

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, February 15, 1993
Volume 29—Number 6
Pages 157–202

Contents

Addresses to the Nation

The economy—157

Addresses and Remarks

Arlington, VA, Fenwick Center—196
Business leaders—185
Cabinet meeting—163
Economic advisers' meeting—160
Detroit, MI
Arrival—170
Town meeting—171
Environmental policy—159
Reduction and reorganization of the White House staff—162

Appointments and Nominations

Commerce Department
Assistant Secretaries—200
Under Secretary—200
Federal Emergency Management Agency,
Director—200
Justice Department, Attorney General—191

Bill Signings

Legislation designating the Thurgood Marshall
Federal Judiciary Building, statement—162

Communications to Congress

President's Task Force on National Health
Care Reform, letter—158

Communications to Federal Agencies

Fiscal responsibility, memorandum—167
Restriction of Government aircraft,
memorandum—168
Use of Government vehicles, memorandum—
169

Executive Orders

Deficit control and productivity in the Federal
Government—165
Reduction of Federal positions—167
Termination and limitation of Federal
advisory committees—166

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Arlington, VA—196
Oval Office—160, 163, 190
Roosevelt Room—160
Rose Garden—189
News conference, February 11 (No. 3)—191

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

See Interviews With the News Media

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill
Signings
Death of Arthur Ashe—158

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—202
Checklist of White House press releases—202
Digest of other White House
announcements—201
Nominations submitted to the Senate—201

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

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

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

Week Ending Friday, February 12, 1993

Radio Address to the Nation on the Economy

February 6, 1993

Good morning. This is Bill Clinton. And this morning, on my first radio address, I want to talk with you about the most important challenge facing our country and the challenge that has consumed almost all my time since I became your President on January 20th: how we can build a strong and growing economy for ourselves and for our children.

Lately we've had some good news about our economy. Our business productivity is up. Our people are producing more at lower cost. And lower interest rates are giving people the opportunity to refinance their home mortgages and to show more activity in the housing market. Now that change is in the air, people have more hope. Consumer confidence is up, and the financial markets are performing well. And all of that is good news for the economy.

But chances are, you're not satisfied. And neither am I, because our economy isn't numbers, it's people and how their lives are affected. And still today, all across America, more than 16 million of us are looking for full-time jobs and can't find them. Our unemployment rate, at 7.1 percent, is over 7 percent for 14 months now and still higher than it was at what we thought was the bottom of the recession. Our country is simply not producing enough new jobs, even in the recovery. And we're having a harder time hanging on to the good jobs that give people a good standard of living and give their children a good future. Too many people are working longer and harder just to stay even, living in fear that their families will be devastated by a serious illness. And too many parents are wondering if their children will live as well as they have or even if they'll be able to afford a college education.

As I traveled across our country last year, I spoke with many thousands of you about my ideas for creating new jobs and increasing our families' incomes. Now, in my first weeks as President, I've learned, as you have, that the economic situation has some greater problems than we thought. Shortly after the election, the Federal Government announced that the proposed deficit for next year and the year after that and the year after that was about \$50 billion more than we'd been told last August. The difference between what the Government spends and what the Government takes in is much larger than we had thought before and poses new challenges for our administration.

For the past 12 years, our leaders haven't completely leveled with us. They loved to tell us how much they cared about us and how much they hated big Government. But Government kept spending more money, and the deficit kept growing. And even worse, all the time Government took care of a privileged elite while our country's real problems kept worsening.

So today we have to do something no generation has ever had to do before. We have to build a high-growth, high-skilled, high-wage economy by investing in the health, the education, the job training, and the technologies of our people and their future. And at the same time, we have to cut that enormous Federal deficit before it chokes off our ability to invest in our future and undermines your living standards and those of your children. When the Government keeps borrowing more and more money, it becomes more difficult for business and Government and for our own families to make the investments we all need. Today the government is spending about a \$1.20 for every \$1.00 it takes in taxes. We've got to act and act now. There is simply no alternative.

In the days ahead, I'll be discussing with you in greater detail my plan to put our economy back on track. But this morning I just

want to tell you about my guiding principles. They are the same ones that got me into this campaign well over a year ago, that kept me going all through the year 1992, and that I carry with me to work every morning in the Oval Office.

We have to ask everyone to contribute something to get the job done. But we're going to ask the most from those who have got the most and gave the least during the past dozen years, those at the top of the ladder. And we're going to do everything we can to protect people who are suffering the most from declining incomes and vanishing jobs, the middle class and the working poor.

First, we've got to control the cost of Government, starting with my own people. I'll be making big cuts in the White House staff, cutting payrolls and perks and privileges. I want to set an example so that I can take the fight to the rest of the Government to eliminate unnecessary commissions, to reduce the Federal payroll, to get rid of needless luxuries like posh dining rooms. And we're going to take on the lobbyists for the special interests that have grown used to getting special favors from our Government.

Then we'll ask the people who have benefited most from the eighties to give something back to their country. While most Americans paid higher taxes on lower real incomes, the privileged few paid lower taxes on much higher real incomes. We're going to ask them now to pay their fair share, along with corporations whose tax burden has been dramatically reduced in the last 12 years. I'm going to cut the cost of our Government and get rid of windfalls for the wealthy before I ask any of the rest of the American people to make a contribution that is fair and essential to grow our economy.

I'd ask you to remember that we didn't get into this mess overnight. In the last 12 years, our debt has grown to 4 times what it was before. We're now spending 14 cents of every tax dollar paying interest on past debt, almost as much as we're spending on our social services and our defense budget. We can't get out of this overnight, but we have to make a beginning.

Together we can return to the time-honored American values of rewarding work, offering opportunity, demanding responsibility,

and providing for our future as a community. We're all in this together. We're going up or down together. I'm convinced we're going up, if we have the courage to invest, if we have the courage to reduce our deficit, and if we have the courage to do it in a fair way.

Thank you, and good morning.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

Statement on the Death of Arthur Ashe

February 7, 1993

I am deeply saddened by the death last night of Arthur Ashe. The embodiment of true sportsmanship, Arthur rose from the segregated courts of Richmond, VA, to the championship at Wimbledon displaying grace, strength, and courage every step of the way.

Arthur Ashe never rested with fame. He used the strength of his voice and the power of his example to open the doors of opportunity for other African-Americans, fighting discrimination in America and around the world.

In the last years of his life he continued his tenacious battle for others in the face of a disease he could not beat. He was a true American hero and a great example to us all.

Letter to Congressman William F. Clinger, Jr., on the President's Task Force on National Health Care Reform

February 5, 1993

Dear Congressman Clinger:

Thank you for your letter of February 1 concerning my health care task force. I appreciate your support of my efforts to formulate a national health care policy. It is my intention to develop a plan for high quality, affordable health care for all Americans, and I have asked the health care task force to help me develop legislation for comprehensive health care reform.

I have referred your questions concerning the Federal Advisory Committee Act to Bernard Nussbaum, the White House Counsel. Mr. Nussbaum has prepared a letter addressing your concerns, which he will deliver to you under separate cover. I have also asked Mr. Nussbaum and his staff to be available to answer any further questions you may have on legal issues relating to the health care task force.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: The President's letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 8 but was not issued as a White House press release. The White House Counsel's letter was attached to the President's letter.

Remarks Announcing a New Environmental Policy

February 8, 1993

Good morning. I want to make a statement this morning and then turn the microphone over to the Vice President to discuss the environmental issues. And then he will take questions on the matter.

Today I am announcing the creation of a White House Office on Environmental Policy, keeping a commitment that both the Vice President and I made to the American people to bring new leadership and new energy to these issues. And I am today reinforcing my intention to work with the Congress for legislation that will make the Environmental Protection Agency a part of my Cabinet.

We face urgent environmental and economic challenges that demand a new way of thinking and a new way of organizing our efforts here in the White House and in the National Government. This office represents in action our commitment to confront these challenges in a new, more effective way, recognizing the connection between environmental protection and economic growth and our responsibility to provide real leadership on global environmental issues.

We must move in a new direction to recognize that protecting the environment means strengthening the economy and creating new jobs for Americans. And we must be ready

to take advantage of the absolutely enormous business opportunities that exist both here and around the world for new environmental technologies that protect the environment and increase business profits and jobs.

The days of photo-op environmentalism are over. The Competitiveness Council is closed and so is the back door the polluters used to be able to use to get out from under our laws. This office represents our commitment to the environment and to a new, more efficient and effective way to craft policies that work, policies that recognize that protecting the environment, strengthening the economy, promoting the global environment, and dealing with global environmental problems have all too often been relegated to the bottom of the agenda. These are policies that will renew for the American people a genuine commitment to their health, their safety, and their jobs.

This office will be responsible for coordinating environmental policy. The director of the office will participate in the National Security Council, the National Economic Council, and the Domestic Policy Council and will work with all the relevant agencies. I am pleased to announce today that Kathleen McGinty will lead this office and its efforts.

We are today changing the way Government works, replacing the Council on Environmental Quality with a new office that will have broader influence and a more effective and focused mandate to coordinate environmental policy. The American people look to us to make Government work better and more efficiently and more effectively for them. We are taking an important step in that direction today. The American people, our economy, and our environment will benefit as a result of this.

And I'd like to say a special word of thanks to Vice President Gore for the work that he has done since the election. We have been working hard now for more than 2 months to determine exactly how we ought to reorganize our environmental efforts and how we could integrate the environment, for the first time really, into national security policy, national economic policy, and other domestic

policies. I think we've taken a long step in that direction. I thank the Vice President for his leadership, and I turn the microphone over to him.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With President Turgut Özal of Turkey

February 8, 1993

Tax Payment for Domestic Help

Q. Mr. President, are you now going to ask all of your Cabinet Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries whether they have paid Social Security taxes and whether they ever had hired any illegal domestic help?

The President. I've handled that through the White House Legal Counsel. I think Mr. Stephanopoulos has already given a statement.

Q. Do you feel confident that everyone will now pay back taxes?

The President. I do. I think everybody will do what they're supposed to do.

Q. Sir, when are you going to—

Bosnia

Q. Sir, when do you expect to have a statement on Bosnia?

The President. We're very close. I don't want to give you a specific time, but we're very close. As you know, we've done an awful lot of work on it. I spent a lot of time on it last week and a considerable amount of time today. So we're quite close.

Q. Do you think this week you might have a diplomatic initiative?

The President. I think we might be prepared to make a statement in the next few days, yes.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:04 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Economic Advisers

February 8, 1993

Economic Stimulus Package

Q. Mr. President, do you have any response to the Republican letter? Did they say that they will not support your economic plan unless you do more on the spending side?

The President. They said they were against the stimulus program, and that's basically a statement that they think things are fine in the economy now, and I just disagree with that.

I'd like to read this statement, and then I'll be glad to answer it. That reflects the old way of thinking, you know, we're coming out of a recession; therefore we don't need a stimulus package. It overlooks the fact that there are now 3 million jobs less in this economy than there would be if we were in a normal recovery, that we now have fewer non-farm payroll jobs today than we did 2 years ago—3 years ago, 646,000 fewer jobs than in January of 1990.

Let me make this announcement about unemployment, and then I'll answer a couple of more questions on this.

Unemployment

You all know that we've been here working every day for hours and hours, putting together this economic package designed to increase income and generate jobs and reduce the deficit.

Before we begin our next meeting, I have two things that I want to say: First, despite these encouraging statistics about the increased productivity, there are still millions of Americans who want to go to work to support their families, but they can't find jobs. The unemployment rate, indeed, is 7.1 percent. It's been above 7 percent for 14 months, and is now higher than it was at the so-called bottom of this recession.

