughout these last 3½ years, who's always out there on the stump speaking up for our values and our causes, and who is still incredibly admired all around this great country and for very good reason.

I was glad to see Victor Morales here tonight and glad to see the hand you gave him and his family. And I want you to send him to the United States Senate. We need him there. I thank the other State officials who are here, Dan Morales and Martha Whitehead. And I want to say a special thanks to my longtime friend Garry Mauro for that very personal statement he made. It may have bored the rest of you, but I relived the last 25 years with every word he said. I don't think it could have—it was an eloquent statement, not of my life but of his commitment—and his commitment to public service and to the people of Texas. And the thing I liked about listening to the speech is I've heard him say the same thing in private 100 times. He is a great resource for you, and I hope the people of Texas understand what they have in Garry Mauro.

I want to thank Speaker Jim Wright for coming tonight. I was delighted to see him, and I thank him for being here. I know I'm leaving some people out. I'm sure Liz Carpenter is here. If she's not, I'm mad at her. [*Laughter*] And I know my good friend Billie Carr is here. She says she got up out of bed to come, and I thought that was the right thing for her to do. [*Laughter*]

I'm sure there may be some other candidates for Congress here, but I can't help mentioning one, Nick Lampson, who's running to recapture Jack Brooks' seat. Boy, do we need a change there, and I want you to help him get elected.

And there's just one other thing—one other person I'd like to acknowledge who was and is about to become again a member of our administration: former Congressman and Commissioner Bob Krueger, who is about to go to Botswana but was in Burundi. And I want everybody here to know he put himself at not inconsiderable personal risk to save lots of people from the slaughter that went on in Burundi. And the people of Texas can be very proud of what he tried to do. And we thank you, sir. Thank you. [*Applause*]

Now let me say, most of what needs to be said, I guess, has been said. But this is a profoundly important election, and I want to just make three or four brief points. Four years ago when I came to Texas and I asked a lot of my friends to help me get elected—and Texas gave me a huge vote in the Democratic primary and propelled me on to the nomination, and we nearly won the general with a shoestring campaign—and let me just say, I've got to say this for the political writers. Normally, I never talk about the polls, but if anybody here thinks that I'm about to write off Texas, they need to think again, because I intend to fight for the electoral votes and the support of the people of Texas.

And I think we've got a pretty good case to make to the people of Texas. I've stood up for the things that mattered to the people of Texas. I fought for NAFTA; I fought for the space program; I fought for a fair resolution of the super collider after I lost my fight to keep it alive. And the people of Texas are better off today than they were 4 years ago, and they're a lot better off than they would have been if the other folks' policies had prevailed. That's a pretty simple case, and I think it's right.

I would say, too, of Governor Briscoe, we've had a good farm policy. Unfortunately, even a good farm policy can't make it rain. So I had to come down here to do that. [*Laughter*] But I'm glad we've rounded it out tonight, and we're going in the right direction.

I was reliving all this today coming in because I knew I'd see a lot of my friends. In the middle of 1991 I was home in Arkansas, having a wonderful time being Governor. My State was finally getting in pretty good shape economically, and Hillary and I were having a great time. Our daughter was doing wonderfully well in her school and with her friends. And I really didn't know whether I wanted to make this race. And I finally decided to do it because I thought the country was drifting toward the future.

I had had a good relationship with President Bush and the White House; it hadn't been a

particularly partisan thing. I had had the honor of representing the Democratic Governors in the education summit. I'd done a lot of work with them. But it just seemed to me that we could not drift into the 21st century, that we couldn't just assume that things would happen that would be good for the country. And we were having the slowest job growth since the Great Depression. We had quadrupled the debt of the country in 12 years, and we were getting more divided racially and ethnically at a time when we plainly needed to come together. There was even some question of the support in our country for America's continued leadership in the world.

And I had three simple ideas that I thought we ought to take with us into the 21st century. First and most important, I thought that we had to keep the American dream alive for everybody who was willing to work for it. Secondly, I believed that we had to make a virtue of our diversity, we had to celebrate it, we had to come together in a stronger sense of community instead of being divided, because it's plain that if we work together we'll do better than if we drift apart. And thirdly, I wanted to see our country continue to be the strongest force in the world for peace and freedom and prosperity.

And I thought if we had a strategy that said America's basic bargain is this: We'll work together to give everybody the opportunity to make the most of their own lives, and they have to assume the responsibility of being good citizens, and then we'll work together to bring this country together instead of being divided—and if we did it, I thought it would work.

In the economy, as Secretary Bentsen said, we had a simple strategy, to organize ourselves for the future. We said, we're going to cut the deficit in half; we're going to expand trade dramatically; we're going to invest in the people of this country; and if we did it, we'd reduce the deficit in half in 4 years and create 8 million jobs. And as all of you remember, it was a very brutal fight to pass that economic program. It passed with the barest of margins. The Vice President had to vote for it in the Senate. Al Gore always says, "You know, whenever I vote, we win." [*Laughter*] So, sure enough, we did.

Well, now we've had 3½ years of that program. After we passed the economic program, we passed NAFTA in a heated fight. We passed the GATT bill in a heated fight. Our trade ambassador's negotiated 200 separate trade agreements. We have continued to invest. We've increased our investment in the infrastructure of America. We've increased our investment in technology and research and made educational opportunities more available to our people, even while reducing the size of the deficit.

Now, I just want to read you something. I had my staff give me this today; I thought you might find this interesting. When we voted on this strategy of ours back in 1993, the majority leader of the House, Mr. Armey, said of our plan, "Clearly, this is a job killer." The Speaker said, "This will lead to a recession next year, I believe." The head of the Budget Committee, Mr. Kasich, said, "This plan will not work. If it was to work I'd have to become a Democrat." [*Laughter*] I'm saving a seat for him in Chicago. [*Laughter*]

The Senate majority leader, Senator Dole, said, "The American people know this plan does nothing to tackle the deficit head on." And your Senator, Mr. Morales' opponent, said, and I quote—now, don't use this in a campaign, Victor—here's what he said. "I want to predict here that if we adopt this bill," our economic program, "the American economy is going to get weaker, not stronger; the deficit 4 years from today will be higher than it is today, not lower."

Well, 3½ years later, we didn't cut the deficit in half, we cut it by more than half; the plan has not helped to create 8 million jobs, we've got 9.7 million new jobs. We were right, and they were wrong. And you ought to tell that in Texas. That's a fact. We also have nearly 4 million new homeowners, all-time high in the sales of American products abroad, all-time high for 3 years running in the creation of new businesses, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years.

So I say to you, we have not solved all the problems of the 21st century, but we're sure moving in the right direction. And if you compare where we are now to 4 years ago, we're better off. And if that's the test, we need to keep going in this direction and not change.

We had similar debates over what it meant to be responsible. One of the things that has driven me as long as I've been in public life, but especially these last few years, is that we've got to do something to lower the crime rate. You cannot have a democracy in which people are terrified anytime they are not locked behind

their own doors. And yet, I know that a lot of people believed that it couldn't be done. I believed that it could be. I saw what the mayor did here in his campaign when he put more police officers on the street. I went to communities in other cities where the crime rate had gone down when they put police officers back on the street and did the right thing.

And so we had a crime bill and we said, "This is not real complicated; we're going to put 100,000 police on the street because crime's tripled in the last 30 years and the police force has only gone up by 10 percent. But the police have to be deployed in the neighborhoods where the crime problem is, not behind desks. And we're going to ban 19 kinds of assault weapons, and we're going to pass the Brady bill. And we're going to pass the violence against women law to try to do something about the problem of domestic violence in this country." And we did.

Now, they made a lot of votes out of all that with all the fear and talk in 1994, because there hadn't been enough time to see whether it would bring any results and because there was so much turmoil. But you know something, since 1994 we've had two deer seasons, two duck seasons in Arkansas—[*laughter*]—and everybody who wants to kill deer or ducks has done it with the same dad-gum rifle they had before the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban passed. They've still got their guns. And all the old boys I grew up with who were mad at me 2 years ago now know that they were fed a line of bull. They feel they're just like where they were.

But I'll tell you one thing. There are 60,000—60,000—people with criminal records—stalkers and other serious problems—who have not been able to get handguns because they're ineligible when we went through the checking period of the Brady bill. That's who doesn't have a gun. The sportsmen and the hunters, they've still got them.

And we are going into—1996 will mark the 4th year in a row when the crime rate goes down in America. Now, is it low enough? Of course it's not. Of course it's not. I'll tell you when it will be low enough. We'll never get rid of crime because we can't transform human nature; that's not within our power. But you will know that we're on the right side of this issue when you turn on the evening news at night and you see a report of a crime, and instead of yawning and waiting for the next story, you're shocked again—you don't feel numb, you actually are surprised. We need to make crime the exception, not the rule. And we can do it if we follow smart policies.

If you look at this record, it is very important to remember that there was, unfortunately, especially in the leadership, a sharp partisan divide. And I think the evidence is that our approach was right and they were wrong in what they said about it.

If you look at the welfare debate, everybody is for welfare reform. And yes, I vetoed a bill that had that label on it—that label on it. But what do you want out of somebody on welfare anyway? Don't you want them to be like you? Don't you want people with children to be able to work and support themselves and be independent, to succeed at work and also—but don't you also want them to be able to succeed at home? I mean, isn't that the struggle that all working families are facing today? They want to be good at work, but they want to be good at home. Isn't that one of the major issues facing America today? If we have to choose between success at work and success at home, we have lost before we start. Isn't that right?

If you're so torn up and upset about your kids you can't function at work, that's going to hurt the economy. If you work like a demon and you neglect your children, what are we working for in the first place? So I said to them, I said, "You want to be tough on work? You cannot write the rules too tough for me. But make sure these people have jobs and child care and make sure their kids have medical care. And don't use the welfare reform bill to punish immigrants." And I want to thank the people of Texas, by the way, Democrats and Republicans alike, for having a more enlightened view on that than a lot of people in the Congress do. I appreciate that.

Well, we've had 3½ years of this now. We never could get a bill worked out. I still hope we will. We need one. So we just went out under authority given the President in 1988 and gave 40 States permission to have 62 experiments, which put 75 percent of the people on welfare under welfare reform anyway—moving people from welfare to work. Now, what have been the results? We got a 40 percent increase in child support collections. We got a million fewer people on food stamps. We have 1.3 million fewer people on welfare. I think the evi-

dence speaks for itself. Our approach is working. We don't need to change it; we need to bear down and build on it. That's the way to do it.

We hear a lot of talk in Washington about family values and about character. Well, one of the political tests is, do you have the character to fight for my family's values? [*Laughter*] Now, we had a fight over whether the United States would become the 173d country or something like that—anyway, over 150 had done it before we did—to tell people they could have a little time off if they had a baby born or a sick parent without losing their jobs when we passed the family and medical leave law. Unfortunately, the leadership of the other party even fought us on that.

Well, we just had research done by a bipartisan group that said in the last 2 years over 12 million Americans had taken advantage of the family and medical leave law. Over 90 percent of the businesses said it cost them nothing or nearly nothing to comply. It was no hassle at all. And they certainly can't make a case that it cost jobs, since we've produced 9.7 million jobs through the American free enterprise system in the last 3 years. What a different world it would make.

Hardly a week goes by that I don't meet somebody, if I'm out and around seeing folks, that has taken advantage of the family and medical leave law. And I'll tell you, of all the stories I hear, when a person—when a father comes up to me, as it happened the other day in the White House—we had all the kids in the Children's Miracle Network there, you know, the kids from the children's hospitals telethons in each of the 50 States and their parents. And two sets of parents, as I shook hands with these kids and I was on the way out, stopped me and said, "My kid was desperately ill, and if it hadn't been for the family and medical leave law, I would have lost my job to care for my child." And that's wrong. And I am glad that that's the law of the land. We were right about that. We were right about that.

Now, I could go on and on. The same story applies to the V-chip and the new cable systems and giving parents more control over what their young children see. The same story applies to whether we should restrict advertising of tobacco products directed at young people. I know that's controversial. No President ever took that on before. But let me tell you something, it's illegal in every State in America for children to smoke. Three thousand kids start to smoke every day illegally. One thousand of them will die sooner because of it. I think it's time the country took a position on it, took a stand on it, and made itself heard. I believe that.

So the second point I'd like to make, in addition to the fact that I think our approach has been right, is that you don't have to guess in this election. I mean, usually there's some guesswork involved in the election. You know, you know one person, you don't know the other. Maybe you don't know either one of them. People took a chance on me in '92, thank goodness. [*Applause*] Thank you very much.

But look, this is great. You don't have to guess at all. You know what will happen. If they have the White House and the Congress, within 6 months of that occurring, the budget that I vetoed in 1995 will be the law of the land. And if that's what you think ought to be the law of the land, you've got a good way to get it. If you really believe we ought to have a two-class Medicare system; if we ought to walk away from the guarantee we've given for 30 years to parents and children with disabilities, to poor children, to the elderly in nursing homes—stop guaranteeing that they'll have health care, even if they can't afford it; we ought to start cutting education funding instead of investing more in education; we ought to walk back on our commitment to a clean environment or a safe workplace, you can do that.

It's clear now. You don't even have to guess. It's great. There's no guesswork involved. You know what I'm going to do. You know what they're going to do. It would already be the law, but I vetoed it. So if you take the veto away, you can have the budget of 1995. I don't think that's good for America, and I think you ought to take the clear course and stay on the course we're on. And that's what I want you to tell the people of Texas. I don't think it would be good for Texans.

The final point I want to make is this: We have not solved problems. We have made them better. We are moving in the right direction. There's still a lot to do. If you imagine what the future is going to be like, young people today will have more possibilities to live out their dreams than any generation of Americans has ever had. But there will be significant new challenges. The world will change much more rapidly.

There are young people in this audience today that 10 years from now will be doing jobs that have not even been invented yet, jobs that some of us cannot even imagine. And with the world changing, we need to do some things that we haven't had to do in the past. We need a system to guarantee that people have lifetime access, for example, to education, to health care, and to pensions. That's a very important thing, even if they're in very small businesses, even if they're self-employed. That's what this fight for the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill is about. That's what the recommendations I've made to Congress to give self-employed people and small-business people the opportunity to take out pensions, and people the opportunity to keep their pensions even if they lose their jobs for a while.

These are important changes because the world is changing. The most important thing I've asked is that Congress change the law to give families a tax deduction for the cost of college tuition and to guarantee that every American can get a tax credit equal to what it costs to go to community college so we can make universal not just a high school education but 2 years of education after high school. These are the kinds of things we need to be looking to the future for.

So we had a plan. We've implemented it. The results were good. You don't have to guess in the election; there are two very different choices. I believe you know that the alternative would not be good. And most importantly, we're going to run a positive campaign with good ideas for the future of the United States.

Let me ask you to think, as I leave, about this choice and these terms. If you were lucky enough to know right before you leave this Earth, the last time you put your head on a pillow that it was your last time, what would you be thinking about? You wouldn't be thinking, I wish I spent more time at the office. [*Laughter*] And frankly, you probably wouldn't be thinking, I wish I'd spent more time on politics. You'd be thinking about your children and the people you love and the people you cared about, the things that really mattered in your life. The purpose of politics is simply to give people the space they need to make those memories, and to remind people that you can't really make those memories unless you give other people the same chance and accord them the same respect, even if they're really different from you.

Now, that's really the purpose—and to stop countries and other destructive forces from taking advantage of us and killing the innocent and snuffing out their dreams. That's really what it's all about. And I believe with all my heart. I don't care about the voting patterns of the past or history and everything. If on election day the American people go into the polling booth thinking about that, what is the purpose of this whole exercise, they'll do the right thing.

The best days of this country are ahead of us. The next century will contain untold possibilities. But we have to meet these challenges and protect our values, and we've got to do it together. That's what this election is all about. And I just want to ask you to commit to spend some time, as much time as you can between now and November, talking to your friends and neighbors about it, because we are going to take a path of change into the 21st century. There is no status quo option. And I want us to walk across a bridge that will take us all there together, better and stronger than ever.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:12 p.m. at the J.W. Marriott Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to B.A. Bentsen, wife of former Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen; Donald L. Fowler, national chairman, Democratic National Committee; Mayor Bob Lanier of Houston, TX, and his wife, Elyse; Dolph Briscoe, Mark White, and Ann Richards, former Texas Governors; Janie Briscoe, wife of Governor Briscoe; Dan Morales, State attorney general; Martha Whitehead, State treasurer; Garry Mauro, State land commissioner; former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Jim Wright; Liz Carpenter, Democratic activist; and Billie Carr, Texas Democratic Party executive council member. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Statement on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses
June 21, 1996

In March 1995, I announced my intention to leave no stone unturned in our efforts to determine the causes of the illnesses being experienced by veterans of the Gulf war and to provide effective medical care to those who are ill. Since that time, we have been pursuing a wide range of initiatives on Gulf war illnesses, including re-examining intelligence and operational records for evidence of possible exposure to chemical or biological weapons.

As part of this ongoing effort, the Department of Defense, based partly on information brought to its attention by the United Nations Special Commission, has confirmed that, shortly after the war, U.S. troops destroyed an Iraqi ammunition bunker that contained chemical weapons. Chemical detectors were used by U.S. troops both before and during the destruction operation. While we have no evidence today that Americans were exposed to chemical weapons during the operation, this is a very important issue which we will continue to investigate thoroughly.

The release of this new information reflects my commitment to unraveling the Gulf war illnesses problem. We will continue to work closely with the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses to ensure that we are doing everything possible to address the health consequences of service in the Persian Gulf. We will also continue to make new information on this important issue available to veterans and their families.

The President's Radio Address
June 22, 1996

Good morning. Today I want to talk with you about keeping our families safe and secure, and especially about how we can help parents to protect their children.

Since I took office we've worked hard to combat the crime and violence that has become all too familiar to too many Americans. We passed a sweeping crime bill in 1994, against steep opposition from partisan politicians and special interest group pressure. We're now putting 100,000 new police officers on America's streets in community policing. Nearly half of them are already funded. We banned 19 deadly assault weapons, passed the Violence Against Women Act to help our communities resist domestic violence. We passed the Brady bill, and already it's stopped over 60,000 felons, fugitives, and stalkers from buying a gun.

We're helping our communities give children something to say yes to, positive programs and good role models to help them stay away from crime and drugs and gangs. These laws are making a real difference across our country. In city after city and town after town, crime and violence are finally coming down. Crime is coming down this year overall in America for the 4th year in a row. But we all know we've got a long way to go before our streets are safe again.

And as we move forward, we have to remember we're not just fighting against crime, we're fighting for something: for peace of mind, for the freedom to walk around the block at night and feel safe, for the security of neighborhoods that aren't plagued by drugs, where you can leave your doors unlocked and not worry about your children playing in the yard. We're fighting to restore a sense of community, and most of all, we're fighting for our children and their future.

Nothing is more important than keeping our children safe. We have taken decisive steps to help families protect their children, especially from sex offenders, people who, according to study after study, are likely to commit their crimes again and again. We've all read too many tragic stories about young people victimized by repeat offenders. That's why, in the crime bill, we required every State in the country to compile a registry of sex offenders and gave States the power to notify communities about child

sex offenders and violent sex offenders that move into their neighborhoods.

But that wasn't enough, and last month I signed Megan's Law that insists that States tell a community whenever a dangerous sexual predator enters its midst. Too many children and their families have paid a terrible price because parents didn't know about the dangers hidden in their own neighborhood. Megan's Law, named after a 7-year-old girl taken so wrongly at the beginning of her life, will help to prevent more of these terrible crimes.

Now we must take the next step. Senator Biden and Senator Gramm have introduced bipartisan legislation to develop a national registry to track sexual offenders and child molesters across the country. They're on the right track, but we have to move forward now, and we can. Today I'm directing the Attorney General to report back in 60 days with a plan to guarantee our police officers this information right away. We must make sure police officers in every State can get the information they need from any State to track sex offenders down and bring them to justice when they commit new crimes. The police officer in Cleveland should be able to get information on all known sex offenders in Cleveland, whether they committed their crimes in New York or Los Angeles. Every bit of information we have about the people who commit these crimes should be available to law enforcement wherever and whenever they need it.

The crime bill laid the foundation for this national registry by requiring States to track sexual offenders within their borders. Megan's Law makes sure parents get this information so they can take steps to watch out for their children. Now I want the Attorney General to work with the States and the Congress to link this information together to make it available to law enforcement at every level in every State. Police officers will be able to prevent more crimes and catch more criminals if they can share and compare the latest information we have.

We respect people's rights, but there is no right greater than a parent's right to raise a child in safety and love. That's why the law should follow those who prey on America's children wherever they go, State to State, town to town.

We'll never be able to eliminate crime completely. But as long as crime is so commonplace that we don't even look up when horror after horror leads the evening news, we know we've got a long way to go. Yes, the crime rate is coming down for 4 years in a row. And, yes, our strategies of 100,000 police, the Brady law, the assault weapons ban, the domestic violence law, the youth prevention programs, these things are helping. But I won't be satisfied until America is once again a place where people who see a report of a serious crime are shocked, not numb to it.

We can make that America real. We know we can if we work together and put our children first.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 12:23 p.m. on June 21 at McCormick Place in Chicago, IL, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 22.

Remarks to the U.S. Conference of Mayors in Cleveland, Ohio

June 22, 1996

Thank you very much, Mayor Rice. His speaking's improved now that he's getting so much practice out there on the stump. [*Laughter*] I'm delighted to be here with you. I thank you for your great year as president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. I'm looking forward to working with Mayor Daley this year. And I'm glad the Democrats are going to give him a little boost in the local economy in Chicago in a few weeks, try to get his term off to a good start.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to the mayor of Chicago for the City Livability Awards that he presents every year at this conference, along with Phillip Rooney of Waste Management. I think that's a very good thing to do, and I've always been impressed with the achievements that earn the awards.

I'm delighted to be here with the other mayors on the platform: Mayor White and my longtime friend Mayor Helmke, Mayor Rhea. I was glad to see Congressman Stokes this morning and Congressman Sherrod Brown. And Reverend McMickle, I got prayed over from a distance; I thank you. I heard it and needed it more than the others here. I appreciate it very much. [*Laughter*]

I enjoyed all of the music in advance, and I want you to know that Mayor Rice and I were out there trying to sing along with Glenn Burks. I didn't make the low notes, and he did. But I appreciated it very much.

I want to thank Mayor Lanier from Houston for his hosting me yesterday in Houston. And we flew up today, and I know that he is the head of the Rebuild America Coalition; that's an important part of your efforts. And we're glad to work with him and looking forward to it.

I also want to thank all the mayors here for the work you did yesterday on the Habitat house. I saw the picture in the local paper when I got here, and I think it's a wonderful thing that you did. I appreciate that. I'm sure that many of you know that I signed an appropriation this year for the first time ever to Habitat for Humanity so that they could buy larger tracts of land in our urban areas and build more houses at one time in one place. And I hope that that will enable a lot of you to cooperate with them and meet the housing needs of your people. And I think you sent a great message to America yesterday. And I thank you, Mayor White, for making that opportunity possible for them, and I thank all of you for doing it.

I would like to say a special word of thanks, too, to Tom Cochran, because he works for you full time and he has to work with us. And I think sometimes we overlook—I know I was in the Governors' association and the attorney generals' association, and we showed up for our conferences and we got credit for whatever we were doing. Most of the time the staff had done it, and we just stood in the way of the camera. So I thank Tom Cochran for what he does every day for you as well.

Mayor, I want to say thank you for welcoming us to Cleveland. I heard what you said outside about the remarkable progress of Cleveland, and I've had an opportunity to see a lot of it myself over the last several years. You remember, it wasn't so many years ago that I came here, I think, for the Democratic Leadership Council in the eighties and then when I was running for President. I have seen this remarkable city's turnaround under your leadership and with the partnership of the private sector and with the enormous spirit of the community here. I have been in all sections of this community, and I have loved every opportunity I have had to be here.

I liked throwing out the ball at your stadium. Somebody told me Mayor Riley was going to throw the ball out tomorrow. Is that true? Mayor Riley can't throw a baseball. [*Laughter*] Better practice, Joe, wherever you are. [*Laughter*] And thank you for welcoming me to Charleston the other night.

I also—I'll tell you one thing you can all do; you can go home and you can get one great story out of this conference. You can go home and tell everybody that, after all, Elvis is alive—[*laughter*]—in Cleveland at the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. He's packing them in as never before. [*Laughter*] I'm going to see how many times I can run that out before people figure out what I'm talking about. [*Laughter*]

If I can get Willie Brown to laugh at my jokes, I'm doing well. [*Laughter*] I've got a real future in this business if I can do that.

I'd like to begin on a serious note, if I might, now. I was thinking about Cleveland coming in here and the remarkable amount of partnership in reaching across the lines that too often divide us that made possible the revitalization of this city in the last few years. And I was thinking about all the different people that I had met over the years in Cleveland who had been, in my mind, heroes of this country of ours because of the work they've done in their churches, in their housing projects, on the streets trying to prevent crime, trying to help rebuild their communities. And it reminds me of what I've been doing the last couple of days.

I'm sure some of you saw the press reports that Hillary and I were privileged to welcome the Olympic torch into the White House the other night. And it burned on the White House lawn for a night, and then we saw it off the next day. The torch was brought into the White House by a nun who had devoted her life to community service and by Dr. I. King Jordan, who is the president of Gallaudet University. He's the first deaf president of our Nation's deaf university. He's—I don't know how old King is, but he's a couple of years older than

I am, and this week he's going to run a 100-mile race. So he's in reasonably good shape as well. [*Laughter*]

And then the next day, the people who brought the flame out of the place where it was sitting in the White House and then ran it out of the White House as we saw it off the next morning—it was a man named Lang Brown, who has devoted his life to trying to save the lives of troubled children. He's an African-American man of about, oh, I don't know, maybe a little older than I am. And he walked up the way at the White House there with 12 kids. They were white, Hispanic, African-American, all walks of life, kids who were in desperate trouble. He helped them to put their lives back together again. He spends his whole life doing that.

One of the people that carried the Olympic torch is a 74-year-old woman in Nevada who has taken in, at a rather advanced age now, 100 children who were abandoned. And she tried to give them their lives back. The young woman that carried the torch out of the White House was a young woman named Carla McGhee, who was a highly recruited high school basketball player. She went to the University of Tennessee, seemed destined for a streaking career. And she was in a terrible accident, almost died; her body was totally crushed. And by sheer dint of will she pulled herself back to the point where she recovered her mobility first and then she recovered her ability to play basketball. And within a couple of years she had gone back to the University of Tennessee and helped them to win a national championship. And now she's leading our women's Olympic basketball team. A miraculous story. And they were carrying this Olympic torch like—thousands and thousands of our fellow citizens have done that. That's the flame I want America to be remembered by.

And then we've been bedeviled, as I heard someone mention, I think the pastor mentioned in the prayer, by another sort of flame. We've had more than a tripling of church burnings in our country in the last year and a half. That's the opposite side of the coin. But we still have some people in our country that give into what seems to be—if you look at Bosnia, if you look at the Middle East, if you look at Northern Ireland, if you look at the problems between the tribes in Burundi and Rwanda, it seems to be an almost universal impulse of human nature that there is this dark part of our soul that can be revved up so that we define ourselves not in terms of our common humanity and what we can do and what we can be for and what our good qualities are but in terms of who we can hate and who we can put down and who we can be different from. And that's really what the racially motivated impulses in the church burnings that have been racially driven represent. And it is the antithesis of everything that makes our American cities great.

We've had an enormous number of black churches burned, unfortunately. We've also had at least one mosque and another Islamic center burned. We've had several synagogues desecrated in this country in the last couple of years. And unbelievably enough, we've—even though there haven't been as many of them, we've had a substantial increase in the number of white churches that have been burned. People are sort of looking at our houses of worship as targets now.

And I just want to say to all of you that that's the opposite of what makes you successful as mayors. And it's also the opposite of what it means to be an American in the finest sense. A lot of these churches have been burned out in the country where people can't catch them, but there have also been burnings in sizable cities, in Knoxville and Sacramento and Tucson. And just this past Thursday, the Emmanual Christian Fellowship in Portland was added to the list of suspicious fires.

So I just want to say to you, I want you to keep speaking out against this. I know that Mayor Menino has sponsored a resolution that you're going to pass, and I thank you for that. But this country has the largest number of houses of worship per capita of any nation in the world. We got started by people coming to our shores searching for religious liberty. It is the first amendment to the Constitution. And so I say to you, your lives and your successes are living examples of what is best in this country. You bring together people every day that are like those folks carrying the torch to Mayor Campbell's city. And I hope before you leave here you will issue the strongest possible statement saying this church burning is not America and we're not going to tolerate it. We're going to stand up to it.

For nearly 4 years now, we have worked together on a strategy that I called in 1992 "Putting People First." I ran for this job because

I wanted to see our country go into the 21st century with great vigor and purpose and determination, meeting our challenges and protecting our values in a way that would enable us to achieve three things: one, to keep the American dream of opportunity available for every person in this country who would assume the responsibility necessary to achieve it; two, to see this country come together as a community over all the lines of our diversity and not be divided; and three, because of this particular moment in history, to make sure that America continued to be the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity.

Now, while no one could say we solved all the problems in this country, and none of you would assert that you have done that in your cities, we are plainly better off than we were 4 years ago. We are clearly moving in the right direction. And the thing that has underpinned a lot of the successes that we have had in other areas has been the revitalization of the American economy.

Our strategy was very straightforward: Cut the deficit in half so you can get interest rates down and the private sector can invest again and create jobs; continue to work to invest in our people, in their education, in their skills, in technology and research; expand trade so that America can sell more of its products and services abroad.

Well, 4 years later we have had the deficit reduced, they say now, by more than 50 percent, from over $290 billion to about $130 billion by the end of this year. We have negotiated 200 separate trade agreements, and our trade is at an all-time high now. In the 21 areas we negotiated with Japan, American exports are up 85 percent in 3½ years. We have continued to expand opportunities in education. And to continue to invest, we have increased our investment in infrastructure by about 10 percent while reducing the deficit, something that I know is important to all of you. And the American people have produced 9.7 million new jobs in 3½ years.

Now, to give you some idea, I'm about to leave next week to go to the annual conference of the G–7, the big seven industrial nations, in Europe. The G–7 nations, in total in the last 3½ years, have produced 10 million jobs, 9.7 million in America. That's something to be proud of our fellow citizens for. They have done a good job. We've done a good job of bringing this country back.

We also see that the welfare rolls have been reduced by 1.3 million. Food stamp rolls are down a million. The poverty rate has dropped for the first time in many years. And, thank goodness, for the first time in 10 years, for the last 2 years average wages are finally going up again in America instead of going down. So we are moving in the right direction.

We've also worked together on some other things. We passed the national service law, and I know a lot of you have made good use of the AmeriCorps volunteers. I want to thank Mayor Ashe for his willingness to serve on the AmeriCorps board; I'm going to appoint him formally next week.

We passed some other very important legislation for America, the family and medical leave law. We now know from a bipartisan study that 12 million Americans have taken advantage of the family and medical leave law in the last couple of years, to take a little time off when they had a family member sick or a baby born or an elderly parent in trouble, without losing their jobs. And it may be, in some ways, the most immediately impactful law that I've had the privilege to sign as President, because I hear—everywhere I go, people come up to me and talk to me about how their children were sick and they couldn't have taken care of them and kept their job if it hadn't been for that. So I feel good about that.

I think we all know we've got more to do and that we can never, never succeed in getting opportunity to all of our people as we move into this information age in this global society unless we have a strategy to make sure that our cities are strong and vibrant. If America's cities can go into the 21st century flourishing, then America will do very well.

We have sought to forge a partnership with you. Mayor Rice talked about it, talked about our early meetings, the accessibility of the Cabinet. I must tell you, I think it's been made a lot easier by this remarkable generation of mayors in the room. I was talking this morning about how I'm amazed that the mayors seem to get more and more and more talented and more innovative with each successive year. And I thank you. You're very easy to work with, practical, people-oriented, flexible, interested in solving problems and working and going forward. I also think it's been made a lot easier

because I have been privileged to have the service of the person I believe will go down in history as the finest HUD Secretary in the history of the United States, Henry Cisneros.

We have worked to establish a comprehensive approach with you to deal with jobs issues; to deal with housing issues; to deal with environmental issues; to deal with the issues of education, the school-to-work program, expanded Head Start, aid to the public schools in Chapter 1; to deal with transportation issues. We've tried to put this program into our community empowerment agenda. And I want to thank the Vice President for the work he's done in leading that effort along with Henry. You have made it possible.

We now have 105 communities that have qualified to be empowerment zones or enterprise communities. We have seen some remarkable transformations in those communities. Here in Cleveland, dozens of new businesses are moving into or expanding in the city zone. One of them is Bearings, a Fortune 1000 company that will build a new $28 million world headquarters here and employ more than 300 workers. Mayor White has taken action to make sure that the local workers will be trained for these jobs and for other jobs that will come into the zone, so that we won't have a purported advantage that doesn't really benefit the people it was supposed to benefit. So I'm pleased about that.

We've got to build on our successes, and I have made some very specific proposals to the Congress which I intend to take into this campaign if they are not enacted in this session of Congress. First, I've asked Congress to create a second round of empowerment zones. My goal will be eventually to get to the point where we can have an empowerment zone of some scope in every community in the country that needs it. That's really what the rule ought to be, and if it works, we'll generate more investment, more jobs, more incomes, and there won't be any loss to the Treasury.

So I think we have to keep going on this. This approach is working. And it's working because it requires the communities to come up with a strategy to make the most of the opportunity and then lets the communities drive their future, not some Federal rule or regulation.

Second, as all of you know, I have asked Congress to enact a new $2 billion incentive to encourage the cleanup and redevelopment of abandoned industrial sites, our so-called brownfields initiative. This one thing could do as much to bring jobs back to urban America as any other thing that we've talked about in a long time. And I want you, regardless of your party, to help me get this passed in Congress. This is good for America; it's good economics.

Congressman Lou Stokes has been a leader in this effort. I want to thank him and Senator Carol Moseley-Braun of Illinois; Congressman Charles Rangel of New York, who will be introducing the community empowerment legislation this week.

We also fought to preserve the low-income housing credit. And I'm pleased that the Local Initiative Services Corporation, LISC, is prepared to announce that it has raised $410 million from corporations to build 8,500 housing units and create another 12,000 jobs. That will benefit a lot of your areas.

We have to do more. Particularly, we have to recognize that there are places in our country where the free enterprise system simply hasn't reached yet. And we have got to do more to provide jobs and opportunities.

I recently signed two Executive orders to address this issue. The first one created a new empowerment contracting program which will offer special incentives for Government contracting awards for companies that locate in distressed communities in all parts of America. I also signed an Executive order directing Federal agencies that are building facilities or relocating to give first priority to the historic districts of our central cities, instead of running away from them. The Government should be investing in America's future where it's most needed.

I think one of the great success stories of urban America in the last couple of years is the success that so many of you have made in lowering the rate of crime and violence. And we have to build on it, because we are nowhere near where we need to be. But we are a lot better off than we were just a few years ago. I have tried to be a good partner in that regard. We have worked to help you put 100,000 new police officers on the street with the crime bill of 1994. I can tell you that we are ahead of schedule and under budget there. We have funded almost half of the 100,000 police already.

The assault weapons ban is making a difference. The Brady bill is making a huge difference. We have now seen, since the Brady bill became law, 60,000—I'll say that again—

60,000 felons, fugitives, and stalkers who were prevented from buying guns simply because we took a few days to check their eligibility. It was the right thing to do.

We have worked to try to help communities give our children something to say yes to, to support your preventive programs and your role models that keep children out of drugs and gangs and violence in the first place. We cannot jail our way out of this crisis. We have to find ways to change the culture of America, to give more of our kids a chance to stay on the right path in the first place.

All of you know that I have not had as much success as I wanted with this Congress in preserving the prevention aspect of the '94 crime bill. But all of you know, and so do your law enforcement officials know, that this is a critical aspect of the strategy. We need to do more in this area, not less. These programs can work. They save children's lives every single, solitary day. And again I say, I hope you will help me to bring some balance, more balance back into the approach that Congress is taking. We are fighting to preserve every single dollar for prevention we can, but we need all the help we can get.

We have also tried to help cities to implement their own strategies. Long Beach, California, led the country in implementing the school uniform policy. They found that it reduced the vulnerability of their children to gangs and that it increased learning and reduced the dropout rate and it increased a sense of cohesion, that even the upper income kids wound up liking it because people began to be identified by what they were inside rather than what they were wearing outside. We helped them, and we have helped others now through the Justice Department, the Education Department, do that in a way that is legal and constitutional and avoids the hassles.

We are supporting cities like New Orleans and many others that have curfew policies that have led to dramatic drops in the juvenile crime rate, to do so in a way that, at least based on anything that we can find through the Justice Department, is likely to be most effective and most positive.

I see Mayor Pat Hays from North Little Rock out there. He's the first mayor, my mayor, that actually introduced a curfew policy. We had a terrible problem in his community. I think most of the mayors that have done it believe that it's a smart thing and a good thing to do. We want to make sure that, at least that if you're interested in it, you know what everyone's experience is, what seems to work best, and how to avoid any potential pitfalls that we have determined around the country.

Here in Cleveland I know the murder rate has been down 12 percent in the last 2 years alone. We see this nationwide. And I guess one of the things that I want to make sure that all of us are doing together, and I would like to help on, is I want the folks back home to know that we can do something about the crime rate. I want people to believe that we can do something about the crime rate. It wasn't so very long ago that I think people had more or less given up. And that would be a terrible thing in this country. It would be a terrible thing. If people gave up on our ability to provide common security, then within 10 or 20 years those of us who could afford it would be living behind walls with our own private security systems and everybody else would be living in a jungle.

So this crime issue is critical to the economic issue; it's critical to the welfare issue; it's critical to all these other issues. We have got to convince our people that in common we can bring the crime rate down, we can restore order and civility and decency and safety to our children's lives. And it's very, very important.

Let me say that in the last few months especially, we have been very active in dealing with those who commit crimes against children, especially those who commit sexual offenses against children. And I wanted to mention that just a moment today.

In the crime bill, we required every State to compile a registry of sex offenders and gave the States the power to notify communities about child sex offenders or violent sex offenders that moved into neighborhoods. And then last month I signed Megan's Law, to insist that States tell a community whenever a dangerous sexual predator is in the midst of the people. Too many children and their families have paid a terrible price because of what their parents didn't know. Megan's Law was named after a 7-year-old girl from New Jersey who was taken at the beginning of her life. And I believe it will help to prevent further Megans.

But there is one other step we have to take. Senator Biden and Senator Gramm have introduced a bipartisan bill to develop a national

registry to track offenders and child molesters across the country. That is the right thing to do, but I believe we can move forward now. Today I directed the Attorney General to report back to me in 60 days with a plan to guarantee that police officers can get this information right away, to make sure that police officers in every State get the information they need from any State to track sex offenders. A police officer in Cleveland ought to know about somebody in Cleveland, whether the crime was committed in Los Angeles or New York. These things have to be shared, and we need a system to share it. So we are working very, very hard on that, and I hope you will support us in that endeavor as well.

Let me just say one last thing about crime. Unless someone finds a magic formula to transform human nature, we will never eliminate crime completely from America. But we can go back to the time when it's the exception, not the rule. And I think that the test that I always say that I will follow is I will believe we're on the right side of the crime problem when I can turn on the evening news at night, and if the lead story is a horrible crime I'm absolutely shocked, instead of numb to it; I don't expect the lead story to be the biggest, latest crime story.

So I say, again, you have proven—mayor after mayor, most of the mayors in this room have seen a drop in the crime rate for 3 or 4 years in a row now. And it's very important that our people believe we can do this. We cannot allow the people to believe that we cannot do this.

I think the resurgence of our cities—and I predict to you that it will continue—driven by new economic strategies and more jobs coming in, driven by innovative housing strategies and more affordable housing—we're going to make Secretary Cisneros' goal: We're going to have more than two-thirds of the American people in their own homes by the end of this decade for the first time in American history. We're going to do that.

The marrying of our attempts to improve the environment and to direct the economy—to develop the economy, as embodied in the brownfields initiative; the continued assault on crime; the continued commitment to invest in our infrastructure, these things will develop a strategy not only to rebuild urban America but to make America great as we move into the next century.

The main thing I would say again, we have to have a vision. You have to imagine, what do you want this country to look like? When these children grow up and they're raising their children, I want this to be a country in a world that is so full of possibility it's unimaginable to us. But I want those possibilities available to every child who will work for them, without regard to their race or the station they start out in life or where they happen to live in the United States.

And I want our diversity to be the crown jewel of our assets in the global society. I want us to revel in the racial and ethnic and religious diversity of America, and I want us to still be standing up for peace and freedom and prosperity for all the people of the world. And if you want that, you have to lead the way. And we have to do it by working together. When I look at this crowd I am very optimistic that that is the future that these children will have.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:50 p.m. in the Cleveland Renaissance Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to the following U.S. Conference of Mayors officials: Mayor Norman B. Rice of Seattle, WA, outgoing president; Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago, IL, incoming president; Mayor Paul Helmke of Fort Wayne, IN, advisory board chair; Mayor Betty Jo Rhea of Rock Hill, SC, trustee; and J. Thomas Cochran, executive director. The President also referred to Phillip Rooney, president and CEO, WMX Technologies, Inc.; Rev. Marvin A. McMickle, who gave the invocation; Glenn Burks, who sang the national anthem; and Mayors Michael R. White of Cleveland, OH, Bob Lanier of Houston, TX, Joseph R. Riley, Jr., of Charleston, SC, Willie Brown of San Francisco, CA, Thomas Menino of Boston, MA, Bill Campbell of Atlanta, GA, and Victor Ashe of Knoxville, TN. The Executive orders of May 21 on empowerment contracting and on locating Federal facilities on historic properties in central cities are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Memorandum on Family Friendly Work Arrangements
June 21, 1996

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Implementing Federal Family Friendly Work Arrangements

I continue to believe that honoring and supporting the concerns of family members in the workplace is vital to good government and to a productive work force. In order to build on its record of support for families in the Federal workplace, the executive branch must continue to examine its practices and to implement the goals of the Presidential Memorandum of July 11, 1994. The Federal Government must continue to set the pace in transforming the culture of the American workplace so that it supports employees who are devoted to their families.

It is clear to me that whenever the Federal Government establishes a goal of providing civilian employees and military personnel with an environment supportive to families, the result is greater cost efficiency, increased worker commitment and productivity, better customer service, and improved family life.

Therefore, today I am directing all executive departments and agencies to review their personnel practices and develop a plan of action to utilize the flexible policies already in place and, to the extent feasible, expand their ability to provide their employees:

(1) assistance in securing safe, affordable quality child care;

(2) elder care information and referral services;

(3) flexible hours that will enable employees to schedule their work and meet the needs of their families. This includes encouragement to parents to attend school functions and events essential to their children;

(4) opportunities to telecommute, when possible, and consistent with their responsibilities, to achieve the goal of 60,000 telecommuters by 1998 as set by the President's Management Council. This includes telecommuting from home and from satellite locations;

(5) policies and procedures that promote active inclusion of fathers as well as mothers;

(6) an effective mechanism by which employees can suggest new practices that strengthen families and provide for a more productive work environment; and

(7) leadership and participation in these policies and programs at the highest level of the agency.

The departments and agencies shall provide an initial report on the results of this review to the Vice President through the National Performance Review within 120 days of the date of this memorandum. This report should include an assessment of progress made towards specific goals and include innovative approaches and detailed success stories.

The National Performance Review, together with the Domestic Policy Council, the President's Management Council Working Group on Telecommuting, the Office of Personnel Management, and the General Services Administration will continue to work with the executive agencies as we move forward together to increase productivity through family friendly work environments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 24.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Deployment of United States Military Forces for Implementation of the Balkan Peace Process

June 21, 1996

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

In my report to the Congress of December 21, 1995, I provided further information on the deployment of combat-equipped U.S. Armed Forces to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as other states in the region in order to participate in and support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led Implementation Force (IFOR). I am providing this follow-up report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed on continued U.S. contributions in support of peacekeeping efforts in the former Yugoslavia.

We and other countries are working in concert to encourage the parties to fulfill their commitments under the peace agreement and to usher in a new era of cooperation. In accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1031 and the North Atlantic Council decision of December 16, 1995, IFOR continues to carry out its mission to monitor and ensure compliance by all parties with the military aspects of the peace agreement initialed in Dayton and formally signed in Paris on December 14, 1995. Consistent with the accomplishment of its principal task, IFOR is also assisting various aspects of civilian implementation, including elections support, support to the International Criminal Tribunal, and the facilitation of freedom of movement of civilian persons. NATO has also agreed and IFOR stands ready to provide emergency support to the United Nations Transitional Administration in Eastern Slavonia (UNTAES). One year ago, war raged throughout Bosnia. Today, the killing has ended and peace is taking hold.

Approximately 17,000 U.S. military personnel remain deployed in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under NATO operational command and control as part of a total IFOR contingent of about 60,000. Most of these U.S. personnel are assigned to a sector surrounding Tuzla. In addition, approximately 5,500 U.S. military personnel are deployed in Hungary, Croatia, Italy, and other states in the region in order to provide logistical and other support to IFOR. These personnel remain under U.S. command and control and rules of engagement.

Many of the U.S. forces participating in IFOR are from U.S. Army forces who are stationed in Germany. Other participating U.S. forces include special operations forces, airfield operations support forces, air forces, and reserve personnel. An amphibious force is normally in reserve in the Mediterranean Sea, and a carrier battle group remains available to provide support for IFOR's air operations.

Thus far, U.S. forces have sustained one fatality, which occurred when a soldier was killed by a mine. One soldier was also slightly wounded by sniper fire in an isolated incident, one soldier was wounded after interrupting an attempted break-in at a storage facility, and several were injured, one seriously, when their vehicle struck a mine. Several other deaths have occurred because of accidents. The IFOR's mission for 1 year ends in December 1996, at which time it will begin withdrawal. At present, it is our intention that IFOR will complete the withdrawal of all troops in the weeks after December 20, 1996, on a schedule set by NATO commanders consistent with the safety of troops and the logistical requirements for an orderly withdrawal.

A U.S. Army contingent remains deployed in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as part of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP). This U.N. peacekeeping force observes and monitors conditions along the border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, effectively contributing to the stability of the region. Several U.S. Army support helicopters are also deployed to provide support to U.S. forces and UNPREDEP as required. Most of the approximately 500 U.S. soldiers participating in these missions are assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 63rd Armor, 1st Infantry Division. A small contingent of U.S. military personnel is also serving in Croatia in direct support of the UNTAES Transitional Administrator.

The U.S. naval forces continued, until recently, to assist in enforcing the U.N.-mandated arms embargo and economic sanctions as part of NATO's participation in Operation "SHARP

Guard." Since the arms embargo has been terminated and economic sanctions have been suspended, U.S. naval activities in support of Operation SHARP Guard have ceased. Operation SHARP Guard, however, will not be terminated until economic sanctions are terminated and U.S. naval forces will remain on call to provide assistance again should economic sanctions be reimposed.

It is in the U.S. national interest to help bring peace to Bosnia. Through American leadership and in conjunction with our NATO allies and other countries, we have seen real progress toward sustainable peace in Bosnia. We have also made it clear to the former warring parties that it is they who are ultimately responsible for implementing the peace agreement.

I have directed the participation of U.S. Armed Forces in these operations pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, and in accordance with various statutory authorities. I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed about developments in the former Yugoslavia. I will continue to consult closely with the Congress regarding our efforts to foster peace and stability in the former Yugoslavia.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 24.

Message to the Congress on Telecommunications Equipment Exports to China

June 23, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by Section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (P.L. 101–246) ("the Act"), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to terminate the suspensions under section 902(a) of the Act with respect to the issuance of licenses for defense article exports to the People's Republic of China and the export of U.S.-origin satellites, insofar as such restrictions pertain to the Hughes Asia Pacific Mobile Telecommunications project. License requirements remain in place for these exports and require review and approval on a case-by-case basis by the United States Government.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 23, 1996.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 24.

Remarks to the Family Re-Union V Conference in Nashville, Tennessee

June 24, 1996

Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Vice President, I kind of hate to talk, that panel was so good. I sort of—I think they were the keynote, and I'll just try to finish it with a grace note.

I'd like to begin by thanking the Vice President and Tipper for showing this consistent commitment to the American family. I mean, it's one thing to have one of these conferences, but to have one every year and have each one be better than the last and to be able to dem-

onstrate to the American people that we are building on it and actually doing something with it—I mean, after that conference last year, I left here with a renewed commitment to make sure that when we passed the telecommunications bill it had the V-chip in it. I left here with a renewed sense that because of the media people that were here, that we could work with the leaders of the entertainment industry to develop a television rating system, and we did. And I believe we'll be able to get an agreement to increase the quality and quantity of educational time on television. And I believe a lot of good things will come out of this conference as well. So, for—we're indebted to them for a lot of things, but this will be a lasting legacy.

I also want to thank Dr. Erickson and Representative Purcell, Speaker Naifeh, Governor Wilder, and the other officials that are here, Attorney General Burson, Attorney General Humphrey, and State legislators from across the country. And I thank you for coming.

I'd like to begin by saying you could probably tell that we're all kind of into this, and that's a very important thing for me for you to know. I believe as we move into this new era that the people of this country are going to have more chances to live out their dreams than any generation of Americans before them. But we have to do it in a way that, number one, gives everybody a chance to live out their dreams, not just a few—or not even just many or most—but everybody who is willing to be a responsible citizen should have a chance to live out their dreams. And we have to do it in a way that brings us together, instead of dividing us.

This is an incredibly diverse country. This is an incredibly complex and diverse economy. We are being more and more drawn into a global—not just a global economy but a global society. And it is absolutely imperative that we have a commitment to dealing with these challenges in a way that increases opportunity for all and brings us together.

When Hillary and I and Al and Tipper all sort of moved into the White House, one of the things that I tried to do was to kind of get a fix on the people who were working for us. Now, a lot of people who work for the White House are young people who haven't started their families yet, and that's probably good because they work these crazy hours and they never seem to get tired. I used to be that way myself. [*Laughter*] And then a lot of people who work for us, all their children are grown, so they can accommodate bizarre schedules and long hours.

But we have a significant number of people in very responsible positions who still have children who are either school age or pre-school age. And one of the things I told them when we started this was that we were on a mission to change America for the better, but it wasn't as important as taking care of their kids, and that if they ever thought that their families were really suffering, they ought to quit, because the most important job any of us have, starting with the President, is to be a good parent. And several of them have taken me up on my admonition—[*laughter*]—sometimes at great personal loss to me.

One of the most brilliant people who ever worked in the White House, at least in the last several years, Bill Galston—a man who made an enormous contribution to our administration, full of new ideas and ways to move America into the 21st century—came to me one day and he said, "My boy keeps asking where I am. He's 10 years old. You can get somebody else to do this job; no one else can do that job. I have to go home. You said I could, and now I have to." And he did. And I think he'll never regret it.

My Deputy Chief of Staff, Erskine Bowles, whose wife went to college with Hillary—his wife is a very prominent executive in the textile industry, and her job got bigger and bigger and she was going to have to travel more. And they just had one child left at home, and he was going into his senior year. And Erskine said, you know, he said, "I just love working here. I love public service, and I don't need the money. But my boy should not be at home in his last year in high school—and I don't want him to ever wonder, not a single time, for the rest of his life, whether he was ever the most important thing in the world to his parents. And I'm going home." And he did. And his son just graduated from high school, and he's going to Princeton next year. He made the right decision.

So I say that to all of you to try to put this into some sort of context and also to try to emphasize what I was saying earlier. One of you said—one of the panelists said, "You know, we don't live to work, we work so we can live. And we hope that we find fulfillment in our work and we do good things." Politics, if you will, is one step removed from that. What

is the purpose of the national enterprise? Well, the first thing we're supposed to do is to give you a safe world to live in—no cold war but new threats, terrorism and things like that. The second thing we're supposed to do is try to help give you a safe country within which to live, safe streets and a clean environment and healthy food. The third thing we're supposed to do is to kind of create a structure of opportunity and a structure of fairness, so that everybody has a chance and we all have a chance to grow together. And if you think about the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the whole history of our Nation, it's been one long struggle to make this country a country with more opportunity, more fairness, more unity, living up to the ideals that the founders enshrined, so that people can then make all their own decisions—and most of the decisions made have nothing to do with Government—about how they're going to organize work, and hopefully the work will permit them to live good personal lives and build strong families. And that's the way I look at my job.

Now, what we have been talking about today are the worries of parenthood. It seems to me there are at least three big challenges that parents face today. Parents are worried about—to go back to what Mrs. Jordan said, even if I teach my kids good values, will something in the society and the culture change my child's life or destroy it? Will my child be subject to violence, to gangs, to drugs, to teen pregnancy? Will my child be subject, even long before that, to cultural influences or other dangers over which I basically have no control, especially if I have to work and my kid is home watching television 4 or 5 hours a day?

Dad says, "Cigarettes are bad for you, and besides that, it's illegal." Right before you get out of the car to go to school or get out of the school bus, you see this great Joe Camel ad on the billboard. You know, Joe Camel is more well-known to 6-year-olds than Bill Clinton. [*Laughter*] And more interesting looking. I mean, you know, let's face the facts. I mean, it's an interesting, brilliant strategy.

Mother says, "Son, you can't be violent. Sticks and stones can break your bones; words won't hurt you. Don't get mad; walk away." And then Mom goes to work. The kid flips on the television and watches 4 hours of people killing each other with assault weapons. So it's a challenging thing. That's what last year's conference was all about. And again, I want to take my hat off to the people in the entertainment industry who are coming to grips with this really tough problem of rating television programs.

You know, it's pretty easy to rate movies. There is a certain fixed number of them that come out every year. You just think about how many channels you have at home and how many hours a day those channels are on and how many different programs are on them, and you get an idea of the staggering task that the entertainment industry has voluntarily taken on itself so that parents, by the time we get V-chips in all these new television sets, so that parents will actually have a guide so they'll know what they're doing to program the V-chip and use it.

But it's a move in the right direction. It's what we were trying to do when our administration became the first one in history to take on the whole issue of the access of young people to exposure to tobacco advertising and sales. Now, it's illegal in every State in the country for kids to buy cigarettes. But 3,000 kids a day start smoking, and 1,000 of them are going to die sooner because of it. There is no other public health problem in America with those kinds of numbers. So we have to try to do something about it.

I want to say a special word of thanks again to Al Gore, who lost his only and beloved sister to lung cancer, for being a constant voice of conscience in our administration, for getting us to come to grips with this. This is what they call in Washington politics a character builder. It's no accident that no one else had ever done this before. And it's not a free decision. But it was the right thing to do, and we're trying to do it, to try to create a framework within which other people can build their lives.

Even the crime bill itself was designed to create a framework: the safe and drug-free schools initiative or putting 100,000 police on the streets in community policing or taking the assault weapons off the street or passing the Brady bill, which has kept 60,000 felons, fugitives, and stalkers from buying handguns in just 3 years. That's an important thing. All I can do is to create a framework within which others are going to be given the opportunity to change the culture of this country community by community.

But let me tell you, lest you grow faint-hearted, we're about to enter the 4th year in

a row of violent crime dropping in America. So don't let anybody tell you it can't be done. It can be done; we can change this. But we are a long way from home, and we still have breathtaking rates of violence among juveniles. You go back to what Robert said about young people needing to be taught to be parents and to be responsible. So I thank you for that.

When we set up this national service program, AmeriCorps, what we were trying to do was not have a Government program but to try to give people a chance, to set up a structure within which people could go out in their communities and solve their own problems. So I wanted to deal with that.

The second pressure I think parents face is increasingly financial. You heard Ms. Allen talk about that. It's no accident that, on average, families today are spending more hours at work and less hours at home than they were 25 years ago. Don't let anybody tell you that Americans aren't hard-working. We are working fools—[*laughter*]—some of us because we like it, others because we have to. But we do it; we show up. We show up. All the surveys show most people on welfare are dying to go to work. We have 1.3 million fewer people on welfare today than we did 3½ years ago, partly because we're giving the States the ability to create opportunities and then move people to work. This is a working country. But you have to be able to create a strong and secure family. Otherwise, the harder you work, the more you fall behind and the more frustrated people get.

Now, what can the Government do about that? Well, we can create a framework. We've cut the deficit in half and got interest rates down and expanded trade and invested in technology and infrastructure and education, and the American people produced almost 10 million new jobs. That's a good thing. It's a good thing. The interest rates brought mortgage rates down; we've got almost 4 million new homeowners in the last 3½ years.

But that doesn't resolve all the problems. There's still—this economy churns so much, and so many of our jobs are now being created in smaller companies where people normally are used to having less security, that we have to find ways, I believe, to reward work by giving people lifetime access to education, training, health care, and retirement.

That's what this debate in Washington is about over the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill. It would give 25 million people access to health insurance by simply saying, you don't lose your health insurance if you have to change jobs or if someone in your family has been sick. That's what insurance is for.

That's what the small-business package of pension reforms that we sent to Congress is all about. It basically says if you're a self-employed person or you work in a little business and you work for a whole series of small businesses and you're always changing jobs or you're out of work for a while, you ought to be able to take out a pension and keep it even through the bad times, and you ought not to have to wait a long time when you move from one job to the other to know that that pension is secure and seamless and continuous. As far as I know, there is no opposition in the Congress to this package in either party, and I'm hoping we can get that out.

The Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Labor worked very hard on a proposal to collapse all the job training programs in the country. Somebody loses their job; they just get a voucher worth $2,600 a year to go to the local community college or do whatever is necessary to get job training. And these are the kinds of things that we think are very important.

And the last thing I would say is that we know that the fastest growing essential in every family's budget in the last 12 years, believe it or not, was not health care, it was the cost of college—was the only thing that went up more rapidly than health care costs. So we proposed to give families a tax deduction of up to $10,000 a year for the cost of college tuition and to make the 13th and 14th years of college universally available in America by giving families a tax credit for the cost of going to a community college. So we could say to people, look, it's just not enough to have a high school diploma anymore, and if you're just coming out of high school or if you've been in the work force for years and you want to go back, everybody, 100 percent of the people ought to have guaranteed access to at least 2 years of education.

Now, these things I think will change the framework within which families have to live and work and will give them more income security and more stability. It doesn't guarantee any results, but at least it sets up a framework within which families can succeed.

The third thing, though, that we have heard a lot about today is time. A lot of people say, "I can make money, but if I do I have to give up all my time." And this is a very important thing. There are so many families, two-parent families that are working two full-time jobs and a part-time job or two. There are so many single parents who are working two jobs or working so much overtime they're worried about whether they will ever see their kids. And I think about this a lot.

You know, when Hillary and I were young parents and she had already spent many years studying all this—she took an extra year in law school to work at the Child Study Center where we were in law school so that she would know a lot about the impact of the law on children and their interests. And I'll never forget, one day I was working on something, working like crazy, and Chelsea was about a year old, and she said, "You know all that stuff they tell you about quality time," she said, "It's about half not true." She said, "Time counts; show up." [*Laughter*] You know, time counts.

And I can remember a lot of nights when I would read my daughter to sleep, and I would fall asleep before she would. And she would elbow me and say, "Dad, finish the book. Finish the book." [*Laughter*] But it meant something. Even the nights when I wasn't very good, you know, it meant something. And I'm proud to say that my daughter is about to be a senior in high school, and she can still count on one hand the number of things that I have missed over her whole life. But I'll tell you something, she hasn't forgotten a single one of them. [*Laughter*] And sometimes I hear, "You remember when I was in the second grade; we had such, and you were—" but I like that. I like that. I'm glad she felt entitled to complain.

And when Captain Bryant was talking about the videotapes—one of the great highlights of my recent life is that we did that in reverse, Captain. I was in Russia meeting with President Yeltsin when Chelsea had her junior prom, and she did a videotape so she could send a message to her dad that she was sorry that I couldn't send her off. And I thought to myself, well, that's one she didn't hold against me. And that kind of bothers me. She has reached the age when I'm not around, she doesn't hold it against me as much. But at least—[*laughter*]—at least I have a film of it.

Every person is entitled to build that memory bank. Somebody who is out there working for 6 bucks an hour in a factory, they are just as entitled to build that kind of a memory bank as the President of the United States. They're just as entitled to it.

And let me ask you also to look at this from the children's point of view. We did a great job here. All of these companies and the public employees that are here, and the people in the Federal Government who do a good job of this, we talk about how it makes for happier workers, and happier parents make more productive workers, and you make more money. And you see that immediately. But let me ask you to think about this over the long haul.

Think about the cumulative impact of all those extra stories at bedtime. Fifteen years later, you have a more literate citizenry. Think about the cumulative impact of the extra hour or two helping your child with homework. Fifteen years down the road, you have a more productive citizenry. Think about what it means to sit at your sick child's beside. By the way, sometimes they don't make it. Fifteen years from now, you have people who are freed from the bitterness of thinking that they were deprived of the right to share what life they had with their children. It may seem small, but it may mean the difference in whether you raise a whole bunch of productive citizens or self-absorbed and completely alienated people. It may make the difference in whether people, when they grow up, live lives of responsibility or lives of rage that they still—they never quite understand.

So we talked a lot of about how this can be done and you can make money today about it because people would be happy and more productive, and that's terrible important. But if you think about it in generational terms, which is how we ought to be thinking about it, it can also shape what this country looks like way into the 21st century. That's why in some ways the first bill I signed as President, the family and medical leave law, may be the most important, because of the framework it established for other people to do things.

I can tell you this, that I still talk to people all the time—about 10 days ago or so we had the Children's Miracle Network and all the children's hospitals telethon people in the White House. And I was upstairs, and they said, "Mr. President, these people are downstairs, and

would you like to go down and say hello to them?" So I did. And they had all these children who had been desperately sick—some of them were well now; some of them were still sick—and their parents, one from each State. And these kids were—they had been through a lot, and their parents had been through a lot. And most of their parents were just working people. And two of them on the way out, separately, said to me, "I do not know what I would have done without the family and medical leave law. It enabled me to take care of my child without hurting my family, without losing my job."

Twelve million people have now taken advantage of that law. And a recent study by a bipartisan commission on leave said that 9 out of 10 companies involved said the act had not cost them any money or done anything to their profits. And obviously, since—and let me put it in some larger context. I'm about to go to Europe in a couple of days to the annual meeting of the G–7 countries, the big seven economies. In the last 3½ years, those economies have created a total of 10 million jobs, 9.7 million in the United States and 300,000 in the other 6. So the family leave law did not hurt the American economy, it helped the American economy.

Now, again I say the most important thing is for us to have a framework. Then, by far, more significant would be changing the culture of America—have, as Vance Opperman said, having more companies follow the leads of the companies that are here. But I do believe that we've had a lot of time now to think about this and work on this in the last 3 years. I've listened to people talk about it. I believe there are two more changes we can make that would help the American economy, not hurt business, and strengthen families. And I want to propose them here today in the hope that you will bring us the same good fortune that you did last year with the V-chip and the telecommunications bill.

First of all, the family and medical leave law has done a lot of good, but it is extremely narrow in its purpose. In other words, you're entitled to time off without losing your job in a workplace of 50 employees or more if there's a medical crisis involving a parent or a child, an immediate family member, or the birth of a child. That's better than it used to be. But I believe, just based on—and you heard some of this today—I believe we should expand the family leave law.

I would propose that we pass a family leave II that would allow employees to take up to 24 hours a year—that's not a lot of time—for parent-teacher conferences or for routine medical care for a child, a spouse, or a parent, because there are a lot of parents who cannot go to school to see the child's teacher because the work schedule and the schedule of the school don't work. And there are a lot of times when there is a routine, what at least starts out to be a routine medical problem, where it really makes a difference if the parent can go, especially with a young child, or where there's nobody else to take the parent.

So I am very hopeful that we can get some support for this. I also think it would create a more honest workplace. I mean, I bet every one of us knows somebody who's called in sick or said they had car trouble so they could go meet with their child's teacher or take a child or a parent to the doctor. So I think that we ought to pass family leave II, and I believe it will make a difference.

Secondly, I think we need to make the workplace more family-friendly, especially where a lot of overtime is concerned, and give people more flextime in taking overtime either in income or in time with their families.

Now, traditionally, overtime has been a very important way for a lot of American workers to realize their dreams. Overtime is really the difference between a good middle class existence and being in real trouble for a lot of workers. And I don't believe we should change that. But with more Americans working more hours, simply spending time with your family can be a dream in itself: a vacation, a maternity leave that goes beyond what's mandated by law, or if the child's in trouble and you just need some time to spend time with your child.

So today what I'm proposing is that we redefine compensation in a way that reflects the value of family and community. I'm going to send to Congress a flextime initiative that will give employees this choice: If you work overtime you can be paid time and a half, just as you are now and just as the law requires. But if you want, you can take that payment in time; and for every hour you work overtime, you can take off an hour and a half. In this sense, the proposal is fundamental to redefining work time. Workers can put in time and get money, or they can put in time and get time. You can choose money in the bank or time on the clock.

It's important that this be a choice for employees. I should say that most employers in America would like this option. And there's a lot of support among employers for giving this kind of option. But it's also important how it's designed, because it will only work as a family-friendly decision if there's a genuine partnership, which means, to go back to what our friend from Saturn says, this is a case where the employee has to make the decision. And that's very important. There must be complete freedom to choose. If you're required to work overtime in your job or you're given the chance to work overtime, then you, the employee, must get the choice of whether to take the overtime in money or time. Otherwise it could simply open the door wide for abuse of the overtime laws, so that families that need the overtime income could fall behind. But if it is honestly administered and fairly given to the employee, think what a difference it could make in critical family situations.

Now, this is a case where more than anything else I think we have to change the culture. But we have to write strong protections into the law. And if you have any doubt, just look at the front page of the Wall Street Journal today, which talks about, in contrast to these companies, the widespread abuse of the overtime laws and how a lot of people are entitled to it and can't get it. So we'll have to write this law in a way that protects the employees. Otherwise, we'll have even more of what is already a problem that is bigger than the Labor Department can manage with its present resources.

But I believe it's important. We have got to develop flextime proposals that recognize that Americans have priorities at home as well as at work. But if we do this, if we give people the opportunity to earn overtime and then take it in cash or time at their discretion and if we pass family leave II so that people can do some ordinary work that is profoundly important over the life of their children or their families as well as deal with the emergencies, I believe this will be a stronger country. I believe we will have a stronger economy. I know we will have stronger children in stronger families. And that is the most important thing of all.

So let me say again, I'm very grateful to Al and Tipper Gore for doing this. It means a lot to Hillary and me just to know that they're our friends and our partners and that they share our values about this. There is nothing more important, I will say again, than doing a good job of raising our kids. I still think I did the right thing, even though I have lost some valued employees, in telling every one of them to leave if they ever thought their responsibilities at home were threatened.

The Talmud says: Every blade of grass has its angel that bends over it and whispers, "grow, grow." Our children are those blades of grass, and we must be their better angels.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. in Polk Theater at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center to participants in Family Re-Union V: Family and Work. In his remarks, he referred to conference cosponsors Martha Farrell Erickson, director, University of Minnesota Children, Youth, and Family Consortium, and Tennessee House Majority Leader Bill Purcell; Tennessee House Speaker Jimmy Naifeh; Lt. Gov. John Wilder and Attorney General Charles Burson of Tennessee; Attorney General Hubert H. Humphrey III of Minnesota; and the following conference speakers: Deloris Jordan, president and cofounder, Michael Jordan Foundation; Robert Pollard, mentor in a teen father program; Deborah Allen, single working mother; Capt. Gregory Bryant, USMC; Vance Opperman, president, West Publishing Co.; and Bob Boruff, vice president-manufacturing, Saturn Corp.

Statement on the Retirement of Archbishop Desmond Tutu

June 24, 1996

The world stood in awe as South Africa overcame apartheid to take its place as a global leader and inspiration to mankind. Archbishop Desmond Tutu epitomizes the process of triumphant, democratic transformation. A leader in both struggle and reconciliation, Archbishop

Tutu reminds us that the search for justice begins in the heart. His appeal to conscience brought out the best in all South Africans, and his leadership leaves a legacy of decency and spiritual renewal. On behalf of the American people, I extend this heartfelt tribute to Archbishop Tutu as a token of our profound respect and lasting admiration.

NOTE: This statement is the text of a message sent by the President to the retirement ceremony for Archbishop Tutu in South Africa.

Message to the Congress Reporting a Budget Deferral
June 24, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budgetary resources, totaling $7.4 million. The deferral affects the Social Security Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

June 24, 1996.

NOTE: The report detailing the deferral was published in the *Federal Register* on July 3.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Reception in New York City
June 24, 1996

Thank you very much. I want to—I sort of want to quit while I'm ahead. [*Laughter*] I've had a wonderful time. Thank you, Wynton Marsalis, and thank you, all you musicians. You were magnificent. Mr. Marsalis, you know, is probably the only great musician today who has basically proved himself a genius at both classical and jazz music. And he's a great American treasure. I'm honored to have his support and to have him here tonight. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Senator Moynihan. I never fail to learn something from Senator Moynihan. And shoot, I didn't know that no other President had a long economic expansion with very low unemployment and high inflation. I knew it was the best in 27 years; I didn't know it never happened before. [*Laughter*] They accuse me of overstatement. [*Laughter*] Senator Moynihan's my dictionary of established truth and fact in America. We have been understating the economic achievements of this administration. Thank you very much.

I always love being with Al Franken, but when I close my eyes I sometimes think that—I have this eerie experience that I'm on the same stage with Al D'Amato. [*Laughter*] He sounds more like Senator D'Amato than Senator D'Amato. [*Laughter*] You know, when Al got up here—I never know what he's going to say; that makes two of us. [*Laughter*] He made that crack about the White House not making any mistakes. I thought to myself, we're about to see one unfold right here on the podium. [*Laughter*] But if you haven't read his book, you ought to read it. It's shameless for me to say, but it's a good book for our side. If you read Al Franken's book and James Carville's book, "We're Right and They're Wrong," you know all you need to know to take you all the way to November. They'll get you through there.

I'd like to just take a few moments to speak somewhat seriously about this election. I have to speak seriously. I used to be funny, and they told me it wasn't Presidential, so I had to stop. The other day I was at one of these—an event rather like this, and there was a young boy there who was 10 years old. His father brought him. And this young man walked up and shook my hand. And just as mature as you please, he said, "Mr. President, I imagine once you become President it's rather difficult to find a joke you can tell in public, isn't it?" [*Laughter*]

Didn't crack a smile, dead serious. I said, "Well, now that you mention it, it is." He said, "Well, I've got one for you." He said, "Do you want to hear it?" I said, "Sure." He said, "Being President with this Congress is like standing in the middle of a cemetery. There's a lot of people under you, but nobody is listening." [*Laughter*] He is now the youngest member of the White House speechwriting staff, and he's cranking them out every day.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to ask you to think back just a moment to where we were 4 years ago, how we felt and where we were. The country was drifting. We had been in the midst of a long recession. Unemployment was high. We had the slowest job growth since the Great Depression. And we seemed to be coming apart as a people. I mean, look around this room. Our country is a place of fabulous diversity, and it's an enormous asset for us as we move into the global society if we figure out how to manage it. But if we don't manage it, you can see the consequences of people not getting along all over the world, can't you? Every place in the world, virtually, where there's a significant conflict today, it's based on race or ethnicity or religion or some combination of all of them, where people insist on defining themselves by who they aren't, instead of who they are.

And so all these things concern me greatly. And I got into the race for President because I felt that we needed to go full steam into the 21st century with three things clearly in mind: That we ought to keep the American dream alive for every person willing to work for it. That we ought to be a country that is coming together, not being driven apart; we ought to stop using political campaigns for cheap ways to divide us one from the other, but we ought to keep coming together. And we ought to maintain the leadership of the United States as the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity. And at the end of the cold war no one else can play those roles.

And so when I was elected with this vision, I thought that the way to do it was to use the power of Government not to guarantee results but to try to make sure we gave people the tools they needed to make the most of their own lives if they were willing to be good, responsible citizens; and to look for ways to keep drawing us together, pushing us forward, and maintaining our leadership.

Now, you've heard a little about that, but as we go into this election season it seems to me there are three central arguments for the case we have to make. Number one, we came into this job with a plan, it was executed, the results were good, and the other side fought us every step of the way. Number two, you don't have to guess in this election, unlike most. You know what I'll do, and you know what they'll do. They already did it once; I just stopped them with a veto pen. If there's no veto pen, they'll just do what they tried to do in 1995. And number three, and most important of all, we are better off than we were 4 years ago, but we can't say that our problems are solved, that we don't still have challenges. This country's transition to the 21st century, to the new economy, to the new world we're living in is a work in progress. And we need to do much more.

And just let me take those three things each in turn. It was clear to me that we needed a new approach to economic opportunity that avoided this dichotomy about whether the Government could create a recovery or was the problem and had to get out of the way. What we tried to do was to reduce the deficit; to expand trade dramatically; to continue to invest in education, technology, research, and the environment; and to do those things that would help us to support those places that had been left behind and people that had been left behind.

So we lowered taxes for 15 million working families because we didn't want them to fall back into welfare. We said, if you work 40 hours a week, you have children in the home, you ought to be lifted out of poverty by the Tax Code, not put in it. And we had an empowerment zone concept for places like the distressed area of New York City that got one to encourage people to invest private capital to put people back to work.

Now, you heard the economic results. It's important to emphasize that this program did not receive a single vote from the other side and that the leaders of the House and the Senate in the Republican Party fought it all the way. They said it would bring on a recession. They said it wouldn't reduce the deficit. John Kasich, the budget chairman from Ohio, said, "If this program were to work, I'd have to become a Democrat." I'm saving a seat for him at the Chicago convention this year. [*Laughter*]

So that's very important, because 9.7 million new jobs is nothing to denigrate. To emphasize what Senator Moynihan said, I'm about to leave in a couple days to go to France for the annual meeting of the seven big industrial powers of the world. In the last 3½ years, those 7 nations have, in total, created 10 million new jobs, 9.7 million of them in the United States of America, a quarter of a million in New York State where the unemployment rate has gone down by 2 percent.

We tried to take a serious approach to crime, to do what was already working in New York City and to try to accelerate it, 100,000 more community police, the assault weapons ban, the Brady bill, prevention programs. And by the way, the Brady bill has now kept 60,000 felons, fugitives, and stalkers from getting handguns. It was the right thing to do, and it is working in this country.