Secondly, no short-term solution to the problems of the unemployed is adequate. Many unemployed workers are what we call "permanently displaced." And they need much better access to reemployment services that will provide them the information and

the changing skills necessary to compete in the changing world. The old ways of doing business are simply not good enough anymore. Unemployment compensation must now be both a short-term lifeline for workers and a long-term link to the skills that it will take for them to get where they want to be, back in the work force.

Interestingly enough, Secretary of Labor Reich just showed me this little chart which makes the point painfully well. In the last four recessions, 56 percent of the workers laid off did not think they would get their jobs back; 44 percent did. In this recession, 86 percent of the workers don't believe they're going to get their jobs back, and only 14 percent think they will. That means that we need a much stronger plan to create new jobs and an aggressive effort at unemployment compensation that does more than just pay.

Today I want to announce a two-part initiative. First, I'm directing the Department of Labor to pursue legislation to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program for 7 months beyond March 6th, the date set for its expiration. I'm very pleased to also announce that this package will include reforms to the unemployment insurance program that will dramatically improve reemployment services available to structurally unemployed workers.

The first step is to provide the critical link between permanently displaced workers and services to help them find the jobs. Using the data that is now routinely collected when an unemployed worker files a claim, individuals can be profiled by the fifth week of their unemployment to determine their need for reemployment assistance, and a referral for appropriate services can then be made. Recently, a number of demonstration projects, particularly the New Jersey Re-Employment Project, showed that this kind of work and referral can significantly reduce the time that workers spend unemployed, as well as raise their earnings once they do go back to work. And of course, that means that that will reduce State unemployment insurance costs and costs to the Federal Treasury.

I will say again: I know the economic upturn looks good in terms of the big statistics, but the unemployment rate is higher than it was at the bottom of the recession. There

are fewer jobs than there were 3 years ago this month. We are 3 million jobs below where we would be in a normal recovery at this time. So we need this unemployment extension, and we need the economic stimulus program that I will propose when the Congress comes back into session.

Economic Stimulus Package

Q. Have you made your decision on that stimulus program, and have you ruled out anything except the COLA on the Social Security?

The President. I have made the decision on the general outline of the stimulus program, and I have made a lot of the specific decisions within it, but we're going to go back over it all one more time to refine it. I have worked very hard on the deficit reduction package, and I'll have more to say about that on the 17th.

Kimba Wood

Q. Mr. President, a lot of groups feel that there is a double standard here on the gender issue, because Kimba Wood was disqualified even though she had paid Social Security, but members of your Cabinet have not paid Social Security and are now trying to catch up. Are women being treated unfairly?

The President. Absolutely not. For one thing, this issue was never an issue, and it never occurred to anyone to make it an issue, until Zoe Baird voluntarily disclosed it. So, no one knew, so no one was subjected to the double standard. Since that time—the Attorney General, which should be held to a higher standard than other Cabinet members on matters of this kind—all of our interviews, for men and women alike, have been conducted in a totally evenhanded fashion.

And finally, I think Judge Wood has been somewhat unfairly treated inasmuch as what happened to her happened in the ordinary course of the vetting process. It's happened to many other people in the months that we have been working on this. She was singled out only because it was wrongly reported that she had been offered a job that she had not been offered by me or anybody else. I'm sorry that happened, and some say that a leak inside this administration caused that. If I knew who did it, they wouldn't be here.

Q. What about the leak about the——

Q. Playboy bunny girls, and——

Q. ——Playboy Club?

The President. That did not come out of here. Absolutely!

Q. Where did——

The President. It categorically did not come out of here, and I thought whoever leaked it, it was outrageous. But it did not come out of here.

Q. When do you hope to have a decision on Attorney General, sir?

The President. I have nothing else to say.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:15 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Signing Legislation Designating the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building

February 8, 1993

Today, I am signing into law, S. 202, which designates the newly-completed Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, D.C. as the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building."

It is fitting that a building which houses the work of more than 2000 judicial employees be named after a man who dedicated more than six decades of his life to public service in the judicial arena. Leading the legal arm of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Thurgood Marshall worked tirelessly for more than a quarter century to dismantle racial segregation in all manner of human endeavor. His twenty-nine victories before the U.S. Supreme Court serve as a reminder to the American people of our individual potential to have a dramatic impact in our service to others.

Marshall brought the same fervent commitment to social equality to his work as an appeals court judge, the Solicitor General of the United States and Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. His insistent

vision for America is a legacy which I hope we will cherish and strive to fulfill.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 8, 1993.

NOTE: S. 202, approved February 8, was assigned Public Law No. 103-4.

Remarks on Reduction and Reorganization of the White House Staff

February 9, 1993

Good morning. Next week I will outline our new economic plan to create jobs, to raise incomes, to reduce the deficit, and to lay the foundation for long-term economic growth for this country. Twelve years of denial and delay have left a legacy that will take years to overcome. Economic renewal will require tough choices from every American. But we have to ask the most of those who got the most and gave the least during the last decade, those at the top of the ladder, and those who have the levers of Government.

We in Government cannot ask the American people to change if we will not do the same. Most families in this country have had to adjust their priorities and tighten their belts in the last decade. Just about every American business from the smallest hardware store to the largest conglomerate has had to change to meet increased competition. And so, too, the Government must do more and make do with less.

During the recent campaign I pledged to reduce the White House staff by 25 percent below the size left by my predecessor. Today I am announcing a reorganization of the White House that keeps that commitment to the American people. Our White House will be leaner but more effective, and designed to work both hard and smart for the changes we seek in America.

These cuts come as part of a quite significant reorganization of the Office of the President. The reorganization will reduce the size of the President's Office including the White

House and the Executive Office of the President by some 350 people from its staffing at the end of the Bush administration, not counting, of course, OMB and the Trade Representative's Office, nor part of the Cabinet.

This reduction will be implemented in the next fiscal year—that is, the one that begins with the new budget—not at some distant date in the future. And these cuts will come at all levels of our operations. I should point out that this is one of the few times in this century that any President has actually shrunk the size of the White House staff.

In addition, we'll be cutting back on some of the perks that can too often delude public servants into thinking that the people work for them instead of the other way around. And the salaries of many top White House staff have been reduced also.

I take these steps not simply to save the taxpayers' money but also because I believe this smaller White House will actually work better and serve the American people better. We have begun a process of revitalization and reorganization that must consume our entire Government and not simply its most visible symbol here on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Over the past decade the best American businesses have had to reorder themselves and revitalize themselves. They've had to reduce layers of bureaucracy, give people on the front lines the freedom to innovate, and do more with less to better serve their customers. Well, the taxpayers of this country are our customers, and we intend to follow those methods of modernization to increase our services to them and to do it at an affordable cost so that this money can be put to more productive purposes.

Millions of dollars will be saved by this reorganization. But we will do more in the other Cabinet Departments, throughout the Government, and not just in this year but in the years ahead. Too often in recent years our Government has been on automatic pilot. People do things today just because that's the way they were done yesterday. It has grown to satisfy not only the needs of the people but its own needs. America has changed, but Washington hasn't. Now, as have so many businesses before, our Government must reform itself to regain the people's trust and

to be able to take the lead in the challenging decisions which lie ahead of us.

Now Mr. McLarty, my Chief of Staff, will explain the details of the reorganization.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:34 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Exchange With Reporters During a Meeting With Boy Scouts *February 9, 1993*

White House Staff Reduction

Q. Mr. President, are you going to share in the sacrifice, giving up perks?

Q. Mr. President, will you raise the corporate tax rate to 36 percent?

Q. Were you a Boy Scout, Mr. President?

The President. I gave up 350 staff members, a remarkable accomplishment. And Mr. McLarty answered the other question.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:14 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks at a Meeting With Cabinet Members *February 10, 1993*

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to sign these Executive orders, and then I will go over to the microphone and make a statement about each one.

The first order requires by attrition a reduction in Federal positions of 100,000. The second order is a reduction in the administrative costs of the present Federal Government by 3 percent per year on average leading up to 5 percent in the 4th year of this 4-year term and abolishing several boards and commissions. The third order deals with the commissions.

These are memoranda to the Department heads. One deals with perks; one deals with Government vehicles; one deals with aircraft.

[At this point, the President signed the documents.]

Members of the Cabinet and staff, tonight I will be going to Michigan and the Vice President will be going to California to hold town meetings with American citizens to talk

to them about the economic problems and the budget mess that we have inherited and the priorities and principles we intend to bring to our efforts to change the country and bring about recovery.

The people demand and deserve an active Government on their side. But they don't want a Government that wastes money, a Government that costs more and does less. They voted for change. They wanted a literal revolution in the way Government operates, and now you and I must deliver.

Yesterday I announced the reorganization of the White House staff that will reduce our staff by 25 percent and cut costs by \$10 million per year. Today I have called you, the Members of the Cabinet, together to take the next step, to begin the overhaul of Government as a whole. The steps we're taking today will save the American taxpayer \$9 billion. They won't be easy, but they will make a difference. We have an obligation and an opportunity to change the way Government works and to show that Government can do more with less.

Our Government needs change. For the last dozen years I've heard our leaders call loudly for less Government while giving people more Government and, perhaps more importantly, while giving almost no attention to better or different Government, to new ways in which partnerships could be made with people in the private sector and in State and local governments. Too often in the last decade people have rushed to defend the power of the few at the top and privileges of the elite, not just in the private sector but also in Government. Too often when economic security of ordinary Americans has been threatened, Government has sat still, refused to lead—not even follow, just get in the way. That era has come to an end with our coming to office.

Today the Cabinet and I are taking several steps to show that we intend to change the way that Government works. But I want to make it clear this is only a beginning, not the end of the process.

First, I am ordering a reduction of the Federal bureaucracy by at least 100,000 positions over the next 4 years. At least 10 percent of these cuts must come from senior management. The cuts can come from attri-

tion; I see no need for layoffs. These cuts will make our Government more efficient and more effective. The Government is full of dedicated people whose hard work is being choked off by our own bureaucracy.

Second, I'm ordering each Federal department and agency to reduce its administrative, as opposed to its program, costs by 12 percent over the next 4 years. With better planning and innovation we can make better use of the money we already have. In many agencies overhead is too high, redtape is too thick, and the day-to-day operations of the agencies have not been reexamined in a very long time. I believe Government can both care about people and be careful with their money.

Third, I am today ordering the elimination of hundreds of unproductive and duplicative advisory commissions that have spread across this Government like kudzu. I'm asking the Office of Management and Budget to eliminate at least one-third of the 700 advisory boards and commissions that were not created by Congress. From now on agencies and departments will not be allowed to create new commissions without permission from OMB. We simply cannot allow the Federal bureaucracy to beget more bureaucracy.

Finally, we have to shrink the gulf between Government and the average citizen. Too often success in Washington is measured not by results but by perks. Today I've issued three directives that will begin to limit perks and privileges that have driven a wedge between Washington and the public: First, an end to widespread use of home-to-office limousines by top officials and a reduction in the limousine fleets overall by half. Second, I'm tightening the rules for using Government airplanes and ordering an inventory of the airplane fleet with an eye toward eliminating unnecessary planes. Many people believe that there are substantial savings here. Finally, I'm ordering the elimination of such perks as below-cost executive dining rooms and free membership in private health clubs.

However, I do want to say to you, as I just told the Cabinet before we came in, this administration was also elected to provide a health care plan for the American people, including setting a good example. And one of the ways I want to do that is to keep people

healthier. So, I will also encourage every Government agency to provide health facilities in any building of any size, as long as they are provided on equal terms to all employees from the building maintenance people to the Secretary of the Department.

These Executive orders are just a beginning, but they're a good beginning. We will now move on to really try to find ways to reinvent the way Government works and relates to people: how we can empower people more and entitle them less, how we can have more effective partnerships with the private sector and with State and local government, how we can find some of the dramatic productivity innovations that have characterized our finest companies over the last few years.

I'd like to now call upon a few of our Cabinet Secretaries to discuss some of the things that they have been doing in their agencies, beginning with the Labor Secretary, Secretary Reich.

[At this point, Secretary Reich spoke about how eliminating executive perks improves management-labor relations.]

The President. Secretary O'Leary.

[At this point, Secretary O'Leary spoke about the example set by staff reductions in her own office.]

The President. I also appreciate what you've done to make the building more accessible over there.

Secretary O'Leary. Thank you.

The President. Secretary Cisneros.

[At this point, Secretary Cisneros spoke about HUD cost-cutting measures and management improvement efforts.]

The President. Secretary Babbitt.

[At this point, Secretary Babbitt spoke about Interior Department management improvement and elimination of perks.]

The President. Well, thank you. One of us has had a big problem to deal with in the last few days, and my impression is that he's done quite well. I'd like to ask Secretary Espy just to give a report about the crisis he's been dealing with and what his recommendation has been.

[At this point, Secretary Espy spoke about plans for improvement of the meat inspection program.]

The President. Anybody else like to be heard?

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, changing the subject, since Secretary Christopher is going to talk about Bosnia this afternoon, could you at least tell us are U.S. troops a part of the initiative that will be unveiled this afternoon?

The President. I think I should let Secretary Christopher give his speech first. We have all worked very hard on this Bosnia policy ever since we took office and even before, trying to find a way to do more but do it with the support of our allies and through the United Nations. I think I'll let him give his speech, and then I'll be glad to answer questions about the policies after he does.

Q. Do you think the public—

The President. I think the public will support the policy that he will outline today, yes. I think they will want us to do more and want us to do it in a prudent way. And I think that they will support this policy.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:33 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House.

Executive Order 12837—Deficit Control and Productivity Improvement in the Administration of the Federal Government

February 10, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1101 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and in order to assist in the control of the Federal deficit and improve the administrative productivity of the Federal Government, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. All executive departments and agencies shall include a separate category for "administrative expenses" when submitting their appropriation requests to the Office of

Management and Budget (OMB) for fiscal years 1994 through 1997. The Director of OMB (Director), in consultation with the agencies, shall establish and revise as necessary a definition of administrative expenses for the agencies. All questions regarding the definition of administrative expenses shall be resolved by the Director.

Sec. 2. The purpose of this order is to achieve real reductions in the administrative costs of Federal agencies. In order to accomplish that goal, agencies shall submit budgets that reflect the following reductions from the fiscal year 1993 baseline:

(a) For fiscal year 1994, all agencies shall submit budget requests that reflect no less than a 3 percent reduction in administrative expenses from the amount made available for fiscal year 1993 adjusted for inflation;

(b) For fiscal year 1995, all agencies shall submit budget requests that reflect no less than a 6 percent reduction in administrative expenses from the amounts made available for fiscal year 1993 adjusted for inflation;

(c) For fiscal year 1996, all agencies shall submit budget requests that reflect no less than a 9 percent reduction in administrative expenses from the amounts made available for fiscal year 1993 adjusted for inflation;

(d) For fiscal year 1997, all agencies shall submit budget requests that reflect no less than a 14 percent reduction in administrative expenses from the amounts made available for fiscal year 1993 adjusted for inflation.

Sec. 3. The Director shall review agency requests for administrative expenses. The Director shall ensure that all agency requests for such expenses are reduced in accordance with section 2. To the extent that any agency fails to comply with the mandates of section 2, the Director is authorized to reduce the request for administrative expenses in that agency's budget to achieve the appropriate reduction.

Sec. 4. All independent regulatory commissions and agencies are requested to comply with the provisions of this order.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 10, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:33 p.m., February 10, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the Federal Register on February 12.

**Executive Order 12838—
Termination and Limitation of
Federal Advisory Committees**

February 10, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Federal Advisory Committee Act ("FACA"), as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Each executive department and agency shall terminate not less than one-third of the advisory committees subject to FACA (and not required by statute) that are sponsored by the department or agency by no later than the end of fiscal year 1993.

Sec. 2. Within 90 days, the head of each executive department and agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, for each advisory committee subject to FACA sponsored by that department or agency: (a) a detailed justification for the continued existence, or a brief description in support of the termination, of any advisory committee not required by statute; and (b) a detailed recommendation for submission to the Congress to continue or to terminate any advisory committee required by statute. The Administrator of General Services shall prepare such justifications and recommendations for each advisory committee subject to FACA and not sponsored by a department or agency.

Sec. 3. Effective immediately, executive departments and agencies shall not create or sponsor a new advisory committee subject to FACA unless the committee is required by statute or the agency head (a) finds that compelling considerations necessitate creation of such a committee, and (b) receives the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Such approval shall be granted only sparingly and only if compelled by considerations of national security, health or safety, or similar national interests. These

requirements shall apply in addition to the notice and other approval requirements of FACA.

Sec. 4. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue detailed instructions regarding the implementation of this order, including exemptions necessary for the delivery of essential services and compliance with applicable law.

Sec. 5. All independent regulatory commissions and agencies are requested to comply with the provisions of this order.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 10, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:34 p.m., February 10, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the Federal Register on February 12.

Executive Order 12839—Reduction of 100,000 Federal Positions
February 10, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 301 of title 3, United States Code, section 3301 of title 5, United States Code, and section 1111 of title 31, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Limits on Hiring Civilian Personnel. Each executive department or agency with over 100 employees shall eliminate not less than 4 percent of its civilian personnel positions (measured on a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis) over the next 3 fiscal years. The positions shall be vacated through attrition or early out programs established at the discretion of the department and agency heads. At least 10 percent of the reductions shall come from the Senior Executive Service, GS-15 and GS-14 levels or equivalent.

Sec. 2. Coverage. This order applies to all executive branch departments and agencies with over 100 employees (measured on a FTE basis).

Sec. 3. Target Dates. Each department and agency shall achieve 25 percent of its

total reductions by the end of fiscal year 1993, 62.5 percent by the end of fiscal year 1994, and 100 percent by the end of fiscal year 1995.

Sec. 4. Implementation. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue detailed instructions regarding the implementation of this order, including exemptions necessary for the delivery of essential services and compliance with applicable law.

Sec. 5. Independent Agencies. All independent regulatory commissions and agencies are requested to comply with the provisions of this order.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 10, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:24 a.m., February 11, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the Federal Register on February 12.

Memorandum on Fiscal Responsibility
February 10, 1993

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies and Employees of the Executive Office of the President

Subject: Government Fiscal Responsibility and Reducing Perquisites

To promote Government fiscal responsibility by cutting the perquisites and excesses of Government office, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Executive Dining Facilities

Executive dining facilities in the executive departments and agencies and the White House Executive Mess will not be permitted hereafter to provide below-cost meals. The Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the agencies as needed, will develop promptly a plan and issue any directives required to recover the costs of meals served in these executive dining rooms.

I strongly support the decision of those Secretaries who have concluded that they do not need an executive dining room for the conduct of their agencies' business and have closed and converted them to other uses. I therefore am requesting the other heads of agencies to review their official needs and close voluntarily executive dining facilities that are not essential for the regular conduct of Government business.

Section 2. Conferences

The public interest requires that agencies exercise strict fiscal responsibility when selecting conference sites. Accordingly, agencies are not to select conference sites without evaluating the cost differences of prospective locations. When agency representatives attend conferences sponsored by others, the agency must keep its representation to a minimum consistent with serving the public's interest. The Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the agencies, will issue further directives necessary to implement this requirement.

William J. Clinton

Memorandum on Restriction of Government Aircraft

February 10, 1993

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies and Employees of the Executive Office of the President

Subject: Restricted Use of Government Aircraft

The taxpayers should pay no more than absolutely necessary to transport Government officials. The public should only be asked to fund necessities, not luxuries, for its public servants. I describe in this memorandum the limited circumstances under which senior executive branch officials are authorized to use Government aircraft.

In general, Government aircraft (either military or owned and operated by a particular agency) shall not be used for nongovernmental purposes. Uses other than those that constitute the discharge of an agency's official responsibilities are nongovernmental.

The Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, Director of the

Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of Central Intelligence may use Government aircraft for nongovernmental purposes, but only upon reimbursement at "full coach fare" and with my authorization (or that of my designated representative) on the grounds that a threat exists which could endanger lives or when continuous 24-hour secure communication is required.

When travel is necessary for governmental purposes, Government aircraft shall not be used if commercial airline or aircraft (including charter) service is reasonably available, i.e., able to meet the traveler's departure and/or arrival requirements within a 24-hour period, unless highly unusual circumstances present a clear and present danger, an emergency exists, use of Government aircraft is more cost-effective than commercial air, or other compelling operational considerations make commercial transportation unacceptable. Such authorization must be in accordance with the May 22, 1992, Office of Management and Budget Circular A-126, "Improving the Management and Use of Government Aircraft." (The provisions and definitions of this Circular are to supplement but not replace the provisions in this memorandum.) In addition, Government funds shall not be used to pay for first-class travel, unless no other commercial service is reasonably available, or such travel is necessary for reasons of disability or medical condition.

In order to assist the Administrator of General Services oversight of agency aircraft, all use of Government aircraft by senior executive branch officials shall be documented and such documentation shall be disclosed to the public upon request unless classified. Each agency and the Executive Office of the President shall report semiannually to the General Services Administration and the Office of Management and Budget data relating to the amount of travel on Government aircraft by such officials at Government expense and the amount of reimbursements collected for travel for nongovernmental purposes.

In addition, all agencies are directed to report to OMB within 60 days of this memorandum on their continuing need for aircraft configured for passenger use in their inven-

tories. OMB, in turn, shall evaluate the sufficiency and effectiveness of current policies. Such review should include a public comment process.

This memorandum shall apply solely to senior executive branch officials. For purposes of this memorandum, senior executive branch officials are civilian officials appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, as well as civilian employees of the Executive Office of the President.

Thank you for your assistance in implementing these restrictions.

William J. Clinton

Memorandum on Use of Government Vehicles

February 10, 1993

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Use of Government Vehicles

The use of Government vehicles for daily home-to-work transportation of high-level executive branch officials is a privilege designed to facilitate the efficient operation of the Government and to provide security to key Government employees with substantial military and national security responsibilities. In the past, however, this privilege has been abused by certain executive branch officials and has come to exemplify a Government out of touch with the American people. Using such perquisites of office outside of the scope of our mission to serve the public is unacceptable. Accordingly, I believe that there must be a strong presumption against the general granting of this privilege absent security concerns or compelling operational necessity.

The law authorizes me to designate up to six employees in the Executive Office of the President to receive daily home-to-work transportation in Government vehicles. In addition, the law allows me to designate up to 10 additional employees of Federal agencies to receive this benefit. However, for the reasons stated above, in my Administration,

no officer or employee of the Executive Office of the President or any other Federal agency is authorized by me to receive use of a Government vehicle for daily home-to-work transportation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1344(b)(1)(B)&(C). The only exceptions, for compelling national security reasons, are the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, the Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, and the Chief of Staff of the White House.

The law also allows Cabinet Secretaries and other Executive Level I officials to authorize one principal deputy to use a Government vehicle for daily home-to-work transportation. The use of Government vehicles for this purpose is simply not appropriate for Government officials at this level absent security or operational requirements. Accordingly, by this memorandum I am instructing you to refrain from authorizing the use of Government vehicles for your deputies for daily home-to-work transportation. This memorandum does not prevent you from authorizing the temporary use of Government vehicles in accordance with the requirements of the law.

I further direct each executive department or agency to reduce the number of executive motor vehicles (except armored vehicles) that it owns or leases by at least 50 percent by the end of fiscal year 1993. Each agency will report on its compliance to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget at that time. I order the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, to issue any further directives necessary to implement this memorandum and to monitor compliance.