And Senator Moynihan will remember, there was bitter opposition from the leadership of the other party, primarily in the Senate where they tried to kill this crime bill with a filibuster. They tried to keep it from happening. They said it would never work; it was a waste of money; it wouldn't lower the crime rate. We're about to have the 4th year in a row where the crime rate in America is going down, led by big drops in our big cities like New York, where there's been an intelligent application of police resources in the right way doing other things that work. Don't let anybody tell you that we cannot do much, much better with the crime problem. But the strategy is working; we need to build on it. And don't forget, we did it with the opposition of the leadership of the other party, and it was bitter and strong. We were right, and they were wrong.

Let me just mention one other area, the sort of buzzword area now in Washington, welfare reform. To hear them talk about it, you'd think they discovered it. Senator Moynihan discovered the welfare problem three decades ago, and I've had the privilege of starting to work with him on it about a decade ago. In 1988, the Congress gave the President the authority to let States experiment to move people from welfare to work. While they've been talking about welfare reform, we've approved 62 of those experiments for 40 of the 50 States. More than three-quarters of the American people on welfare are already under welfare reform where they have to try to move to work. And there are 1.3 million fewer people on welfare today than there were the day I became President. And we didn't have to punish immigrant kids to get there. We did the right thing.

They say, "Well, President Clinton doesn't care about welfare reform; he vetoed our bill." I did veto their bill. I vetoed their bill because it was tough on children and weak on work. I don't have any problem, none of us do, with requiring people to move from welfare to work, but you don't want to hurt the kids. They should have child care. They should have health care. And there has to be a job there if you're just going to cut people off. So that's what I believe very strongly. That's what we need to do.

There's been a lot of talk for years in Washington, justifiably, about family values. People are concerned about the stresses families feel. But we tried to do something about it. The family and medical leave law—12 million American families have now benefited when they had a sick child, a sick parent, or a newborn, from the family and medical leave law, and the leadership of the other party fought us on it. And if you look at all the family initiatives—requiring the V-chip, and the voluntary rating system that Hollywood is developing for television to help parents with young children; the initiative to try to discourage the advertising and dissemination of cigarettes to young people, which is illegal in every State in the country. But 3,000 kids a day start to smoke; 1,000 will die early because of it. It's the big health problem of the country.

In each of these three cases we tried to do something to promote and strengthen the family in America; the leadership of the other party fought us. We were right; they were wrong. We need to keep going in this direction. This is very important to the United States.

The next point I'd like to make is—I just want to say it one more time—you don't have to guess about this election. Every election, there's a little bit of guesswork. You know, when I was running in '92 I knew a lot of the Members of Congress, they looked at me. I'd never served in Congress before. Some of them probably barely knew where my home State was on the map. We only had six electoral votes. It was a guess; they took a chance. The American people took a chance on me. The people of New York took a chance on me. I'm grateful for that.

But now you don't have to guess. You have two known quantities, two known programs. You know what I'll do, and you know what they'll do. They already did it. Like I said, I just stopped them with a veto pen. So you take the veto away, the budget I vetoed will be law within 6 months. The antienvironmental measures will be law within 6 months. The end of the commitment to put 100,000 police on the street will be law within 6 months. The abolition of the national service program, AmeriCorps, which has given—by the end of next year, will have given 96,000—or 69,000, excuse me—young people a chance to earn college credit by serving their communities and helping people solve problems at the grassroots level—it will be gone within 6 months.

So you don't have to guess. And that's really good. Do we have to do something about the entitlements problem? You bet we do. Do we have to balance the budget in a way that keeps the budget balanced in the short run and in the long run controls health care costs? Of course we do. That does not mean we have to turn Medicare into a second-class citizen and have two classes of Medicare. It does not mean we have to remove Medicaid's guarantee to children with disabilities in middle class families that would go broke if they didn't have Medicaid help or people in nursing homes or poor children or their pregnant mothers. It does not mean that. It does not mean to balance the budget you have to cut education spending when education is more important than any time in history. And it certainly doesn't mean that you have to wreck the environment. So we should remove the guesswork of this, and don't let the people of New York or any of your friends or family members anywhere in the country pretend that the future will be anything other than you know what the roadmap is.

They passed their program once, and we stopped them. If there is no veto pen and they keep the Congress and have the White House, you don't have to guess what they'll do. You know what I'll do. You know what they'll do. Hallelujah, we know. Let's show up and make our voice heard and stand up for that.

But let me also say, as you go toward the 21st century, there is more to do. There is more to do. One of the things that our economy has finally begun to do, we've finally begun to see average wages go up for the first time in 10 years. And that's very encouraging. But there's still a lot of inequality in this country. The only way to deal with it is to give people the tools they need to lift themselves through education.

If we are returned to office, our administration, working with the Congress, will finish our commitment to hook up every classroom and library in this country to the Internet by the year 2000, to democratize educational opportunities all across America. If we're returned to office, I will do everything I can to see that we are very prudent in budgeting but we do give people a tax cut for the cost of college tuition and we give a tax credit to guarantee access to community college to every American citizen. Everybody should have 2 more years of education after high school. It should become universal.

I will do what I can to make health care available and affordable so that people don't lose it when they lose their jobs or when someone in their family has been sick, to provide for access to retirement for all these people that are going into small businesses now and are having a terrible time getting it, to do what I can to extend the effort to make people able to succeed at home and at work.

Today in Nashville, Tennessee, at the Vice President and Mrs. Gore's annual family conference, I proposed that we enact a family leave law II. Today, the family leave law applies to people when there's a genuine medical emergency for a parent or a child or an immediate family member or when there's a baby born. I think it should be extended for up to 24 hours a year for routine medical visits with a parent or a child and for going to school to a child's teacher-parent conference. I think people ought to be able to go to school and see how their kids are doing in school and see their teachers. These are basic things that will enable the working families of this country to succeed at home and not to have to choose between being parents and being successful employees. These are the kinds of things I think we have to do. I also proposed today a way to give workers more option to have flexible time, to convert their overtime into cash or into time at their own choice, if it helps them with their families, but in ways that also gives greater protections to the overtime of working people.

These are the kinds of things we ought to be thinking about. And there are a lot of other issues we have to face. We've got to do something about all these toxic waste dumps. The

present Congress is not permitting us to go clean them up. We need to do it. We need a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. We need to continue the fight against terrorism. We've got important legislation in the Congress today which will enable us to take a stronger stand against Iran which is very important. We've got a lot of things out there. And what I want you to do is to go out in this next 4 months and 3 weeks and say to people, "Hey, this is an important election."

In '92, remember what the thing was? Are we going to have change, or are we going to have the status quo? The good news in this election is there is no status quo option. The bad news is, from my point of view, is one of the change options is not very attractive. You know, their argument is that Government is the problem. If you just get it out of the way, everything will be fine. If you were just on your own, left to the tender mercies of the global economy, to float out there in cyberspace, you'd do great.

I believe no great nation has ever done well without giving more and more people the opportunities to succeed if they're willing to be responsible for it. I believe we cannot do well unless we have a commitment as a nation to coming together across the lines that divide us, instead of allowing ourselves to become more divided. And I know we cannot do well unless we're continuing to stand up for peace and freedom and decency around the world. I believe these things. So you get to decide which road we're going to walk into the 21st century.

And I'll just leave you with this image. In the last 2 weeks my life and Hillary's life and Al and Tipper and all of our administration, they've sort of been dominated by flames—that and conversations with Eleanor. [*Laughter*] But I want you to think about—well, at least she's from New York, you ought to draw some pleasure from that. [*Laughter*] I want you to think about this, because this is what we've done the last 2 weeks. We've worried about church burnings, and we've celebrated the Olympics. You saw it. I mean, I went down to South Carolina to dedicate a little church. It was way down a country road. The church gets burned down; they rebuild it a mile away. I really identify with that. My great-grandparents are buried 5 or 6 miles down a country road in Arkansas in a little country churchyard almost exactly the size—the church is almost exactly the size of that little church that burned down I saw in South Carolina. And I would be ripped out of my mind with anger if anybody had burned that little church down where my great-grandparents, with whom I often stayed as a little child, are buried.

We've had a tripling of church burnings in the last year and a half, a lot of synagogues desecrated, two or three Islamic centers burned. And even, believe it or not, there's been a big uptick in the burning of white churches, although not nearly as many have been burned as African-American churches.

And I don't think it's a conspiracy. But I think it manifests, in the extreme behavior of some people, a trend in the society to become more intolerant of people who are different from us and to believe that people who are really different from us are sort of subhuman and it's okay to do just about whatever you want. I mean, after all, this country got started by people looking for religious liberty. It is the first amendment. The idea of desecrating a church, a synagogue, a mosque, a Hindu temple, any religious institution in America, violates the core of what it means to be an American. And it can only be done by people who really believe that the people they're burning out are basically lower than they are in the human food chain.

On the other hand, we welcomed the Olympic torch to the White House, where it burned overnight and then left the next morning. The Olympic torch was carried by thousands and thousands of Americans of all races and ages and walks of life, the able, the disabled. And they were all picked for one reason. Every one of them had one thing in common: They were good citizens of this country; they represented the best of this country.

In Nevada, a 74-year-old woman, who took 100 children who had been abandoned by their own parents into her home, carried that torch for a kilometer. When the torch came into the White House, it was carried first by a Catholic nun who devoted her life to serving the poor and the disadvantaged, and then by the first deaf president of America's deaf university, Gallaudet University in Washington, Dr. I. King Jordan, who, just a few days after he delivered the Olympic torch to me at the age of—I think he's 56 or 58—was going to run a 100-mile race.

The next morning we sent the Olympic torch on its way to Atlanta, first with a man named

Lang Brown and 12 children. He's African-American, but these children were African-American, Hispanic, and white, all troubled kids, all had really had difficult lives. This man is devoting his life to rescuing them one by one. He gave the torch to me, and I gave it to Carla McGhee, a woman who is on our Olympic basketball team. She was recruited for the University of Tennessee, was in a terrible wreck, was almost dead. Her body was broken and destroyed. And her will was so strong to come back that she wound up, against all medical predictions, returning to her team and helping it to win a national championship.

Now, you've got to figure out which torch America's going to be identified with. So I leave you with that. I think this is the country of the Olympic torch where citizens who are real citizens are the heroes of America. I believe that the 21st century will give the young people in this audience more possibilities to live out their dreams than any time in human history. But we have to make the right decisions. More opportunity for people who are responsible, a deeper commitment to bringing our people together, an understanding that we have to continue to stick up for peace and freedom in the world, those are the decisions I ask you to make sure we make in November.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:37 p.m. at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to comedian Al Franken. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks Announcing Support for a Constitutional Amendment on Victims' Rights

June 25, 1996

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and let me thank you all for being here. Thank you, Senator Kyl and Senator Feinstein, for your ground-breaking work here. Thank you, Senator Exon; my longtime friend Senator Heflin. Thank you, Congressman Frost, Congressman Stupak, Congressman Orton.

I thank all the representatives here of the victims community, the law enforcement community. I thank the Attorney General and John Schmidt and Aileen Adams and Bonnie Campbell for doing such a fine job at the Justice Department on all criminal justice issues. I thank the Vice President and, especially, I want to thank Roberta Roper and the other members of the National Movement for Victims' Advocacy. Mr. Roper, thank you for coming. Thank you, John and Pat Byron; thank you, Marc Klaas; and thank you, Pam McClain. And especially, John Walsh, thank you for spending all of these years to bring these issues to America's attention. Thank you, sir.

I'd also like to say a special word of thanks to the person who did more than any other person in the United States to talk me through all the legal and practical matters that have to be resolved in order for the President to advocate amending our Constitution: former prosecutor and a former colleague of mine, Governor Bob Miller of Nevada. Thank you, sir, for your work here.

For years, we have worked to make our criminal justice system more effective, more fair, more even-handed, more vigilant in the protection of the innocent. Today, the system bends over backwards to protect those who may be innocent, and that is as it should be. But it too often ignores the millions and millions of people who are completely innocent because they're victims, and that is wrong. That is what we are trying to correct today.

When someone is a victim, he or she should be at the center of the criminal justice process, not on the outside looking in. Participation in all forms of government is the essence of democracy. Victims should be guaranteed the right to participate in proceedings related to crimes committed against them. People accused of crimes have explicit constitutional rights. Ordinary citizens have a constitutional right to participate in criminal trials by serving on a jury. The press has a constitutional right to attend trials. All of this is as it should be. It is only the victims of crime who have no constitutional

right to participate, and that is not the way it should be.

Having carefully studied all the alternatives, I am now convinced that the only way to fully safeguard the rights of victims in America is to amend our Constitution and guarantee these basic rights: to be told about public court proceedings and to attend them; to make a statement to the court about bail, about sentencing, about accepting a plea if the victim is present; to be told about parole hearings to attend and to speak; notice when the defendant or convict escapes or is released; restitution from the defendant; reasonable protection from the defendant; and notice of these rights.

If you have ever been a victim of a violent crime—it probably wouldn't even occur to you that these rights could be denied if you've never been a victim. But actually, it happens time and time again. It happens in spite of the fact that the victims' rights movement in America has been an active force for about 20 years now.

The wife of a murdered State trooper in Maryland is left crying outside the courtroom for the entire trial of her husband's killers, because the defense subpoenaed her as a witness just to keep her out and never even called her. A rape victim in Florida isn't notified when her rapist is released on parole. He finds her and kills her.

Last year in New Jersey, 8-year-old Jakiyah McClain was sexually assaulted and brutally murdered. She had gone to visit a friend and never came home. Police found her in the closet of an abandoned apartment; now, her mother wants to use a New Jersey law that gives the murder victims' survivors the right to address a jury deciding on the death penalty. She wants the jury to know more about this fine young girl than the crime scene reports. She wants them to know that Jakiyah was accepted into a school for gifted children the day before she died. But a New Jersey judge decided she can't testify even though the State law gave her the right to do so. He ruled that the defendant's constitutional right to a fair trial required him to strike the law down.

Well, Jakiyah's mother had the courage to overcome her pain to be with us today. We have to change this for her and for other victims in America. Thank you, and God bless you.

The only way to give victims equal and due consideration is to amend the Constitution. For nearly 20 years I have been involved in the fight for victims' rights, since I was attorney general in my home State. We passed laws then to guarantee victims' rights to attend trials and to get restitutions and later to get notice and to participate in parole hearings. Over all those years, I learned what every victim of crime knows too well: As long as the rights of the accused are protected but the rights of victims are not, time and again, the victims will lose.

When a judge balances defendants' rights in the Federal Constitution against victims' rights in a statute or a State constitution, the defendants' rights almost always prevail. That's just how the law works today. We want to level the playing field. This is not about depriving people accused of crimes of their legitimate rights, including the presumption of innocence; this is about simple fairness. When a judge balances the rights of the accused and the rights of the victim, we want the rights of the victim to get equal weight. When a plea bargain is entered in public, a criminal is sentenced, a defendant is let out on bail, the victim ought to know about it and ought to have a say.

I want to work with the congressional leadership, the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, including Senators Kyl and Feinstein and Chairman Hyde and law enforcement officials, to craft the best possible amendment. It should guarantee victims' rights in every court in the land, Federal, State, juvenile, and military. It should be self-executing so that it takes effect as soon as it's ratified without additional legislation. Congress will take responsibility to enforce victims' rights in Federal courts, and the States will keep responsibility to enforce them in State courts, but we need the amendment.

I also want to say, just before I go forward, again I want to thank Senators Kyl and Feinstein and the others who have approached this in a totally bipartisan manner. This is a cause for all Americans. When people are victimized, the criminal almost never asks before you're robbed or beaten or raped or murdered: Are you a Republican or a Democrat? This is a matter of national security just as much as the national security issues beyond our borders on which we try to achieve a bipartisan consensus. And I applaud the nonpolitical and patriotic way in which this matter has been approached in the Congress, just like it's approached every day in the country, and we ought to do our best to keep it that way.

We know that there can be, with any good effort, unforeseen consequences. We think we know what they would likely be, and we believe we know how to guard against them. We certainly don't want to make it harder for prosecutors to convict violent criminals. We sure don't want to give criminals like gang members, who may be victims of their associates, any way to take advantage of these rights just to slow the criminal justice process down.

We want to protect victims, not accidentally help criminals. But we can solve these problems. The problems are not an excuse for inaction. We still have to go forward.

Of course, amending the Constitution can take a long time. It may take years. And while we work to amend it, we must do everything in our power to enhance the protection of victims' rights now. Today I'm directing the Attorney General to hold the Federal system to a higher standard than ever before, to guarantee maximum participation by victims under existing law and to review existing legislation to see what further changes we ought to make.

I'll give you an example. There ought to be, I believe, in every law, Federal and State, a protection for victims who participate in the criminal justice process not to be discriminated against on the job because they have to take time off. That protection today is accorded to jury members; it certainly ought to extend to people who are victims who need to be in the criminal justice process. And we shouldn't wait for that kind of thing to be done.

I want investigators and prosecutors to take the strongest steps to include victims. I want work to begin immediately to launch a computerized system so victims get information about new developments in a case, in changes in the status or the location of a defendant or a convict.

I do not support amending the Constitution lightly. It is sacred. It should be changed only with great caution and after much consideration. But I reject the idea that it should never be changed. Change it lightly, and you risk its distinction. But never change it, and you risk its vitality.

I have supported the goals of many constitutional amendments since I took office, but in each amendment that has been proposed during my tenure as President, I have opposed the amendment either because it was not appropriate or not necessary. But this is different. I want to balance the budget, for example, but the Constitution already gives us the power to do that. What we need is the will and to work together to do that. I want young people to be able to express their religious convictions in an appropriate manner wherever they are, even in a school, but the Constitution protects people's rights to express their faith.

But this is different. This is not an attempt to put legislative responsibilities in the Constitution or to guarantee a right that is already guaranteed. Amending the Constitution here is simply the only way to guarantee that victims' rights are weighted equally with defendants' rights in every courtroom in America.

Two hundred twenty years ago, our Founding Fathers were concerned, justifiably, that Government never, never trample on the rights of people just because they are accused of a crime. Today, it's time for us to make sure that while we continue to protect the rights of the accused, Government does not trample on the rights of the victims.

Until these rights are also enshrined in our Constitution, the people who have been hurt most by crime will continue to be denied equal justice under law. That's what this country is really all about, equal justice under law. And crime victims deserve that as much as any group of citizens in the United States ever will.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:11 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to the following parents who lost children in violent attacks: Roberta and Vincent Roper; John and Pat Byron; Marc Klaas; Pam McClain; and John Walsh. The President signed a related memorandum on crime victims' rights on June 27.

Memorandum on the Development of a National Sexual Offender Registration System
June 25, 1996

Memorandum for the Attorney General

Subject: Development of a National Sexual Offender Registration System

One of the most important duties of government is to provide safety and protection for our children from sexual offenders. Sex crimes and sex offender recidivism present very real and substantial challenges to law enforcement in protecting vulnerable populations and preventing crime. Law enforcement data show that, as a group, sex offenders are significantly more likely than other repeat offenders to commit additional sex crimes or other violent crimes, and that tendency persists over time.

One of the most significant provisions in the "Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994" (Crime Bill) was the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act (Wetterling Act). It promotes the establishment by States of effective registration systems for child molesters and other sexually violent offenders.

In addition, I recently signed "Megan's Law," which builds upon the Crime Bill by making community notification concerning registered sex offenders mandatory. Megan's Law will require States to make public relevant information about child molesters and sexually violent offenders who are released from prison or placed on parole.

Sex offender registration systems can greatly assist the investigation of sex crimes. In addition, creation of State-based registration systems is crucial for enabling State law enforcement agencies to communicate with each other regarding sex offenders who cross State lines. When sex offenders move, the law should move with them.

It is time to take the next step. That is why I am directing the Department of Justice to develop a plan for the implementation of a national sexual predator and child molester registration system. This system should build upon the Wetterling Act—which is already establishing 50 separate sex offender registration and notification systems—by combining this information into a national system.

I want the Department to work with all 50 States, the Congress, the Judiciary, and all appropriate Federal agencies on a plan for such a system so that law enforcement officers at every level will have access to information on all sexual offenders in the United States and share this information with one another.

Please report to me in writing by August 20, 1996, on the specific steps you will take to develop this policy. Thank you for all the work you and the Department have done to date, and for the work it will take to put this important piece in place.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Remarks on the Terrorist Attack in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia
June 25, 1996

An explosion occurred this afternoon at the United States military housing complex near Dhahran, Saudi Arabia.

Our best information at this time is that there are many injured. There have been fatalities. We do not yet know how many. The explosion appears to be the work of terrorists, and if that is the case, like all Americans, I am outraged by it.

The cowards who committed this murderous act must not go unpunished. Within a few hours, an FBI team will be on its way to Saudi Arabia to assist in the investigation. Our condolences and our prayers go out to the victims' families and their friends. We're grateful for the professionalism shown by the Saudi authorities in their reaction to this emergency. We are ready to

work with them to make sure those responsible are brought to justice.

Let me say again, we will pursue this. America takes care of our own. Those who did it must not go unpunished.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:22 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. The related proclamation of June 26 honoring the victims of the bombing in Saudi Arabia is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Memorandum on the Combined Federal Campaign
June 25, 1996

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: 1996 Combined Federal Campaign of the National Capital Area

I am delighted that the Secretary of the Treasury Robert E. Rubin has agreed to serve as the chair of the 1996 Combined Federal Campaign of the National Capital Area. I ask you to support the campaign by personally chairing it in your Agency and appointing a top official as your vice chair.

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

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

BILL CLINTON

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

Remarks on the Terrorist Attack in Saudi Arabia and an Exchange With Reporters
June 26, 1996

The President. Good morning. As I leave for the G–7 summit, which is the fourth of my Presidency, I want to say a few words about yesterday's outrageous attack on Americans in Saudi Arabia. First, I ask every American to take a moment today to say a prayer for the victims and their families and to rededicate ourselves to the fight against terrorism.

Let me now tell you what we know, what we do not know, and what we are doing about the attack. Here's what we know about what happened: Saudi police were immediately suspicious of a truck which was parked outside the security perimeter of our base. They alerted an American patrol and began to warn the occupants of nearby buildings. As our patrol approached the truck, two of its occupants fled, and shortly thereafter, the bomb exploded. No person or group has claimed responsibility for the attack yet, and we do not know who is responsible yet.

As of this moment, 19 are confirmed dead, all Americans. Eighty people have been seriously wounded, including some non-Americans, and more than 200 people were treated for minor injuries. Secretary of State Christopher will fly to Saudi Arabia today. Last night, I directed an FBI team of 40 experts, investigators and forensic experts, to go there to work with the Saudi Arabian authorities. We deeply appreciate the cooperation of the Saudi Government.

Now as I head to Lyons, my first order of business will be to focus the strength and the energy of the G–7 on the continuing fight against terrorism. Let me be very clear: We will not rest in our efforts to find who is respon-

sible for this outrage, to pursue them, and to punish them. Anyone who attacks one American attacks every American, and we protect and defend our own.

This attack underscores the struggle of all those who share tolerance and freedom and security. Our struggle at the end of the cold war is to deal with these new perils: the rogue states like Iran and Iraq; the smugglers who would poison our children with drugs; those who deal in sophisticated weapons or weapons of mass destruction, chemical, biological and nuclear; terrorists who strike not just in Saudi Arabia but in the subways of Tokyo, in the streets of London, in the Holy Land, and in America's heartland—usually people in the paralyzing grip of religious, ethnic, and racial hatred.

To meet these threats, last year the G–7 in Halifax and then, at the United Nations General Assembly, the United States launched initiatives to fight international organized crime, drug trafficking, nuclear smuggling, and terrorism. Now at Lyons, we expect to expand that work, and we expect to see very practical results, including a package of 40 specific recommendations to combat terrorism. Defeating these organized forces of destruction is one of the most important challenges our country faces at the end of this century and the beginning of the next.

The G–7 is primarily an economic group. We've worked hard to advance our economic security, and compared to 4 years ago, we're much better off. We know we still have a long way to go. But I will say to my partners there what I say to my fellow Americans today: We cannot have economic security in a global economy unless we can stand against these forces of terrorism. The United States will lead the way, and we expect our allies to walk with us hand-in-hand. We cannot tolerate this kind of conduct.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, in light of the possibility that the bombing was carried out by people who don't want American and Western forces on Arab soil, do you feel the need to reaffirm the mission to the American people?

The President. Well, first of all, I believe that the United States has been made very welcome there. We have tried not to be an obtrusive presence. We have worked in close partnership with the Saudis for a long time, since the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt. And I think it would be a mistake for the United States to basically change its mission because of this.

We are there at the invitation of the Saudi Government and in partnership with the Saudi Government. I am reluctant to comment on what the possible motives of this act are and whether it was directed primarily against us because we're Americans or simply because we're there in partnership with this government.

I had a good talk with King Fahd yesterday who expressed his deep regret at our loss and his determination to find those responsible, and I believe that we should wait until we know who did this and what their motives were to say more. But I believe the United States mission in the Middle East is important, and it is supportive of countries that support the peace process, and I believe that we should continue on that mission.

Q. Mr. President, will the FBI be able to conduct an independent investigation?

Q. Are you going to Saudi Arabia, Mr. President?

The President. On the question of going to Saudi Arabia, at this time I have no plans to do it. If we change our plans, I'll let you know. As I'm sure you know, I have been there since I've been President. My heart is there today and has been. It is difficult to think about anything else but our people in uniform there, and especially those whose lives were lost, and their families. But I do not want to be in the way of the attempt to take care of all of the people there and to get this investigation off to a good start.

If something happens that makes me think it's appropriate for me to go, I will let you know at the earliest possible time.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:01 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to his departure for Lyons, France. In his remarks, he referred to King Fahd bin Abd al-Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia. The proclamation of June 26 honoring the victims of the bombing in Saudi Arabia is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Aeronautics and Space
June 26, 1996

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit this report on the Nation's achievements in aeronautics and space during fiscal year 1995, as required under section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476). Aeronautics and space activities involved 14 contributing departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and the results of their ongoing research and development affect the Nation in many ways.

A wide variety of aeronautics and space developments took place during fiscal year 1995. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) successfully completed seven Space Shuttle flights. A Shuttle program highlight was the docking of the Shuttle *Atlantis* with the Russian space station *Mir*.

NASA launched three Expendable Launch Vehicles (ELV), while the Department of Defense (DOD) successfully conducted five ELV launches. These launches included satellites to study space physics, track Earth's weather patterns, and support military communications. In addition, there were 12 commercial launches carried out from Government facilities that the Office of Commercial Space Transportation (OCST), within the Department of Transportation (DOT), licensed and monitored.

NASA continued the search for a more affordable space launch system for the coming years with its Reusable Launch Vehicle program. NASA hopes to develop new kinds of launch technologies that will enable a private launch industry to become financially feasible.

In aeronautics, activities included development of technologies to improve performance, increase safety, reduce engine noise, and assist U.S. industry to be more competitive in the world market. Air traffic control activities focused on various automation systems to increase flight safety and enhance the efficient use of airspace.

Scientists made some dramatic new discoveries in various space-related fields. Astronomers gained new insights into the size and age of our universe in addition to studying our solar system. Earth scientists continued to study the complex interactions of physical forces that influence our weather and environment and reached new conclusions about ozone depletion. Agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as well as the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, used remote-sensing technologies to better understand terrestrial changes. Microgravity researchers conducted studies to prepare for the long-duration stays of humans that are planned for the upcoming International Space Station.

International cooperation, particularly with Russia, occurred in a variety of aerospace areas. In addition to the Shuttle-*Mir* docking mission and the Russian partnership on the International Space Station, U.S. and Russian personnel also continued close cooperation on various aeronautics projects.

Thus, fiscal year 1995 was a very successful one for U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in these areas have contributed significantly to the Nation's scientific and technical knowledge, international cooperation, a healthier environment, and a more competitive economy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 26, 1996.

Remarks to the Citizens of Perouges, France
June 27, 1996

Mayor de la Chapelle; Mayor Bussy; Prefect Ritter; to Mr. Mavereaux, the president of the local veterans association; to Henri Girousse; to all the World War II veterans who are here; to members of Parliament; especially to the children and the teachers of Perouges and Meximieux; to my fellow Americans: Let me begin by saying that Hillary and I and our party

are very, very pleased to be here in Perouges today, to be so warmly welcomed by you, and especially to be here with all the schoolchildren. Thank you very much. I would like to say a special word of thanks to the very large number of members of Parliament who are here and to the military band for providing such excellent music today.

Mayor de la Chapelle, I know that your ancestor Pierre fought in our Revolutionary War and even advised our first President, George Washington. So, Mr. Mayor, I'm glad to be here with you today, and I would be happy to have any advice you might have for me today. [*Applause*] Thank you.

Americans have been at home here since our soldiers trained together during World War I and our people fought together in the final days of World War II. I am glad to be here to renew our friendship with the people of Perouges, as we stand on the brink of a new century and an age of great possibility for the children who are here.

As we drove from Lyons, Perouges rose in the distance, its great ramparts crowned by your beautiful church tower and tile roofs. Then we discovered the cobblestone streets, the narrow lanes, the hand-painted signs, the sundials, the drinking wells. The sense of timelessness is so strong in this beautiful place it is easy to forget that the story of Perouges is also the story of change. Weavers, craftsmen, and farmers once made this town a great medieval trading center. A century ago, the railroad passed you by and people began to leave. But then artists, historians, and ordinary citizens worked with government to establish your community as a historic monument. And ever since, the history you have preserved here has brought people like me from all around the world and allowed this wonderful community to thrive.

We should all learn from this lesson. Today the world we live in is changing faster than ever. While more and more people prosper in this new global economy, others struggle without the proper education and training. While new technologies and rapid movements of information and money and people across national borders bring all of us closer together, they also make all of us more open to common dangers: crime, drug trafficking, and terrorism, as we saw in Saudi Arabia, where 19 Americans were killed and many more were wounded. And I thank you, Mr. Mayor, for that moment of silence in their memory.

To meet these challenges, we must show strength and steadiness and judgment and flexibility. We must meet our challenges and protect our values, just as you have here. That is what this G–7 meeting is all about, because I know that if we all work together, we can keep the world economy growing so that more and more of our people have the opportunity to make the most of their own lives. And if we all work together, we can face these terrible new threats to our security successfully.

Terrorism is on our minds today because of the cowardly bombing in Saudi Arabia. So let me repeat what I said yesterday to the American people: We will not rest in our efforts to discover who is responsible, to track them down, and to bring them to justice. My friends, we must rally the forces of tolerance and freedom everywhere to work against terrorism, just as we are working together for peace in Bosnia today with the strong leadership of France and President Chirac.

Last year the United States launched an international initiative to fight terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking, and nuclear smuggling. Here in Lyons, I expect the G–7 nations to adopt 40 very specific recommendations to combat crime and terror, to increase our efforts to prevent terrorists from committing their crimes and our ability to track, catch, and punish them when they do. The future of the children here depends upon our success in this effort.

Fifty-two years ago the French Resistance worked here in common cause with American GI's to win your freedom back. Now we must join together to face down the new threats to our freedom. Your unshakable devotion to freedom is literally rooted here in the heart of your town in this mighty linden tree, which was planted just over 200 years ago during the French Revolution. You call it the Tree of Liberty. Today's threats to the liberty your tree symbolizes are very different from those of 200 years ago, different from the threats of World War II or the cold war, but they are real, and we must face them. We must face them so that the children here today will enter the 21st century free and secure, with the greatest opportunity to live out their dreams of any generation in human history. That is my dream. It is one I hope we all share.

Thank you very much. God bless America, and *vive la France*.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. at Liberty Place. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Guy Passarat de la Chapelle of Perouges, France; Mayor Christian Bussy of Meximieux, France; and Philippe Ritter, Prefect of the Ain.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Jacques Chirac of France in Lyons

June 27, 1996

Terrorist Attack in Saudi Arabia

Q. Mr. President, is there any way the tragedy in Saudi Arabia could have been avoided, given the history of terrorism in the Middle East, especially in the aftermath of the agency bombing in Beirut? Why weren't those airmen protected?

President Clinton. Well, as you know, they were behind a fence that gave them a 35-yard cushion, and the bomb was just bigger than anyone calculated could be gotten in that close to the building.

So I think the casualties were far smaller than they would have been had not the security precautions been taken. But you may be sure that the Defense Department and the others who are in charge of this are reviewing the security operations to see what else should be done, to see if we can even do better in the future.

Q. Is there any indication yet who is responsible for that?

President Clinton. We're working on it, but I don't want to announce a conclusion until I know what the facts are. We're working very hard, and so are the Saudis. And I want to thank, I might say if I could, I'd like to thank President Chirac for his expression of condolences and support for the United States. And he said to me—and I hope that you will have some statement coming out later today.

President Chirac. I just want to say to the American press how deeply horrified the French people were at this barbaric act that has been perpetrated in Saudi Arabia. And I can assure you that you have the heartfelt condolences of France to the families of the victims and those who have been wounded and to the American people.

NOTE: The exchange began at 3 p.m. at the Prefecture. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom in Lyons, France

June 27, 1996

Terrorist Attack in Saudi Arabia

Q. Mr. President, what do you do if you discover that there was a state sponsorship behind the Saudi Arabian incident? What happens?

President Clinton. Well, I will take whatever action I believe is appropriate based on what the facts are. But let's wait until we see what the facts are.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—has said that there was intellectually a very strong case for the bombers. What is your reaction to that?

Prime Minister Major. I haven't seen the context of what he said, but I can see no case, intellectual or any other sort of case, for the sort of activity in Dhahran. It is indefensible by any tenet.

Q. Do you think there are further measures which you can agree here jointly with the other leaders to combat both the sort of terrorism

you saw in Dhahran and also that we saw in Manchester from the IRA last week?

President Clinton. I do.

Prime Minister Major. So do I.

Q. Like what?

Prime Minister Major. Well, we have some——

President Clinton. Well—go ahead, please.

Prime Minister Major. We had some ideas discussed. We had some British ideas. I understand there are some American ideas. We will discuss them bilaterally, I'm sure, and we will discuss them with our colleagues. But I think we will probably unveil them after the discussions.

Q. Mr. President, you were going to talk about your ideas?

President Clinton. No, I was just going to say that we have already agreed on a number of things that we will do together to deal with the problems of international crime that specifically bear on terrorism. And we may come up now with some other things that we can do together.

But I think all of us understand that terrorism is a problem from which no one can hide and on which we must all cooperate. We have had terrorism in the United Kingdom, we have had terrorism in the United States, had this awful attack in Dhahran, had the problem in the Tokyo subway. This is the security challenge of the 21st century, I'm afraid, and we have to get after it.

Extraterritorial Impact of Sanctions

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, are you concerned about the U.S. efforts to impose sanctions on foreign companies that deal with Iran and Libya and Cuba? Is this a problem you're discussing——

Prime Minister Major. I don't think that's a—I don't think that's particularly a G–7 subject. It's a matter I have no doubt will come up in discussions at some stage.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:21 p.m. at the Sofitel Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan in Lyons, France

June 27, 1996

Terrorism

Q. Mr. President, now that you have had the chance to meet with a few European leaders, do you get any sense that they would be more willing to crack down on Iran and other nations that are known to sponsor terrorism and perhaps not have business dealings and other dealings with them?

President Clinton. Well, let me say I think they're going to support a lot of the recommendations we have made, as far as cooperation. I believe they will be willing to do more. We now know that no one can hide from terrorism. We've had terrorist attacks in Japan, in the United States, Great Britain, of course now the terrible incident in Saudi Arabia. So I believe we will see a high level of support for common activities.

Q. Does that include, perhaps, other nations ceasing economic activity?

President Clinton. Well, let's wait and see. You know what my position is on that, so we'll just keep working on it.

Q. Prime Minister Hashimoto, is there any possibility that you would agree to an extension of the U.S.-Japan semiconductor agreement that is scheduled to expire at the end of July?

Prime Minister Hashimoto. Before going to that question, I would like to add a few words to what President Clinton has just said. On the moment I saw President Clinton in the lobby, the first words that I said to him was my sincerest condolences to the deceased and their families that—in the tragic incident in Saudi Arabia.

This was painful enough for me to think about as we were approaching Lyons, and on the moment we arrived in Lyons we heard of another tragic incident concerning Israel. We must eliminate terrorism. We must make utmost ef-

forts to eliminate terrorism. It's our common enemy.

And also on this question—the leaders will have discussion and whatever ideas the President may have on this subject we would like to extend as much cooperation as possible. I expect Bill to make some comments on this subject at the dinner we're having this evening, for example. We will support the President as much as possible with our utmost might.

And you mentioned semiconductors. If I may add a few items to that, we do have insurance and also the passenger talks concerning the civil aviation. We are meeting today to try to solve those issues. We are not here to fight over those issues. I believe that we can find a solution. Both sides have to make compromises.

President Clinton. Thank you.

Q. So you might agree to extend the agreement?

President Clinton. It's time to go to work.

Q. So you won't say whether you're going to extend the agreement or not?

President Clinton. We have to go to work.

Prime Minister Hashimoto. But we will have to work on that.

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:30 p.m. at the Sofitel Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks With President Jacques Chirac of France on the G–7 Response to Terrorism and an Exchange With Reporters in Lyons

June 27, 1996

President Chirac. Ladies and gentlemen, this press point is, in fact, to explain to you that we changed our agenda at the G–7. We all together were united in condemning the dreadful bombing that has taken place and the fact that the United States and Saudi Arabia have fallen victim to this appalling event. We expressed our deepest sympathy to the President of the United States and the people of the United States as well. And we decided to place terrorism on our agenda as the very first point for discussion and to prepare a communique in order to fight this scourge. This is a communique which you will be receiving at the close of this pre-press conference, so that you can see the top priority that we assign to fighting terrorism.