Finally, I urge the head of each agency to strictly enforce the Governmentwide regulations prohibiting the unauthorized use of Government vehicles, including the use of corrective or disciplinary action where appropriate.

William J. Clinton

Remarks on Arrival in Detroit, Michigan

February 10, 1993

Thank you very, very much. Thank you for coming out on this cold day to make me feel warmly welcome to Michigan. I want to say how grateful I am to be back here again. This is my first trip out of the Nation's Capital as your President. The first time I've ever been on Air Force One, I flew here to Michigan.

I want to say a word of thanks to Chairman Dingell and your wonderful Congressman from this district, David Bonior, and all the Members of Congress who are here, and Senator Levin and Senator Riegle. I want to thank my good friend Governor Blanchard, who flew here with me from Washington. I want to thank all of you who are here, and I'd like to say a special word of thanks to the men and women in uniform who are here in this crowd who serve our Nation every day. I know you're grateful to them. I want to thank the people of Michigan, without whom I might well not be here as President today, for your support in November and your support in March, and, more importantly, maybe, for all the things that I learned here in Michigan.

When I was a boy, the first thing I ever knew about Michigan, growing up in Arkansas, was it was sort of the land of opportunity for our people who couldn't make a living on the farm anymore. They came here and became middle class citizens by working in the auto plants or by other industries that were successful. When I came here as a candidate for President, I didn't know whether I could do very well. And after I came home the first time, I called my wife. I said, "Every other person I met was from Arkansas; we're going to do all right up here." *[Laughter]*

People came here because Michigan was the American dream. When I came back to Michigan in this Presidential campaign I found a different picture, not all bad by any means but much more mixed. I saw in Michigan people who were developing new industries and new technologies and new hope for the future. I saw people working together across racial lines. But I also saw industries dying on the vine and people who had

worked all their lives losing jobs and losing their health care. And I saw people divided by race, too.

I saw everything about America writ large here in this State: all that is best, all that is most troubling. But I saw an awful lot of hope, too. Today when I left the White House to come here, we had a crowd of folks come out on the lawn to say goodbye, and when I knew that we'd bring in some folks just from the public who were there and some people who work in the White House, many of whom had never met the President before. And I had so many people who work in correspondence who were telling me that the letters are coming in at record rates here, massive numbers of letters for me, for my wife, for my daughter, people writing us about their hopes, their dreams, their new ideas.

I'm going to do a town hall meeting tonight, a televised meeting connecting four cities, not just Detroit but three others, too, and all across the country. You know, between June and November I did nine of those. But I started a year ago in New Hampshire doing them, because I believe that people like me shouldn't hide from the people who elected them. I think we ought to be accountable.

There will be many difficult and challenging days ahead. But if you'll stay in touch with me, if you'll let me hear the truth of your feelings and your ideas, when you agree and when you disagree, I think we can change this country. And if you will give courage to your elected officials and tell them that that's what you voted for, for a change, that as difficult as it may be to change, staying where we are is the most expensive course of all, we can do it.

You know, shortly after you elected me to President, I was given my first piece of good news and my first piece of bad news. The good news was that consumer confidence was up and people were feeling better and people thought we could change the economy; that American companies, in a tough global environment, were becoming more productive; that interest rates had come down some and people were financing their home loans. The bad news was that no new jobs were being created in our economy and

that incomes were not going up and that after the election it was announced that the Government deficit was going to be \$50 billion higher next year and just about that high every year thereafter during my term of office. And so I had to go back to the drawing board and figure out how we were going to put the American people first, take on the special interests, invest in jobs and incomes and deal with the health care crisis and still bring the deficit down, as I promised to do, and to do it in a way that is fair to the middle class, people who've worked hard and paid the bills for 12 years. It isn't easy, I'll tell you that. But I'm doing my best.

We have spent literally hours and hours and hours, the administration people and I, and I've met with large numbers of people in Congress, many people many times, since I became President just 3 weeks ago, doing almost nothing but focusing on this economy. And I am telling you I am confident that if we'll make some challenging decisions now and put this country on the right path, we can lift this economy up, we can create jobs, we can deal with the health care crisis and have a bright future.

But remember: Everywhere I went in this election I said, "Do not vote for me if you're going to quit on election day. Do not come to the Inaugural and celebrate the victory unless you're going to help us make the victory good." I need your help. I didn't see a single soul all those thousands of miles I traveled on those buses, stopping on the country roads and going to the big cities, I never did see a person holding up a sign saying, "Everything's just fine. Leave well enough alone." [Laughter] Not the first sign. Even the people who honestly disagreed with me on a whole range of issues never said they believed that we didn't have to have the courage to change.

And so tonight I ask you, watch what we do closely. If you think I'm wrong, call or write and tell me. But continue to support me with your prayers and your voice and your conviction, and give the Members of Congress the courage to change. That is what the election was all about. And we are going to try to make good on it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:10 p.m. at the Selfridge Air National Guard Base. In his remarks, he referred to John D. Dingell, chairman, House Energy and Commerce Committee.

Remarks at a Town Meeting in Detroit

February 10, 1993

The President. Thank you, thank you very much. Let me, first of all, thank all of you for being here in Michigan, and thank our audiences in Washington and Georgia and Florida for joining us, and all the people across this country who are watching this event.

I started doing these televised town meetings a year ago in New Hampshire. Between June and November I did nine that were televised alone, including one here at this station. And I wanted to come out of the White House 3 weeks to the day after I became President because I can see now, after only 3 weeks, how easy it is for a President to get out of touch, to be caught up in the trappings of Washington, and basically to be told by people that nothing needs to be changed or you can't change things.

Let me just briefly say, I want to take as much time as possible for questions, but I want to say one or two things real quickly. I believe I got elected on a commitment to change America, to create jobs, try to raise incomes, to face the health care crisis, to try to liberate the Government from special interests and turn it back to the people, and to try to reduce the deficit and put America on a path to long-term health and recovery, bringing the American people together.

There's been some good news and bad news since I won the election. The good news is that productivity of American firms is up. People are buying houses because interest rates are down. Consumer confidence is up since the election. I like that. People think things are going to be better.

There's been some bad news. With all these economic improvements, we aren't generating new jobs. And the deficit of this country is about \$50 billion a year bigger than

I was told it was going to be before the election.

So we have to put together a plan that keeps my commitments to you, invest in you, in your jobs, in your education, your health care, and your future; that brings that debt down; that deals with the health care crisis; and that does it in a way that's fair to all Americans.

I've been working almost exclusively on the economic issues of the country since I became President. I've got another week to put it together. And I wanted to come up here tonight and just listen to your questions, answer them as candidly as I could, and share with you as much as I can my feelings about where we're going to go.

But I'll say this: All the hundreds of thousands and maybe a million miles that I've traveled, I never saw one person along the highway with a sign that said, "Things are just fine the way they are. Don't change anything." [Laughter] So I'm going to keep trying to change, and I'm going to try to stay in touch with you this whole 4 years so that you can honestly tell me what you think.

I'm really proud of the fact that the voter turnout was not only up, we not only had the biggest crowd for the Inauguration in history, but the mail and the phone calls in the White House are running at record levels, some good, some critical. But that's good. That's democracy. And it proves that people really feel, at least so far, that I'm going to listen and try to move forward. And that's what we're here to do tonight. So let's begin.

Bill Bonds. Thank you very much, Mr. President. You know, in reality there are several town meetings tonight besides our audience here at WXYZ. The President is going to be taking questions from people in three other major American cities. From the far northwest, we welcome the people at station KOMO in Seattle, Washington. Ken Schramm will be the moderator, bringing us questions from the people of that Evergreen State; Ann Bishop, our moderator from station WPLG in Miami, Florida; from our station in Atlanta, Georgia, Bill Nigut taking questions from the people visiting him at station WSB.

The response from the people in these American cities has been overwhelming. And

we'll begin right now by taking a question from a member of the audience here at WXYZ in Detroit and see if this bird's going to fly tonight.

Our first question is from Susan Esser. Susan Esser was the political coordinator for the Ross Perot campaign for the Presidency in the State of Michigan. I suspect this is going to be about—well, it's "the economy, stupid," as we heard—the economy.

Balancing the Budget

Q. The American people, Mr. President, feel that Congress does not have the political will to balance the budget. If this is true, and as you say, if the economy is your priority, will you support a strong balanced budget amendment, one that is not watered down, and with us send a signal to Congress that we need them to face the issue? And when can we expect Washington to start to solve this enormous problem of ours?

The President. I think you can—first of all, I'm not for any version of the balanced budget amendment that I have seen because I think it is basically a gimmick and a way of putting the decision off that would give us 5 years to deal with it. Secondly, if we balanced the budget tomorrow, we'd drive unemployment up because it would require such terrible sacrifices.

I hate to say this again, but if you look at what the Japanese did, they had a huge deficit in the 1970's, about as big, even a little bigger than ours is now. And they brought it down over about a 10-year period until, in 1990, they were the only major industrial country with a balanced budget; one reason, they had low unemployment and high growth.

Let me just tell you what I'm going to do, and I wouldn't rule out other measures later. I'm going to try to get the Congress to pass the modified line-item veto bill that the House passed the last time and the Senate didn't. I strongly support it. I'm going to try to pass a strong campaign finance reform law and a lobby reform law to free the Congress of undue influence of special interests. I'm going to ask them to cut spending, and dramatically, across a broad range of areas, and to raise some more money to try to bring this deficit down in a dramatic way that will

send a signal that we're in control of our own house again. And we're going to lower interest rates as a result of it and get this economy going again. I think that's what we want.

The important thing is not to balance the budget overnight but to put it on a steady and decided downward tack. If we don't do it—let me just say, there's no virtue in any of this unless it helps you.

Let me just answer this. A lot of people say to me, "Why do you want to balance the budget?" It's no fun cutting spending or raising more money to balance the budget or reduce the deficit. If you reduce the deficit, the United States doesn't borrow so much money. We have more of your tax money to spend on the education of your children or on developing new jobs or on health care. We keep interest rates down, and it's easier for you to borrow money in the private sector. So you create more jobs. If the deficit gets bigger and bigger and bigger every year, it weakens the economy.

So we have to do two things at once that no Government in your country's history has ever done. We've got to increase investment in jobs and reduce the deficit, and we're going to do it. And I think we can start next week. Look at my plan. See how you like it and see if the Congress responds. I predict to you that they will respond in a bipartisan fashion and reduce the debt for the first time in a long time.

Mr. Bonds. Mr. President, we've kicked it off with that first question. Thank you, Susan. We're going to keep this moving right along. Let me throw it now and link up with Ann Bishop from station WPLG in Miami.

Ann Bishop. Thank you very much, Bill. And with me is Kelly Kaprin, an attorney, and she has a question for the President. Kelly.

Family Leave Bill and Gays in the Military

Q. Why did you choose to tackle the gays in the military and the family leave bill first versus getting right to the economy and the Federal deficit?

The President. I didn't—I did choose the family leave bill first. Let me answer the question separately. I chose to deal with the family leave bill because I knew there was

a majority support in both Houses for it and because I thought it was a pro-family bill. I thought it was a bill that would be helpful to strengthen the American family with so many people forcibly in the work force. It contained an exemption for small business. It had been passed twice by the Congress before and vetoed. I thought it would help families and illustrate we had ended gridlock.

I tried to put off the gays in the military issue for 6 months. Senators in the other party wanted it dealt with now. They say it as a way to delay family leave and to throw the whole Federal Government into debating that. I actually spent very little time on the issue myself. I met with the Joint Chiefs on a number of issues, including that; met with the Senate Democrats on the Armed Services Committee. But I was, frankly, appalled that we spent so much time the first week talking about that instead of how to get the economy going again. It wasn't my idea. My agreement with the Joint Chiefs was to study the issue for 6 months, so we could focus immediately on the economy. Thank goodness that's what we're now doing.

Mr. Bonds. Some people say you probably would have been better off if you sat down with Sam Nunn and a couple of—maybe somebody like Admiral Crowe, a couple of the heavyweights in the U.S. Senate and say, "Look, how do I approach this thing with the Joint Chief of Staff and not get the mess that we got into?"

The President. That's just what we did do. The Joint Chiefs wanted to meet with me on that and other issues. I met with them. Senator Nunn got into this because I asked him to. I hate that it was written, particularly in Georgia, that there was some conflict between us. I asked him to help me craft a resolution to do what the Joint Chiefs asked, which was to review it for 6 months and to put it off. We did our best, but there were others in the Senate, mostly Republicans, who just wanted to debate it to death because they thought it was hurting the other efforts we were making. And now we're on the economy, and that's where we ought to stay.

Mr. Bonds. Mr. President, we're going to switch now to Atlanta, a little bit closer to your hometown part of the country. Bill Nigut, WSB. Bill.

Tax Increases

Bill Nigut. Mr. President, we're glad that you could join us by satellite from Detroit. We're going to start with Katie Rapkin, who works here for the Atlanta Symphony and who is a bit concerned about at least one of the campaign promises that she believes you made and yet she feels—you're not quite sure he's going to follow through on it.

Q. I'm concerned about your campaign promise to not raise the taxes for the middle class, how you intend to keep that promise.

Mr. Nigut. Did you vote for President Clinton?

Q. Yes, I did.

Mr. Nigut. Was that one reason you did?

Q. Yes, I did.

The President. Well, first of all, I did put out a plan which didn't contain a middle class tax increase, but I also repeatedly said, and I said in the debates in front of 100 million people, I refuse to say "read my lips." That's not responsible.

Now, what's happened since the election. We have been told since the election that the Federal debt every year is going to be \$50 billion bigger than we were told it was before the election. I wish I could promise you that I won't ask you to pay any more. But I can tell you this: Look what I'm doing. I'm doing my best to keep my campaign commitments.

I have, first of all, started by cutting the Government. I cut the White House staff by 25 percent yesterday. I bet that's never happened in the lifetime of anybody in this audience. And it's real cuts. Today I announce \$9 billion in cuts in the central administration of the Federal Government, \$9 billion. I have also said that before I ask the middle class to pay, I'm going to ask the wealthiest Americans and companies who made money in the eighties and had their taxes cut to pay their fair share. And I'm going to cut more Government spending. But I cannot tell you that I won't ask you to make any contribution to the changes we have to make.

We have got to do two things at the same time. We've got to bring the debt down for the reasons that the first questioner so clearly articulated. And secondly, we've got to invest more in creating new jobs, in educating peo-

ple, and providing health care for all Americans and controlling cost.

I'm doing my best to do that in a way that is fairest to middle class America. But I have to be honest with you; the debt is \$50 billion a year bigger than we were told it was before the election. I'm doing my best. I have done nothing almost for 3 weeks but wrestle with this budget, try to cut costs, and find ways to finance what we have to do. But we've got to change what we're doing.

Let me say I do have an alternative. I could play the same kind of games with you that have been played for the last 10 or 12 years. And this is not a partisan comment. This happened out of Washington. I could give you a bunch of smoke and mirrors and pretend the deficit is not there, and then 3 or 4 years from now we'd be spending 20 cents of every tax dollar paying off the debt. And it's not right.

So I'm going to do the best I can. Listen to what I say next week. Decide whether you think it's fair, and tell me and your Senators and Congressmen whether you think I'm right or wrong.

Crime and Gun Control

Mr. Bonds. Mr. President, there are a lot of people who are convinced that the Federal Government doesn't spend enough money battling crime. I don't have to tell you about the mean streets of America. This man is John Marbury. His son was killed in the city of Detroit for a leather jacket. Right, Mr. Marbury?

Q. Yes. I would like to ask Mr. Clinton what advice would he give to the administrations of these large urban areas of how to get rid of these illegal handguns and curbing the violence with an immediate impact?

The President. I wish I knew how to have an immediate impact. And I thank you for having the courage to come here tonight, with all the pain you must feel.

Let me tell you where I think we ought to begin. We ought to begin by passing the crime bill that nearly passed last year, which does two things: It gives the urban areas of this country more police officers for the streets. I have been in areas that were dominated by drugs, by weapons, and by murders, which are now virtually crime-free because

they have enough policemen. They have neighborhood policemen walking the streets on every block, working with their neighbors. That's the first thing.

The second thing that bill has is the Brady bill that would require a waiting period before people could buy handguns.

And the third thing we probably ought to do is do what Governor Wilder in Virginia is trying to do. It takes a lot of guts to do that, but he's trying to pass a law which says that you can't buy a handgun more than once a month. Try to stop all these people that go to legal gun stores and buy guns and then turn around and just give them to kids like they're going out of style.

So those are three places that I think we ought to start. And if you've got any other ideas, I'd like to have them. I think the problem of violence among young people, particularly in our inner cities and not all big cities, is maybe the biggest problem we've got today in terms of their future and the future of our cities.

I'm now preparing a jobs package for the Congress that I want to try to boost the job-creating capacity of the economy for the next year or so while we bring the deficit down, because I don't want unemployment to go up. And one of the things I want to do is give extra incentives for companies to invest in inner cities. But they're not going to do it if they think it's not safe. You can't have a job in a place where people can't walk to work safely.

Mr. Bonds. The most powerful lobby perhaps in the U.S. Congress is the NRA, and they don't want gun control. How are you going to overcome that?

The President. We're going to fight to change. All I can tell you is, that's what I hired on to do. I may not win every battle I fight, but that's one of the changes we ought to make. And let me say, I live in a State where more than half the people have a hunting or fishing license or both. I believe in the right to keep and bear arms. I believe in the right to hunt. I believe in all this. I do not believe that we're well served by having a bunch of 14- or 15-year-old kids out there with handguns shooting each other because of blood battles between gangs or because they're mad or because they're high

on drugs. It's wrong. We've got to do something about it.

Mr. Bonds. We've had some difficulty linking up with our station out in Seattle. We switch there now to Ken Schramm, KOMO.

Aerospace Industry

Ken Schramm. Thanks, Bill. I'd like to introduce Larry Brown, who is a machinist with the Boeing Company. I'm going to go out on a limb here and suggest that perhaps you have a question concerning the economy.

Q. I certainly do. Good evening, Mr. President.

The President. Good evening, Larry.

Q. Yesterday the Boeing Company announced that there would be 16,000 layoffs here in Seattle. Recently, Pratt Whitney announced 10,000 layoffs, and over 200,000 aerospace workers have lost their jobs in southern California. At last report, the governments in Europe involved with the airbus consortium have subsidized their industry to a tune of \$26 billion. My question is, how can America meet the challenge of maintaining our leadership in the very important aerospace industry?

The President. The answer, I think, is twofold: First, a lot of those aerospace workers who lost their jobs, lost their jobs because of cutbacks in defense which had to come at the end of the cold war. That is, we couldn't keep spending so much more than all of our competitors in these high-wage countries on defense without paying an economic price for it. But we shouldn't have cut defense as much as we did in terms of high-tech, high-wage employment without a plan to reinvest in other industries, in other technologies, to put those people to work. So the first thing we have to do is to invest more in converting these high-wage jobs to other technologies.

The second thing we need to do, frankly, is to take a serious look at the aerospace industry itself. The Congress passed a bill last year that was never enacted that we're now trying to get up and going, where I will appoint someone and they will appoint some people to a commission to focus on how to rebuild the aviation industry in our country in two ways: Number one, people who work for Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, and other

subsidiary companies—how can we get more jobs in making these planes and selling them at home and around the world. And number two, how can we do something about the commercial airlines themselves to avoid further bankruptcies and massive layoffs like—we've got a Florida station here with us tonight. Miami, has been devastated by layoffs at Eastern and Pan Am.

So we are going to work on that. And I assure you that I'm going to have a strategy to try to invest in commercial aviation. And we're also going to either have to—either the Europeans are going to have to quit subsidizing airbus and trying to deny us access to those contracts, which is something else that's going on now, or we're going to have to meet the competition. I am not going to roll over and play dead.

Seven, seven technologies are going to shape the highway jobs of the future. And one of the biggest is commercial aviation. The United States has a lead there. We are losing it because we have not fought to maintain it. And I assure you, as soon as I get this budget and this investment plan, this jobs program sent up to the Congress, we're going to start working on defense conversion and aerospace.

Mr. Bonds. We're going to switch now to Ann Bishop, WPLG, Miami.

Florida Disaster Assistance and Military Base Closings

Ms. Bishop. Thank you very much, Bill. And of course, we've not only had the devastation of the air industry but also Hurricane Andrew. And I want you to meet now the Reverend Walter Richardson, who certainly lives in the area that was hardest hit.

Q. Good evening, Mr. President. On August 24th, many of the things that we had in the south Florida area were gone. One of the things that was gone because of Hurricane Andrew was Homestead Air Force Base. What plans do you have for the restoration of Homestead Air Force Base?

The President. Well, first of all, let me talk generally about the hurricane. There is a lot of aid left to go to south Florida which has been approved but not spent, that's tied up in various Government pipelines. Some of it was not pushed through under the pre-

vious administration. But I have to say, frankly, some of it was slowed down because of the transition, the change of governments. That happens. And I'm going to put someone on that next week because of something Governor Chiles said to me. I want to put one person in charge of making sure that all the assistance that's supposed to go to south Florida for Hurricane Andrew actually goes there as quickly as possible. We'll run through all those Departments and try to push it out.

On Homestead Air Force Base: In the campaign, President Bush said that he would just rebuild it while we were closing a lot of other air force bases. The Congress voted against that and said Homestead had to be considered along with all other bases. I agree with that; I think we have to consider Homestead along with all other air bases. There's a base commission, and they will evaluate the needs for it.

But let me say what I believe, based on having spent an enormous amount of time in south Florida and having talked to your congressional delegation about it and others. I think that is an invaluable asset. I think it is important to rebuild enough support systems so that all the retired military personnel, around the air base at least, don't lose the dependence they had on it and turn around and leave your community, which would be bad for you.

I think it's important to find a mission for Homestead. And I believe that there are a number of multiple use missions which are potential. We may even have joint use between military and commercial uses. I've given a good deal of thought to it, and it's one of the things that I want to talk to you folks about. Now, if it clears the base closing commission, it will just be rebuilt with its mission. If it doesn't, then I think we need to look at whether there is a mixed use for it as both a military and commercial mission.

It's an incredible resource for south Florida, and it has to be used as a part of the rebuilding process. So if the base is not rebuilt because the base closing commission doesn't recommend it, then I'll help you do something else with it to generate an equal amount of jobs.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

Ms. Bishop. Thank you, Mr. President. We'll throw it back to you, Bill, now in Detroit.

Mr. Bonds. Okay, thank you very much Ann. We switch now to Bill Nigut, WSB, in Atlanta, Georgia. Bill.

Gays in the Military

Mr. Nigut. Bill Bonds, as you know, the issue of lifting the ban on gays in the military has been a particularly heated one here in the South. Roger Turner wants to ask you, Mr. President, why you want to do it. Tell the President why you don't want him to lift the ban and see if he can respond to that.

Q. Having served in the United States Navy for 5 years aboard a guided missile destroyer and also doing isolated duty in Alaska and as a Christian and having the opportunity to minister to a number of men in the Navy, I believe it would just add continued undue pressure on the situation that's already pressure-packed to begin with. And I want to know, why do you want to lift the ban, and what impact do you see the ban having on the military?

Mr. Bonds. Mr. President, does it surprise you to hear a minister—we also have a minister standing here who very much wants the ban lifted. Does it surprise you to hear a minister say we should keep the ban in place or continue a discriminatory pattern?