We've also agreed to convene a ministerial conference in about 3 weeks time which will be attended by the ministers of foreign affairs and ministers responsible for security at the level of the eight countries meeting here. And this is all designed to identify the steps which will bolster our fight against terrorism.

President Clinton. I want to thank President Chirac and my other G–7 colleagues for their very powerful statements and their expression of sympathy to the victims and their families.

We have once again stood united against terrorism. We understand that an attack on one of us is an attack on all of us and that none of us is invulnerable. Attacks of terror can occur anywhere, whether in a Paris metro station or in Manchester or the subway in Tokyo or the World Trade Center or the Oklahoma City Federal Building. This latest act of outrage reminds us of one of the great burdens of the modern world.

As we become more open, as our borders become freer to cross, as we can move information and money and people and material across national boundaries more quickly, we all become more vulnerable to terrorists, to the organized forces of destruction, to those who live to kill for ethnic or racial or religious reasons, especially. And I want to emphasize that I am convinced that the G–7 leaders are every bit as determined as I am to take stronger action.

In the next day or two we will be discussing, as I said earlier, 40 specific actions we can take to try to protect our borders, to try to stop the illegal weapons trade, to try to stop the money laundering and illegal currency transactions, to try to protect the witnesses and others who support our efforts to crack terrorists and their operations. And then President Chirac, in suggesting this ministerial, has given us the chance to try to come up with even more specific steps that will involve, we hope, even more people rallying to our cause.

This is a very sad day for the United States. I have been very moved by the deep and genuine expressions of condolence by the President of France and the other leaders here. But I have been even more moved by the determination that they have shared with me in common to take stronger stands against terrorism, to prevail and not to give in. That is the message we want to go out to the world tonight.

Thank you.

Terrorist Attack in Saudi Arabia

Q. Mr. President, is there anything tonight that you discussed that might have an effect on the type of bombing that took place in Saudi Arabia, any difference in approach that that bombing——

President Clinton. Well, among the things we are looking at, for our next statement on this and for the ministerial meeting, is the question of whether we can do more to help each other protect our people against larger and more powerful explosives, and perhaps even more important, whether we can do more to detect them.

If you will recall, when we had the terrible bomb explosions in Israel several weeks before the election, one of the things that I did was to send to the people of Israel the latest detection equipment that we had to try to aid them in finding people who had explosives on their persons or in their cars. And we believe that made a contribution to their endeavors.

So one of the things that we are going to do is to try to figure out how much more we can do in the area of prevention and how much more we can do in the area of detection of explosives, which are becoming the weapon of choice for terrorists all around the world.

Extraterritorial Impact of Sanctions

Q. President Clinton and President Chirac, in your discussions this evening did Helms-Burton and the pending legislation involving Libya and Iran come up, and if so, did you detect any change of views on the subjects?

President Clinton. We did not discuss that at all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 10:50 p.m. at the Prefecture. President Chirac spoke in French, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A portion of this exchange could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Memorandum on Crime Victims' Rights

June 27, 1996

Memorandum for the Attorney General

Subject: Renewing Our Commitment to Crime Victims

We have made tremendous progress over the last 3 years in reducing crime and making America safer. Nonetheless, crime continues to affect the lives of millions of Americans, greatly diminishing their sense of safety and security.

For too long, the rights and needs of crime victims and witnesses have been overlooked in the criminal justice system. Through the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, we have begun to address this problem. But those important measures are not enough.

As important as the protections those laws provide are, they do not—and cannot—give victims equal status with the accused. That's the next step we need to take.

I strongly believe that victims should be central participants in the criminal justice system, and that it will take a constitutional amendment to give the rights of victims the same status as the rights of the accused. In the interim, I want my Administration to do everything possible to ensure that victims' rights are respected and that victims' participation in the criminal justice process is encouraged and facilitated. Our Federal investigators and prosecutors should not simply comply with the letter of the law, they should also fulfill the spirit of the law.

That is why I am directing you to take a number of important steps that will improve the treatment of victims in the Federal, State, military, and juvenile criminal justice systems.

First, I am directing you to undertake a system-wide review and to take all necessary steps to provide for full victim participation in Federal criminal proceedings. I want you to hold the Federal system to a higher standard of victims' rights than ever before. In particular, I want you to adopt a nationwide automated victim information and notification system so that we can better inform and protect crime victims.

Second, I would like you to work with other Federal agencies whose missions involve them with crime victims in order to ensure that a common and comprehensive baseline of participation for victims can be achieved.

Third, I want you to review existing Federal statutes to see what further changes ought to be made. For example, I would like you to consider legislation that would prohibit employers from dismissing or disciplining employees who are victims of crime and whose participation as victims in criminal proceedings requires them to take time away from their employment.

Finally, I want you to work with State officials—governors, attorneys general, legislators, district attorneys, and judges—and victims' rights advocates to identify the needs, challenges, best practices, and resources necessary to help achieve a uniform national baseline of protections for victims. The Department of Justice should provide technical assistance to State and local law enforcement, as well as other Federal agencies, and serve as a national clearinghouse for information about the most effective approaches to realizing fully the rights of victims of violent crime.

To achieve these objectives, I expect you to identify funding needs where and as appropriate. Please report to me in writing as soon as possible on the specific steps you will take to achieve these goals.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Statement on House of Representatives Action on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for China

June 27, 1996

I applaud the action of the House of Representatives to approve my decision to renew most-favored-nation trade status for China. The strong bipartisan show of support today is clear evidence that the American people agree that engagement, not isolation, is the best way to advance America's interests with China as elsewhere.

This positive vote helps us continue to engage China on a broad range of issues, including human rights, nonproliferation, trade, regional security, and relations with Taiwan. It enables us to continue to strengthen cooperation while firmly addressing our differences. It is a strong vote in favor of America's interests.

As I meet with the G–7 leaders, this vote is also a strong reaffirmation of America's continued leadership and engagement in the world.

I thank the House of Representatives for its overwhelming support and look forward to continuing our work with the Congress on a bipartisan China policy that advances America's interests.

Statement on the Death of Mollie Beattie

June 28, 1996

America lost one of its great spirits with the untimely passing of Mollie Beattie. Mollie was a person who believed in the value of life and wildlife so deeply that she dedicated her many talents to preserving God's gracious Earth.

As the first woman director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mollie presided over a sea

change in the administration of the Endangered Species Act by improving the way Government worked. She was the number one advocate for our national wildlife refuges, forever fighting to keep the system strong and growing.

Mollie Beattie's devotion to this Earth and its creatures was passionate, caring, and wise. There is a grace and natural beauty in America; because of Mollie our country has even more of that grace. Hillary and I send our prayers and sympathies to Mollie's family. We will miss her.

Statement on Action Toward a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
June 28, 1996

Today the Chairman of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament's (CD) Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban tabled a compromise treaty text that reflects his best efforts to record agreement and resolve remaining issues. This action brings us one step closer to the day when no nuclear weapons are detonated anywhere on the face of the Earth. I applaud this milestone in our efforts to reduce the nuclear threat and build a safer world.

American leaders since Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have believed a comprehensive test ban would be a major stride in the international effort against nuclear proliferation and toward our ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament. Over the past four decades, many world leaders, including Jawaharlal Nehru of India and Harold Macmillan of Great Britain, along with citizens from around the globe have worked hard to achieve a CTBT. Today, such a treaty is within our reach.

As President, my most basic duty is to protect the security of the American people. That's why I have made reducing the nuclear threat one of my highest priorities.

As a result, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at our people. We entered into force the START I Treaty that will, in combination with the START II Treaty pending ratification in the Russian Duma, reduce by 14,000 the number of warheads deployed by the United States and Russia just 5 years ago. We convinced Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakstan to give up the nuclear weapons left on their land when the Soviet Union broke up. We persuaded North Korea to freeze its dangerous nuclear weapons program under international monitoring. We are working with countries around the world to safeguard and destroy nuclear weapons and materials so that they don't fall into the hands of terrorists or criminals. We led global efforts to win the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which bans the spread of nuclear weapons to states that do not have them.

It is now up to the 61 member states of the CD to study the Chairman's compromise treaty text and maintain the momentum toward a CTBT. I call on the members of the CD to return to Geneva in late July prepared to agree to forward a CTBT to the United Nations, so that a special session of the General Assembly can be held in August to approve the treaty and open it for signature in the United States in September.

The President's Radio Address
June 29, 1996

Good morning. I'm speaking to you today from Lyons, France, where the leaders of the world's industrialized democracies have gathered for our annual summit. We're meeting at a time of peace and prosperity but in the shadow of terrorism. The cowardly, brutal attack on American military personnel in Saudi Arabia is on everyone's mind. This weekend, all Americans

will join me in mourning the 19 Americans who lost their lives, in sending prayers to their loved ones. I've made it clear that I'll do everything in my power to discover who's responsible, to pursue them, and to punish them.

I am pleased that our summit partners here agreed with me to direct our agenda to the work we can do together to fight terrorism and international crime. This is especially important now. While the international perils of the 20th century, fascism and communism, have been defeated, new dangers are rising up to take their place as we enter the 21st. New technologies and the rapid movement of information, money, and people across borders bring us closer together and enrich our lives. But they also make us all more vulnerable to rogue states, crime, drugs, and terrorism.

Unlike the previous great struggles of this century, we must confront these threats along a moving front, from the Tokyo subway to the streets of London, from a bus in Paris to the World Trade Center in New York and the heartland in Oklahoma City and, of course, in Saudi Arabia. But just as no enemy could drive us from the fight to meet our challenges and protect our values during World War II and the cold war, we will not be driven from the frontiers of our fight against terrorism today. Working with our partners around the world, we will take on the forces of terror.

As a result of United States leadership, here in Lyons we have adopted specific recommendations to combat crime and terrorism, practical steps that all governments can take and should take. They fall into four key areas.

First, we need to make sure that criminals and terrorists have nowhere to hide. So we will strengthen our efforts to prosecute and extradite major criminals and terrorists, to share information, and to develop joint witness protection programs.

Second, we must deny criminals and terrorists the resources they need to do violence to our citizens. So we will work to seize their assets, to gather more information on their financial transactions, and to shut down money laundering.

Third, we have to strengthen the defense of our national borders so that criminals and terrorists cannot violate them. So we will crack down on weapons trafficking, alien smuggling. We'll do a better job in safeguarding travel documents from fraud and abuse. And we will track forged or stolen documents together.

Finally, we must stop criminals and terrorists from misusing the high-tech communications we all rely on for commerce and cooperation, so we will take the fight to those who would abuse government and financial institutional data bases.

There's more we can do together, so we directed our senior officials to come together as soon as possible to discuss additional steps to intensify the worldwide fight against terrorism.

All these steps against terrorism, international crime, drug trafficking, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction are part of a campaign America has been leading for 3 years now. Without our leadership, the job will not get done. The good news is, the United States at this G–7 summit is in the best position we've been in for years to protect the physical security of our people, in part because of our strong leadership toward a more stable and prosperous economic future for ourselves and our allies.

When I attended my first G–7 in Tokyo 3 years ago, the United States was not in a strong position to lead. Our partners said, "Instead of telling us what to do, you should get your own house in order." Well, they were right. When I took office, our budget deficit was at an all-time high. Unemployment was more than 7 percent. We had the slowest job growth since the Great Depression. And we were being outcompeted in everything from automobiles to computer chips. But America has traveled a great distance from Tokyo in 1993.

Here in Lyons in 1996, I was gratified to hear our partners praise the strength of our economy. We cut the budget deficit in half and proposed a plan to balance the budget. Lower interest rates have helped us to slash unemployment to 5.6 percent and create 9.7 million new jobs. Inflation is near a 30-year low. Interest rates have stayed down. Business investment is up nearly 30 percent. And America is the number one exporter and the most competitive nation on Earth.

We stand on the brink of a new century and an age of great possibility. To realize its potential, we must face the threats to our generation, just as previous generations faced the threats to theirs. If we show strength and steadiness and judgment and flexibility in the face of change, if America continues to lead the world and to work with others as we have here in

Lyons, we will meet our challenges and protect our values. And we will enter the 21st century prosperous and secure with the greatest opportunity of any time in our history.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 3 p.m. on June 28 in the Cite Internationale in Lyons, France, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 29.

The President's News Conference in Lyons
June 29, 1996

The President. It's really beautiful, isn't it? Please sit down. Well, the weather has certainly cooperated for our summit.

Ladies and gentlemen, this summit made real progress in the three areas that we came here to address: the fight against terrorism and crime, strengthening the peace in Bosnia, and advancing our common agenda for economic growth.

I thank the leaders for sharing our outrage at the cowardly attack in Saudi Arabia and for agreeing to intensify the fight against terrorism. We resolved to take a range of concrete steps that will extend the efforts we are making at home. These steps will help us to achieve four key objectives. First, terrorists and criminals must have nowhere to hide. For example, we must cooperate to speed up extradition and prosecution of those who practice terror and then leave the country in which they commit their acts. Second, we must dry up the resources terrorists use to fund their violence. Third, we must do a better job of defending our national borders to keep the terrorists, the criminals, and the illegal weapons out. And finally, we must stop terrorists from misusing the high-tech communications that we all rely on for commerce and cooperation.

Even more can be done. That's why we directed our senior officials to meet as soon as possible to recommend additional measures.

As to the bombing in Dhahran, we will do everything in our power to discover who was responsible, to pursue them, and to punish them. We must also make sure we have taken all reasonable steps to protect our own people. To that end, I am announcing today that General Wayne Downing, former Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command, will lead a full assessment of the facts surrounding the bomb attack in Dhahran. General Downing will also evaluate all policies and measures at other facilities in the entire Central Command which includes the Persian Gulf and Middle East regions. He will recommend any further steps necessary to prevent similar attacks. And he will submit his report to the Secretary of Defense within 45 days.

But let me be clear: Just as no enemy could drive us from the field in World War II and the cold war, we will not be driven from the frontiers of our fight against terrorism today.

We devoted a good deal of time to our work on Bosnia. We shouldn't forget that since our last meeting in Halifax, we've helped achieve something many thought was impossible: Bosnia has moved from the horror of war into the hope of peace.

Here we laid the groundwork for more progress in the next 6 months. We committed ourselves to full support for the elections in September and accelerating the civilian reconstruction that is now underway. Even as we support these efforts, we're also making it clear to the parties in Bosnia that they must live up to their obligations under the Dayton accords, spelling out what steps they must take to prepare for the elections and to move the reconstruction along.

Today I'm also proud to announce three new American initiatives to help that peace take root. First, we will devote $15 million to train demobilized soldiers to clear the estimated 3 million landmines still in Bosnia. Until that happens, no child will be able to walk in safety and life cannot return to normal.

Second, we are establishing an international commission on the missing in the former Yugoslavia, to be chaired by former Secretary of State Cy Vance. This group will work to resolve the almost 12,000 cases of missing persons, to reduce the anguish of their families and lessen the tension between the parties.

Third, we will contribute $5 million to the work of the Bosnian women's initiative. After

a past in which so many men were killed in the fighting, Bosnia's future may depend more than ever upon its women. We will provide training and loans to help women find jobs and create businesses so they can support their families and get their nation going again. I want to recognize and thank our Ambassador to Austria, Swanee Hunt, for helping to create this initiative. Women today are meeting in Bosnia—today—on this issue. Muslim, Croatian, and Serbian women are meeting in Bosnia today in a multiethnic, cooperative determination to regenerate the capacity of the Bosnian economy through the efforts of its women. This has real potential to make a difference.

Finally, let me just note that the environment of this summit was very different than the first one I attended in Tokyo in 1993. Then we were not in a strong position to lead, and our partners kept telling me that we had to get our house in order. And frankly, they were right. When I took office, our budget deficit was at an all-time high, unemployment was more than 7 percent, we had the slowest job growth since the Great Depression. But since that time, we have cut our budget deficit in half, and our economy has reduced unemployment to 5.6 percent and produced 9.7 million new jobs. Inflation is near a 30-year low, interest rates are down, and business investment is up by 30 percent. Our country is now the number one exporter and the most competitive nation on Earth again.

So here I was pleased, and I know the American people will be, to see that our partners recognize this and ask for our suggestions about what we could do together to promote more economic growth around the globe, to generate jobs out of that economic growth, and to make those jobs good jobs so that people would have the tools to make the most of their lives and to build strong families.

Finally, there was a lot of very serious conversation about how we can grow the economy and sustain our environment. And we resolved to work harder on that in the year ahead and to make that a central focus of our meeting next year in Denver.

We know we have to work on these problems together. That's the last point I want to drive home to the American people. We know that when we do cooperate, we can make a positive difference for our own people in maintaining our leadership in the world and meeting our challenges and protecting our values. I found that this summit was very helpful in all those regards.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]?

Bosnia and Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, I'd like your views on two points—foreign policy points of tension in the communique. One, are you prepared to reimpose sanctions against Yugoslavia if the Serb leader in Bosnia does not step down from his government functions by, say, Monday? And two, in terms of the Middle East peace process, does the United States have any leverage to persuade Israel to abide by previous agreements on land for peace?

The President. Well, first of all, let's talk about the sanctions issues. Under the Dayton accords, both Mr. Bildt and the IFOR commander have the ability and the responsibility to impose sanctions if the accords are violated. We want Mr. Karadzic, in the words of the Secretary of State, out of power and out of influence. And we think that is very important. We want all the other parties to help us achieve what is clearly required by the Dayton accords and the Paris peace agreement. And, therefore, we will support appropriate action by Mr. Bildt.

Although I have to say I have no information, Helen, that there is in fact a Monday deadline that would operate against Serbia, as opposed to the Bosnian Serbs or anyone else. I do not know that there will be a Monday deadline. But you should just know that both the IFOR commander, Admiral Smith, and Mr. Bildt have the authority and the responsibility under the Dayton accords to reimpose the sanctions. And under the right circumstances, they would be bound to do so and we would be bound to support them.

Yes, sir?

Q. Mr. President, what did Prime Minister——

Q. What about the second part of the——

The President. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry—the Middle East. I apologize. It's been a long 3 days.

On the Middle East, we all agree that the commitments Israel has made to date should be kept. And Mr. Netanyahu has said that he expects Israel to keep those commitments.

I think it's fair to say that we also all agree that the Israeli Government is recently constituted, just getting its bearings, and it's going

to work. And we believe it's quite important that both sides in the Middle East, the Arab parties and the Israelis, give each other some room here. A little time needs to pass. And we hope that no one, including those of us who are third parties here, will say or do anything which would make the peace process more difficult down the road. We just—we need to honor the commitments that have been made and then go forward.

In that connection, today we talked a lot about development assistance and the importance of doing more in that area, and I tried to make a strong point that we have seen in the Middle East a substantial increase in the capacity of the Palestinian Authority under Mr. Arafat to provide law and order and to run the daily operations of life in Gaza and the West Bank. And I think we need to support that as much as anything else if we want to preserve the gains of the past and make sure that this peace process continues to have integrity and effect.

Yes, go ahead.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, what did Prime Minister Chernomyrdin tell you about President Yeltsin's health and his ability to govern, and how concerned are you? And also, is the fact that Mr. Yeltsin was not here the reason why there wasn't a whole lot in today's communique dealing with relations and aid to Russia in the future?

The President. Mr. Chernomyrdin said that President Yeltsin was in good health, but that he had a sore throat—something I can identify with right before an election—and that he had determined that he ought to take the day off from any kind of public speaking or public appearances. But he said he'd talked to him yesterday and he was doing fine.

I'm not sure that this communique would have had more in it about Russia even if President Yeltsin had been here, because we basically talked about the subjects of the meeting here, and we tried to have a more limited communique that didn't just go all over every issue.

I want to emphasize that in these G–8 political meetings we consider Russia to be an integral partner here in all our deliberations. The Russians are cosponsors with the United States in the Middle East peace process. The Russians are our partners in IFOR. So we value Russian participation for issues that have nothing to do with Russia.

Yes?

Bosnia

Q. Mr. Karadzic today was reelected head of his party. He says he doesn't acknowledge the authority of the War Crimes Tribunal. And at some point do you reach a point where, if it's not a deadline this Monday, there has to be a deadline and that the IFOR forces would have to move into Pale and simply escort him out?

The President. Well, I guess the short answer to that is no, in the way you asked it, because there was an explicit decision made in the Dayton accords that the mission of IFOR would not be a police mission, that is, to actually go in with the purpose of apprehending Mr. Karadzic or anybody else suspected of war crimes.

On the other hand, I can say that the number of patrols has been increased in the region. And the responsibility of IFOR is, if they run into anybody who is wanted by the War Crimes Tribunal, they have to apprehend them. So I suppose the chances of his being apprehended or some others who may be wanted being apprehended have been increased by the fact that the number of patrols has been increased.

But it is not a part of the mandate of IFOR to actually be the police agency to go in and arrest him. That's one of the reasons that Mr. Bildt has been talking about the sanctions.

Q. Should there be a deadline?

The President. Well, the deadline, in effect, will present itself in terms of the integrity of the elections. But we'd like to see something done well before then because we want other political leadership to develop among the Bosnian Serbs, people who believe in the rule of law and don't believe it's legitimate to kill large numbers of other people just because they're of a different ethnic group.

Terrorist Attack in Saudi Arabia

Q. Mr. President, regarding the bombing, what can you say to American families about servicemen now serving in that area of the world, in the Middle East, to reassure them? You mentioned that you'd appointed this commission to report back in 45 days, but what about tonight, what about tomorrow, and this week? Are some steps being taken now?

The President. Well, first of all, I think it's fair to say that everybody's on extra alert. But remember, when the warnings came out before this last incident—to be fair to the people who were involved there—they increased lookouts, they increased patrols, they increased training of people involved, they put more barriers up. And each and every one of those steps actually contributed to saving lives. The fatalities would have been much greater if those things had not been done.

But the plain fact is that they did not believe that, based on past terrorist practice, that a bomb that big could be exploded—could be put together and delivered and exploded at that point. That's frankly what happened. So we're—everybody is assessing what their short-term and their long-term options are, and they're taking all the possible steps they can to see what should be done. But we want General Downing to take a bigger and longer look at this. Meanwhile, we'll be doing everything we can to protect our people, of course.

Yes, Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN]?

FBI Files of White House Passholders

Q. Mr. President, if I could just turn the subject to a domestic issue. You've been described by your aides as being very angry when you first heard about the FBI file matter in the White House, and you initially said that this was a bureaucratic snafu, a simple bureaucratic mistake. But now that Anthony Marceca, who is an Army civilian detailee to the White House, has decided to take the fifth and not testify, are you still sticking by that assertion that this was simply a mistake, a simple bureaucratic mistake?

And the second part, I wonder if you'd care to comment on these other allegations by this former FBI agent who had worked in the White House of all sorts of sordid deeds going on? So just the two-part question.

The President. Well, first of all on the—Mr. Marceca testified in the first hearings. I don't know why he decided not to testify in the second ones.

Let's go back over what I said. I value the privacy that every American is entitled to, and I have done my best as President to protect the individual rights of the American people, their rights to free speech, to religious liberty, to association, and certainly to privacy. Secondly, from my earliest days as a young man being interested in public life, one of the things that has most appalled me is any kind of abuse of public authority that tramples on the liberties of individual citizens. And I believe my career shows a consistent pattern of opposition to that. So I'm concerned about it.

What I said was that based on the evidence we had, there was no evidence that anyone had intentionally acquired the papers wrongly or had used them wrongly once they were acquired. I repeat that to the best of my knowledge that's what the evidence showed. Now, I understand there was some testimony yesterday from the Secret Service and from others which may offer an explanation about how the wrong lists were acquired. I was told that the Los Angeles Times had an article about it today, but I have not had an opportunity to read it.

So what I'm saying is, I've told everybody I want to cooperate with the special counsel. I want to cooperate with the congressional committees. I want to get to the bottom of this as quickly as possible. And I would encourage everyone else to do the same thing. Meanwhile, I don't want to prejudge anybody to go beyond what the evidence shows. That's the only thing I said.

As to that other thing, I mean, I hardly even know how to comment on that. I mean, I hardly know what to say. I feel bad for the FBI.

Q. This new book by the ex-FBI agent says that Craig Livingstone was hired through the sponsorship of the First Lady. Is that true? And if it isn't true, can you tell us definitively today who brought Craig Livingstone into the White House?

The President. Can I tell you what?

Q. Can you tell us who brought Craig Livingstone into the White House if it is not true, that the First Lady did not bring him in?

The President. The answers to your two questions are no and no. Now, I know for a fact that is not true. But I don't know that anything in that is true. I don't know, but——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—ask who hired this person?

The President. I have, and I don't think he knows. But let me tell you—what we decided to do was not to raise any questions about how this thing had been handled, but instead to cooperate with outside forces who are looking into it. I think that's the best way to do it. So we just instructed everybody to cooperate, first with—we thought the FBI was going to look into it, and then when there was a delay there—

I think if that happened this whole thing would be resolved by now, and I'm sorry it didn't. But since the FBI didn't look into it, from our point of view, then we had to wait for the congressional committees and the special counsel. But we are going to fully cooperate with them, and I expect them to be able to answer all relevant questions.

Yes, Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio]?

Terrorism

Q. Mr. President, getting back to the terror issue at this summit, almost every one of these summits has included tough talk on terrorism—those that you've attended and those before. Yet the attacks have continued in the Middle East and in Saudi Arabia and even at home. Is there any reason to believe that those you have described as people who live to kill are impacted at all by what you all say at these summits?

The President. I don't know if they're impacted by what we say, but they're certainly impacted by what we do. I mean, let me remind you that there is—the people who did the World Trade Center bombing were arrested and tried. There was an intense effort after Oklahoma City to apprehend the suspect, and there's now going to be a criminal justice process working its course there. We have extradited suspected terrorists in the United States from all over the world. And I can tell you, perhaps even more importantly, we have succeeded in preventing planned terrorist incidents. And I have learned from working in the Middle East so intensely the last 3 years that in spite of all the horrible things we read about there, there are still more incidents that are planned that are prevented and averted than there are which are carried out.

So I don't expect our words to have any impact on these people. But if our words are put into action, just as we did in the United States, for example, in passing the antiterrorism legislation, we will acquire greater capacity to prevent these incidents, and to catch and punish people severely when they do, and to tie them to their sponsors, if they have sponsors beyond their own little cells. And those are the three things that I want to do. So I don't expect them to be moved by my words. But they need to know that I'm going to do my best to put our words into action.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, if Boris Yeltsin is reelected on Wednesday, are you personally confident that he will continue on the path of reform in a second term? And are there specific steps you would urge him to take to confirm from the start that he intends to govern as a democrat and as a reformer?

The President. Well, I do believe he will continue because that's the path that he's followed to date, first of all. And secondly, let me just say, everybody ought to take a deep breath next week and consider that you are literally observing something that has not happened in 1,000 years of Russian history. Since what we now know of as modern Russia geographically united, this has never happened. They not only had one election, they are about to have another election which basically confirms their commitment to democracy. You remember President Aristide said the second election is the most important. So you're—in the context of Russia and all those affected by them, you're going to witness something when that election occurs that has never occurred in 1,000 years.

And I think that—President Yeltsin and I once had a talk, and I don't want to betray any private confidences, but he—if you go into the Kremlin and they have these statues of the great czar reformers, Peter the Great and Catherine the Great and Alexander, who freed the serfs, and Nicholas, who had the parliamentary government before the Russian Revolution—the difference between what they're doing now and what those other Russian reformers did, and the reason I think reform has a chance to survive now when it always failed before, is that the czars never created anything that was greater than they were.

And the whole purpose of democracy is to make sure that none of us are indispensable. That's against my self-interest, since I'm facing an election, to say that. But if you think about it, the whole purpose of democracy is to create a system in which the people and the rules and laws under which they live are more important than any one individual. And the ultimate legacy of President Yeltsin and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and all those who have been part of this is that they have for the first time in Russian history created something that is greater than any individual, that supersedes them. And I think they're quite mindful of that, and I think

that's one big reason they'll stay on the path of reform.

I also think, on a purely human level, they know that there are still a lot of people in Russia having a tough time. And they want all the people in Russia to have the benefits that reform has brought to so many. They won't be satisfied until a lot of the people that won't vote for them this week—or next week—feel the benefits that so many feel today.

Economic Growth and Job Creation

Q. You and the other leaders gather at a time when Europe is facing near record unemployment levels. I wonder if you could tell me what specific actions you took here that will help that? And what actions did you take here that will help Americans who are having a tough time as well?

The President. Well, actually, what we talked about here on that point was what the Europeans could do to create jobs when they have economic growth. The frustrating thing for a lot of the Europeans is not only that they've had slow growth but that even when they've had growth, they haven't necessarily been able to create jobs.

And Prime Minister Major discussed that in some length, because Great Britain has of late had some pretty good success in bringing their unemployment rate down. And the highest job growth countries in the G–7 are the United States and Canada, so we talked a lot about what we thought the relationship of low interest rates and no barriers to small business formation and expansion and affirmative help for small business could have. Because it's very interesting, even in all the European countries, most of their jobs are being created by small and medium-sized businesses, the same as in America. But there isn't the same almost obsession that exists in our country both to clear out barriers to small business formation and expansion and to take affirmative steps to accelerate it. So we talked a lot about that from their point of view.

From our point of view, we talked a lot about how we could reduce the inequality and the wage stagnation that affects some of the people in the bottom half of the wage earners. And we talked about whether—the extent to which we could integrate into our systems some of the things that work in Europe and still keep our ability to create jobs. And that's what we're trying to do, for example, with the apprenticeship programs, the school-to-work programs, giving everybody access to 2 more years of schooling after high school, and trying to accelerate the rate at which we retrain the existing work force, and also trying to provide some more security in terms of access to movable retirement and health care benefits.

What we're both trying to do, if you will, is to create dynamic economies in which we can generate jobs that are good jobs, but also give people who are working hard the necessary conditions and tools they need to build a stable life and a stable family life. So in that sense, the Europeans like a lot of the security that a lot of their working people have, but they want to be able to create more jobs. We like the fact that we create a lot of jobs, but we want our people to be able to live with all the upheavals of the modern economy. So we basically decided we needed to try to find how we could learn from one another.

Russian General Aleksandr Lebed

Q. I wonder what your reaction was to General Lebed's remarks about Jews and Mormons, and if you asked Prime Minister Chernomyrdin for an explanation, and what did he tell you?

The President. Well, I had a very negative reaction to the remarks. We've been dealing with these church burnings in America, and I know how dangerous any kind of religious slur can be. So I had a very negative reaction to the remarks. I like some of the things I've seen from General Lebed; he's a very impressive fellow in many ways, but I didn't like that at all. And I said so to the Prime Minister.

But I also noted that President Yeltsin has had a good record on issues relating to religious liberty. And he told me that he expected no change in the administration's positions, the Yeltsin administration's positions on religious liberty after this next election.

Terrorism

Q. Mr. President, in the aftermath of this tragedy in Saudi Arabia, a lot of commentators and some officials have said that one of the problems and frustrations is that experts end up fighting the last war, and that the next time, as you say, it comes in a little different—the bomb is bigger than you thought or whatever. To what degree is that a part of the General's mandate—is to look at, try to predict how the

next incident might come and steps that can be taken? And is that something that you and the leaders discussed as well?

The President. Well, yes, although that's a lot of the work that the rest of our national security team will be doing, too, including making sure our intelligence networks are more attuned to that. I think it's fair to say that—if you remember, these things have sort of gone in waves, you know. We had this huge wave of terrorism in the eighties; it primarily involved something other than bombs, although we had that awful incident in Lebanon. And we just learn as we go along. And I'm sure that there will be times in the future when murderous forces outsmart those of us that are trying to stop them. But I believe we will learn something from this, and I believe we will be able to continue our mission.

The main thing I'd like to say to you, though, is—and, yes, it will be part of General Downing's mandate, but it's also a big part of what the Secretary of Defense and the director of our intelligence operations and all our national security operations should be doing. The main thing I would like to say, though, is that for all those families of the people who were lost and all those who are still laid up in the hospital that were cut up so bad by the glass, we can't make all the problems of the world go away. And our generation's time is going to be increasingly occupied with dealing with the terrorists and the people who try to proliferate dangerous weapons—chemical, biological, small-scale nuclear weapons—the drug smugglers and others who try to kill people in this way. It's not the cold war, it's not World War II, but it's an important part of our struggle to make this a civilized and sane world. And we have to continue to do it. And I'm very proud of those people that served, and I grieve for those who died and their families.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 126th news conference began at 4:18 p.m. on the terrace at the Pavillon du Parc. In his remarks, he referred to Carl Bildt, United Nations High Commissioner for Bosnia; Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic; Adm. Leighton Smith, USN, Commander in Chief, Allied Forces Southern Europe; Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin and President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; former President Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti; Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom; and retired Lt. Gen. Aleksandr Lebed, security adviser to President Yeltsin.

Statement on the International Commission on Missing Persons in the Former Yugoslavia

June 29, 1996

I am pleased to announce today the formation of an international blue ribbon commission on the missing in the former Yugoslavia, with former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance as its chairman. The commission will be made up of distinguished members of the international community.

Uncertainty about the fate of the missing is a source of anguish for their families and a cause of tension between the parties to the Dayton peace agreement. Only a handful of the nearly 12,000 missing-person cases thus far certified by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) have been resolved to date. This initiative will help to promote a full and timely accounting of the missing.

The new commission will work closely with representatives from the United Nations, the ICRC, the Office of the High Representative, Physicians for Human Rights, and other organizations to accomplish its primary task: to secure the full cooperation of the parties to the Dayton peace agreement in locating the missing from the 4-year conflict and to assist them in doing so. This initiative aims to support and enhance the work of the ICRC and the Office of the High Representative, which have exerted significant effort and leadership in dealing with this very difficult issue.

The commission will encourage public involvement in its activities and will take firm steps to see that the parties devote the attention

and resources necessary to produce early, significant progress on missing-person cases. It will also reinforce efforts to ensure that exhumations, when necessary to identify the fate of missing persons, are conducted under international supervision and in accordance with international standards. In addition, the commission will facilitate the development of an ante mortem data base to support exhumation efforts.

In the longer term, and with the help and guidance of affected families, the commission will work to develop appropriate expressions of commemoration and tribute to the lost and the missing and to their loved ones.

Although the commission will be an international effort, the United States will make a startup contribution of $2 million.

Statement on the United States Demining Initiative in Bosnia
June 29, 1996

I am pleased to announce a new U.S. initiative to develop an indigenous demining capability in Bosnia. Using about $15 million in U.S. funds, we will train demobilized soldiers and fund new demining programs for former soldiers. U.S. Special Operations Forces will train and equip deminers from the former warring factions. Training by U.S. military personnel will be completed by the time IFOR leaves. No U.S. personnel will participate directly in mine clearance operations nor will U.S. forces enter active minefields.

Achieving rapid progress on demining is vital to the success of rebuilding Bosnia. Demining supports IFOR's mission, ensures that humanitarian assistance gets to places it is needed, helps create conditions for refugees to return, and enables the rapid reconstruction of infrastructure and the country's basic economy.

The United States has taken the lead in establishing the Mine Action Center (MAC) in Sarajevo, which coordinates all landmine-related activities, including collecting and disseminating landmine data, coordinating mine awareness campaigns, conducting mine surveys, and overseeing mine clearance operations. The new initiative I am announcing today builds on what we have accomplished so far.

With an estimated 3 million landmines, Bosnia is one of the five most heavily mined countries in the world. The landmine problem in Bosnia is typical of a post-conflict state: inadequate and inaccurate minefield records, little institutional memory of where mines were laid, no experience in clearing mines to humanitarian standards, and a growing need for large numbers of people to move about.

Returning refugees and displaced persons are vulnerable and the risks to children are enormous. Children often "play war," but in Bosnia the toys available to them are real; bunkers and fighting positions are often stocked with weapons caches, landmines, grenades, and other forms of dangerous materials found in a battlefield.

We must all work together to accelerate demining activity in Bosnia so that economic reconstruction can proceed, assistance reaches those most in need, our soldiers in IFOR can go about their job without fear of accident, and above all, the people of Bosnia can get on with their daily lives.

Statement on the Bosnian Women's Initiative Fund
June 29, 1996

Today, I am pleased to announce an initial contribution of $5 million to establish the Bosnian women's initiative fund. A peaceful, prosperous Bosnia will require the full participation of its women.

Many Bosnian women now find themselves sole providers for their families. They have lost

their husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers. Despite the hardship they have suffered, these women have displayed incredible strength, endurance, and resourcefulness, qualities that are essential to rebuilding their country.

To do this successfully they need resources. They need training. This initiative means loans for income-generating projects that women can do from home. It means loans to women-owned businesses or to companies where large numbers of women work. It means training in business management, marketing and accounting, farming techniques for those returning to agricultural communities, and in skills vital to rebuilding their country, like engineering, architecture, plumbing, and construction.

The fund will be managed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) with international and national nongovernmental organization as implementing partners.

Even as I am making this announcement, over 500 Bosnian women leaders are meeting in Sarajevo. They have traveled from every part of the region, crossing ethnic lines, to work together on plans to rebuild their country. These plans will be incorporated into this initiative, for it is the Bosnian women themselves who hold the key to their future.