The President. Absolutely not, because a lot of ministers of the gospel believe that homosexuality is morally wrong and, therefore, that ground alone is enough to justify the ban.

Let me tell you why I favor lifting it very briefly. We have now and everyone concedes we have always had homosexual men and women in the military service. I received a letter from a retired officer, a woman, the other day who told me she left the service because she could not be honest about her sexual orientation, even though she was a distinguished officer with a remarkable service record, one of many such letters I have received. Your Government spent \$500 million to get rid of about 16,300 homosexuals from the service in the 1980's.

Now, here's my position. If there are homosexual men and women in the service anyway, if we know they have served with dis-

tinguished and they have always been there, the issue is should you be able to say what you are and not be kicked out. This is not about conduct. This is about status. I believe there ought to be the strictest code of behavioral conduct applicable here. I also believe there ought to be an even stricter code applicable to sexual harassment, whether homosexual or heterosexual. The biggest sexual problem in the armed services, according to the men and women who talked to me, involves heterosexual harassment.

I think there ought to be a tough code of conduct. If people do wrong, they ought to be gotten out. But I think people should not be asked to lie if they're going to be allowed to serve, because the question is not whether they should be there or not. They are there. So the narrow question of this debate is should you be able to stay and admit it.

The military itself has admitted they should stop asking people when they join. That's the position of the Joint Chiefs. So the only question here is should you be able to say that you're a homosexual if you do nothing wrong. I say yes. Others say no. The military is studying the practical problems about duty assignments and other things, and we'll revisit this in about 6 months.

Mr. Bonds. I want to advise my stations along the link-up that it's time for us to take a break here. They'll be taking a break. Speaking about the military, we have military forces in the Persian Gulf. We have military forces still in the Kuwait area. Are we going over to Bosnia-Herzegovina? And we'll be back with that question for you, Mr. President, in just a moment.

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

Mr. Bonds. I appreciate your enthusiasm. I think we'd save a little time if we'd hold the applause to the end so that you could get more questions in, the President of the United States could get more answers in. So you do what you want to do, but we feel it would be better. That we have troops in the Middle East, we have troops in Somalia. Are we going to go into Yugoslavia? That's this young lady's question.

Bosnia

Q. Good evening, Mr. President. Serbian death camps and rape camps have shocked the world. And today we have heard Mr. Warren Christopher stating that he supports negotiated settlement in Bosnia. How does one negotiate with war criminals without a clear enforcement to let them know that they have to stop with the atrocity? And how does one ensure that the Serbs will not continue with their atrocities and that they will negotiate in good faith and that they will lay down the arms?

Will you ask NATO for their enforcement of the terms of agreement and give them the authority to use force in this case? And will you also help Croatia regain its sovereignty on the territories it's lost so that 700,000 people can return to their homes? Thank you.

The President. I'm glad you asked the question in the way you did. I was afraid you were going to ask me why we agreed to get involved in this process today.

Just for the benefit of the people who don't know as much about it as you, let me tell you what happened today. Today, the Secretary of State announced a new policy by our Government that we would agree to become more involved in what is going on in Bosnia, not in committing our ground troops now or anything like that, but in trying to get involved in these negotiations, to protect the rights and the integrity of the Bosnians, the Croatians, and others who have been basically subject to the assaults of the Serbs; that we would be in a position to say we're not going to enforce a peace agreement on the Croatians or the Bosnians that they don't believe in, but that if we could get an agreement, then the United States would participate, not alone, but with the United Nations and with Europe, in guaranteeing that the agreement would protect the basic human rights of the people involved and the terms of the agreement.

Now, people say, "So we are not committing today to make war in the former Yugoslavia." We are committing to try to help get a peace and then to enforce it. Why is that? Because if we don't, number one, the terrible principle of ethnic cleansing will be validated; that one ethnic group can butcher another if they're strong enough to do it at the

end of the cold war; number two, that problem could spread to other republics and nations near there.

Never forget: It's no accident that World War I started in this area. There are ancient ethnic hatreds that have consumed people and led to horrible abuses. You know about it: the rapes of the women, the murders of the children, all these things you have read about. We've got to try to contain it.

And I think we have to be very much stronger standing up to aggression. We've got to get the heavy weapons out of utilization; you implied that. We've got to toughen the embargo against the Serbs. We ought to open a United Nations war crimes inquiry, and we ought to enforce the no-fly zone against Serbian aircraft, strongly. Those are the things that I think we should do.

I do not believe that the military of the United States should get involved unilaterally there now. We have to work with these other countries. And I might say that that's the position that General Powell and our foreign policy folks have taken. But this is a much more aggressive position than the United States has taken.

But I can tell you, folks: We're not going to make peace over there in a way that's fair to the minorities that are being abused unless we get involved. And if we don't get involved and the thing spreads all over creation over there, then we'll be pulled into it in horrible ways that could be very dangerous to our people. So we ought to do what is right now. It's also what is safest for the United States.

Mr. Bonds. But isn't it a reality, Mr. President, that if the United States doesn't get involved and doesn't lead, nothing is going to change?

The President. I think that it is reality that if we don't get involved, either nothing will change or the Bosnians will be wrecked and the Croatians will be hurt badly.

Mr. Bonds. And it could still spread after that.

The President. And it could go into Kosovo, which is next door; it could go into Macedonia. You could involve the Turks. You could involve the Greeks. We could have a serious problem.

Mr. Bonds. Then you've got a major policy decision to make.

The President. I just did it. [Laughter] We're going to get involved.

Mr. Bonds. I don't think she thinks you did make it.

The President. Let me just say, the United States has learned one thing: When we operate—look at the Gulf War. If we operate with the support of the United Nations and with the support of Europe and with the support of our allies, we can do a lot of things at an acceptably low cost of life, and get something done. If we go off on our own and everybody else is over here, we can't get it done.

I have to deal with the fact that Europe believes today that negotiations are possible, that Russia wants negotiations from a different point of view. And even though they've been historically sympathetic to the Serbs, they have supported our position that we ought to toughen the embargo and stand up to aggression.

And if I go in there, the United States now takes a leadership role, I think there's a real chance we can stop some of the killing, stop the ethnic cleansing, and get a peace agreement. And then we'll have to help enforce it. She's absolutely right. If we don't have an enforcement mechanism, you won't be able to do it. But I believe this is the best thing to do for the Croats and for the Bosnians and for humanity at large in the former Yugoslavia. I think it's the right thing to do.

Health Care Reform and Meat Inspection

Mr. Bonds. Thank you, Mr. President. Ken Schramm, KOMO in Seattle.

Mr. Schramm. Thank you. Mr. President, my understanding is that while you were en route to tonight's program, while aboard Air Force One you called an area hospital because you were concerned and wanted to speak to some parents and some children who have been affected by the *E. coli* bacteria contamination in this area. I'd like to introduce Vicky and Darrin Detweiler, whose 16-month-old son remains in critical condition at Takoma's Mary Bridge Hospital. And they have a question concerning health care.

Q. Mr. President, actually our child is at Children's Hospital in Seattle, but he is in

intensive care, in critical condition. And only 2 days prior to him going in there with *E. coli* poisoning from tainted meat, my husband lost his job, and we were left without medical coverage.

I'm Canadian originally and always took comfort in the medical system there and in knowing that my children would be taken care of. My question to you now is: What are you prepared to do in regards to the tainted meat problem, and is there any hope in the near future of seeing universal health care so no one else has to go through what we've gone through?

The President. Let me, first of all, say I thank you for being on the program, and I hope your child will be well. I did call two other sets of parents who are in the hospital with their children, on the way out here, just to inquire about that and to get their ideas about what we should do.

Let me answer your second question first. As I'm sure you know, I've asked my wife to head a task force to come up with a bill within 100 days which will bring a new system of health care to America which offers us the chance to provide basic health coverage to everybody, to stop people from losing their health coverage when they lose a job, to stop people from their inability to change jobs because they've had someone in their family sick, and to bring the cost of health care in line with inflation.

I think we can do that. And if we don't do it, we'll never balance the budget, and we'll never restore health to this economy. Fifty percent of the projected deficit growth between now and the year 2000 is all in health care costs. So it is a terrific human issue, but it's a big economic issue for Americans. And the answer to your question is: Within 100 days of my becoming President, we're going to have a bill to the Congress to do just what you've said.

Now, the second thing, this *E. coli* thing—have you all been following it up in Washington? I asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Mike Espy, who is responsible for the regulation of the slaughterhouses and the meat before it comes to a restaurant, to go up there and look into the situation. And we think there are two things that have to be done.

First of all, we've got to make it clear to people who are providing the fast food that they've got to do everything they can to comply with our cooking regulations. Some of these viruses would have clearly died had the heat been observed. On the other hand, we've got to find ways to do more inspections and to try to do them in a more effective way. And so we are reviewing now the possibility of not only hiring more inspectors, which I've already agreed to do, but secondly, seeing if there is some way we can do a better job of actually inspecting the meat, empowering the inspectors to do some more things.

We have got to do that. And I can tell you, if you have any more ideas, I'd like to have them. The parents that I talked to today had some, actually, some quite good ideas that we're going to pursue. And I want to invite you and any others who are listening who have other ideas to let me know. But you can look forward to more inspectors, and we're looking for ways to inspect better as well.

Mr. Bonds. In that case, you're increasing Government.

The President. We are there. But that's a direct service to people. That's not a waste of bureaucracy. I think the American people want us to make sure they're safe if we can.

Job Retraining

Q. Mr. President, I'm a former Pan American Airline employee, and I'm still unemployed at this time. And I would like to know if you have any new provisions for people who suffer from big industries' traumas.

The President. Let me tell you, we're going to try to do two things. One is to provide a much more comprehensive program of retraining and job placement; and secondly is to try to have a strategy available when we know that major, major industries are going to shut down, to try to do conversion, to try to provide investment opportunities for new kinds of economic activities.

I said earlier something that I probably should have broadened. This is not just a problem in defense industries. It's also a problem in other big employers. As we're in Michigan tonight, as the people in Michigan know, the biggest companies in America did

nothing but basically lay off people in the 1980's and the early nineties. Even when they were making more money, they restructured.

For the last 10 years, until 2 or 3 years ago, a lot of the jobs that were lost by big companies were made up by jobs that were created by small companies. About 2 or 3 years ago, that process slowed to a halt because of the cost of health care to small business, because of the general recession, because of the credit crunch.

So my answer to your question is: We're going to be much more aggressive than American governments have been in the past in trying to find ways to deal with these problems when we know in advance they're coming, and go in and give people the chance to restructure their lives, to rebuild them, and try to create other kinds of economic activities with new partnerships in the private sector.

We're also going to try to change the tax system to favor investment more. That is, we want to raise the corporate tax rate some. But then we want to say, if you want to lower your taxes, invest more. And you can lower your taxes if you invest to create jobs. And I think that will help a lot. We're going to try to do that.

Q. I have a followup on Homestead and some of that training. We obviously have plenty of space down here to have it done. But what kind of training are you going to give someone who's middle-aged or even older but who still needs to work?

The President. Well, I think that is both the burden and the excitement of the time in which we live. That is, there is nothing I or any public official can do about the fact that the average 18-year-old American today will change jobs about eight times in a lifetime. Even if you keep working for the same company, if you're lucky enough never to be laid off, in order to keep a job, an 18-year-old today will have to be retrained to do eight different jobs. So whether we like it or not, middle-aged people will have to keep learning new things, developing new skills.

Now, that will be very exciting and interesting for people in their middle and later years if we can spare them of the gnawing insecurity of thinking they're going to be

thrown onto the scrap heap of history, they're going to lose their job and never get another one, or they're going to lose their job and then getting another one making one-third of what they used to make. That's our great challenge. And we are working on it. That is something that I think America ought to be able to lead the world in, and now we're behind some of our other countries.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, is it possible to pay them and give them benefits as well, like health benefits, while they're learning?

The President. Oh, I think so. What we're going to try to do with this health care plan is to make sure that everybody, whether employed or unemployed, has access to a basic package of comprehensive benefits. Every other country in the world, advanced country, does this. Every industrialized country but South Africa does this, everybody. And yet we spend 30 percent more of our income on health care than anybody else.

Now, if you have access to health care in America it's the best in the world—and a lot of good things about it. But there are ways to give people a choice of doctors, high quality care, and do it for lower cost if we're willing to take on the insurance cost, if we're willing to take on a lot of the other waste in this system, the phenomenal waste. The paperwork in the American health care system alone is enough to cover virtually everybody without health insurance.

Let me just give you an example. In most hospitals in America today for the last 5 years have hired clerical workers at 4 times the rate of health caregivers like nurses, even though there's been a national nursing shortage. Why? Because we're the only country in the world with 1,500 separate health insurance companies writing thousands of different policies, covering small, small groups with a blizzard of rules that would choke a horse. Plus the Government makes it worse by the way we run Medicare and Medicaid.

And we're going to try to fix it. It's the most complicated problem I've ever messed with. But if we don't fix it, we can't control the deficit, we can't restore health to the economy, and most important, we can't re-

store security to the lives of people like those who've asked these questions tonight.

Child Care

Mr. Bonds. Child care and the terrible dilemma that so many working parents have had finding competent child care has obviously been in the news a great deal recently, Mr. President. Hattie Henry lives in a community just north of Atlanta. She is a first-time mother with a 6-week-old baby, and you want to go back to your job as a nurse. You're struggling with that dilemma. Is there something that you think that the President can do to help ease this terrible child care crisis out there?

Q. That's what I want to know. I'm obviously going to be a working mother, and I'm very concerned about the child care crisis, which has finally been thrown into the spotlight with "nannygate." And I would like to know what your first thing is that you're going to do to address the child care issue, to make it affordable and reasonable.

The President. Let me ask you—can you hear me?

Q. Yes, go ahead, Mr. President.

The President. Bill, I'd like to ask your questioner a question first. As you contemplate going back to work, is your biggest concern the cost of child care or the availability of quality care?

Q. The quality of the care. The quality of what I can get for the affordability of what I can get; if it is even worth it to go back to work with what we have available. And what about working mothers who don't have any choice about going back to work? Where can they take their children and have it be affordable and quality care, whether they're sure their children are safe and getting good care?

The President. Well, I think there are two or three things we can do that we're working on now. First is to work in partnerships with States to help them to develop high standards for child care but also quality care at affordable prices. And one of the things that we did in my State when I was Governor is to spend a good deal bit of our training money. For example, training people who are on welfare but who were quite intelligent and capable of—for taking care of their own chil-

dren—to work in child care facilities and moving them from welfare to work in ways that took maximum advantage of money the taxpayers are spending already and lower the cost of child care. And we often put these child care facilities in and around job training facilities to help working mothers and working parents that were going back to school. Sometimes they were going to school and working at the same time. I think we can do that.

The second thing we can do is to increase the earned income tax credit for working Americans, especially middle to lower middle income working Americans, so that they will have more disposable income to pay their child care expenses.

The third thing we can do is simply to increase the child care credit itself. We basically have got to make the economics of this work. And I think there are lots of other things that can be done, but they won't affect the population as a whole. The population as a whole needs to be helped by making sure you've got a steady stream of trained quality child care workers and then more income for middle-class people, either through the child care tax credit or through the general earned income tax credit, which basically says if you work 40 hours a week and you've got kids in the house, you shouldn't be put into poverty because of your other expenses, including child care. The Government ought to reduce your tax burden, if necessary even give you money back, as long as you're working hard and playing by the rules and you need to take care of your kids.

Kimba Wood

Mr. Bonds. Mr. President, as long as we're on the subject, let me come in the back door on it and ask you the same question that many Americans apparently have felt, and that is, Judge Kimba Wood certainly did everything she could legally to attain child care. Why was she penalized, punished by being eliminated as a candidate for Attorney General if, in fact, she dealt with this rather difficult problem in a perfectly legal way?

The President. Well, first of all, I never selected her to be Attorney General. There was a press report that she was, and I regret—I think she was treated quite unfairly

in this whole thing. I have high regard for her, but she was one of three or four people I was considering.

Secondly, the facts of her case was that she did not violate the law, because in 1986 the law was changed to say if you knowingly hire an illegal alien, you're violating the law, but if you did it before the law became into effect, you're not violating the law. So a few months before the law was passed, she knowingly hired an illegal alien.

Now, I think—and she did not do anything illegal. She knew the person providing child care was doing something illegal, but she didn't. But the question there that you can ask or answer, that I would have had to answer had I decided to put her up for Attorney General, is whether the Attorney General, who runs the Immigration and Naturalization Service, has a special standard to meet in this area that other Cabinet members might not have to meet. And that's a question that I would have had to resolve, had I decided to nominate her.

One of the things that I think has been very good in this whole business is that we've now taken a lot of these issues out. They're now the subject of public debate, and I hope that we will be able to resolve some of them, including—you would be amazed how many people who come to my attention as potential candidates for various positions in Government honestly did not know that they had to take out withholding on anybody who worked for them if they spent more than \$50 on them every 3 months. They just didn't know. And that's something that I think has really been raised on the public agenda. I think people are so much more aware of that than they were. You know, some people don't think that ought to be the law, but that's what the law is.

Health Care Reform

Mr. Bonds. Mr. President, a lot of people wonder if when your wife speaks on health care reform she is speaking directly for you and if that is the message that you're sending to the American people. Here's a young woman by the name of Marcie Hoffmaster; she's 17. She's going to be graduating soon, and you've got a tough future in front of you.

Q. Yes, I do. I suffer from a chronic illness called systemic lupus, and I've already discovered that it will be almost impossible for me to get health care. I'd like to know what you're going to do ensure that people with a preexisting condition can get health care. And also, if the Government decides to regulate health insurance and prioritize illnesses, where will long-term, incurable illnesses, such as lupus and cancer and AIDS, stand on that list of priorities?

The President. Let me answer your first question first. The reason so many people with preexisting conditions can't get health insurance is because people are so often insured in very small pools. Like, look around here, suppose there are about 60 people in this room. Suppose all of us belong to a group health insurance, and suppose we have the standard array of illnesses and problems, and a couple of us have cancer, and you have lupus and maybe one person has HIV and all the rest of us are healthy as can be, right? It only takes one or two people in a group that small to bankrupt the pool.

But in most countries, and in a few States in America, insurance companies are required to rate people for insurance according to huge community pools with hundreds of thousands of people in them, so that the risk of your care is spread across large numbers of people. And insurance companies make money the way grocery stores do, a little bit of money on a lot of people, instead of a lot of money on a few people. So the short answer to your question is, the way to keep preexisting conditions from barring people from getting health insurance is, number one, to make it illegal and, number two, to make it possible for the insurance pools to be big enough so that they don't go broke taking people like you.

The second answer is, I believe, if you look at how much money we're spending on health care, if we can redirect a lot of the money that would be saved from administrative costs and from insurance overcharges per person, because of the system we have, if we could do more preventive and primary health care, if we can, in short, maximize the money we're now spending and keep people like you in big pools, I believe there would be enough money to cover your care.

If that is not true, what the Government will have to do is to develop a Government long-term care program, because you cannot abandon people who have AIDS or who have prolonged bouts with cancer. In fact, a lot of cancer survivors, as you know, are living now for 10, 15, 20 years and during most of that time, even when there's a recurrence, are serving quite productively. So I think we have to do that.

I just approved, by the way, a strategy to fully fund the Ryan White Act for the care of AIDS patients over the next couple of years, because I think that's an important issue. But we'll never do it, you won't be treated right until we have a national program that covers everybody.

Mr. Bonds. Mr. President, we're going to move into kind of a roundrobin here. We're going to throw it now to Seattle. Ken Schramm, KOMO.

Antidrug Program

Mr. Schramm. Thank you. I've got two quick questions for you here, Mr. President. The first one is from Rochelle Pinrod, who is 9 years old, has never spoken to a President before, but she has written you a letter.

Q. Mr. President, how will you help make a drug-free America so I can feel safe walking out on the streets, so that no one's going to come up and ask me, would you like to buy some drugs?

The President. Good for you. There's no easy answer to your question. One thing I can do is to speak out. Another thing I can do is to hire a person to be our national drug czar, the developer of, the leader of our drug policy, who understands that you have to have a combination of things. You have to have a strong education program in the schools. You have to have a strong program in the communities to keep the streets safe and to protect the children and to give them something to do. And you have to have a strong enforcement program designed to break those people who are bringing drugs into our country in large quantities. I went to college with a person who's done a lot of very serious prosecution of people involved in and around drug transactions. And he tells me one big mistake we've made, for example, over the years, is not to go after people who

make big money at it by chasing the money instead of the drugs.

So all I can tell you is that drugs have affected my family. I hate what they are doing to America and to children's future. And I'm going to do what I can to fight it through education, through treatment, through opportunities for safety on the streets, and through trying to go after the people who are really causing the problems.

Who's next, Bill?

Mr. Bonds. Well, I have a young man here in the studio, but I think we're going to throw it to Miami. Ann Bishop, WPLG.

Ms. Bishop. Thank you very much, Bill. We have with us Marlene Bashin, who has a question for you. Marlene.

Haiti

Q. President Clinton, during the Presidential campaign, you severely criticized George Bush's policy on Haitian refugees, but now you're not only carrying that same policy, you also place a naval blockade against Haiti, giving these frightened people no chance to escape. How do you explain these actions, especially at a time when the situation in Haiti is as bad as possible?

The President. Well, for one thing, the situation in Haiti is getting better. But let me tell you, I explain the action in the following ways: My policy is not the same as President Bush's policy because I'm trying to bring democracy back, because I am committed to putting more resources there to process people who want to be political refugees and can meet the standards and bringing them safely to the United States.

And let me tell you why I did what I did. I did what I did because of the evidence that people in Haiti were taking the wood off the roofs of their houses to make boats, that were of questionable safety, to pour in thousands of numbers to come to this country, when we knew for sure hundreds of them would die on the high seas coming here and a human tragedy of monumental proportions. And that if they came here, they would all come to south Florida, where the unemployment rate is high. The government is strapped, they don't have any money, and the Federal Government has constantly broken their commitment to the people of south

Florida to help them deal with the immigrant problem.

I decided that the better course was to launch an aggressive effort to restore democracy to Haiti and to launch an aggressive effort to protect people who want to apply to be political refugees in this country, in Haiti, and to process their applications all over the island, which is what we are doing now.

And I might say, the ultimate proof that my policy is different is that President Aristide himself asked the Haitians to stay home and work with him to restore democracy. And if you noticed, just in the last day, the present rump government in Haiti has agreed to let us send observers there. And I look forward to fully changing the policy and in restoring democracy in Haiti. But I could not, in good conscience, let hundreds of people die on the high seas and create an enormous problem simply because the United States has not used its muscle to restore democracy to Haiti. That's the problem, and that's the one I'm trying to tackle.

Mr. Bonds. But Mr. President, if you place or slap an embargo on Haiti, you don't hurt the people at the top, you hurt even more severely the people at the bottom.

The President. The embargo was there all along, and I support it.

Mr. Bonds. Yes, but I mean, it gets worse.