By providing new programs focused on women's reintegration into the Bosnian economy, we will enable them to support their families, to work as full partners in society, and to promote prosperity. I believe that the enhancement of Bosnian women's economic and political participating will help foster stability in the region.

I urge our fellow members of the G–7 and other countries to join the United States in supporting this initiative and contributing funding for it.

Remarks at the Memorial Service at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, for American Servicemen Killed in Saudi Arabia

June 30, 1996

Governor Chiles, Congressman Scarborough, Lieutenant Governor MacKay, General Shalikashvili, Secretary White, Secretary Widnall, Under Secretary de Leon, General Fogleman, General Hawley, General Cranston, Colonel Dylewski, the chaplains, Chief Lowe; to those brave servicemen who were injured, we thank God for your presence here today; to the families of the 12 men who we honor today who died in the service of our Nation.

These men represented the best of America, and they gave America their best. They stepped forward to lead our mission for peace and freedom. They did so with courage, strength, and skill. As members of the Nomads, the 33d Fighter Wing, as communicators and mechanics, crew chiefs and technicians, they kept our aircraft flying, and they owned the skies. Time and again they gave up the comforts that most of us take for granted, traveling far from home and family to take up America's cause.

There is a passage in Isaiah in which God wonders, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" Isaiah answers, "Here am I, Lord. Send me." These men we honor today said to America, "Send me."

We will remember them as patriots, but they were also husbands and fathers, sons and brothers, colleagues, neighbors, and friends. Some came from families with a proud tradition of military service. Some have brothers and sisters serving our military today. Some had dreamed of joining the Air Force since they were little boys.

All of them showed by the example of their lives the same spirit of service they brought to their careers. They were always among the first to lend a hand when someone was in need. They served as soccer coaches and Sunday school teachers. They helped the victims of hurricanes and volunteered as firemen. They loved their cars, their sports, their families, and their mission. One of them was on his third tour in Saudi Arabia. Another volunteered so a man with larger family obligations could stay home.

They were all very different, as I saw when I met with their families. They came from different regions, different ethnic groups, different

religious and political backgrounds. But they were united by love of nation, mission, and family. They touched the lives of many other people, and because of them we all lead safer and better lives.

On behalf of the American people, let me say to their families and loved ones and to their friends in the Eglin community: We are grateful for their service. We stand with you in sorrow and in outrage. They were taken before their time, felled by the hands of hatred in an act whose savagery is matched only by its cowardice. We will not rest in our efforts to capture, prosecute, and punish those who committed this evil deed. But today, in the warm embrace of our faith, let us put aside our anger for a moment to remember and honor those who were lost, to find strength in their service, to thank God for the lives they lived, to continue the struggle for freedom and decency to which they devoted their lives.

We're blessed to live in a prosperous land in a time of peace, but we are not free from peril. While the modern world brings to all of us many new opportunities, it also leaves us more open to the forces of intolerance and destruction and especially to terrorism, so often rooted in ethnic and religious hatreds, because terrorists can strike anywhere, from the Tokyo subway to the streets of London, from the Holy Land to the World Trade Center in New York and Oklahoma City and now in Saudi Arabia.

My fellow Americans, during the long struggles of World War II and the cold war, America stood fast for freedom. In our time, terrorism is the enemy of peace and freedom. America must not and America will not be driven from the fight against terrorism. In this effort, every American must stand behind the men and women of our Armed Forces. Every American must stand against violence and hatred and stand for dignity and tolerance, at home as well as abroad. We must honor the memory of those we have lost by upholding the ideals for which they lived and the mission for which they gave their lives.

To the loved ones of these 12 fine men, I know there are no words to soothe the loss of a father or a husband, a brother or a son, a fiance or a dear friend. The rest of us can only hope that there is some solace for you in the pride and passion they brought to their work, the strength and decency they demonstrated every day, the love and respect they engendered and which surround you today, and the gratitude of their Nation.

Let us now praise these quiet American heroes who gave their lives in service to America. May they rest in peace, and may their names live on forever:

Technical Sergeant Daniel Cafourek
Sergeant Millard Dee Campbell
Senior Airman Earl Cartrette, Jr.
Technical Sergeant Patrick Fennig
Master Sergeant Kendall Kitson, Jr.
Technical Sergeant Thanh Gus Nguyen
Airman First Class Brent Marthaler
Airman First Class Brian McVeigh
Airman First Class Peter Morgera
Airman First Class Joseph Rimkus
Senior Airman Jeremy Taylor
Airman First Class Joshua Woody

Our Nomads have ceased their wandering. They have come home. May God embrace their souls. May God bless their families and their loved ones. And may God bless America's mission of peace and freedom, for which they gave the last full measure of their devotion.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:32 a.m. in the King Hangar. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Lawton Chiles and Lt. Gov. Buddy MacKay of Florida; Gen. Ronald R. Fogleman, USAF, Air Force Chief of Staff; Gen. Richard E. Hawley, USAF, Commander, Air Combat Command; Maj. Gen. Stewart E. Cranston, USAF, Commander, Air Force Development Test Center; and Col. Gary R. Dylewski, USAF, Commander, and Chief Master Sgt. Troy Lowe, USAF, Senior Enlisted Adviser, 33d Fighter Wing.

Remarks at the Memorial Service at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, for American Servicemen Killed in Saudi Arabia

June 30, 1996

Governor Chiles, Lieutenant Governor MacKay, Congressman King, Congressman Weldon, General Shalikashvili, Secretary White, Secretary Widnall, General Fogleman, Under Secretary de Leon, General Hawley, General Hinson, Colonel Carr, Colonel Friers, Lieutenant Colonel Holliway, Lieutenant Colonel Jozayt, Chaplain Nguyen, and Chief Graves; to the wounded airmen who are here, whose survival we give thanks for; to the families and friends of those we come to honor.

Today, in this place, we honor seven sons of America who sacrificed their lives in the service of our Nation. To their loved ones and their friends and their families and to their family here at Patrick, I know I bring the thoughts and the prayers of all Americans with me. As one we mourn your loss, we share your grief, we thank God for the lives of your loved ones.

Five of our fallen sons come from this base. They were pilots and navigators, communicators and engineers. Each was a part of the 71st Rescue Squadron, whose motto hangs especially heavy on our hearts today, "So that others may live." Two others came from further away, but they, too, are now back home in this land that they loved and that they gave everything to defend.

To the families and the loved ones of these fine men, I say I know well that no one can ever make whole the loss of your father, your husband, your brother or son, your fiance, or your best friend. But I do hope you can find some solace in the strength they showed every day, in the pride they took in their work, in the love and respect they engendered from so many others, love and respect which surround you today.

They were extraordinary Americans who made a difference. They made a difference in Operation Desert Storm. Afterward they made a difference in enforcing the no-fly zone over Iraq, in helping to defend Iraq's neighbors. They made a difference in Bosnia, delivering planeload after planeload of food and equipment and medicine, allowing the people of Bosnia the chance to rebuild their lives and their land. They made a difference in seeking for others the blessings of liberty we hold so dear. And they made a difference in smaller ways, teaching others their hard-won skills, taking care of their crews, giving a helping hand, lending a sympathetic ear.

They were of diverse races and regions and religions and ethnic groups. But to the man, they were liked by their peers, loved by their families, admired by their communities. And they were united in their love of country and the mission they assumed. They represented the best of our Nation, and they gave America their best.

Let me say to their families and friends, as I did who mourned the 12 Americans from Eglin Air Force Base who also lost their lives in Dhahran: America stands with you in your sorrow and in your outrage. Your loved ones were taken before their time, felled by the hands of hatred in an act whose savagery is matched only by its cowardice. We will not rest until our efforts to capture, prosecute, and punish those who did this evil deed are successful.

But today let us just for a moment put aside our anger to remember those who were lost, to find strength in the service they gave, to thank God for the lives that they did live, and to resolve to continue the struggle for freedom and decency to which they were so devoted.

We are blessed to live in a prosperous land at a time of peace. But we see here again today, in heartbreaking reality, that this time is not free of peril. While the modern world opens many new opportunities to us, it also opens us to the forces of intolerance and destruction and especially to the forces of terrorism that are so often rooted in ethnic and religious hatred. We know now painfully that terrorists can strike anywhere, from a subway in Tokyo to the streets of London, from the sacred ground of the Holy Land to the World Trade Center in New York and Oklahoma City and now in Saudi Arabia.

My fellow Americans, during the long struggles of World War II and the cold war, our Nation stood fast for freedom. In our time, terrorism is the enemy of peace and freedom. America must not and America will not be driven from the fight against terrorism. In this ef-

fort, every American must stand with the men and women of our armed services. Every American must stand against violence and hatred and stand for dignity and tolerance, at home as well as abroad. We must honor the memory of those we have lost by upholding the ideals for which they lived and the mission for which they gave their lives.

The men we mourn today made the most of their lives. And they made all the rest of our lives richer and safer. We are the poorer for their passing. But the bright light of their devotion still shines. May their names live on forever. May we never forget Captain Christopher Adams, Captain Leland Haun, Master Sergeant Michael Heiser, Staff Sergeant Kevin Johnson, Airman First Class Justin Wood, Staff Sergeant Ronald King, and Airman Christopher Lester.

They gave their lives for our freedom. May they now rest in the warm embrace of God. May God bring peace to their families and their loved ones. And may God bless the country for which they gave the last full measure of their devotion. Amen.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3 p.m. in the theater. In his remarks, he referred to Brig. Gen. Robert C. Hinson, USAF, Commander, Col. Patrick Carr, USAF, Vice Commander, and Chief Master Sgt. David Graves, USAF, Senior Enlisted Adviser, 45th Space Wing; Lt. Col. Tom Friers, USAF, Commander, and Lt. Col. Robert Holliway, USAF, Deputy Commander, 1st Rescue Group; Lt. Col. Donald R. Jozayt, USAF, Commander, 71st Rescue Squadron; and Capt. Philip Nguyen, USAF, base chaplain.

Subject Index

Abortion. *See* Health and medical care
Acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS). *See* Health and medical care
Adoption. *See* Children and youth
Advancement of Colored People, National Association for the—302, 1014
Aeronautics and Space Administration, National—982
Affirmative action. *See* Armed Forces, U.S.
AFL-CIO. *See* Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, American Federation of
Africa
  See also specific country
  U.S. trade and investment—166
African-Americans
  See also specific subject; Civil rights
  Church burnings—830, 874, 875, 888, 898, 905, 908, 913, 914, 921, 928, 957, 975, 1017
African Development Foundation—1007
Aging, White House Conference on—379
Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, Federal—1011
Agriculture
  Cattle prices—671
  Crop insurance—545
  Environmental impact—544
  Exports—545
  Farm assistance—544
  Farm credit system reform—172, 225
  Farming legislation—222, 488, 544
  Research and development—544
  Southern Plains States drought relief—834
Agriculture, Department of
  Budget—544
  Commodity Credit Corporation—796
  Secretary—10, 169, 310, 671, 888
Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, Federal—544
Air Force, Department of the
  See also Armed Forces, U.S.
  Air Force Academy, U.S.—724, 1005
  Assistant Secretary—1015
  Dover Air Force Base, DE—554
  Eglin Air Force Base, FL—999
  Operating location near Groom Lake, NV—117
  Patrick Air Force Base, FL—1001
  Secretary—724, 999, 1001
  Under Secretary—321, 999, 1001
Alabama, storms, flooding, and tornadoes—1008, 1009
Alaska
  Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—581
  Fires—1016
  Governor—651
  Mineral resources report—594
  Oil exports—651
  President's visit—581
Albania
  Trade with U.S.—851
  U.S. Ambassador—1013
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Bureau of. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Alfalfa Club—1005
American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, Institute of—1014
American Israel Public Affairs Committee—653
America's Heritage Abroad, Commission for the Preservation of—1016
AmeriCorps—67, 82, 254, 276, 637, 855, 891, 940, 958
Amtrak—1006, 1007
Andorra, Ambassador to U.S.—1006
Angola
  Economic sanctions—509
  National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA)—509
  U.S. national emergency—509
Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996—628, 630, 641
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board—1010
Arctic Research Policy Committee, Interagency—375
Arkansas
  Governor—1015
  Storms and tornadoes—1012
Armed Forces Day—768
Armed Forces, U.S.
  See also specific military department; Defense and national security
  Affirmative action programs—65
  Armed Forces Service Medal—57, 61
  Base conversions—478
  Chief of Naval Operations—754, 763, 785, 792, 793, 862, 1014
  Human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)—200, 226
  Marine helicopter crash near Camp Lejeune, NC—724, 820
  Military housing and support services—226, 746
  National Guard—253
  Pay—226
  Security—984
  Supreme Allied Commander, Europe—60
  Tax provisions while serving under hostile conditions—340, 483
  Terrorist bombing of U.S. military complex in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia—979, 980, 984, 987, 989, 991, 993, 997, 999, 1001, 1018
  Veterans. *See* Veterans
Armenia, trade with U.S.—851
Armenian Apostolic Church—1004

Arms and munitions
See also Defense and national security; Law enforcement and crime; Nuclear weapons
Arms control negotiations and agreements—85, 489, 604, 614, 849, 989
Chemical and biological weapons—85, 629, 630, 790, 954
Explosives—463, 467, 552, 580, 629, 630, 987
Landmines—754, 991, 998
Missile systems and technology—226, 611, 614, 656, 670, 776
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, U.S.—1004, 1011
Armstrong World Industries' Building Products Operations—379
Army, Department of the
See also Armed Forces, U.S.
Corps of Engineers—247, 251, 253, 273, 274
Arts and the Humanities, National Foundation on the
Arts, National Endowment for the—906
Humanities, National Endowment for the—593
Arts, National Council on the—1003, 1004, 1006
Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum—775, 1015
Asia-Pacific region
See also specific country
Security—583, 589, 596, 603, 775, 776, 789
Trade and investment—597, 761, 775
U.S. military role—776
Asian Pacific American Caucus Institute, Congressional—759
Atlanta Braves—340
Atlantic Tunas, International Commission for the Conservation of—1011
Attorneys General, National Association of—507
Australia
Ambassador to U.S.—1006
U.S. Ambassador—1010
Austria
Social Security agreement with U.S.—767
U.S. Ambassador—992
Automobile industry—356, 574
Aviation Administration, Federal. *See* Transportation, Department of
Aviation industry—318
Azerbaijan, trade with U.S.—851

Bahamas, narcotics production—316
Balkans
See also specific country
U.S. Special Representative—1014
Banking—100, 157
Bankruptcy Review Commission—1009
Belarus
Arms control negotiations and agreements—611
Trade with U.S.—851
Belize, narcotics production—316
Bolivia
Ambassador to U.S.—1006
Narcotics production—316
Border Environment Cooperation Commission—1008
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bosnian Women's initiative—991, 998
Demining efforts—991, 998
Bosnia-Herzegovina—Continued
Economic assistance—587
Economic sanctions—818, 836, 963, 992
Elections—904
NATO peacekeeping role—46, 121, 304, 963
Peace efforts—45-47, 127, 304, 528, 560, 611, 717, 721, 806, 809, 811, 827, 901, 904, 963, 991, 993, 1014, 1018
President—46, 62, 304
President Clinton's visit—35, 45, 60, 62, 320
Refugees—811
Tuzla Airfield—60, 62
United Nations High Commissioner—992, 993
United Nations Security Council resolutions—836
U.S. military role—45, 47, 55, 56, 58-60, 62, 63, 65, 127, 162, 163, 526, 963
U.S. Special Adviser—304
U.S. Special Representative for Civilian Implementation—827
Botswana
Ambassador to U.S.—1006
U.S. Ambassador—1007
Brazil, narcotics production—316
Brunei, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Budget, Federal
See also specific agency; Economy, national
Arts funding—157
Balanced budget proposals—1, 2, 11, 13, 16-18, 24, 30, 33, 36, 37, 43, 48, 53, 68, 73, 79, 91, 101, 116, 140, 150, 164, 175, 220, 370, 407, 435, 479, 525, 532, 619, 624, 632, 643, 649, 680, 683, 705, 719, 730, 850, 867
Debt limit—40, 42, 76, 86, 101, 104, 111, 116, 124, 190, 435, 525
Deficit—525, 527, 556, 559, 570, 643, 680
Drug control efforts, funding—638, 659, 1011
Enrollment requirement waiver legislation—562
Fiscal year 1996—12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 43, 48, 68, 101, 103, 105, 124, 140, 370, 407, 411, 435, 462, 488, 525, 526, 562, 619, 632, 633, 636, 641, 642
Fiscal year 1997—164, 479
Foreign relations funding—578
Intelligence community budget, report—562
International population assistance programs, funding—687
Line-item veto—85, 148, 522, 556, 559
Rescissions and deferrals—309, 322, 375, 579, 736, 971
Bulgaria
Trade with U.S.—114
U.S. Ambassador—1013
Burkina Faso, U.S. Ambassador—1009
Burma, narcotics production—316
Burundi
Conflict resolution—923
U.S. Ambassador—1012
U.S. Special Coordinator—923
U.S. Special Envoy—923
Business and industry
See also specific company or industry; Employment and unemployment

Business and industry—Continued
Corporate responsibility—352, 401, 405, 415, 490, 491, 499, 741, 749, 860, 894
Employee-owned businesses—749
Employee training and education—416, 860
Environmental cleanup incentives—411, 959
Meeting Federal pollution standards, pilot projects—410
On-the-job training—400, 749
Small and minority business—82, 98, 155, 310, 525, 569, 857, 863
Tobacco sale to minors, prevention efforts—481, 699
Business Roundtable—1017

California
Democratic Party events—1008, 1016
Glendale Community College—891
Jackie Robinson Academy in Long Beach—325, 327
Museum of Television and Radio in Los Angeles—470
President's visits—318, 322, 325, 327, 396, 403, 884, 886, 888, 891, 1007, 1008, 1016
Ygnacio Valley High School in Concord—403
Cambodia, narcotics production—316
Canada
Prime Minister—361
U.S. Ambassador—361
Cancer Advisory Board, National—1017
Cape Verde, U.S. Ambassador—1005
Central African Republic
Civil conflict—817
U.S. military role—817
Central Intelligence Agency—445, 694
Chad, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Challenger. *See* Space program, shuttle
Children and youth
See also specific subject
Adoption—693, 731
Child support—915, 926-928
Community-based curfews—833, 878, 894, 896, 960
Educational television programming—894
Juvenile crime and violence—27, 83, 95, 207, 384, 388, 735, 764, 831, 876, 881, 896
Juvenile drug abuse—27, 384, 388, 658, 660, 735
Juvenile use of tobacco products—23, 80, 239, 264, 386, 480, 507, 684, 695, 697, 742, 815, 894, 919, 924
Missing children—70, 71
Teenage pregnancy and parenting—81, 111, 688, 729, 733, 913
Violence in entertainment, effects—80, 181, 187, 191, 221, 343, 344, 347, 351
China
Arms control negotiations and agreements—616, 777
Foreign Minister—601
Human rights—778
Korean Peninsula peace process—583
Narcotics production—316
President—798
Relations with Taiwan—417, 508, 588, 776
China—Continued
Trade with U.S.—177, 178, 716, 762, 778, 847, 921, 964, 988
U.S. policy—417, 578, 588, 777
Chinese New Year—271
Cinco de Mayo—689
Cities
See also State and local governments
Community development—85, 89, 100, 157, 309, 414, 866, 959
Empowerment and enterprise zones. *See* Empowerment zones
Citizens Medal, Presidential—337
Civil justice system
Federal habeas corpus review—631
Federal judiciary—533
Product liability legislation—464, 486, 677, 681
Reform—678, 680, 681
Civil Liberties Public Education Fund—1004
Civil rights
See also specific subject
Affirmative action. *See* Armed Forces, U.S.
Discrimination—247, 809, 873
Coast Guard, U.S. *See* Transportation, Department of
Coastal Zone Protection Act of 1996—851
Colleges and Universities, National Association of Independent—178
Colombia
Cocaine smuggling—677
Narcotics production—316
Narcotics trafficking, U.S. national emergency—621
President—908
Colorado, Governor—556, 696
Commerce, Department of
Acting Secretary—553
Advanced Technology Program—637
Deputy Secretary—243
Export Administration, Bureau of—424
General Counsel—424
Information Infrastructure, U.S. Advisory Council on the National—243
Secretary Brown—170, 205, 243, 378, 541, 543, 545, 547, 550, 553, 554, 562, 575, 576, 599, 1010, 1011
Secretary Kantor—576, 595, 803, 1011
Standards and Technology, National Institute of—379
Under Secretaries—553, 1003
U.S. aircraft tragedy in Croatia—541, 543, 545, 547, 550, 553, 554, 562, 599, 874, 1010, 1011
Commerce, international
See also specific country or subject; Economy, international
Alaska North Slope oil exports—651
Export controls—857
Exports, U.S.—575, 777, 865, 964
Free and fair trade—319, 323, 777, 814
Group of Seven nations (G-7)—980, 982, 984-986, 989, 991, 1018
Investment treaties—341
Natural rubber agreement, international—932

Commerce, international—Continued
North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)—160, 382
Trade and development policy for Africa, report—166
Trade expansion, U.S.—475
Trade Policy Agenda and Trade Agreements Program, report—519
U.S. sanctions against countries trading with Iran or Libya, proposed legislation—809
Commodity Credit Corporation. *See* Agriculture, Department of
Commodity Futures Trading Commission—1006, 1013
Communications
Educational television—894
Electronic information, access and literacy—81, 98, 134, 243, 257, 261, 269, 335, 403, 517, 620, 826, 845, 854, 940
Electronic information, content—906
News media. *See* specific State, country, or news organization
Telecommunications—127, 150, 185, 188, 191, 221, 243
Television programming blocking device—80, 181, 187, 189, 191, 194, 221, 343, 344, 346, 351
Violence in entertainment—80, 181, 187, 191, 221, 343, 344, 346, 351
Communications Commission, Federal—189, 243, 894
Communications Decency Act of 1996—906
Community Service, Corporation for National and—67, 637, 1004, 1011
Comoros, U.S. Ambassador—1008
Computers. *See* Communications; Education
Congo
Ambassador to U.S.—1013
U.S. Ambassador—1008
Congress
See also specific subject
Enrollment requirement waiver legislation—562
Members, meetings with President—1, 18, 671, 683, 861, 1003, 1009, 1017
Regulatory review—525
Senate majority leader—35, 92, 171, 624, 634, 680, 740, 809, 874, 891, 1014, 1016
Speaker of the House of Representatives—39, 92, 1005
Congressional Gold Medal—685
Connecticut
Blizzard—1005
Democratic Party event—796
President's visit—787, 796, 1014
Conservation
See also Agriculture; Environment
Coastal zone protection—851
Endangered species protection—637
Federal lands—884
Forest preservation—332, 335, 581, 637, 639, 700
Wetlands protection—637
Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996—525
Contracts, Federal. *See* Government agencies and employees
Corning, Inc.—379
Corporate Citizenship, White House Conference on—741, 749, 1014
Counties, National Association of—366, 395
Credit Union Administration Board, National—1011
Crime. *See* Law enforcement and crime
Crime Control and Prevention, National Commission on—1006
Crime Victims' Rights Week, National—603, 629
Croatia
Ambassador to U.S.—1006
Bosnia conflict. *See* Bosnia-Herzegovina
President—46, 63, 304, 1004
President Clinton's visit—63, 1004
U.S. aircraft tragedy near Dubrovnik. *See* Commerce, Department of
Cuba
Democracy and freedom—432, 433
Downing of U.S. civilian aircraft—331, 339, 350, 432, 433
Economic sanctions—339, 432, 433, 532, 903, 912
U.S. national emergency—350
U.S. restrictions on travel and other activities—339, 350, 433
Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996—432, 433, 532, 808, 903, 912
Cultural Property Advisory Commission—1006
Customs Service, U.S. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Cyprus
Conflict resolution—8, 394, 560, 675, 717, 718, 921, 922
President—921, 1016
U.S. Ambassador—1010
U.S. Special Emissary—8, 394, 921, 922
Czech and Slovak American Enterprise Fund—1013

Dallas Cowboys—245
Defense and national security
See also Arms and munitions; Nuclear weapons
Counterterrorism efforts—202, 445, 447, 454, 463, 466, 467, 551, 579, 589, 603, 628, 630, 641, 656, 980, 983, 985, 986, 990, 991, 995, 996
Military strength and deterrence—790
Terrorists threatening Middle East peace efforts, U.S. national emergency—77, 78, 201
Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, National—226
Defense, Department of
See also specific military department; Armed Forces, U.S.
Assistant Secretary—1006
Budget—226
Deputy Secretary—5, 476, 820, 999, 1001, 1006
Joint Chiefs of Staff—60, 117, 227, 476, 755, 785, 820, 999, 1001
Military Academy, U.S.—1010
Retirement Board of Actuaries—1005
Secretary—33, 117, 200, 227, 256, 265, 573, 656, 670, 755, 763, 785, 849, 991, 1006, 1013

Delaware
Blizzard—1003
President's visits—554, 1011, 1012
Democracy, National Endowment for—305
Democratic Business Council—1015
Democratic Club, National—24
Democratic Governors Association—167
Democratic National Committee—502, 640, 709, 948, 971, 1009, 1011, 1013-1017
Democratic Party
See also specific State; Elections
Senate Democratic Issues Conference—1012
Department. *See* other part of subject
Development Cooperation Agency, U.S. International
Development, Agency for International (USAID)—1008
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)—1015, 1016
Disabilities, President's Committee on Employment of People With—801
Disability, National Council on—1003, 1009
Disabled persons—801
Disaster assistance
Alabama storms, flooding, and tornadoes—1008, 1009
Alaska fires—1016
Arkansas storms and tornadoes—1012
Connecticut blizzard—1005
Delaware blizzard—1003
District of Columbia blizzard—33, 1003
Idaho storms and flooding—1006
Illinois storms, flooding, and tornadoes—1012, 1013
Indiana blizzard—1010
Iowa storms and flooding—1017
Kentucky blizzard, flooding, and tornadoes—850, 1004, 1015
Maine storms and flooding—1009, 1014
Maryland blizzard and flooding—33, 1003, 1004
Massachusetts blizzard—1005
Minnesota ice storm and flooding—1003, 1015
Montana storms and flooding—1008, 1014
Nebraska storms and tornado—1018
New Jersey blizzard—1004
New York blizzard, storms, and flooding—1003, 1005
North Carolina blizzard and winter storm—1004, 1008
North Dakota storms and flooding—1016
Northwest and Northeast, blizzard, flooding, and hurricanes—1014
Ohio flooding—1005, 1017
Oregon storms, flooding, and high winds—200, 253, 1006, 1009
Pennsylvania blizzard and flooding—273, 274, 277, 1004, 1017
Rhode Island blizzard—1005
South Dakota winter storm—1003
Southern Plains States drought—834
Vermont ice and flooding—1007, 1018
Virginia blizzard and flooding—1004, 1005
Washington storms and flooding—200, 248, 1006
Disaster assistance—Continued
West Virginia blizzard and flooding—1004, 1005, 1014
Discrimination. *See* Civil rights
Disease Control and Prevention, Centers for. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
District of Columbia
Blizzard—33, 1003
Budget—9, 14, 526
Eastern High School—673
Djibouti, U.S. Ambassador—1014
Dominican Republic, narcotics production—316
Drake University—228, 232
Drug abuse and trafficking
See also Law enforcement and crime
Cocaine smuggling—677
Drug control strategy, national—657, 660, 665, 735
Federal District Court reversal of drug case ruling in Manhattan, NY—533
International cooperation—660, 901
Juvenile drug abuse—27, 384, 388, 658, 660, 735
Narcotics producing and transit countries—316, 621, 660
Prevention and treatment efforts—83, 376, 551, 659, 661, 790, 1011
Substance abuse by women, report—863
Drug Control Policy, Office of National—83, 148, 376, 386, 657, 659, 660, 735, 738, 1004, 1008, 1009, 1016
Drug Enforcement Administration. *See* Justice, Department of

Earth Day—617
Easter—544, 556
Economic summit, international—980, 982, 984-986, 989, 991, 1018
Economy, international. *See* Commerce, international
Economy, national
See also Budget, Federal; Commerce, international
Federal budget negotiations, effect—38, 40
Growth—79, 272, 315, 403, 406, 479, 489, 527, 570, 872, 874, 943, 990
Savings Association Insurance Fund, proposed legislation—633, 639
Stock market—873
Ecuador
Narcotics production—316
President—1017
U.S. Ambassador—1010
Education
See also specific institution; Taxation
Bilingual education—107
Blue Ribbon schools—823
Charter schools—516
College grants and loans—82, 134, 182, 550, 638, 855, 893, 940
Electronic information, access and literacy—81, 98, 134, 257, 261, 269, 335, 403, 517, 620, 826, 845, 854, 940
Fulbright scholarship program—866
Funding—638, 856
Goals 2000—69, 81, 141, 513, 637

Education—Continued
Goals, national—97, 134, 178, 511, 620, 823, 843, 854
HOPE scholarships. *See* Taxation, tuition tax credit and deduction
National Governors' Association summit—511
Postsecondary and job training—82, 98, 134, 136, 165, 182, 222, 333, 335, 400, 413, 418, 490, 491, 500, 570, 749, 843, 855, 860, 893, 936, 940
Safe schools programs and efforts—324-326, 328, 383, 388, 516, 766, 832, 896
Satellite seminar programs—470
School uniforms—324-326, 328, 390, 736, 832, 894, 897
Service program, national—69, 184, 637, 731, 855
Standards, national—513
Teachers—515, 619, 827
Work-study programs—228, 731, 855
Education, Department of
Assistant Secretaries—803, 1003, 1004
Deputy Secretary—243
Read-Write-Now Challenge—825, 919
Secretary—28, 178, 257, 261, 325, 326, 331, 390, 511, 513, 516, 619, 620, 823, 919, 940
Egypt
See also Middle East
President—436, 438, 1008, 1017
President Clinton's visit—436, 438, 1009
Summit of peacemakers—434-436, 438, 446, 453, 457, 463, 466
Eid al-Adha—639
Eid al-Fitr—301
El Salvador, U.S. Ambassador—1013
Elections
See also specific party or State
Campaign finance reform—85, 148, 281, 290
1996 Presidential campaign—40, 123, 124, 142, 228, 233, 241, 245, 306, 531, 532, 662, 707, 714, 949
Primaries—280, 290, 291, 306
Redistricting—912
Emergency Management Agency, Federal—3, 33, 200, 247, 248, 253, 274, 276, 337, 546, 850
Employment and unemployment
See also Business and industry; Labor issues
Family-friendly initiatives in the workplace—744, 962, 964, 974
Family leave—490, 499, 675, 687, 933, 969, 974
Job creation—412, 418
Job training and education—82, 98, 134, 136, 165, 182, 222, 333, 335, 400, 413, 418, 490, 491, 500, 570, 749, 843, 855, 860, 893, 936, 940
Minimum wage—82, 150, 310, 522, 527, 619, 627, 634, 705-707, 796, 815
Pension plans—82, 98, 310, 413, 490, 500, 569, 627, 747, 815, 860, 864, 883, 936
Workplace safety—490, 501, 746
Empowerment zones—309, 414, 866, 959
Endeavour. *See* Space program, shuttle
Energy
Alaska North Slope oil exports—651
Low-income home energy assistance—1011
Energy—Continued
Nuclear energy—604, 617
U.S. petroleum reserves—661, 664, 706
Energy, Department of
Energy Regulatory Commission, Federal—1013
Secretary—661, 664
Enrichment Corporation, U.S.—1005
Entertainment industry—80, 181, 187, 191, 343, 344, 346, 351, 742, 894
Environment
See also Agriculture; Conservation
Environmental management waivers—639
Federal policy—84, 409
Federal regulation—410
Global warming—273
Nuclear waste storage—883
Superfund program—412
Sustainable development—992
Toxic waste—69, 101, 409, 411, 430, 959
Waste disposal—510
Environment Day Conference, White House—1016
Environmental Protection Agency—101, 410, 510, 617, 637, 638, 859
Environmental Quality, Council on—617
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—1016
Eritrea, U.S. Ambassador—1014
Estonia, President—1017
Ethiopia, U.S. Ambassador—1009
Europe
See also specific country
Conventional armed forces treaty—849
Economic conditions—996
Trade with U.S.—901
European Coalition, Central and East—1006
European Commission—901
European Communities, Commission of the—1006
European Union—9, 339, 394, 529, 837, 901, 1016
Export Administration, Bureau of. *See* Commerce, Department of
Export-Import Bank of the U.S.—1003, 1011
Exports, U.S. *See* Commerce, Department of; Commerce, international

Fairleigh Dickinson University—408, 412
Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993—675, 687
Family Re-Union V: Balancing Work and Families—964
Farm Credit Administration—225
Farm Credit System Reform Act of 1996—225
Father's Day—919
Federal. *See* other part of subject
FEMA. *See* Emergency Management Agency, Federal
FHA. *See* Housing and Urban Development, Department of
Fine Arts, Commission of—1008
Finland, Ambassador to U.S.—1013
Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. *See* Interior, Department of the
Fishery agreements. *See* Maritime affairs
Florida
Democratic Party event—662
Everglades restoration—545, 665

Florida—Continued
George Washington Carver Middle School in Coral Gables—657
Governor—696, 999, 1001
Mainland High School in Daytona Beach—823
President's visits—657, 662, 999, 1001, 1018
Food and Drug Administration. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Foreign Assets Control, Office of. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, President's—1004, 1007, 1015
Foreign policy, U.S.
See also specific country, region, or subject
Economic and political involvement abroad—27, 84, 108, 125, 126, 197, 319, 526, 578, 790, 795
Foreign relations legislation—578
Science, Technology and American Diplomacy, report—483
France
Economic summit in Lyons. *See* Commerce, international; Economic summit, international
Middle East peace efforts, role—636, 669
President—120, 121, 128, 984, 986, 1018
President Clinton's visit—982, 984-986, 989, 991, 1018
South Pacific nuclear free zone treaty with United Kingdom and U.S.—489
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission—1013
Freedom, Presidential Medal of—75
Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board, J. William—1005, 1008

Gambling impact study commission, national—416
General Services Administration—72, 102, 1008
Geologic Mapping Advisory Committee—1007
Georgetown University—741, 749
Georgia
Governor—856
Olympic games in Atlanta. *See* Sports
President's visit—63, 1004
Georgia, Republic of, trade with U.S.—851
Germany
Aviation agreements with U.S.—806, 814
Chancellor—801, 804, 805, 812, 815, 1008, 1012, 1014
Ghana, U.S. Ambassador—930
Goals 2000. *See* Education
Government agencies and employees
See also specific agency
Combined Federal Campaign—980
Compliance with immigration and naturalization laws—246
Congressional regulatory review—525
Family-friendly initiatives—746, 962
Federal building bombing in Oklahoma City. *See* Oklahoma
Federal contracts—85, 141, 246, 321, 865, 959
Funding—1, 2, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 27, 35, 73, 86, 253, 407, 411, 435, 462
Government agencies and employees—Continued
Locating Federal facilities on historic properties—959
Missing persons and missing children, posting of photos—71
Personnel reductions—26, 750
Procurement—226
Regulatory reform—524, 525, 859, 864
Government Printing Office—510
Governors' Association, National—163, 164, 171, 511
Greece
Cyprus conflict. *See* Cyprus
Foreign Minister—723
President—715, 716, 718, 723, 1004
Prime Minister—117, 560, 1005, 1007
Relations with Turkey—117, 560, 716-719, 722, 905, 922
Gridiron Club—1010
Group of Seven nations (G-7). *See* Commerce, international; Economic summit, international
Guam, Commonwealth Negotiations, Special Representative—1008
Guatemala
Ambassador to U.S.—1013
Narcotics production—316
U.S. Ambassador—1010
Guinea, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses, Presidential Advisory Committee on—255, 265
Gun control. *See* Law enforcement and crime

Habitat for Humanity—900, 956
Haiti
Economic reforms—485
Elections—184, 198
Human rights—487
Investment and development—185
Narcotics production—316
President—184, 485
U.S. military role—476, 487
Harman International Industries—396
Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation—1004, 1009
Health and Human Services, Department of
Assistant Secretary—1004
Disease Control and Prevention, Centers for—264, 480, 591, 815
Food and Drug Administration—239, 351, 480, 523, 524
Head Start—69
Low-income home energy assistance program—1011
Medicare and Medicaid—19, 31, 41, 50, 69, 83, 165, 175, 219, 708, 803, 841, 848, 862, 925, 946
Radiation control, annual report—518
Secretary—112, 239, 256, 265, 307, 480, 523, 733, 779, 915, 927
Health and medical care
Abortion—227, 342, 565, 567, 568, 810, 874
Acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS)—291, 351, 685, 779, 780
Cancer prevention and treatment—523
Ebola virus—591

Health and medical care—Continued
Human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)—200, 226, 638, 779, 780
Infectious disease control, international efforts—901
Insurance—82, 98, 146, 150, 176, 208, 212, 236, 310, 371, 413, 418, 419, 435, 484, 490, 500, 570, 619, 627, 634, 649, 664, 733, 747, 752, 803, 861, 873, 883, 925, 936
Nurses—923
Post-partum hospital stays—733
Teenage pregnancy—81, 111, 913
Veterans illnesses. *See* Veterans
Helms-Burton act. *See* Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996
Hispanic Americans, President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for—1011
Hispanic Publications, National Association of—105
Historic Preservation, Advisory Council on—1007, 1015
Historical Publications and Records Commission, National—1010
Holocaust Memorial Council, U.S.—1006, 1007, 1010
Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal—1003, 1013
Home Team Sports—537
Homeless persons—100
Honduras, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Hong Kong, narcotics production—316
Housing
Homeownership—101, 314, 644, 867, 868
Low-income housing—959
Public housing—519, 521
Housing and Urban Development, Department of
Assistant Secretaries—310, 1009, 1011
Housing Administration, Federal (FHA)—648, 867, 870
"One strike and you're out" initiative for public housing—519, 521
Secretary—100, 101, 310, 314, 519, 520, 521, 648, 867, 869
Human immunodeficiency virus (HIV). *See* Armed Forces, U.S.; Health and medical care
Humanities, National Council on the—1015
Humanities, National Endowment for the. *See* Arts and the Humanities, National Foundation on the
Hungary
Minister of Defense—59
President—59
President Clinton's visit—56, 58, 59
Prime Minister—59
Taszar Air Base—56, 59

Iceland, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Idaho
President's visit—256
Storms and flooding—256, 1006
Illinois, storms, flooding, and tornadoes—1012, 1013
Immigration and naturalization
See also specific country or region
Denial of Federal contracts to businesses hiring illegal immigrants—85, 246
Federal policy—85, 108, 632, 886
Immigration and naturalization—Continued
Illegal immigration, prevention efforts—684, 708, 887
Immigration and Naturalization Service. *See* Justice, Department of
Immigration Reform, Commission on—68
"In Performance at the White House"—695
India
Ambassador to U.S.—1013
Narcotics production—316
Indiana, blizzard—1010
Indians, American. *See* Native Americans
Individuals With Disabilities Education Act—802
Information Agency, U.S.—46, 339
Information Infrastructure, U.S. Advisory Council on the National. *See* Commerce, Department of
Infrastructure
See also Transportation
Development—101
Insurance Agents of America, Independent—484
Intelligence. *See* Central Intelligence Agency; Defense and national security
Intelligence Community, Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the U.S.—1008, 1012
Inter-American Dialogue—758
Interior, Department of the
Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S.—988
Park Service, National—617
Secretary—617
Internal Revenue Service, National Commission on the Restructuring of the—1015
Investigation, Federal Bureau of. *See* Justice, Department of
Iowa
North Iowa Area Community College—215
President's visit—209, 215, 228, 232, 1006
Storms and flooding—1017
Iran
Narcotics production—316
Nuclear weapons development—605, 607
U.S. national emergency—403, 423, 756
U.S. policy—441, 450, 467
Iraq
Economic sanctions—7, 8, 203, 380, 692
Human rights—7, 692
Humanitarian assistance—7, 205, 380, 692
Maritime sanctions enforcement—380, 692
No-fly zones—7, 380, 692
President—380, 692
Reparations to Kuwait—7, 8, 381, 693
United Nations Security Council resolutions—7, 380, 691
U.S. military role—7, 692
U.S. national emergency—202
Weapons of mass destruction, development—7, 380, 692
Ireland
Deputy Prime Minister—1006
President—461, 907-909, 917, 918
Prime Minister—206, 343, 426, 456, 460, 872, 920, 1009, 1016
U.S. Ambassador—425, 458, 460, 917

Ireland—Continued
U.S. Special Adviser—96, 458-460, 872, 908
Ireland, Northern. *See* Northern Ireland
Irish-American of the Year—425
Israel
See also Middle East
Agreement with Lebanon and Syria—635, 653, 669, 720
Ambassador to U.S.—374, 465, 653
Blockade of Palestinian areas—440, 447
Capital location—444
Counterterrorism agreement with U.S.—445, 447, 454, 465, 656, 667, 670
Counterterrorism assistance—366, 373
Elections—451, 669, 822, 828, 847, 848
Foreign Minister—76, 670
Hezbollah rocket attacks and Israeli response—588, 599, 601, 606, 623, 653, 654, 720
Likud Party—441, 451
President—444
President Clinton's visit—443, 444, 451, 1009
Prime Minister Netanyahu—847, 848, 911, 992, 1015, 1018
Prime Minister Peres—124, 353, 359, 373, 382, 444, 451, 454, 635, 653-656, 667, 670, 847, 848, 1009, 1012, 1015
Security relationship with U.S.—446, 448, 656, 670
Terrorist attacks—336, 353, 359, 366, 373, 374, 382, 395, 408, 422, 434, 436, 443, 451, 465, 552
U.S. Ambassador—653
U.S. loan guarantees—1
Italy
Ambassador to U.S.—1006
Aviano Air Base—55
Elections—531
President—528, 529, 537, 540
President Clinton's visit—55
Prime Minister—901

Jamaica, narcotics production—316
James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation—1012
Japan
Ambassador to U.S.—1006
Arms control negotiations and agreements—587
Emperor—594, 1011, 1012
Foreign Minister—1004
President Clinton's visit—585, 591, 594, 595, 598, 1011, 1012
Prime Minister—319, 322, 585, 592, 594-596, 598, 603, 985, 1003, 1006, 1007, 1011
Security alliance with U.S.—573, 586, 589-592, 596, 603, 776
Trade with U.S.—322, 356, 574, 587, 597
U.S. Ambassador—591
U.S. military presence on Okinawa—653, 587, 589-591, 596
Whaling activities—205
Joint Chiefs of Staff. *See* Defense, Department of
Jordan
See also Middle East
King—381, 435, 848
Justice, Department of
Assistant Attorney General—875
Associate Attorney General—307
Attorney General—71, 87, 88, 90, 201, 227, 307, 327, 331, 390, 434, 507, 552, 622, 628, 657, 659, 677, 735, 736, 738, 834, 886, 898, 955, 978, 979, 987
Drug Enforcement Administration—660
Immigration and Naturalization Service—632
Investigation, Federal Bureau of (FBI)—71, 875, 903, 912, 914, 979, 980, 994
Violence Against Women, Office of—307
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Coordinating Council on—1005

Kazakstan
Ambassador to U.S.—1013
Arms control negotiations and agreements—611
Trade with U.S.—851
Kentucky
Blizzard—1004
Governor—89
Male High School in Louisville—90
President's visit—87, 90
Storms, flooding, and tornadoes—850, 1015
Kentucky, University of—783, 1010
Kenya, U.S. Ambassador—1010
King's College—274, 275
Korea, North
Korean Peninsula peace efforts—583, 584, 589, 603
Nuclear weapons development—776
Korea, South
Korean Peninsula peace efforts—583, 589, 603
President—581, 582, 589, 603, 1011
President Clinton's visit—582, 1011
Security relationship with U.S.—583
Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization—122
Kuwait, Amir—1007, 1008
Kyrgyzstan, trade with U.S.—851

Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, American Federation of—627
Labor, Department of
Assistant Secretary—1006
Occupational Safety and Health Administration—501, 747, 859
Secretary—625, 928
Solicitor—1015
Labor issues
See also specific industry; Employment and unemployment
General Motors strike, mediation efforts—486
Railroad disputes—1014
Replacement of workers on strike—141
Labor Relations Board, National—1004
Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996—510
Laos
Narcotics production—316
U.S. Ambassador—1010
Latvia, President—1017, 1018
Law enforcement and crime
See also Drug abuse and trafficking

Law enforcement and crime—Continued
Assault weapons ban—147, 485, 507
Capital punishment—629, 631
Child support enforcement—915, 926-928
Church burnings—830, 874, 875, 888, 898, 905, 908, 913, 914, 921, 928, 957, 975, 1017
Community-based curfews—833, 878, 894, 896, 960
Community policing—87, 90, 92, 108, 153, 637, 729, 735, 737, 739, 763, 765, 887, 937
Counterterrorism efforts. *See* Defense and national security
Crime prevention efforts—83, 99, 507, 691, 735, 765, 954, 960
Domestic violence—307, 371, 936
Gun control—935
Illegal immigration—85, 246, 684, 708, 887
International cooperation—48, 122, 445, 454, 466, 529, 551, 589, 656, 718, 981, 983, 985, 986, 990, 991, 995, 996
Juvenile crime and violence—27, 83, 95, 207, 384, 388, 735, 764, 831, 876, 881, 896
Memorial ceremony for law enforcement officers—738
"One strike and you're out" initiative for public housing—519, 521
Sex offenders—763, 766, 954, 960, 979
Victims' rights—976, 987
Lebanon
Agreement with Israel and Syria—635, 653, 669, 720
Economic assistance—624
Hezbollah rocket attacks on Israel and Israeli response—588, 599, 601, 606, 623, 653, 654, 720
Humanitarian assistance—624
Lebanese sovereignty—623, 720
Narcotics production—316
President—623, 635
Prime Minister—720
Legal Services Corporation—638
Legal system. *See* Civil justice system
Liberia
Civil conflict—557, 572, 781
Evacuation of U.S. citizens—572, 781
U.S. military role—572, 781
Library of Congress—185
Libya
Economic sanctions—4, 77
U.S. national emergency—4, 77
Line-item veto. *See* Budget, Federal
Line Item Veto Act—556, 559
Literacy, National Institute for—1005, 1007, 1013
Lithuania, President—1017, 1018
Louisiana
Economic development—193
Fort Polk, Leesville—476
Governor—838, 1015
President's visits—471, 476, 478, 829, 838, 845, 1009, 1015

Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of
Ambassador to U.S.—1006
Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of—Continued
Bosnia conflict. *See* Bosnia-Herzegovina
U.S. Ambassador—1009
Maine, storms and flooding—1009, 1014
Malaysia
Ambassador to U.S.—1013
Extradition treaty with U.S.—768
Narcotics production—316
Prime Minister—1014
Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards—378
Management and Budget, Office of—3, 200, 275, 315, 577
Marine Corps, U.S. *See* Navy, Department of the
Maritime affairs
Fishery agreements—206, 305
Oil tankship safety measures—651
Whaling—205
Maritime Commission, Federal—1006
Marshall Islands, Ambassador to U.S.—1013
Maryland
Blizzard—33, 1003
Eleanor Roosevelt High School in Greenbelt—383, 388
Flooding—1004
Governor—383, 393
President's visits—5, 383, 388, 534, 537, 617, 1003, 1010-1013
Train collision in Silver Spring—296, 303
Welfare reform—774
Massachusetts, blizzard—1005
Mauritius, U.S. Ambassador—449, 1008
Mayors, U.S. Conference of—96, 395, 955
McDonnell Douglas—318
Meals on Wheels—10, 12
Medical care. *See* Health and medical care
Medicare and Medicaid. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Megan's Law—763, 766, 955, 960, 979
Memorial Day—818, 820
Mental Retardation, President's Committee on—1017
Mexico
Cocaine smuggling—677
Narcotics production—316
Michigan
Democratic Party event—360
Detroit airport expansion—782
Governor—782
President's visit—354, 359, 360
Microsoft Corporation—332
Middle East
See also specific country
Counterterrorism efforts—437, 439, 440, 442-445, 447, 448, 450, 453, 456, 466
Economic sanctions—202
Peace efforts—77, 124, 336, 353, 359, 366, 373, 381, 395, 422, 438, 444, 528, 588, 599-602, 606, 611, 623, 625, 635, 641, 653, 667, 670, 671, 720, 794, 822, 848, 901, 992, 1008
Summit of peacemakers—434-436, 439, 443, 446, 453, 457, 463, 466
Terrorists threatening peace efforts, U.S. national emergency—70, 201

Middle East—Continued
U.S. Special Coordinator—599, 601, 653
Military Academy, U.S. *See* Defense, Department of
Minnesota
Ice storm and flooding—1003, 1015
Worthington High School—621
Minority business. *See* Business and industry
Missing and Exploited Children, National Center for—71
Missouri
Governor—1017
President's visit—764, 769
Webster Groves High School—764
Mojave National Preserve—637
Moldova, trade with U.S.—851
Mongolia, trade with U.S.—851
Montana, storms and flooding—1008, 1014
Montenegro
Economic sanctions—818, 836
U.S. national emergency—818, 835
Morocco, King—1009
Mortgage Association, Federal National—577, 1013
Museum Services Board, National—1007

NAACP. *See* Advancement of Colored People, National Association for the
Namibia, U.S. Ambassador—1009
National. *See* other part of subject
Native Americans, gambling rights—416
NATO. *See* North Atlantic Treaty Organization
Navy, Department of the
See also Armed Forces, U.S.
Marine Corps, U.S.—253, 724
Secretary—5, 785, 792, 793
U.S.S. *Independence*—591
U.S.S. *Intrepid*—792
Nebraska, storms and tornado—1018
Nepal, Ambassador to U.S.—1013
Netherlands, taxation convention with U.S.—5
Nevada
Governor—881, 976
President's visit—876, 881, 1016
Nevada, University of—876
New Hampshire
Democratic Party event—297
President's visits—129, 136, 142, 151, 155, 162, 281, 282, 286, 290, 297, 1005
Salem High School—142
New Hampshire College—290
New Jersey
Blizzard—1004
Christopher Columbus Junior High School in Union City—257
Democratic Party events—700, 1013
President's visits—257, 261, 408, 695, 697, 700, 851, 1007, 1009, 1013
Woodbridge High School—695, 697
New Mexico
Governor—895
Grover Cleveland Middle School in Albuquerque—895
President's visits—412, 895
New York
Blizzard—1003
New York—Continued
Democratic Party events—265, 427, 971, 1017
National Governors' Association education summit—511
President's visits—265, 425, 427, 511, 792, 793, 971, 1017
Storms and flooding—1005
Nicaragua, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Niger, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Nigeria, narcotics production—316
North Atlantic Treaty Organization—58, 60, 120, 121, 304, 529, 614, 775, 806, 905, 1005, 1007
North Carolina, storms and blizzard—1004, 1008
North Dakota, storms and flooding—1016
North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission—1003
Northern Ireland
Alliance Party—460
Cease-fire—458, 461, 602
Democratic Unionist Party—1009
Irish Republican Army (IRA)—199, 206, 459
Peace efforts—96, 199, 206, 242, 301, 336, 343, 426, 458, 459, 461, 573, 602, 606, 872, 907-909, 912, 913, 920, 1015
Sinn Fein—460, 1005
Social Democratic and Labour Party—425, 460
Ulster Unionist Party—460, 1007
U.S. Special Adviser—96, 458-460, 872, 908
Nuclear Regulatory Commission—1010
Nuclear weapons
See also Arms and munitions; Defense and national security
Arms control negotiations and agreements—85, 104, 105, 122, 489, 581, 587, 603, 604, 611, 616, 777, 849, 989
Dismantling and disposal—227
Nonproliferation—104, 105, 989
Nuclear materials security—551, 605, 611
South Pacific nuclear free zone treaty with France and United Kingdom—489
Test ban—85, 122, 238, 581, 587, 604, 616, 790, 989
Nurses Association, American—923
Nutrition Monitoring Advisory Council—1007

Occupational Safety and Health Administration. *See* Labor, Department of
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission—1006, 1011
Office. *See* other part of subject
Ohio
Democratic caucuses—43
Democratic Party events—502, 1017
Flooding—1005, 1017
President's visits—491, 495, 502, 955, 1017
Welfare reform—688
Oklahoma
Federal building bombing in Oklahoma City—546, 547, 549, 553, 579, 600, 603, 1010
Governor—546, 547, 549, 628
President's visit—546, 547, 549, 1010
Oklahoma, University of Central—549
Olympic Committee's Champions in Life, U.S.—673

Olympic games. *See* Sports
Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996—636, 641, 642, 687
Oregon
  Governor—253
  President's visit—253, 1007
  Storms, flooding, and high winds—200, 253, 1006, 1009
  Welfare reform—158
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC). *See* Development Cooperation Agency, U.S. International

Pacific Basin Economic Council—775
Pacific Halibut Commission, International—1005
Pakistan, narcotics production—316
Palau, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Palestinian Authority—353, 359, 373, 382, 422, 437, 447, 456, 655, 669, 671, 993, 1009
Palestinians
  See also Middle East
  Palestinian Covenant revision—671, 672
Panama, narcotics production—316
Panama Canal Commission—1015
Panama Canal Consultative Committee—1013
Papua New Guinea
  Ambassador to U.S.—1013
  U.S. Ambassador—1014
Paraguay
  Narcotics production—316
  President—1012
Park Service, National. *See* Interior, Department of the
Partnership Council, National—1004, 1008
Partnership For Peace—58, 775
Passover—543
Peace Corps—930
Pennsylvania
  Blizzard—1004
  Democratic Party events—640, 1012
  Flooding—272, 274, 276, 1004, 1017
  Governor—274, 276
  President's visits—272, 274, 275, 640, 725, 1007, 1012
Pennsylvania State University—725
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation—569
Peru
  Narcotics production—316
  President—1014
  U.S. Ambassador—1010
Peterbilt Truck Plant—46
Pharmaceutical industry—386, 392
Philippines, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Point Reyes National Seashore—618
Poland
  Fishery agreement with U.S.—206
  President—1013
Prayer Breakfast, National—118
Presidential. *See* other part of subject
President's Day—295
Princeton University—851
Prison Industries Corporation, Federal—1005
Procter & Gamble—491, 499
Public Broadcasting, Corporation for—1015

Radio Marti. *See* Information Agency, U.S.
Railroad industry—1014
Ramadan—72
Realtors, National Association of—644
Red Cross, International—997
Regulatory reform. *See* Government agencies and employees
Reserve System, Federal—40, 68, 272, 315, 424, 577, 622, 874
Retirement Thrift Investment Board, Federal—1005
Rhode Island, blizzard—1005
Romania
  Ambassador to U.S.—1006
  Trade with U.S.—4
Ron Brown Corporate Citizenship Award—744
Russia
  Arms control negotiations and agreements—104, 105, 581, 611, 849
  Chechnya region—614, 804
  Economic and Technological Cooperation, U.S.-Russian Joint Commission on—114
  Economic assistance—115, 609, 616
  Economic conditions—114, 995
  Elections—530, 607, 612, 669, 810, 911, 921, 928, 995
  Highly-enriched uranium agreement with U.S.—617
  Humanitarian assistance—609
  Minister of Defense—849
  Nuclear equipment and technology, sale to Iran—605, 607
  Nuclear security summit—602, 604, 610, 642, 1012
  President—105, 114, 115, 604, 607, 610, 804, 810, 921, 928, 993, 995, 996, 1005, 1007, 1009, 1011-1013
  President Clinton's visit—599-602, 604, 610, 1012
  Prime Minister—114, 993, 996
  Relations with U.S.—611
  START II nuclear arms reduction treaty with U.S.—104, 105
  Trade with U.S.—611
Rwanda
  Ambassador to U.S.—1013
  United Nations war crimes tribunal—226
  U.S. Special Coordinator—923
Ryan White CARE Act Amendments of 1996—685, 779, 780

St. Patrick's Day—350, 456, 460
Salary Council, Federal—1011
Sander Lockheed Company—136
Saudi Arabia
  Foreign Minister—450
  King—981
  Terrorist bombing of U.S. military complex. *See* Armed Forces, U.S.
  U.S. Ambassador—1016
Saxophone Club—713, 888, 1017
Scholars, Presidential—937, 1003, 1012, 1018
Schools. *See* specific institution or State; Education
Science and technology
  Communications. *See* Communications

Science and technology—Continued
Research and development—865
Science, Technology and American Diplomacy, report—483
Space program. *See* Space program
Science and Technology Policy, Office of—1013, 1014
Science Board, National—741
Science Foundation, National—795
Science, National Academy of—822
Science, National Medal of—1016
Securities and Exchange Commission—864
Security, national. *See* Defense and national security
Security Policy Advisory Board—1009
Senegal, U.S. Ambassador—1009
Serbia (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)
Bosnia conflict. *See* Bosnia-Herzegovina
Economic sanctions—818, 836
President—304, 1004
U.S. national emergency—818, 835
Service Employees International Union—625
Service program, national. *See* AmeriCorps; Education
Seychelles, U.S. Ambassador—1014
Small business. *See* Business and industry
Small Business Administration—155, 255, 274, 380, 857-859, 864, 1008
Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996—859, 865
Small Business Week—857
Small Business, White House Conference on—525, 859, 863
Smithsonian Institution
Art, National Gallery of—1004
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts—650, 1013
Social Security—86, 116, 190, 525, 767
Social Security Administration—767, 971
Social Security Advisory Board—1004
Solomon Islands, U.S. Ambassador—1014
South Carolina, President's visits—898, 1003
South Dakota, winter storm—1003
Soviet Union, New Independent States (NIS) of the Former
See also specific country
U.S. Special Adviser—1004
Space program
International cooperation—982
Report—982
Shuttle—75, 103, 110
Sports
Baseball—340, 481, 534, 537, 1010
Basketball—783, 1010
Football—245, 724
Olympic summer games—481, 536, 636, 673, 676, 716, 732, 942, 956, 975, 1017
Soccer—481
Stand for Children—847
Standards and Technology, National Institute of. *See* Commerce, Department of
State and local governments
See also specific subject or State; Cities
Tobacco use by minors, prevention efforts—481, 507, 699
State and local governments—Continued
Welfare reform—419, 505, 646, 663, 688, 773, 842
State, County and Municipal Employees, American Federation of—943
State, Department of
Ambassadors. *See* specific country
Assistant Secretaries—304, 1004, 1011, 1014, 1015
Deputy Secretary—185
International agreements, reports—395, 932
Secretary—3, 117, 201, 434, 445, 588, 591, 595, 599-602, 606, 622, 623, 625, 635, 653, 670, 785, 980
Treaties and conventions, reports—305, 341, 768
State Justice Institute—1018
States, Organization of American—487
Sterling Forest—618, 700
Sudan, Ambassador to U.S.—1013
Suriname, U.S. Ambassador—1010
Sustainable Development, President's Council on—394
Swaziland, U.S. Ambassador—1014
Switzerland, U.S. Ambassador—21, 1016
Syria
See also Middle East
Agreement with Lebanon and Israel—635, 669
Narcotics production—316
President—124, 449, 606, 623, 635

Taiwan
Narcotics production—316
Relations with China—417, 508, 588, 776
Tajikistan, trade with U.S.—851
Taxation
Adoption tax credit—694, 731
Earned-income tax credit—42, 82
Flat tax—126, 421, 648
Gas tax—679, 705-707, 807
Health insurance deduction—864
Tax cut proposals—19, 38, 421
Tax-free retirement account contributions—571
Tax incentives for environmental cleanup—411, 959
Tax provisions for U.S. forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina—340, 483
Tax system simplification—421, 864
Tuition tax credit and deduction—137, 146, 183, 624, 843, 855, 861, 869, 883, 893, 936, 941, 967
Teacher of the Year, National—619
Teaching Standards, National Board for Professional—515
Technology, National Medal of—1016
Telecommunications. *See* Communications
Telecommunications Act of 1996—127, 185, 188
Telecommunications Advisory Committee, President's National Security—1007, 1015, 1018
Television. *See* Communications; Entertainment industry
Tennessee
Democratic Party event—52
President's visit—46, 52
Tennessee, University of—783, 1010
Tennessee Valley Authority—1010, 1015

Terrorism. *See* specific State, country, or region; Defense and national security; Law enforcement and crime
Texas
Democratic Party events—948, 1017
President's visits—74, 75, 948, 1004, 1017
Thailand
Ambassador to U.S.—1006
Narcotics production—316
3M Media—684, 699
Tobacco-Free Kids, National Center for—480
Tobacco industry—482, 699, 742
Tongass National Forest—637, 639, 687
Trade agreements. *See* specific country; Commerce, international
Trade and Investment Policy, Commission on U.S.-Pacific—1009, 1011
Trade Commission, U.S. International—166, 1014
Trade Policy and Negotiations, Advisory Committee for—1007
Trade Representative, Office of the U.S.—574, 575, 577
Transportation
See also specific industry; Infrastructure
Airline safety—735
Transportation, Department of
Annual report—102
Assistant Secretary—1004
Aviation Administration, Federal—526, 735
Coast Guard, U.S.—331, 339, 652, 787, 797, 1014
Research and Special Programs Administration—274
Secretary—33, 101, 108, 200, 227, 248, 253, 275, 350, 652, 735, 783
Transportation Safety Board, National—1010
Treasury, Department of the
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Bureau of—519, 875, 914, 1017
Assistant Secretary—875
Customs Service, U.S.—203, 424
Foreign Assets Control, Office of—77, 201, 203, 424, 509, 622, 756, 836, 837
Secretary—40, 111, 116, 525, 569, 629, 631, 657, 738, 898, 980
Under Secretary—1010
Turkey
Cyprus conflict. *See* Cyprus
President—117, 675, 719, 1005, 1009, 1010
Prime Minister—117, 1005
Relations with Greece—117, 560, 716-719, 722, 905, 922
Turkmenistan, trade with U.S.—851

U.S.S. *Intrepid* Freedom Award—793
Ukraine
Arms control negotiations and agreements—611, 849
Economic and political reform—307
Minister of Defense—849
President—306, 604, 849, 1006, 1012
Trade with U.S.—851
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences—1009, 1015
United Jewish Appeal—465
United Kingdom
Labour Party—573
Northern Ireland. *See* Northern Ireland
Prime Minister—206, 343, 426, 458, 602, 606, 872, 920, 984, 996, 1009, 1012, 1016
Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs—1015
South Pacific nuclear free zone treaty with France and U.S.—489
Terrorist attacks—199, 206, 211, 301, 920
United Nations
Administrative reform—912
Fishery agreement—305
General Assembly—755
High Commissioner for Refugees—999
Human Rights, Commission on—692
Iraq Sanctions Committee—381
Secretary-General—436, 675
Security Council—339, 432, 487
U.S. participation—578, 912
U.S. Representative—60, 185, 339, 432, 755, 1006
Women, Commission on the Status of—1008
Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission—1003
Uzbekistan
Investment treaty with U.S.—341
President—1017, 1018
Trade with U.S.—851

Vanuatu, U.S. Ambassador—1014
Venezuela
Narcotics production—316
U.S. Ambassador—1013
Vermont
Governor—1014
Ice and flooding—1007, 1018
Veterans
Agent Orange-related disability benefits for Vietnam veterans—821
Benefits—14
Gulf war veterans' illnesses—255, 265, 954
Veterans Affairs, Department of
Deputy Secretary—821
Secretary—200, 227, 256, 265, 820, 821
Vice President
Community development, role—310, 519
Economic and Technological Cooperation, U.S.-Russian Joint Commission on, role—114
Sustainable development, role—395
Telecommunications and electronic information infrastructure, role—186, 187, 191, 243, 257, 261, 344, 346, 404
Vietnam
Narcotics production—316
U.S. Ambassador—1014
Vietnamese Lunar New Year—272
Violence Against Women, Office of. *See* Justice, Department of
Virginia
Blizzard and flooding—1004, 1005
President's visits—191, 820, 907, 1004, 1011, 1015
Voice of America. *See* Information Agency, U.S.

Voter Registration Education Project, Southwest—1014

Washington
  Governor—248
  President's visits—247, 248, 331, 332, 1007, 1008
  Shoreline Community College—331, 332, 1008
  Storms and flooding—200, 247, 248, 1006
Washington Airports Authority, Metropolitan—1011
Washington, DC. *See* District of Columbia
Washington Post—1005
WBAL Radio—534
Weapons. *See* Arms and munitions; Nuclear weapons
Welfare Indicators, Advisory Board on—1012
Welfare system
  See also specific State; State and local governments
  Reform—22, 81, 97, 114, 116, 158, 176, 419, 505, 646, 688, 729, 733, 773, 808, 841, 848, 915, 925, 927, 928, 945
West Virginia
  Blizzard and flooding—1004, 1005, 1014
  Governor—826
White House
  Security—764
  Travel office—37
White House Correspondents' Association—689
White House fellowships—1017
White House Office
  Assistants to President
    Deputy Chief of Staff—1003
    Deputy Counsel—929
    Legislative Affairs, Director—1003
    National Security Affairs—331, 560, 591, 1005, 1007, 1009
    Science and Technology—243
  Chief of Staff—247, 591, 634, 1006
White House Office—Continued
  Counselor to President—676
  Deputy Assistants to President
    Economic Policy—1007
    National Security Affairs—1006
  Senior Adviser to President on Teen Pregnancy and Youth Issues—113, 914, 1005
Whitewater Development Corp. investigation—21, 37, 39, 42, 635, 721, 823, 1012
Wisconsin
  Governor—812
  President's visit—804, 805, 812, 1014
  Welfare reform—774, 808, 925
Women, United Nations Commission on the Status of—1008
Women's Business Enterprise, Interagency Committee on—1005
Women's International Convention of the Church of God in Christ—829
Women's Legal Defense Fund—932
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars—1012
World Trade Organization (WTO)—323

Xavier University—491, 495

Yellowstone National Park—351
Youth Drug Use and Violence, White House Leadership Conference on—388, 660, 1007
Yugoslavia, former
  See also specific country
  International commission on missing persons—991, 997
  United Nations war crimes tribunal—226

Zambia, U.S. Ambassador—1014

Name Index

Abbas, Abu—673
Abbene, Diana—136
Abercrombie, Neil—759
Abrams, John N.—56
Abramson, Jerry E.—88, 99, 947
Acevska, Ljubica—1006
Ackerman, Roger—746
Adams, Aileen—976
Adams, Christopher—1002
Adams, Gerry—426, 460, 909, 1005
Adams, John Hurst—898
Adams, Michael—178
Adams, Molly—230
Ades, Claudia—566
Ades, Richard—566
Agnelli, Susanna—606
Ahearn, Greg—137
Aikman, Troy—246
Alarid, Jake—105
Albano, Michael J.—868
Albright, Madeleine K.—57, 60, 185, 339, 432, 755, 1006
Alderdice, John—460
Aldrich, Gerald—555
Alejandre, Armando—433
Alexander, Don—547
Alexander, Leslie M.—1010, 1023
Allen, Lew, Jr.—1007
Allen, Paul—403
Allen, Robert E.—378, 414
Alstaetter, Margaret—390
Altieri, Nick—88
Alvarez, Everett, Jr.—1015, 1026
Ament, Thomas—812
Anand, Raj—760
Anderes, Mark—383
Anderson, Anthony—833
Anderson, Brady—539
Anderson, C.L.—829
Anderson, Mark—248
Anderson, Mary Lou—895
Anderson, Robert E.—1009, 1021
Anderson, Terry—857
Angelos, Peter—535
Arafat, Yasser—353, 360, 373, 382, 422, 437, 447, 655, 669, 671, 720, 791, 993, 1009
Archer, Dennis W.—361, 783
Arias, Oscar—758
Aristide, Jean-Bertrand—608, 911, 930, 995, 1017
Aristide, Mildred—930, 1017
Armey, Richard K.—2, 40, 119, 124, 175, 944
Armstrong, David—868
Armstrong, Michael—565
Arnelle, Leslie—725
Arnold, Larry—422
Asad, Hafiz al- —77, 124, 436, 449, 606, 623, 636
Ashe, Victor H.—1011, 1024
Atkinson-Gates, Yvonne—879, 881
Atwood, J. Brian—57, 828, 1008
Aung San Suu Kyi—776
Austin, Johnny—476
Ayala, Salvador—913, 916

Babbitt, Bruce—617, 1008
Babbitt, Harriet C.—758
Babson, Mary Burrus—1004, 1019, 1023
Baden, Fred—478
Baer, Harold—533
Bahr, Morton—1011
Bailey, Vicky A.—1013, 1026
Baird, Zoe—1007
Baker, Sheldon—891
Baldwin, Alec—888
Bandler, Ned W.—1016
Barak, Ehud—76
Barnes, Ben—949
Barram, David J.—243, 1008, 1024
Barrett, Steve—253
Barrett, Thomas M.—812, 914
Barry, Marion S., Jr.—10, 1003
Barshefsky, Charlene—577
Bartholomay, Bill—340
Bartholomew, Reginald—55
Baskir, Lawrence—1023
Bass, Peter—852
Bataillon, Joseph F.—1021
Bauman, Michelle—734
Beally, Martin—938
Beasley, David M.—939
Beattie, Mollie—988
Beattie, Richard I.—8, 394, 921, 922
Bednarczyk, Betty—625
Beers, Charlotte—112
Bell, Burwell (Bill)—57
Bell, Hubert T., Jr.—1010, 1024
Bell, Peter—758
Bendheim, Jack—653
Benedict, Lawrence Neal—1005, 1019
Benkowski, Larry—746
Bentsen, B.A.—948
Bentsen, Ken—948
Bentsen, Lloyd—569, 948, 950
Benz, Daimler—901
Bera-Morris, Marsha M.—1005
Berger, Mitchell W.—662
Berger, Samuel R.—1006

Berkman, Brenda G.—1017
Berman, Chris—537
Berman, Jason S.—1011
Bernardin, Joseph Cardinal—568, 892
Berne, Rachel—657
Bernier, Harvey E.—282
Bersin, Alan—886
Betts, Virginia Trotter—923
Bias, Lonise—389
Biden, Joseph R., Jr.—736, 738, 955, 960
Bildt, Carl—992, 993
Bingaman, Jeff—835, 895
Black, Mary—918
Blair, Bonnie—673
Blair, Richard—462
Blair, Tony—573
Blaisedell, Clesson—286
Blake, Charles E.—829
Blanchard, James J.—361, 782
Blanco, Kathleen—471
Blatnick, Jeff—673
Blegen, Mary Beth—621, 1018
Bliley, Thomas J., Jr.—128
Blinder, Alan S.—68, 852
Bloch, Nancy J.—1010
Blocker, Andy—383
Blum, Barbara—1027
Blumenthal, Dick—797
Boarman, Gerald—383
Bogan, Nagora—1013
Boggs, Barbara—24
Boggs, Corinne Claiborne (Lindy)—471
Bogosian, Richard W.—923
Bohlen, Avis T.—1013, 1024
Bolton, Michael—797
Bon Jovi, Jon—541
Bonior, David E.—27
Boorda, Anna E.—754, 785
Boorda, Bettie—754, 763, 785, 793
Boorda, David—754, 785
Boorda, Edward—754, 785
Boorda, Jeremy M.—5, 754, 763, 785, 793, 862, 1014
Boorda, Robert—754
Booth, Russ—644
Born, Brooksley Elizabeth—1013, 1025
Borski, Robert A.—640
Bosley, Freeman R., Jr.—738, 769
Bossidy, Lawrence A.—744
Boutros-Ghali, Boutros—436
Bovin, Douglas—366
Bowles, Erskine B.—162, 858
Boxer, Barbara—320, 884, 885
Boxer, Richard J.—1017
Boynton, Peter—787
Bozoretz, Beth—709
Bradley, Bill—700, 702
Bradley, Valerie J.—1017
Bradshaw, Henry A.—378
Brady, Sarah—678
Brand, Philip G.—1008
Branstad, Terry E.—172, 511, 512
Brantley, Jasmine—813
Bratton, William J.—1006
Brazauskas, Algirdas—1017, 1018
Breaux, John B.—683, 842, 845
Breiseth, Christopher—277
Briggs, Margo H.—1018
Brighton, John A.—725
Brill, Kenneth C.—1010, 1022
Brinson, Ron—471
Briscoe, Dolph—948, 949
Briscoe, Janie—948
Bristow, Lonnie R.—480, 1009, 1021
Britten, Verneilya—493
Broadwater, W. Craig—1020
Brody, Kenneth D.—1009
Broecker, Wallace S.—1016
Bronfman, Edgar—653
Brooks, Jack—949
Brooks, P.A.—829
Brooks, Thomas A.—1009
Brooks, William C.—1004, 1020
Brophy, Susan—425
Bross, Terry—599
Brown, Alicia—674
Brown, Alma—541, 562, 709, 744
Brown, Chip—562
Brown, Dave—697
Brown, Jesse—227, 256, 820-822
Brown, Lang—942, 957, 976
Brown, Larry—246
Brown, Michael—541, 562
Brown, Pat—296
Brown, Robert Clarke—1011, 1023
Brown, Ronald H.—170, 243, 378, 460, 541-543, 545, 550, 554, 555, 562, 599, 637, 744, 1010, 1011
Brown, Sherrod—956
Brown, Tammy—562
Brown, Tracey—562
Brown, Willie—737, 738, 873, 884, 956, 1003
Browner, Carol M.—101, 369, 408, 410, 617
Brownstein, Norman—1007
Bruno, George C.—297
Bruton, Finola—457, 460
Bruton, John—206, 343, 426, 456, 460, 462, 872, 920, 1009, 1016
Bryan, John—744, 932
Bryan, Richard H.—879-882
Bryant, Gregory—968
Bryant, John—492
Buchanan, Calvin D.—1022
Buergenthal, Thomas—1006
Bumpers, Dale—618
Bunn, Jim—253
Burckel, Nicholas C.—1010
Burgess, Kirby—876
Burke, Arleigh A.—1, 5, 1003
Burke, James E.—389
Burks, Glen—956
Burks, Joseph, Jr.—90

Burns, George—76, 408
Burson, Charles—965
Burton, Dan—432
Burton-Ramsey, Linda—250
Busch, August, IV—769
Bush, George—511, 512, 557, 808, 835, 949
Bush, George W.—689
Bushnell, Prudence—1010, 1023
Bussy, Christian—982
Butterworth, Bob—657
Buzzelli, David—395
Byrne, Brendan—408, 700
Byrne, Tom—700
Byron, Joe—151
Byron, John—976
Byron, Pat—976

Cafourek, Daniel—1000
Cage, Nicholas—541
Califano, Joseph A., Jr.—388, 863
Calles, Luciano—259
Campbell, Bill—957
Campbell, Bonnie—209, 224, 307, 763, 936, 976
Campbell, Carroll W.—512
Campbell, Joan—898, 900
Campbell, Millard Dee—1000
Caoile, Gloria—759, 943
Caperton, Gaston—167, 515, 826
Caradin, Deedee—738
Cardin, Benjamin L.—556
Cardot, Gregory—477
Carey, Paul—266
Carnahan, Mel—167, 1017
Carpenter, Liz—949
Carpenter, Mary Chapin—918
Carper, Thomas R.—1003
Carr, Billie—949
Carr, Patrick—1001
Carrera, Michael A.—913
Carson, Harry—697
Carter, Jimmy—557
Cartrette, Earl, Jr.—1000
Carville, James—224, 290
Casellas, Gilbert F.—105
Cavanagh, Betty—318
Cavanaugh, John J.—1013
Cecil, Charles O.—1010, 1023
Celeste, Richard F.—502
Chafee, John H.—5, 683, 842
Chamberlin, Wendy Jean—1010, 1023
Chambers, Mary—297
Chandler, Robert—884
Chandra, Naresh—1013
Chang, Ming E.—759
Chapman, Alvah—657
Chapman, Jim—948
Chapman, Max—793
Chavez, Martin—895
Checchi, Alfred A.—801
Chernomyrdin, Viktor—52, 114, 993, 996
Chesky, Pam—697
Chiles, Lawton—696, 999, 1001
Chirac, Bernadette—1018
Chirac, Jacques—120, 121, 128, 606, 984, 986, 1018
Choi, Audrey—1017
Chouinard, Yvon—745
Chow, Barbara—760
Chretien, Jean—361
Christian, Duane—555
Christopher, Warren M.—117, 445, 588, 591, 595, 599, 601, 602, 606, 623, 625, 635, 653, 671, 720, 785, 980
Chung, T.S.—760
Cianciolo, Frederick—321
Ciller, Tansu—117, 1005
Cisneros, Henry G.—100, 101, 105, 310, 383, 519, 520, 648, 869, 870, 944, 959, 961
Clark, Gussie—640
Clark, Melvin E.—829
Claussen, Eileen B.—1004, 1020
Clay, Eric L.—1021
Clemins, Archie—591
Clemons, Ithiel—829
Clerides, Glafcos—921, 1016
Clinton, Chelsea—23
Clinton, Hillary Rodham—21, 34, 36, 328, 337, 541, 676, 710, 716, 797, 924, 932
Close, Rebekah P.—937, 939
Clyburn, James E.—898
Coady, E. Patrick—1013
Coady, Felisha—496
Coat, Pauline—151
Coats, Dan—731
Coble, Robert D.—898
Coburn, Christopher M.— 1005, 1021
Cochran, J. Thomas—96, 956
Coe, Doug—118
Coehlo, Tony—801
Coffin, Bob—881
Cofield, D.Z.—74
Cogswell, Clint—129
Cohn, Carl—325, 327, 390
Coil, Margaret A.—1011
Colby, William—694
Coleman, William—275
Conn, Carroll W., Jr.—1010
Conrad, Barry—555
Conway, Lynn—1005
Conyers, John, Jr.—307, 342, 876, 888, 898, 900
Cook, Robin—88
Cook, Samuel DuBois—1006
Coolidge, Charles H., Jr.—874
Corcione, Domenico—55, 56
Cordtz, Richard—625
Cornett, Kimberly R.—1017
Corrales-Diaz, Susan—775
Correnti, John—748
Cossio, Fernando—1006
Costa, Carlos—433
Costello, Coreen—566

Costello, Jim—566
Covarrubias, Anthony—876
Coverdell, Paul—432
Cox, Bobby—340
Cranston, Alan—885
Cranston, Stewart E.—999
Crawford, Linda—482
Crea, Jennifer—697
Creagan, James Francis—1010, 1023
Creel, Harold J., Jr.—1006
Crosby, Michael—699
Crotty, E. William—1016
Crouch, Emma—829
Crouch, William W.—56
Cullen, Jim—259, 261
Culp, Marilyn—657
Culver, John C.—1008
Cuomo, Andrew M.—310
Curry, Bill—797
Curry, Wayne—383, 868
Cushman, Paul, III—555

Dailey, Jim—170
Daley, Richard M.—96, 955
Daley, William M.—1013
Dalton, John H.—5, 785, 792, 793
Dalton, Margaret—793
Darko, Daniel—10
Darling, Adam—555
Dart, Justin—801
Daschle, Thomas A.—2, 17, 19, 119, 175, 738, 821
Davidow, Jeffrey—1015, 1026
Davidson, Norman—1016
Davis, A. Arthur—233
Davis, Arthur Q.—1007
Davis, Ashley James—555
Davis, Dick—749
Davis, Gray—403
Davis, Latina—784
Davitt, John—891, 893
Dawson, Peggy—88
Dayan, Ilana—373
de Brum, Banny—1013
De Charette, Herve—606
de Chastelain, John—96, 872
de la Chapelle, Guy Passart—982, 983
de la Garza, E.—835
de la Pena, Mario—433
de Leon, Rudy F.—321, 999, 1001
De Sarno, James—833
Deak, Janos—59
Dean, Howard—167, 1014
Dean, Richard—86
DeBerry, Fisher—724, 725
DeConcini, Dennis—1013
DeFazio, Peter A.—253
DeFrantz, Anita—676
deGagli, Jeremy—137
DeGrassi, Brian—404
Delaney, Glenn Roger—1011
Delaney, John A.—738
Delk, Tony—784
Demby, Bill—674
Demirel, Suleyman—117, 675, 719, 1005, 1009, 1010
Denham, Robert—775
Denny, Brandon—546
Denny, Rebecca—546
DeSimone, Livio—699
Desing, Sherry—232
Deutch, John M.—445
Deutsch, Peter—432
Devenny, Joan—452
Devlin, Marie—136
Diamonstein-Spielvogel, Barbaralee—1008
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln—432
Dicks, Norman D.—332
Die, Anne—178
Dingell, John D.—128, 354, 360, 782
Dinkins, David—265
DiNunno, Joseph J.—1019
Dobert, Gail—555
Docette, Ronald—833
Dodd, Christopher J.—425, 662-664, 709, 711, 796, 801
Doi, Takako—595
Dole, Bob—2, 35, 39, 84, 92, 119, 124, 171, 175, 176, 419, 531, 532, 538, 560, 606, 608, 624, 628, 634, 643, 649, 680, 706-709, 740, 796, 808, 810, 815, 850, 861, 873, 875, 891, 944, 1014, 1016
Domenici, Pete V.—897
Donovan, Robert—555
Douglas, Bill—47
Dow, Melvin—653
Downer, H.B., Jr.—838
Downing, Wayne A.—991, 997
Doyle, James—812
Drach, Ron—801
Drell, Sidney D.—1007
Drinan, Robert F.—1004, 1020
Duchin, Peter—700
Duff, Bryan—851
Duffey, Joseph D.—178
Dugan, Donald A.—162, 163
Duker, Sarah—452, 465
Duran-Ballen, Sixto—1017
Durbin, Richard J.—480, 943
Durling, Jennifer—286
Dutko, Dan—709
Dwiggens, Ashley—591
Dylewski, Gary R.—999

Eagleton, Thomas F.—1007
Eastin, Delaine—403
Echaveste, Maria—107
Eddleman, Linda—1017
Edelman, Peter B.—1004, 1020
Edwards, Harry T.—304
Effron, Andrew S.—1027
Eidenberg, Eugene—1012
Eisenfeld, Matthew—452, 465

Eizenstat, Stuart E.—1003, 1016, 1019
Ekeus, Rolf—692
Elia, Claudio—555
Ellerbee, Linda—23
Ellis, Bob—327
Ellis, James—591
Emblidge, Mark E.—1007
Emerson, Richard—886
Emperor Akihito—594, 595, 1011, 1012
Empress Michiko—594, 595, 1011, 1012
Engel, Eliot L.—653
Engler, John—515, 782
Epstein, Jonathan—653
Erickson, Martha Farrell—965
Erickson, Rodney—725
Estep, Robert E., Jr.—1008
Evans, Lane—821
Evans, Terry—1006, 1021
Evers-Williams, Myrlie—302
Evert, Chris—1019
Ewing, Randy—838
Exon, J. James—867, 976

Fair, Janey—679
Fairbanks, Bernie—556
Fallin, Mary—546
Fallows, James—1012
Farrington, Robert, Jr.—555
Fattah, Chaka—868
Favreau, Peter—151
Fay, Toni G.—1005, 1020
Fazio, Bob—257, 258, 261
Feingold, Russell D.—281, 290, 812
Feinstein, Dianne—320, 873, 884, 885, 976, 977, 1016
Fennig, Patrick—1000
Ferguson, Joel I.—1003, 1013
Ferguson, Stephanie—1017
Ferrari, Michael R.—232
Feuerstein, Aaron—143, 745
Feuerstein, Louise—143
Fields, Cleo—829
Fields, Jack—128
Fierce, Hughlyn F.—1013
Figueroa, Rona—759
Filner, Bob—886
Fink, Susan D.—1017
Fink, Thomas A.—1005, 1020
Fisher, Elizabeth—793
Fisher, Ellen—307
Fisher, George—476
Fisher, Lee—502
Fisher, Zachary—793
Fiske, Peter S.—1017
Fitzgerald, Ella—920
Fitzgerald, Thomas—422
Fitzpatrick, Bill—476
Flanagan, James L.—1016
Flanagan, W.J.—792, 793
Flanigan, Mike—537
Flatlow, Alyssa—452
Fleming, G. Andrew—676
Fleming, Patsy—779
Fleming, Rose—494
Florio, Jim—408, 412, 700, 947
Fogerty, John—888
Fogleman, Ronald R.—874, 999, 1001
Foley, Robert F.—820
Foley, Thomas S.—1004
Foote, Edward Thaddeus (Tad)—657, 866
Foote, Roberta (Bosey)—866
Forbes, Malcolm S., Jr. (Steve)—126
Ford, Betty—863
Ford, David—555
Ford, Gerald R.—557
Ford, Joe—512
Forsberg, Randall—1004
Foster, Alice—838
Foster, Henry W., Jr.—111, 113, 914, 1005
Foster, Mike—838, 1015
Fowler, Donald L.—361, 502, 640, 700, 709, 797, 888, 948
Fowler, Joann—521
Fowler, Wyche, Jr.—1016, 1026
Fox, Sarah M.—1004, 1020
Foxley, Alejandro—758
Franken, Al—690, 971
Frazier, George—484
Freedman, Anita—297
Freeh, Louis J.—376, 875
Freeman, Waldo—591
Frey, Bob—749
Friers, Tom—1001
Frist, Bill—779
From, Al—557
Froonjian, John—422
Frost, Martin—427, 653, 948, 976
Fruman, Matt—713
Fujimori, Alberto—1014
Fulbright, Harriet Mayor—866
Fuller, Millard—898, 900
Fynmore, Russell—775

Gaede, Mark S.—1007
Gage, John—404
Gagnon, Paul—151
Gagnon, Ray—151
Gajarsa, Arthur—1024
Galiano, Robert—644
Gallucci, Robert—62, 304
Galston, Bill—965
Ganga, Dieudonne-Antoine—1013
Garagiola, Joe—481
Garamendi, John—1008
Garcia, Jesus—877
Garrett, Wendell D.—1006
Gates, Bill—209, 332-334, 367, 452
Gearan, Mark D.—425, 460, 930
Geisel, Harold Walter—1008, 1014, 1021, 1025
Genega, Stanley—274
Genovese, Debbie—764

Geoana, Mircea—1006
George, Alberta S.—1007
Gephardt, Jane—764, 769
Gephardt, Richard A.—2, 119, 175, 427, 764, 765, 769, 943
Gerstner, Louis—511, 512
Gibbons, John H.—243
Gibbons, Sam—365
Ginger, Denise—277
Gingrich, Newt—2, 35, 39, 40, 79, 92, 119, 124, 175, 185, 280, 689, 690, 706, 708, 740, 796, 944, 1005
Ginsburg, Ruth Bader—376
Girousse, Henri—982
Giuliani, Donna—792, 793
Giuliani, Rudolph—792, 793
Givens, Jeanne—1014, 1025
Gladwin, Joy—877
Glavine, Tom—340
Glendening, Parris N.—383, 393, 1003
Glenn, John—43, 493, 495, 502
Glicken, Howard—662
Glickman, Dan—10, 169, 310, 653, 671, 834, 835, 887
Glover, Jere W.—857
Glover, Nat—393
Gober, Hershel—821
Godi, Art—644
Goldberg, Whoopi—112, 700, 888
Goncz, Arpad—59
Gonzales, Jesse—895, 897
Goodman, Jim—422
Good, Mary L.—541, 553
Gore, Albert, Jr.—46, 52, 79, 100, 114, 119, 128, 175, 185, 187, 188, 191, 243, 257, 258, 263, 265, 276, 291, 309, 329, 344, 346, 354, 393, 395, 404, 405, 408, 409, 430, 480, 507, 519, 523, 524, 541, 553, 574, 617, 618, 620, 628, 660, 672, 673, 676, 689, 709, 713, 714, 742, 746, 747, 750, 783, 784, 821, 823, 826, 854, 875, 893, 901, 930-932, 942, 950, 959, 964, 974, 1006, 1015
Gore, Albert, Sr.—187
Gore, Lesley—265
Gore, Tipper—191, 237, 345, 349, 689, 709, 713, 964, 974
Gorton, Slade—250
Goss, Porter J.—556
Goto, Leo K.—1004, 1020
Gottschalk, Alfred—1010
Grachev, Pavel Sergeyevich—849
Graeper, Michael—644
Graham, Billy—118, 685, 900
Graham, Franklin—685
Graham, James—247, 249
Graham, Ruth—685
Graham, Thomas, Jr.—90
Gramm, Phil—432, 955, 960
Grams, Rod—763
Grant, Jocelyn—764
Grassley, Chuck—731
Graves, David—1001
Greco, Dick A.—738
Green, Gene—948
Green, Mark—695
Green, Natalie—829
Green, Steve—676
Green, Yvonne—391
Greene, Mary D.—1007
Greenspan, Alan—40, 272, 315, 316, 874, 1022
Greenstein, Fred—557
Greenwald, Gerry—751
Greer, Bruce W.—1025
Grenados, Marlon—261
Griffey, Ken, Jr.—538
Grossman, Steve—653
Gueron, Judith M.—1012
Guerra, Nancy G.—1005
Guiliani, David—747
Gunderson, Steve—779
Gussner, William—764
Gutierrez, Lino—1010, 1023
Guttman, Daniel—1006, 1011, 1021, 1023
Guyse, Tyrone—151
Guzman, Ana M.—1011

Hagan, John P.—785
Hait, William—697
Hakim, Peter—758
Hale, Marcia L.—96
Haley, Charles—246
Haley, Maria—760
Hall, James E.—1010, 1022
Hall, Keith R.—1015, 1026
Hall, Sophia H.—1018, 1027
Halsted, David C.—1010, 1023
Halvatzes, Tony—155
Hamburg, David—112
Hamill, Catherine—461
Hamilton, Carol—555
Hamilton, Doug—87, 90
Hamilton, W.W.—829
Hannan, Phyllis—857
Harawi, Ilyas—623, 636
Hardymon, James F.—676
Hariri, Rafiq al- —720
Harkin, Ruth—209, 215
Harkin, Tom—209, 215, 231
Harman, Jane—320, 396, 397, 933
Harman, Sidney—396, 397, 751
Harshbarger, L. Scott—507
Harter, Carol—880
Hartigan, Laura—361
Harvey, James R.—884
Harvey, Paul—685
Hasboun, Patricia—476
Hashim, Dato Dali Mahmud—1013
Hashimoto, Kumiko—594, 598, 599
Hashimoto, Ryutaro—319, 322, 585, 592, 594, 595, 598, 603, 985, 1003, 1006, 1007, 1011
Hatch, Orrin G.—628, 635, 779
Hatfield, Mark O.—253

Haun, Leland—1002
Hawkins, Larry—662
Hawley, Richard E.—999, 1001
Hayase, Susan—1004, 1020
Hayashi, Dennis—760
Hayes, Johnny H.—1010, 1015, 1023, 1026
Haynes, Audrey Tayse—1005, 1020
Haynes, Neaul J.—829
Hays, Dennis K.—1010, 1023
Hays, Patrick Henry—960
Heaney, Seamus—427
Hechinger, John W., Sr.—1024
Heflin, Howell—976
Heise, Pregri—657
Heiser, Michael—1002
Helmke, Paul—96
Helms, Jesse—432
Henderson, Jim—749
Henrich, Marilyn—230
Henry, Steve—783
Herenton, Willie W.—738
Herman, Alexis M.—378, 542, 932
Hermelin, David—465
Hernandez, Christine—1019
Heumann, Judy—802
Heyman, Ronnie Feuerstein—1004, 1019
Hicks, John F.—1014, 1025
Higgins, Kathryn O'Leary (Kitty)—425
Hightower, Michael—366
Hildebrandt, Anthony—617
Hill, Calvin—245
Hill, Christopher Robert—1009, 1022
Hill, Jim—574
Hill, Larry—898
Hilley, John L.—852, 1003
Hillgren, Sonja—109
Hinders, Sally—228
Hines, Jason—302
Hinkle, Robert L.—1026
Hinson, Robert C.—1001
Hoard, Ralph G.—1005
Hobgood, William P.—1014
Hoff, James E.—495
Hoffman, Kathryn—555
Holbrooke, Richard—57, 304
Holden, Tim—274
Holkeri, Harri—96, 872
Hollander, Thomas—725
Holleb, Doris B.—1015, 1026
Hollings, Ernest F.—128, 898
Holliway, Robert—1001
Holmes, Genta Hawkins—1010, 1022
Holmes, Joshua—137
Hooks, Aubrey—1008, 1021
Horn, Gyula—59
Horn, Stephen—320, 329
Horton, Frank—759
Houghton, James R.—378
Hubbard, Thomas C.—1010, 1022
Hudgins, LeRon—725
Hughes, Morris N., Jr.—1012, 1023
Hultin, Jerry M.—1013
Hume, John—425, 427, 460
Humphrey, Hubert H., III—965
Hundt, Reed E.—243
Hunnicutt, Charles A.—1004, 1020
Hunt, James B., Jr.—511, 514, 515
Hunt, Swanee G.—992
Hunt, Terence—689, 1007
Hunter, Robert E.—57
Hussein, Saddam—7, 380, 692, 789, 792
Huston, Anjelica—425
Hyde, Henry J.—464, 628, 635, 876, 888, 900

Ieyoub, Richard P.—471
Ifshin, David—1013
Iglesias, Enrique—758
Indyk, Martin—653
Ingle, Robert—422
Inglis, Bob—898
Ingram, Catherine—492
Irving, Larry, Jr.—1015
Ishimaru, Stuart—760
Itoh, William H.—760
Izetbegovic, Alija—46, 62, 127

Jabir al-Ahmad al-Jabir Al Sabah—1007, 1008
Jackson, Amanda—930
Jackson, Jesse—303, 383, 387, 388, 393, 898
Jackson, Lee—556
Jackson-Lee, Sheila—948
Jacobson, Neil—801
James, Fred—898
James, Sharpe—738
Jayne, Catherine—764
Jean-Baptiste, Ayinda—302
Jefferson, William J.—829
Jett, Dennis C.—1010, 1023
Jiang Zemin—181, 197, 214, 798
Johnson, Bernard—829
Johnson, Dee—895
Johnson, Ed—898
Johnson, Eddie Bernice—948
Johnson, Gary E.—895
Johnson, James E.—875
Johnson, Jay L.—785, 792, 862
Johnson, John—764
Johnson, Kevin—1002
Johnson, Lawrence M.—1012
Johnson, Roger W.—102
Johnson, Roosevelt—572
Johnson, Stanley—876
Johnson, Vinnie—309
Johnston, J. Bennett—193, 471
Jones, Bernice Young—337
Jones, Daryl—657
Jones, David—754
Jones, James Earl—265
Jones, Jan Laverty—879, 881
Jones, Jerry—245
Jones, Kerri-Ann—1013, 1026

Jones, Mac Charles—898
Jones, Paul Tudor, II—793, 913
Jones, Reginald Earl—1016, 1026
Jones, Shirley Ledbetter—1009, 1021
Jones, Susan—734
Jordan, Barbara—68, 72, 74, 1004
Jordan, I. King—801, 956, 975
Jordan, Mary Lucille—1024
Joseph, Irwin—471
Josey, J. Rene—1025
Joulwan, George A.—55, 56, 60
Jozayt, Donald R.—1001
Judd, Bruce D.—1015
Julian, Elizabeth K.—1011, 1024
Junkins, Lowell Lee—1011, 1024
Justice, David—340

Kadish, Ron—321
Kahn, Lawrence E.—1024
Kaman, Charles H.—1016
Kamarck, Martin A.—1003, 1011, 1024
Kamensky, Phyllis—1016
Kaminski, Stephen—556
Kanjorski, Paul E.—273, 274
Kanka, Maureen—763
Kanka, Richard—763
Kantor, Michael (Mickey)—574, 576, 595, 858, 1011, 1024
Karadzic, Radovan—904, 992, 993
Karaer, Arma Jane—1014, 1025
Karekin I—1004
Karimov, Islom—1017, 1018
Karp, Richard M.—1016
Kasich, John R.—944
Kassebaum, Nancy Landon—82, 146, 150, 176, 196, 212, 371, 634, 779, 914
Kasten, Lisa—867, 868
Kasten, Spencer—867, 868, 870
Kasten, Stan—340
Katz, Vera—253, 254
Kaufman, Michael—404
Kean, Tom—112, 914, 915
Keanes, Sandra—282
Keating, David—557
Keating, Frank—546, 628
Keefe, Joseph F., Jr.—297
Keleti, Gyorgy—59
Kelikian, Alice A.—1016
Kellahan, Russell—898
Kellogg, Katherine—556
Kelly, Raymond W.—1023
Kelly, Shelly—556
Kelsall, Pedro Miguel Lamport—1013
Kelsey, Stephen—88
Kemp, Jack—303
Kempthorne, Dirk—256
Kenigsberg, Rositta E.—1006
Kenmore, Ayse Manyas—1027
Kennedy, Edward M.—82, 146, 150, 176, 196, 212, 307, 371, 425, 634, 779, 780, 943, 944
Kennedy, Patrick J.—432
Kerr, Andrew—630
Kerr, John—460
Kessler, David A.—480, 521, 523, 524
Kim Yong-sam—581, 582, 603, 1011
King, Alice—895
King, Ashley—617
King, Bruce—895
King, Connie—332
King, Coretta Scott—63, 303, 599
King, Dexter—63, 303
King Fahd—981
King Hassan II—1009
King Hussein I—381, 435, 848
King, Martin Luther, Jr.—63, 1004
King, Peter T.—425
King, Ronald—1002
Kinoshita, Cherry T.—1019
Kinzer, Joe—476
Kitson, Kendall, Jr.—1000
Kitzhaber, John A.—253
Klaas, Marc—763, 976
Kleczka, Gerald D.—812
Knight, Edward S.—1015
Knight, Peter—710
Knoll, Mina Baker—640
Knollenberg, Joe—782
Knowles, Tony—651
Ko-Yung Tung—1012
Kohl, Hannelore—813
Kohl, Helmut—801, 804, 805, 812, 814, 1008, 1012, 1014
Kohl, Herb—736, 812
Kohn, Joe—640
Kolender, William—886
Kollar-Kotelly, Colleen—1023
Kono, Yohei—1004
Koop, C. Everett—112, 919
Kornblum, John C.—1011, 1024
Kory, Richard—521
Kozlowski, Don—318
Kramek, Robert—787
Kramer, Franklin D.—1006, 1021
Krauser, Peter B.—374
Krueger, Robert—949, 1007, 1021
Kuchma, Leonid—306, 849, 1006, 1012
Kudo, Elsa H.—1004, 1020
Kunin, Madeleine M.—243, 1016, 1026
Kuwayama, Yeiichi—1004, 1020
Kwasniewski, Aleksander—1013
Kwolek, Stephanie Louise—1016
Kyl, Jon—976, 977

Laajava, Jaakko Tapani—1013
Lackenmeir, James—276
Lader, Philip—162, 857, 858
Lake, Anthony—425, 560, 591, 852, 1005, 1007, 1009
Lamaute, Daniel—1012
Lamm, Eric—137
Lampreia, Luiz—758

Lampson, Nick—949
Lancaster, Martin—274
Landgraf, Kurt—392
Landreau, Mary—471
Langbo, Arney—750
Lanier, Bob—99, 868, 948, 956
Lanier, Elyse—868, 948
Lanier, Richard S.—1006
Larkin, Barbara Mills—1011, 1024
Larsen, Ralph—746
Larson, Alan Philip—1014, 1025
Larson, Charles—5
Lash, Jonathan—395
Lashof, Joyce—255
Lau, Valerie—760
Lautenberg, Frank R.—257, 259, 264, 408, 412, 432, 653, 697, 699, 700
Lawrence, M. Larry—21, 1004
Lawrence, Robert Z.—1012
Laws, Paul—493
Laye, Jesse—476
Lazzara, Richard A.—1025
Leach, Claude (Buddy)—194
Leahy, Patrick J.—10, 307, 755
Lebed, Aleksandr—996
Lee, Buddy—673
Lee, Harry—833, 841
Lee, Karen—389
Lees, Robert—775
Lehman, Kenneth—744, 745
Leland, David—43, 502
Leonard, R.A.—898
Leonard, Thomas A.—1013
Leslie, Jan—493
Lesniak, Raymond J.—700
Lester, Christopher—1002
Leubersdorf, Carl—689
Levin, Carl—356, 574, 782
Levin, Sander M.—574, 653
Levin, Susan Bass—1009, 1022
Levy, Edward—653
Lew, Ginger E.—760, 857, 1008, 1022
Lewek, James—556
Lewis, Carl G.—1010
Lewis, Delano E.—243
Lewis, Kenneth—1012
Li, Frederick P.—1017
Liberman, Rachmiel—1016
Lichtman, Judy—932
Lieberman, Evelyn S.—1003
Lieberman, Joseph I.—731, 800
Lindsey, Bruce—929
Lindsey, D.L.—830
Line, Mary-Dorothy—566
Lino, Marisa R.—1013, 1024
Linowitz, Saul—758
Livingston, Bob—194
Livingstone, Craig—994
Locke, Gary—332
Loel, Tal—454
Lofgren, Zoe—763
Long, Bill—253
Long, Lewis P.—1017
Long, William—24
Longchamps, Adrian—151
Lott, Trent—906
Lowe, Troy—999
Lowery, Joseph—898
Lowey, Nita M.—653, 914
Lowman, Patricia S.—898
Lowry, Mike—247, 249, 332
Lowy, Alan G.—1012, 1024
Lozano, Laurie—857
Lozano, Robert—857
Lucey, Bill—943
Lugar, Richard G.—5
Luke, John—901
Lupberger, Ed—556
Lyss, Lynn—1006

Macell, Shawn—569
Machit, Melissa—327
Macias, Reynaldo Flores—1013, 1025
Mack, Connie—432
MacKay, Buddy—657, 662-664, 999, 1001
Mackey, Terrence—898
MacLuton, Carolyn—88
Maddux, Greg—340, 536
Magaw, John W.—519, 875
Maglaris, George—282
Mahathir bin Mohamad—1014
Mahler, Jill—823
Maier, Frank—556
Maier, Russ—749
Maisto, John Francis—1013, 1024
Major, John—206, 343, 426, 458, 459, 602, 606, 804, 872, 920, 984, 996, 1009, 1012, 1016
Malcolm, Ellen—932
Malkowski, Bob—787
Malone, Eric—274, 277
Mandel, Ruth B.—1006
Mandela, Nelson—608
Manfra, Fred—534
Manton, Thomas J.—425
Marceca, Anthony B.—994
Marchman, Kevin Emanuel—1009, 1022
Marciniak, Michelle—783, 784
Markey, Edward J.—128, 431
Marsalis, Wynton—971
Marshall, Sandy—233
Marthaler, Brent—1000
Martinez, Matthew G.—329
Marullo, Geri—1011
Massee, Bill—739
Mathabane, Mark J.—1017
Mathews, Harlan—1004, 1020
Mathis, Dawson—24
Mathur, Kailish—1007
Matsui, Doris—760
Matsui, Robert T.—759

Matthews, David—282
Mattleman, Marciene S.—1005, 1020
Mauk, William H., Jr.—1008
Mauro, Garry—949
Maxwell, Mark—476
Mayberry, Harold—833
Maynard, Rebecca—914, 915
Mazuka, Miriam—492
McAteer, J. Davitt—1015, 1026
McAuliffe, Christa—110
McAuliffe, Terence—361, 709
McCaffrey, Barry R.—83, 93, 148, 376, 383, 385, 390, 394, 430, 460, 657, 659, 660, 735, 738, 1004, 1008, 1009, 1016, 1019
McCaffrey, Bill—376
McCain, John—281, 290
McCarthy, John—1006
McCaw, Craig O.—1015
McClain, Pam—976, 977
McConnell, Frank—280, 289
McCracken, Edward R.—243
McCraw, Les—775
McCurry, Michael D.—422, 680, 689, 829, 852, 905
McDermott, Jim—332
McDonald, Gina—1009, 1022
McDonough, Peter—151
McDougal, James B.—823, 1012
McDougal, Susan—823, 1012
McEntee, Gerarld W.—943
McFate, Patricia—1004
McGhee, Carla—942, 957, 976
McGinty, Kathleen A.—425, 617
McGowan, Gerald S.—1015, 1026
McGowan, Patrick—155, 161
McGrath, Judy—112
McGreevey, James E.—697
McGroarty, Thomas—273, 274
McGuirk, Terry—340
McIntosh, Susan Keech—1006
McKee, Alan R.—1014, 1025
McKeown, M. Margaret—1023
McKoy, Henry E.—1007, 1021
McKune, Jim—253
McLarty, Thomas F. (Mack)—37, 378, 676, 758
McLuckey, John A.—1015
McMahon, Patricia M.—1016, 1027
McMickle, Marvin A.—956
McMinds, Guy R.—1003
McNamara, Edward H.—354, 360, 782
McVeigh, Brian—1000
McWherter, Ned Ray—46, 52
Meade, Dave—476
Meehan, Martin T.—481
Meissner, Charles—556
Meissner, Doris—886
Melillo, Jerry M.—1013, 1026
Menendez, Robert—257, 259, 261, 264, 432
Menino, Thomas—957
Meri, Lennart—1017
Merrill, Charlie—404
Merrill, Margie—404
Mertz, Frank—408
Metcalf, Joseph, III—5
Metzler, John—820
Meyer, Jim—478, 479
Meyer, Karen—801
Meyer, Laurence H.—315, 1022
Meyerhoff, Harvey M.—1006
Mfume, Kweisi—302
Michel, Bob—676
Michelson, Abigail—653
Miller, Allison—209
Miller, Bob—163, 164, 171, 511, 517, 876, 881, 976
Miller, Carla—679
Miller, Jon—534
Miller, Marcia E.—1014, 1025
Miller, Matt—787
Miller, Norm—801
Miller, Paul D.—476
Miller, Walker D.—1024
Miller, Warren L.—1016
Miller, Zell—63, 856
Millon-Underwood, Sandra—1017
Mills, Cheryl—383
Milosevic, Slobodan—127, 1004
Milow, Ronni—451
Minami, Dale—1004, 1020
Mineta, Norm—759
Minoves-Triquell, Juli—1006
Mitchell, George J.—96, 426, 457-460, 872, 909
Mittenhall, Richard—1014
Mitterrand, Francois—18, 120
Mladic, Ratko—904
Modrick, Liad—451
Mogwe, Mooketsa—1006
Mohamed, Mahdi Ibrahim—1013
Moldaw, Stuart G.—937, 1003
Mondale, Joan—591
Mondale, Walter F.—591
Monroe, Kevin—1017
Montgomery, G.V. (Sonny)—188
Moody, David L.—55
Moore, David A.—1017
Moore, Kristin Anderson—1012
Moore, Mike—678
Moorman, Thomas S., Jr.—724
Morales, Dan—949
Morales, Pablo—433
Morales, Victor—949, 950
Morgan, James C.—1012, 1016
Morgera, Peter—1000
Morial, Marc H.—471, 833
Morine, Bob—290
Morningstar, Richard L.—828, 1004, 1019
Morrison, Bruce—425
Morrow, Margaret M.—1025
Morton, William—556
Moseley-Braun, Carol—959, 1005
Mount, Day Olin—1010, 1022
Moy, Kirsten S.—1019

Moynihan, Daniel Patrick—971, 973
Mubarak, Hosni—436, 438, 446, 457, 1008, 1017
Murphy, Catherine—347, 349
Murphy, J.J.—276
Murphy, Patrick—276
Murphy, Walter—556
Murray, Lori Esposito—1011
Murray, Patty—247, 332, 652
Muskie, Edmund S.—508
Mussina, Mike—536
Myers, Betsy—932
Myers, Michael—55
Myers, Richard—591

Nagae, Peggy A.—1004, 1020
Nagahwatte, Tonya—261
Nagy, Tibor P., Jr.—1010, 1023
Naifeh, Bill—965
Nakanishi, Don T.—1004, 1020
Nash, Nathaniel—556
Nash, William L.—60
Neal, Ralph—673
Neeson, Liam—425
Netanyahu, Binyamin—440, 451, 828, 847, 848, 911, 992, 1015, 1018
Neville, Aaron—695
Newman, Paul—797
Nguyen, Philip—1001
Nguyen, Thanh Gus—1000
Nickles, Don—556
Nigh, George—549
Nitya Pibulsonggram—1006
Nomo, Hideo—599
Norick, Ronald J.—546
Norquist, John O.—737, 812
Norton, Eleanor Holmes—10
Nunn, Sam—118
Nurgaliyew, Bulat K.—1013
Nutter, James B., Sr.—1013
Nye, William S.—244

Oakman, Hannah—309
Obernauer, Marne—557
O'Brien, Robert M.—1014
O'Donovan, Leo J.—741
O'Dowd, Niall—425
O'Dwyer, Paul—425
Oerter, Al—673
Oertli, Gary—332
O'Keefe, Joseph L.—820
O'Leary, Hazel R.—661, 664
Oller, Stacy—523
O'Neill, Beverly—318, 327
O'Neill, Brian—884
O'Neill, William—797
Opperman, Vance—969
Orr, Robert C.—1017
Orseck, Jeffrey—1013
Orton, Bill—976
Orzag, Jon—852
Osborne, Randall—898
Otero, Joaquin F. (Jack)—1006, 1021
Otii, Ageno—696
Owens, Chandler D.—829
Owens, William A.—5

Paemen, Hugo—1006
Paez, Richard A.—105, 1019
Paisley, Ian—1009
Palmer, Jim—537
Panetta, Leon E.—175, 247, 252, 574, 577, 591, 634, 680, 903, 1006
Pang, Frederick F.Y.—1004
Pangalos, Theodoros—723
Papandreou, Yeoryius—723
Pardew, James W., Jr.—1014
Parker, M.J.—662
Parker, Robert—749
Pataki, George E.—1003
Patel, C. Kumar N.—1016
Patrick, Deval L.—875
Patrick, Ruth—1016
Patterson, Anne W.—1013, 1024
Patterson, Gilbert E.—829
Patton, Neal—62
Patton, Paul E.—87, 90, 174
Payne, Lawrence—556
Payne, William P.—676
Pease, Donald J.—1007
Pelosi, Nancy—759, 779, 884, 885
Pena, Federico—101, 105, 108, 227, 248, 253, 275, 652, 735, 782, 783, 787
Pennington, Richard—833
Pepper, John E.—491, 499, 1007
Peres, Shimon—77, 124, 336, 353, 360, 373, 382, 443, 444, 451, 454, 469, 635, 636, 653-656, 667-671, 847, 1009, 1012, 1015
Perez, Alfredo—329
Perez de Cueller, Javier—758
Perez, Sonia—1008
Perkins, Huel D.—1005
Perkins, Richard—881
Perot, Ross—5, 710
Perry, Dorothy—657
Perry, William J.—117, 227, 256, 573, 589, 656, 670, 754, 755, 763, 785, 849, 1006, 1013
Peterson, Dave—697
Peterson, Douglas (Pete)—1014, 1026
Pham, Dang—760
Phillips, J.C.—574
Phillips, Robert—347
Phingst, Paul—886
Pickering, Thomas R.—907
Pieroni, Leonard—556
Pitino, Rick—784
Planty, Donald J.—1010, 1023
Plimpton, Tom—47
Plumley, Mike—749
Polatty, David—591
Poling, Harold A.—1012
Pope, Mark—784

Pote, Harold W.—1015
Powers, Stephanie—297
Prado, Izaak—389
Pregerson, Dean D.—1020
Pressler, Larry—128
Prestowitz, Clyde V., Jr.—1009
Preval, Rene—184, 485, 1006
Priebe, Cameron G.—354
Primakov, Yevgeniy—606
Prince Saud al-Faysal—450
Proctor, Mel—537
Prodi, Romano—901, 902, 904, 905
Purcell, Bill—965

Qualls, Roxanne—495
Quick, Norman—829
Quick, Shane—876

Rabin, Leah—408
Rabinovich, Efret—465
Rabinovich, Itamar—374, 653
Raines, Franklin D.—577, 1026
Raiser, Molly—852
Ralston, Joseph W.—820
Ramirez, Frank—519, 521
Ramos, Hazel—891
Ramos, Jorge—476
Randolph, Ned—478
Rangel, Charles B.—959
Rase, Glen Robert—1010, 1022
Rauh, John—297
Rayoff, Charles—387
Reagan, Ronald—165, 557, 757, 808, 919
Reberra, Madeline—503
Reed, Bruce N.—852
Reeve, Christopher—803
Reeves, Joan M.—1012
Reger, Lawrence L.—1006
Register, Joseph, Jr.—476
Regli, Keith—297
Reich, Robert B.—625, 764, 967
Reid, Harry—879-882
Rendell, Edward—640
Render, Arlene—1014, 1025
Reno, Janet—87, 90, 99, 227, 307, 326, 376, 507, 517, 628, 657-659, 677, 735, 736, 738, 834, 886, 898, 900, 955, 961, 978
Reynolds, Albert—425, 426
Rhea, Betty Jo—956
Rhodes, Linda Colvin—1021
Rice, Lois D.—1007
Rice, Norman B.—96, 332, 955, 958
Richards, Ann—949
Richardson, Bill—523, 835, 897
Ridge, Tom—93, 273, 274
Rifkind, Malcolm—1015
Riley, Joseph P., Jr.—898, 956
Riley, Richard W.—28, 178, 182, 257, 259, 261, 325, 390, 425, 460, 511, 513, 515-517, 619, 620, 823, 843, 919, 937, 939, 940, 967
Rimer, Barbara K.—1017
Rimkus, Joseph—1000
Riordan, Richard—737
Ripken, Cal—534, 537
Rissler, Patricia—24
Ritter, Philippe—982
Rivers, Lynn N.—782
Rivlin, Alice M.—315, 577, 1022
Robas, Danny—451
Robb, Charles S.—821
Robidas, Ronald (Red)—151
Robinson, Leora—519, 521
Robinson, Mary—461, 907-909, 917, 918
Robinson, Nick—918
Robinson, Willam Edward—738, 739
Rockefeller, John D., IV—486
Rodgers, Jennifer—86
Rodriguez-Rodriguez, Anabelle—1020
Rogers, Fran—744
Rogers, Robert B.—1004, 1019
Rohatyn, Felix—269, 272
Romer, Roy—174, 515, 556, 557, 696
Romero, Marlene—105
Ronstadt, Linda—695
Rooney, Philip—955
Roper, Roberta—976
Roper, Vincent—976
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana—432
Rose, Peter H.—1016
Rosen, Amy M.—1006
Rosen, Marvin—662, 709, 797
Ross, Dennis B.—599, 601, 653
Rossi, Louis—105
Rothenberg, Stephen—129
Rothert, Caroline—938
Roy, J. Stapleton—1021
Royston, Ivor—1017
Rubin, Robert E.—111, 116, 525, 569, 629, 657, 738, 898, 900, 980
Rudashingwa, Theogene—1013
Rudman, Warren B.—112
Ruiz-Alessi, Alexis—327
Rush, Bob—209
Rush, Bobby L.—943
Russell, Pat—286
Ruvolo, Jim—43
Ryan, Bonnie J.—1017
Ryan, June—787
Ryan, Michael—55
Ryan, Shirley W.—1003, 1019

Sabatino, Jason—290
Safire, William—21
Saito, Juro—595
Saito, Kunihiko—1006
Salleo, Ferdinando—1006
Samper, Ernesto—908
Sampiano, Jorge—1008
Samuelson, Paul A.—1016
Sanchez, Tomas—895, 896
Sanders, Jerry—886

Sandler, Art—653
Sanford, Stefanie J.—1017
Santer, Jacques—901, 902, 904
Santorum, Rick—273, 274
Sasso, John—1025
Satcher, David—480
Sawhill, Isabel—112
Scalfaro, Mariana—540
Scalfaro, Oscar Luigi—528, 529, 540
Scalia, Antonin—541
Scattergood, Joe—47
Schafer, Amber—233
Schafer, Timothy—556
Schenk, Lynn—886
Schiff, Steven—895
Schiller, Harvey—340
Schmidt, John—307, 976
Schmoke, Kurt—1011
Schneider, Pauline—932
Schrager, Stanley N.—1014, 1025
Schrempp, Juergen—901
Schuerholz, John—340
Schulman, Heidi H.—1015, 1026, 1027
Schultz, Howard—747
Schultz, Richard D.—676
Schumer, Charles E.—430, 736
Scoville, John—556
Sears, Collin—113
Segal, Mady Wechsler—1010
Seitz, Lee—697
Seleznev, Sergei—600
Septin, Alice—151
Seymour, Margaret—735
Shaffer, George—484
Shaheen, Jeanne—281, 282
Shalala, Donna E.—10, 111, 239, 256, 307, 376, 480, 523, 524, 779, 915, 931
Shalikashvili, John M.—56, 60, 117, 227, 476, 724, 755, 785, 999, 1001
Shanker, Albert—514
Shapell, Nathan—1010
Shapiro, Harold T.—851
Sharma, D.K.—274
Sharp, Jack—738
Shaw, Deborah—521
Shaw, Nelson—137
Shea, Gerald M.—1004, 1020
Sheehan, John J.—185, 476
Sheer, Betsy—653
Sheinbaum, Stanley K.—1019
Shelton, Henry H.—476
Sher, Neal—653
Sherfield, Michael B.—476
Shinn, David H.—1009, 1021
Shmarov, Valeriy—849
Shoshmin, Alexander—600
Shriver, Eunice—930
Shriver, Sargent—930
Shrontz, Frank—775
Shumaker, Terry—297
Siena, Jane S.—1008
Simitis, Konstandinos—117, 560, 717, 1005, 1007
Simon, Matthew H.—374
Simpson, Alan K.—118, 683
Sims, Ron—1012
Siracuse, Jim—274, 277
Skaggs, Dorris—47
Skeen, Joe—835
Sklar, Richard—827
Slade, John—697
Slate, Martin—569
Slaughter, Candice—307
Smale, Stephen—1016
Smith, Bobbie—327
Smith, Dane Farnsworth, Jr.—1009, 1022
Smith, Emmitt—246
Smith, Jaimie—302
Smith, Jean Kennedy—425, 458, 460, 917
Smith, Leighton—60, 992
Smith, Linda—248, 250
Smith, Mark—320
Smith, Ron—484
Smith, Shelita—833
Snyder, Christina A.—1025
Sobchak, Anatoliy—600
Soderberg, Nancy E.—425
Sodoma, Deanna—673
Sokness, Curt—129
Solana, Javier—304, 1005, 1007
Soldati, Lincoln—282
Solomon, Gerald B.H.—556
Somson, Barbara—346
Sonnenberg, Maurice—1015
Sorenson, Theodore C.—930
Soucy, Donna—290
Sowinski, Larry—792
Spanier, Graham—725
Spears, David D.—1006, 1025
Specter, Arlen—273, 274
Spio-Garbrah, Ekwow—930
Spratt, John M., Jr.—556
Spring, Richard—1006
Staats, Elmer B.—1004, 1019
Stack, Charles R.—1025
Stangler, Gary J.—1012
Stein, Paul—724, 725
Steine, Peggy Weil—1013
Stella, Nicholas—566
Stella, Vikki—566
Stenholm, Charles W.—835
Stephanopoulos, George—282, 717
Stephanopoulos, Konstandinos (Kostis)—715, 716, 718, 723, 1004
Stern, Andy—625
Sterrit, David—461
Stewart, Nina J.—1009
Stock, Elisabeth A.—1017
Stokes, Bruce—1012
Stokes, Louis—956, 959
Stonecipher, Harry—318

Stovall, Ellen L.—1017
Stowell, Charles—851
Strickland, Ted—502
Stupak, Bart—976
Styles, Michael B.—1008
Suh, Susan—851
Summitt, Pat—783, 784
Surhoff, B.J.—535
Sutton, Loree K.—1017
Sweeney, John—625, 627, 801
Swett, Dick—152, 297
Switzer, Barry—245
Synar, Alan—480
Synar, Mike—22, 95, 239, 480, 482, 1005

Tai, Jackson P.—1012
Tal, Uri—454
Talbott, Strobe—185
Tarr-Whelan, Linda—1008
Tarullo, Daniel K.—1007
Tasat, Ramon—374
Tate, Blessing—913, 916
Tauber, Jeff—392
Taylor, Charles—572
Taylor, Jeremy—1000
Terner, I. Donald—556
Terrell, Mary Ann Gooden—1026
Tessier, Nancy—151
Thapa, Bhekh Bahadur—1013
Theimer, Jack W.—1013
Tholan, P. Stuart—556
Thompson, Bobby Lee—47
Thompson, Kathryn G.—1013
Thompson, Kenneth—833
Thompson, Tommy G.—163, 164, 171, 511, 812, 814
Thrash, Thomas W., Jr.—1025
Tilelli, John H., Jr.—476
Tilley, Jack—60
Tirozzi, Gerald N.—1003, 1004, 1020
Titus, Dina—881
Tobar, Andres—105
Tobias, Robert M.—1015
Tobin, Byron—591
Tomita, Tamlyn—759
Tomlin, Lily—186
Tooker, Gary—775
Torres, Bertha—396
Torres-Gil, Fernando M.—10
Torricelli, Robert G.—261, 412, 432, 700, 705
Trie, Charles Yah Lin—1012
Trimble, David—460, 1007
Troutman, Maurice—327, 330
Tseng, David—760
Tucker, Jim Guy—823, 1012, 1015
Tucker, John (J.P.)—812, 813
Tudjman, Franjo—46, 63, 127, 1004
Turnage, Cheryl Ann—556
Turner, Reginald M.—1017
Turner, Ted—346
Tuttle, Bill—481
Tuttle, Gloria—481
Tutu, Desmond—970
Twomey, David P.—1014
Tyson, Laura D'Andrea—852

Ucko, David A.—1007, 1021
Udall, Tom—507
Ulmanis, Guntis—1017, 1018
Underwood, Robert A.—759
Unruh, James A.—1007

Valdez, Luis—1003, 1019
Valenti, Jack—345
Van Horn, Carl E.—1014
Vance, Cyrus—758, 991, 997
Vaughan, M. David—1014
Veroneau, William—129
Versaw, Paul E.—787
Villarreal, Jose H.—1013
Voigt, Jean—193
Voigt, Ric—193
Voss, Patricia—764

Wachsman, Nachshon—452
Wakata, Koichi—76
Walchak, Dave—151
Wald, Charles—55, 56
Wald, David—422
Walesa, Lech—850
Walker, Aziza—325
Walker, L.T.—830
Walker, LeRoy T.—676
Walker, Monica—332
Walker, Nathaniel—492
Walker, Sheila—403
Walker, Sylvia—801
Waller, Calvin A.H.—732
Waller, Marion—733
Walsh, Joe—888
Walsh, John—763, 976
Walter, Bruce D.—259-261
Wang, Garrett—759
Warbasse, Naomi—556
Ward, George F., Jr.—1009, 1022
Ward, Patrick C.—5
Warren, David—178
Washburn, Don—782
Wasmosy, Juan Carlos—1012
Waters, Charles—88
Watson, Alexander F.—432
Watts, Mitchell—566
Watts, Tammy—566
Waxman, Henry A.—653, 779
Weaver, A. Vernon—1016, 1027
Weiler, Todd A.—1005
Weimer, Bill—787
Weiner, Mark—167
Weinstein, Harvey—797
Weis, Sheval—443
Weisman, James J.—1010
Weizman, Ezer—444
Welch, Larry D.—1009

Westfall, Buzz—769
Weston, Josh S.—1015
Wetterling, Patty—763
Wetzler, James W.—1015
Wheat, Yolanda Townsend—1011, 1024
Whelan, Katie—167
White, Byron—5
White, Jeanne—779
White, John P.—5, 820, 999, 1001, 1006
White, Mark—949
White, Mary Jo—628
White, Michael R.—737, 956, 959
Whitehead, Martha—949
Whitesides, George—851
Whittaker, Robert Al—556
Wible, Cullin—129
Widnall, Sheila E.—724, 999, 1001
Wiesel, Elie—1006
Wilde, Jean—274
Wilder, John—965
Wilkins, Roger—302
Wilkinson, Sharon P.—1009, 1022
Willard, Nick—151
Williams, David—521
Williams, Jody L.—1003
Williams, Robin—709
Williams, Terry—764
Williamson, Brady C.—1009
Williamson, Robert C.—792, 793
Wilson, Robert A., Jr.—1012
Winbush, R.H.—829
Wingett, Richard—876
Winnacker, Betsey Fulbright—866
Winterfeld, Trudy—250
Wishna, Harold—1012
Wisner, Irene—674
Witt, James Lee—3, 200, 247, 248, 253, 274, 276, 337, 546, 850
Wofford, Harris—67, 276, 641, 731, 930, 931
Wolf, Frank R.—417
Wolf, John Stern—1015, 1026
Wolpe, Howard—923
Womack, Richard G.—1005
Wonder, Stevie—709
Woo-Cummings, Meredith—1012
Wood, James—482
Wood, John (Randy)—1017
Wood, Justin—1002
Woods, Harriet F.—1013
Woody, Joshua—1000
Wooten, Wayne—47
Wright, Jim—949
Wright, Lucius—86
Wyden, Ron—123, 253, 1005

Yaacobi, Gad—465
Yanta, Jeanne—678
Yeltsin, Boris—105, 114, 115, 149, 436, 604, 607, 608, 610, 804, 810, 849, 911, 921, 928, 968, 993, 995, 996, 1005, 1007, 1009, 1011-1013
Young, Andrew—112, 599
Young, Gene—764
Youngberg, Francey—759
Youngnickel, DeLois—247
Youngnickel, Doug—247
Yunits, John T.—868
Yzaguirre, Raul—105

Zimmer, Dick—763
Zisa, John F.—408, 409
Zubieta, Alberto Aleman—1015, 1026
Zumwalt, Elmo R., Jr.—822
Zuzul, Miomir—1006
Zyuganov, Gennady—921

Document Categories List

Addresses to the Nation

State of the Union—79

Addresses and Remarks

See also Addresses to the Nation; Bill Signings; Bill Vetoes; Interviews With the News Media; Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials
Alexandria, LA, community—478
Alexandria, VA, V-chip roundtable discussion—191
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees convention, Chicago, IL—943
American Israel Public Affairs Committee policy conference—653
American Nurses Association—923
Anticancer initiative—523
Antigang and youth crime control legislation, announcement—735
Antipersonnel landmines initiative—754
Baton Rouge, LA
  Citizens—845
  State Legislature—838
Blue Ribbon schools—823
Boise, ID, departure—256
Boorda, Adm. Jeremy M., funeral service—785
Bosnia-Herzegovina
  Citizens, video address—45
  Death of U.S. soldier—162
  U.S. troops at Tuzla Airfield—60
Burke, Adm. Arleigh A., funeral service—5
Cancer Control Month proclamation signing—523
Cattle producers, assistance—671
Church burnings—928
Cincinnati, OH
  Community—495
  Corporate mentoring, roundtable discussion—491
Commerce Department
  Employees, aircraft tragedy in Croatia—541
  Secretary, recess appointment—574
  Secretary Brown
    Funeral—562
    Memorial service—543
Community policing grants, teleconference—737
Concord, NH, community—129
Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus Institute dinner—759
Coral Gables, FL, national drug control strategy—657
Crime victims' rights, proposed constitutional amendment—976
Croatia
  U.S. aircraft tragedy
    Memorial service at Dover Air Force Base, DE—554

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Croatia—Continued
  U.S. aircraft tragedy—Continued
    White House lawn tree planting ceremony—545
  Zagreb, arrival—63
Cuba, downing of U.S. aircraft—331, 339
Cyprus, President Clerides, discussions—921
Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee dinner, New York City—427
Democratic Governors Association dinner—167
Democratic National Committee
  Dinners
    Columbus, OH—502
    Houston, TX—948
    Nashua, NH—297
    Washington, DC—709
  Receptions, New York City—971
Democratic Party events
  Coral Gables, FL—662
  Detroit, MI—360
  Jersey City, NJ—700
  Nashville, TN—52
  New York City, NY—265
  Philadelphia, PA—640
  Stamford, CT—796
Des Moines, IA
  Community—232
  Work-study program roundtable discussion—228
Detroit metropolitan airport expansion, teleconference—782
Domestic violence hotline, unveiling—307
Earth Day at Great Falls, MD—617
Easter egg roll—556
Economy—872
Egypt, Sharm al-Sheikh, Summit of the Peacemakers—434, 436
Eid al-Fitr—301
Entertainment and media executives—343, 344
Family Re-Union V conference in Nashville, TN—964
Federal budget
  Negotiations—2, 17, 30, 68, 116, 683
  Proposal—479
Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors, Chairman, Vice Chair, and member, nomination—315
Fleet Week participants aboard the U.S.S. *Intrepid* in New York City—792
Fort Polk, LA, community—476
France
  Perouges, citizens—982
  President Chirac
    G–7 response to terrorism—986
    State dinner—128

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
France—Continued
President Chirac—Continued
Welcoming ceremony—120
Fulbright scholarship program, 50th anniversary, dinner—866
Gephardt, Representative Richard, dinner in St. Louis, MO—769
Germany, Chancellor Kohl, meeting—804
Glendale Community College, Glendale, CA—891
Graham, Billy and Ruth, dinner in honor of—685
Greece
President Stephanopoulos
Discussions—716
State dinner—723
Welcoming ceremony—715
Prime Minister Simitis, discussions—560
Greeleyville, SC, dedication of Mount Zion A.M.E. Church—898
Greenbelt, MD
Eleanor Roosevelt High School—383
White House Leadership Conference on Youth Drug Use and Violence, roundtable discussion—388
Group of Seven nations (G-7) summit—986
Grover Cleveland Middle School, Albuquerque, NM—895
Hackensack, NJ, community—408
Haiti, President Preval
Meeting—485
Teleconference—184
Harman International Industries employees, Northridge, CA—396
Health care legislation—861
Houston, TX
Arrival of space shuttle *Endeavour* astronauts—75
Funeral service for Barbara Jordan—74
Hungary, Taszar Air Base
Meeting with President Goncz—59
U.S. troops—56
"In Performance at the White House"—695
Independent Insurance Agents of America legislative conference—484
Inter-American Dialogue dinner—758
Iowa City, IA, community—209
Ireland, President Robinson
Arrival at Fort Myer, VA—907
State dinner—917, 918
Irish-American of the Year Award, presentation ceremony, New York City—425
Israel
Citizens, video address—373
Counterterrorism accord with U.S., signing ceremony—667
Elections—828
Jerusalem, President Weizman, meeting—444
Memorial service at the Embassy of Israel in Washington, DC—374
Peace agreement—635
Tel Aviv
Arrival—443
Question-and-answer session—451
Terrorist attacks—353, 359

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Italy
Aviano Air Base, U.S. troops—55
President Scalfaro
State dinner—540
Welcoming ceremony—528
Japan
Tokyo
Diet—595
State dinner—594
State luncheon—598
Trade with U.S.—574
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 25th anniversary reception—650
Keene, NH, community—286
Las Vegas, NV
Community—881
Juvenile crime, roundtable discussion—876
Lebanon
Peace agreement—635
President Harawi, discussions—623
Legislative agenda—633, 705
Long Beach, CA
Community—327
McDonnell Douglas employees—318
School uniforms, roundtable discussion—325
Louisiana economic development brunch—193
Louisville, KY
Community—90
Community policing, roundtable discussion—87
Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards, presentation ceremony—378
Manchester, NH, community—151, 290
Martin Luther King, Jr., commemorative service in Atlanta, GA—63
Mason City, IA—215
McDougal-Tucker trial, verdict—823
Memorial Day wreath-laying ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery—820
Merrimack, NH, small business roundtable discussion—155
Middle East
Citizens, video address—395
Peace process—381, 635
Milwaukee, WI, community—812
Museum of Television and Radio, Los Angeles, CA, satellite address—470
Nashua, NH, school-to-work program roundtable discussion—136
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, President, swearing-in ceremony—302
National Association of Attorneys General—507
National Association of Counties—366
National Association of Hispanic Publications convention—105
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities—178
National Association of Realtors—644
National Campaign to Reduce Teen Pregnancy, announcement—111
National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids—480
National Democratic Club dinner—24

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
National Emergency Management Association, teleconference—337
National Governors' Association
Conference—171
Dinner—163
Education summit, Palisades, NY—511
Roundtable discussion—164
National Homeownership Summit—868
National Information Infrastructure Advisory Council—243
National Prayer Breakfast—118
National Teacher of the Year, award ceremony—619
NCAA champions
Men's basketball, University of Kentucky Wildcats—783
Women's basketball, University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers—783
NetDay in Concord, CA—403
New Orleans, LA
Nashville wharf, dedication ceremony—471
Women's International Convention of the Church of God in Christ—829
Office of Management and Budget, Director, nomination—574
Office of National Drug Control Policy, Director, swearing-in ceremony—376
Ohio Democratic caucuses, teleconference—43
Oklahoma City, OK
Bombing victims' families—547
YMCA day care center, plaque dedication ceremony—546
Olympic games
Torch, departure from Washington, DC—942
U.S. Olympic Committee—673, 676
Pacific Basin Economic Council—775
Palestinian Authority, Chairman Arafat, discussions—671
Peace Corps, 35th anniversary—930
Peace officers memorial service—738
Pennsylvania State University graduate school, State College, PA, commencement ceremony—725
Peterbilt truck plant employees, Nashville, TN—46
Portland, OR, flood wall—253
Presidential Citizens Medal, presentation ceremony—337
Presidential scholars, awards presentation ceremony—937
President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities, conference—801
Princeton University, commencement ceremony in Princeton, NJ—851
Public housing, "One strike and you're out" initiative—519
Radio addresses—12, 58, 72, 110, 149, 207, 280, 324, 351, 406, 463, 489, 526, 553, 579, 602, 642, 687, 733, 773, 818, 847, 875, 919, 954, 989
Retirement savings and security legislation, announcement—569

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Rochester, NH, community—281, 282
Russia
Prime Minister Chernomyrdin, meeting—114
St. Petersburg
Arrival—599
Kazan Cathedral—601
Wreath-laying ceremony—600
St. Patrick's Day
Ceremony—456
Reception—460
Salem, NH, community—142
San Diego, CA, community—886
San Francisco, CA, Presidio—884
Saudi Arabia, terrorist attack on U.S. military facility—979, 980, 999, 1001
Saxophone Club
Culver City, CA—888
Washington, DC—713
Senior citizens, St. Monica's Episcopal Church—10
Service Employees International Union, convention—625
Shoreline, WA, community—332
Small Business Week dinner—857
Summit of the Peacemakers—434, 436
Super Bowl champion Dallas Cowboys—245
Syria, peace agreement—635
Taylor, MI, community—354
Teen pregnancy, report—913
Teenage smoking
Nickelodeon's "Clearing the Air: Kids Talk to the President About Smoking" TV program—23
Roundtable discussion—239
Television programming, roundtable discussion—346
U.S.S. *Independence* in Yokosuka, Japan, 7th Fleet—591
U.S.S. *Intrepid* Freedom Award—793
Union City, NJ, education technology initiative
Remarks—261
Roundtable discussion—257
United Jewish Appeal Youth Leadership Conference—465
United Kingdom
London, terrorist attack—206
Prime Minister Major, meeting in Moscow, Russia—602
U.S. Air Force Academy football team, trophy presentation ceremony—724
U.S. Coast Guard Academy, commencement ceremony at Groton, CT—787
U.S. Conference of Mayors
Cleveland, OH—955
Washington, DC—96
University of Central Oklahoma in Edmond, OK—549
Vietnam veterans, Agent Orange-related disability benefits—821
Webster Groves, MO, Webster Groves High School—764
White House Conference on Corporate Citizenship Panel I—741

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
White House Conference on Corporate Citizenship—Continued
Panel II—749
White House Conference on Empowerment Zones—309
White House Correspondents Association dinner—689
Wilkes-Barre, PA
Community—275
Flooding—272, 274
Women's Legal Defense Fund, 25th anniversary—932
Woodbridge, NJ, Kick Butts Day—695, 697
Woodland, WA
Community—247
Floods, roundtable discussion—248
World Series champion Atlanta Braves, welcoming ceremony—340

Appointments and Nominations

See also Digest (Appendix A); Nominations Submitted to the Senate (Appendix B); Checklist (Appendix C)
Commerce Department, Secretary, recess appointment, remarks—574
Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors, Chairman, Vice Chair, and member, remarks—315
Navy Department, Chief of Naval Operations, statement—862
Office of Management and Budget, Director, remarks—574
White House Office
Special Envoy to the President and the Secretary of State for Burundi, statement—923
Special Representative of the President and the Secretary of State for Bosnia, statement—827

Bill Signings

Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996
Remarks—628
Statement—630
Armed Forces, tax benefit legislation for military personnel serving in Operation Joint Endeavor, statement—483
Coastal Zone Protection Act of 1996, statement—851
Continuing appropriations legislation
6th continuing resolution, statement—13
7th continuing resolution, statement—15
9th continuing resolution, statement—103
10th continuing resolution, statement—462
11th continuing resolution, statement—488
12th continuing resolution, statement—526
13th continuing resolution, statement—632
Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996, statement—525
Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996
Remarks—432

Bill Signings—Continued
Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996—Continued
Statement—433
Debt limit extension, statement—190
District of Columbia appropriations legislation, statement—9
Enrollment, legislation waiving certain requirements—562
Farm Credit System Reform Act of 1996, statement—225
Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, statement—5441
Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996, statement—510
Line Item Veto Act
Remarks—556
Statement—559
Megan's Law, remarks—763
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, statement—226
Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996
Statement—636
Technical corrections, statement—687
Ryan White CARE Act Amendments of 1996
Remarks—779
Statement—780
Telecommunications Act of 1996
Remarks—185
Statement—188

Bill Vetoes

Foreign relations legislation, message—578
Partial birth abortion legislation
Message—567
Remarks—565
Product liability legislation
Message—681
Remarks—677
Welfare reform legislation, message—22

Communications to Congress

See also Bill Vetoes
Adoption legislation, letter—693
Aeronautics and space activities, message transmitting report—982
Africa, comprehensive trade and development policy, letter—166
Alaska mineral resources, message transmitting report—594
Angola, U.S. national emergency, message—509
Austria-U.S. social security agreement, message transmitting—767
Bosnia-Herzegovina, U.S. forces deployment, letter—963
Bulgaria, trade with the U.S., message transmitting report—114
Central African Republic, U.S. forces deployment, letter—817
China, trade with the U.S.
Letter transmitting memorandum—847

Communications to Congress—Continued
China, trade with the U.S.—Continued
Messages—177, 178, 964
Colombia narcotics trafficking, message—621
Commodity Credit Corporation, message transmitting report—796
Cuba, U.S. national emergency, message—350
Cyprus, letters transmitting reports—8, 394, 675
Eastern Bloc, trade with states of the former, letter—851
Environmental management waivers, message—639
Export Administration Act of 1979, lapse, message transmitting report—857
Federal budget
Proposed legislation, message transmitting—16
Rescissions and deferrals
Letters—309, 579
Messages—322, 375, 736, 971
Groom Lake, NV, U.S. Air Force operating location, letter—117
Haiti, U.S. military forces deployment, letter—487
Intelligence community budget, letter transmitting report—562
Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee, message transmitting report—375
International agreements, letter transmitting report—395
International Natural Rubber Agreement, message transmitting—932
Iran, U.S. national emergency
Message transmitting notice—403
Messages—423, 756
Iraq
Compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions, letter—7, 691
U.S. national emergency
Letter—380
Message—202
Israel, loan guarantees, message transmitting report—1
Japan, whaling activities, message—205
Law of the Sea fishery agreement, message transmitting—305
Liberia
Civil war, letter—572
U.S. military forces deployment, letter—781
Libya, U.S. national emergency, messages—4, 77
Malaysia-U.S. extradition treaty, message transmitting—768
Middle East, U.S. national emergency
Letter transmitting notice—70
Message—201
Narcotics producing and transit countries, letter—316
National drug control strategy, message transmitting—660
National Endowment for Democracy, message transmitting report—305
National Endowment for the Arts, message transmitting report—906
National Endowment for the Humanities, message transmitting report—593

Communications to Congress—Continued
National Science Board, message transmitting report—741
National Science Foundation, message transmitting report—795
Netherlands-U.S. tax protocol, message transmitting—5
Poland-U.S. fishery agreement, message transmitting—206
Product liability legislation, letter—464
Radiation control for health and safety, message transmitting report—518
Retirement savings and security legislation, message—815
Romania, trade with the U.S., message—4
Savings association insurance fund legislation, letter—633
Science, Technology, and American Diplomacy, letter transmitting report—483
Serbia and Montenegro, U.S. national emergency, letters—818, 835
Small business, message transmitting report—863
Trade Agreements Program, message transmitting report—519
Transportation Department, message transmitting report—102
Uzbekistan-U.S. investment treaty, message transmitting—341

Communications to Federal Agencies

See also Presidential Documents Published in the Federal Register (Appendix D)
Armed Forces, military personnel subject to involuntary separation, memorandum—200
Child support initiative, memorandums—927, 928
Combined Federal Campaign, memorandum—980
Commerce Department, designation of Acting Secretary, memorandum—553
Crime victims' rights, memorandum—987
Federal Government employees, family-friendly work arrangements, memorandum—962
Missing persons and missing children, memorandum—71
"One Strike and You're Out" public housing guidelines, memorandum—521
Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses interim report, memorandum—265
School uniforms manual, memorandum—326
Sexual offenders, development of a national registration system, memorandum—979
Teenage parents, welfare initiative, memorandum—733

Interviews With the News Media

See also Addresses and Remarks
Exchanges with reporters
Air Force One—435
Anchorage, AK—581
Capitol Hill—861

Interviews With the News Media—Continued
Exchanges with reporters—Continued
Cheju, South Korea—582
Jerusalem, Israel—444, 451
Lyons, France—984-986
Milwaukee, WI—804
St. Petersburg, Russia—601, 602
Santa Monica, CA—322
Shoreline, WA—331
Taszar, Hungary—59
Taylor, MI—359
Tuzla, Bosnia-Herzegovina—62
West Des Moines, IA—228
White House—1, 2, 17, 30, 76, 114, 116, 239, 243, 305, 307, 315, 353, 381, 456, 479, 484, 485, 507, 556, 560, 573, 623, 633, 635, 667, 671, 677, 683, 705, 716, 763, 821, 823, 828, 847, 850, 867, 872, 908, 921, 928, 980
Wilkes-Barre, PA—272
Interviews
Home Team Sports—537
New Jersey media—412
Voice of America—46
WBAL Radio—534
Joint news conferences
Egypt, President Mubarak—438
European Union leaders—901
France, President Chirac—121
Germany, Chancellor Kohl—805
Greece, President Stephanopoulos—718
Ireland, President Robinson—909
Israel, Prime Minister Peres—444
Italy, President Scalfaro—529
Japan, Prime Minister Hashimoto—585
Korea, South, President Kim—582
Russia, President Yeltsin—610
News conferences
No. 112 (January 9)—18
No. 113 (January 11)—33
No. 114 (February 1)—121
No. 115 (March 13)—438
No. 116 (March 14)—444
No. 117 (April 2)—529
No. 118 (April 16)—582
No. 119 (April 17)—585
No. 120 (April 20)—604
No. 121 (April 21)—610
No. 122 (May 9)—718
No. 123 (May 23)—805
No. 124 (June 12)—901
No. 125 (June 13)—909
No. 126 (June 29)—991

Joint Statements

Israel-U.S. relations—670
Russia-U.S. highly enriched uranium agreement—617
South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty, joint statement with France and the United Kingdom—489

Letters and Messages

See also Bill Vetoes; Communications to Congress; Communications to Federal Agencies
Armed Forces Day, message—768
Chinese New Year, message—271
Cinco de Mayo, message—689
Dole, Senator Robert, retirement from the Senate, letter—740
Easter, message—544
Eid al-Adha, message—639
Federal Government employees, furlough, open letter—16
Partial birth abortion legislation, letters—342, 568
Passover, message—543
Presidents' Day, message—295
Ramadan, message—72
St. Patrick's Day, message—350
Vietnamese Lunar New Year, message—272

Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials

Armenia, Patriarch Kerekin I—1004
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Government officials—1014
President Izetbegovic—62
Croatia
Government officials—1014
President Tudjman—62, 63, 1004
Cyprus, President Clerides—921
Ecuador, President Duran-Ballen—1017
Egypt, President Mubarak—438
Estonia, President Meri—1017
European Union leaders—901
France, President Chirac—120, 121, 128, 984, 986, 1018
Germany, Chancellor Kohl—804, 805, 1014
Greece
President Stephanopoulos—715, 716, 718, 723
Prime Minister Simitis—560
Group of Seven (G–7) leaders—1018
Haiti
Former President Aristide—1017
President Preval—485
Hungary, President Goncz—59
Ireland
Deputy Prime Minister Spring—1006
President Robinson—907-909, 917, 918
Prime Minister Bruton—456, 460, 1009
Israel
Foreign Minister Barak—76
Likud Party leader Netanyahu—451
President Weizman—444
Prime Minister Peres—444, 667, 670, 1009, 1012
Italy, President Scalfaro—528, 529, 540
Japan
Emperor Akihito—594, 1011, 1012
Foreign Minister Kono—1004
Prime Minister Hashimoto—322, 585, 598, 985, 1007, 1011
Jordan, King Hussein I—381, 435
Korea, South, President Kim—582, 1011

Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials—Continued
Kuwait, Amir Jabir—1008
Latvia, President Ulmanis—1018
Lebanon, President Harawi—623
Lithuania, President Brazauskas—1018
Malaysia, Prime Minister Mahathir—1014
Morocco, King Hassan II—1009
NATO, Secretary General Solana—1007
Northern Ireland
Democratic Unionist Party leader Paisley—1009
Sinn Fein leader Adams—1005
Ulster Unionist Party leader Trimble—1007
Palestinian Authority, Chairman Arafat—671, 1009
Peru, President Fujimori—1014
Poland, former President Walesa—850
Political Eight Nations (P-8) leaders—1012
Russia
President Yeltsin—610, 617, 1009, 1012
Prime Minister Chernomyrdin—114
Turkey, President Demirel—1010
Ukraine, President Kuchma—305, 1012
United Kingdom
Foreign Secretary Rifkind—1015
Labour Party leader Blair—573
Prime Minister Major—602, 984, 1009, 1012
Uzbekistan, President Karimov—1018

Resignations and Retirements

See also Statements by the President
General Services Administrator, statement—102

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings; Resignations and Retirements
Alaska North Slope crude oil exports—651
Armed Forces, tax relief for troops deployed to Bosnia-Herzegovina—340
Balkan peace process—304
Blinder, Alan, decision not to seek a second term as Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System—68
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bosnian women's initiative fund—998
U.S. demining initiative—998
Burns, George, 100th birthday—76
China, most-favored-nation trade status renewal, congressional action—988
Communications Decency Act, court decision—906
Comprehensive test ban treaty—989
Deaths
Beattie, Mollie—988
Brown, Pat—296
Burke, Adm. Arleigh A.—1
Burns, George—408
Colby, William—694
Dugan, Donald A.—163
Fitzgerald, Ella—920
Jordan, Barbara—68
Lawrence, M. Larry—21
Mitterrand, François—18

Statements by the President—Continued
Deaths—Continued
Muskie, Edmund—508
Synar, Mike—22
Waller, Calvin A.H.—732
Drought relief for Southern Plains States—834
Economy—403
Family and Medical Leave Act—675
Farm bill—488
Federal Government contracts
Illegal immigrants—246
Striker replacement—141
Floods in Oregon and Washington—200
Gasoline prices, administrative action—661
General Motors, tentative agreement to end strike—486
Gibbons, Representative Sam, decision not to seek reelection—365
Gulf war veterans' illnesses—954
HIV/AIDS drug approval by the Food and Drug Administration—351
Immigration legislation, congressional action—684
Israel, terrorist attacks—336, 353
Kentucky, tornado—850
Line-item veto legislation, Senate action—522
Minimum wage—522, 796, 815
Missing persons and missing children—70
Navy Department, Chief of Naval Operations, nomination—862
Northern Ireland
Peace process—98, 343, 872
Peace vigil—336
Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses, interim report—255
President's Council on Sustainable Development report—394
Replacement workers, Circuit Court decision—141
Russia
Arms reduction agreement with Ukraine—849
Election results—928
START II nuclear arms reduction treaty, Senate ratification—104
Ryan White AIDS legislation, congressional action—685
Silver Spring, MD, railroad accident—296
Space shuttle *Challenger*, 10th anniversary of accident—103
Substance abuse and women, report—863
Teenage smoking—265, 685, 815
Telecommunications reform legislation, congressional action—127
Tutu, Archbishop Desmond, retirement—970
United Kingdom
London, terrorist attacks—199, 301
Manchester, terrorist attack—920
Violent crime—691
White House Conference on Aging, report—379
Yellowstone National Park—351
Yugoslavia, former, commission on missing persons—997