The President. Look, if we lift the embargo, then what incentive does the government have to change? That is an unelected government there. The man who was elected president, everybody down there concedes, if he were on the ballot again today would win overwhelmingly. And we have got to try to restore democracy there. I want to lift the embargo very badly. I want to do more than lift the embargo; I want to help rebuild the economy of Haiti. That would be good for America. They could be good partners for us. A lot of the Haitians who are in south Florida would dearly love to go home. But I am not going to lift the embargo as long as there is a government down there oppressing the people.

Relations With Press

Mr. Bonds. You can't do a town meeting every month, Mr. President, and many people in the White House press corps are saying

“He’s going to have to come and answer our questions.” You’ve got about 50 seconds left to answer that question. How are your relationships with the White House press corps?

The President. I think they’re all right.

Mr. Bonds. They’d like to talk to you.

The President. I answer their questions just about every day. They come in and ask me questions, and I answer them. We don’t see the world the same way.

Mr. Bonds. Well, I think the point is, are there going to be many more of these?

The President. Oh, I hope there will be a lot of these.

Mr. Bonds. Thanks, Mr. President.

The President. I hope there will be a lot of these.

NOTE: The town meeting began at 8 p.m. at the WXYZ-TV studios in Southfield, MI.

Remarks to Business Leaders

February 11, 1993

Thank you very much. I would like to thank all of you ladies and gentlemen for coming here to join me today. I would like to say a special word of thanks to the leaders of various organizations and sectors of our economy who came in a little earlier for a briefing. And thanks to the members of the administration who are here, who have been working so hard for the last 3 weeks on our economic program, and to the Vice President who went all the way to California last night to do a town meeting and came in about 5 o’clock this morning. He’s the only person here who’s had less sleep than I have. That’s what Vice Presidents are for. [*Laughter*]

I have asked you to come here today because we have to meet a challenge together. Many of you have been my friends for some time, and you have worked with me in this campaign and in others. Many of you are members of the other party who love your country and care very deeply about the health of our economy.

It doesn’t matter. If you look at the history of our country, whenever the chips have been down, the private sector, the business community has rallied to help America meet its challenges in war and in peace. In two World Wars, business men and women were among

the leaders in our great national mobilizations, putting aside narrow interests for the national interest. When our Nation faced challenges from civil rights to the energy crisis, businesses have taken the lead in coping with change. Americans are at their best answering alarm bells in the night. But I think every one of you know that today we face a crisis which, while quieter, is every bit as profound as those we have faced in our past.

We risk losing the standard of living that we have taken for granted for so many years as Americans. Too many middle class Americans have already suffered through a decade or more of declining real wages and rising basic costs. Now, even though it is said we are in a recovery and the overall economic indicators are quite impressive, the job creation that normally accompanies a recovery is not in evidence. Small businesses are having trouble creating jobs because of the lack of the availability of credit or because of the costs of health care. Big businesses are continuing to restructure, not just manufacturing businesses now but service organizations, too, because of the demands of the global economy.

Business people have to deal with the realities they face, and they often make annual plans and 5-year forecasts, based on the best numbers they can get. Your Government for the last several years has either not been making annual plans or 5-year forecasts, or they’ve been based on numbers which aren’t real and plans which were never intended to be carried out.

Early in my campaign for President I did what I had always done when running for Governor: I put out a plan which, as nearly as I could, set forth what I thought we ought to do as a country to increase jobs and incomes, to reduce the national debt, to restore the health of our economy, and to deal with the long-term problems we face. I wanted to increase investment, reduce consumption, restore fairness to the Tax Code and growth to the incomes of America, deal with the structural problems of this economy like health care and the credit crunch, and to do it in a context that would enable us to have

long-term health by reducing the national debt considerably.

I did it last year based on the numbers that were then available. I revised the plan again in late spring. In August the Government said that the deficit was going to be bigger than we had anticipated. Then, still, I thought we could do essentially what we had outlined. But after the election, the Government revised the deficit figures upward again, this time by as much as \$50 billion per year in each of the next 4 years.

Now I have a choice. I can do what has been done by people in both parties for the last several years and has certainly been done by administrations unwilling to give up the rhetoric of low taxes and less Government, even though costs were exploding: I can sort of deny the problem and finesse the numbers. Or I can tell you what I think is the truth. I think I should follow the latter course.

I believe that given the size of this deficit, given the burden it will put on today and tomorrow in terms of higher interest rates, given the fact that we also have a plain investment deficit in the education and training of our people and the investment in our infrastructure and those things that are critical to building high-wage, high-growth jobs, we have to take even more dramatic action than I had previously thought to increase investment for jobs and incomes, restrain unnecessary Government spending, raise revenues in a fair way, and reduce the national debt so we can have long-term growth.

I think if we do not do these things, we will pay for it. I think the cost of the status quo is far, far higher than facing our problems and moving forward. Business people have known for years that something had to be done about our deficit. The national debt has quadrupled since 1980. Even more disturbing, unless present trends are altered, the debt on an annual basis will explode in the years ahead with 50 percent of it coming from increases in health care costs.

I want to reduce this deficit, not as an end in itself but because I think it is a critical part of a strategy to build jobs and growth for America today and over the long run. In order to do that, I need your support and your contribution. Everyone will have to pay

their fair share. But if you do, we will all be better off, and the business community will be stronger in the years ahead.

Government has an obligation to provide the proper environment in which business can prosper, but the private sector drives the economy. If interest rates are too high, if the financial system is in disarray, if health care costs are crushing out discretionary income which can be put into new plant and equipment or hiring additional workers, the environment in which we operate will be crippled because the private sector cannot work. I want to be a better partner than that to you so that you can do your job.

Productivity has gone up at an astonishing rate in many sectors of the American economy in the 1980's and in the early nineties. This recovery, indeed, that we now see underway seems to be based on three things: home mortgages going down enough for people to refinance their homes and buy new homes; consumer confidence coming up since the election—I hope I can keep it up; but most important, dramatic increases in productivity in the private sector. Those productivity increases are not yet manifest in more jobs for the American people or higher incomes, and they won't be until we do something about health care, about the deficit, and about doing the things it takes to make our country as a whole competitive over the long run. That is what I am trying to grapple with as your President, and what I need your support beginning next Wednesday in the Congress with, so that we can make progress on these great issues.

If we don't reform our economic policies, I'm convinced eventually we will fall further and further behind. Ten years from now we won't even recognize the country that we all grew up in. Ten years from now, if we don't change present policies, the following things will happen: The deficit will be \$653 billion in a given year. The national debt will be 78 percent of our gross domestic product. Health care costs will take up almost 20 percent of GDP. They are at 14 percent today. Only one other advanced nation in the entire world, Canada, is above 9, and they're just a little bit above 9 today. Medicare and Medicaid costs will triple for taxpayers and people less able to bear the burden.

We have got to change. The short-term pain of making changes now is so much less than the long-term cost of continuing to do things the way we're doing them. So next week I will try to propose an economic package that will give the American people fundamental change. A goal is an economy that faces the world without fear and not only meets but beats our rivals in economic competition around the world; an economy that is growing, that provides jobs to everyone willing and able to work, that does not rest until the great American middle class that built this country once again feels that people who work hard and play by the rules will be rewarded and not punished.

The broad outlines of this plan are no secret, but I'd like to restate them. First, to ensure that we do not lose the momentum and the new confidence that we have seen among consumers and in the markets and to finally get sustainable job growth, I believe strongly that we need an investment-led jobs package. But all of us here know that our problems go beyond the business cycle. More importantly, we need a long-term plan to increase investment in the American people and their future. We will put in place a program of investment in the physical infrastructure that is a precondition for prosperity and productivity. Finally, we will reduce our deficit, not as an end in itself, as I said, but as a means to achieve higher incomes and more jobs. This will require tough choices from all Americans. And before I turn to the middle class for help I have to turn to people who did well in the last decade.

This past week we began with the Government, where we ought to begin, setting our own house in order. Too often in recent years our Government has been on automatic pilot. And believe me, it's been a very long time since the kind of searching reexamination of the mission of Government has been undertaken that you do all the time, that you do just to survive. And so we are beginning a process of literally trying to reinvent your National Government so that we can increase its productivity, its effectiveness, and its ability to be a partner with you in the great enterprise on which we now embark.

I believe that Washington has to change before we can ask America to change. On

Tuesday I kept my campaign pledge to cut the White House staff by 25 percent below the level that I found it. That was a significant cut, but I want to emphasize to you I did it the way most of you would have done it. I didn't just slash the numbers. We have reorganized the White House staff, and I believe this smaller group will increase its ability to serve the American people.

We now have an Economic Security Council to go with our National Security Council and our domestic policy operation. We're going to have a smaller drug policy operation, but it's finally going to have something to do with the rest of the Government. It's not going to be politics and speeches and posturing; it's going to be affecting the policies of every Department of the National Government. We are going to have a smaller, but more importantly, far more productive White House.

And on yesterday, we extended those measures to the entire Government, ordering a reduction in Federal bureaucracy by 100,000 people by attrition over the next 4 years, with at least 10 percent of those cuts to come from senior management. And ordering Agency and Department costs to be reduced by between 3 and up to 5 percent over the next 4 years, for savings in excess of \$9 billion by administrative actions alone. And again, not cutting for cuts' sake, but to redirect those monies to more productive purposes and leaving those Departments not only leaner but more efficient than they were before.

This is just the beginning. We are going to reexamine whether you're getting your money's worth. One of the people I spoke with already this morning said, "I can give you some examples of things that work and things that don't in the National Government." I'll just mention one publicly because we all know it doesn't work: The Superfund has been a disaster. All the money goes to lawyers, and none of the money goes to clean up the problems that it was designed to clean up. Those are the kinds of challenges we expect to do a better job of meeting, perhaps with fewer people whenever possible, but with greater productivity.

Now I ask you to do your part. We have to replace this social contract that somehow

crept into our thinking in the 1980's, that somehow we had to have greater inequality in this country to get prosperity. That was the idea. Even in the years in which we created jobs, income inequality was exacerbated in America.

Now I think we need a new compact. Everybody does his or her part, pays their fair share, joins our national effort, and garners the rewards of a growing economy. The plan I will offer will give a climate in which you can grow, investing in people and the best trained work force in the world, giving us the kind of flexible employees that we all need. That is Government's responsibility to work with you to do and one that we have not done a very good job of in the past.

We want to lower the cost of capital through long-term reductions in the deficit. We want to provide special incentives to new enterprises with long-term capital gains treatment. We want to provide some changes in the Tax Code that will plainly reward investment as opposed to consumption in the business sector. But we also have to face the fact that the deficit will not vanish in a flash. We will cut it, and we will cut it as much as we reasonably can. And if our plan is adopted, it will be the first time since the 1940's that the Government has succeeded in dramatically slashing the debt. And I might add, it was inevitable then at the end of World War II, when the debt was running at about 120 percent of gross national product.

We are going to work as hard as we can, and we desperately need your support to do it, to bring health care costs under control. I have to say this: If you want this deficit brought down, not for 4 years but for 8 or 10 years until we can do away with it, it will never, ever be done until we pass a national health plan to control costs and provide a basic health system for all Americans and to stop shifting costs onto you for people who aren't insured. It will never happen unless we do that.

Fifty percent—let me reiterate—fifty percent of the projected growth in this debt between now and the year 2000 is in health care costs. And we only pay 33 percent of the national health care bill. More than two-thirds of it is being paid by you. And the

same thing will happen to your cost. The best thing the President and the Congress could do for the American economy over the next decade is to bring health costs in line with inflation. It would free up hundreds of billions of dollars to reinvest in new jobs and higher incomes and greater productivity and growth. And we must not delay that.

So I implore you not only to feel that you can be involved in our deliberations on what should be in the national health strategy but also to help us pass that, along with this budget, in Congress this year.

I want to also do something the governments of our competitors do without apology. I think we ought to have pragmatic partnerships with the private sector to strengthen our technological leadership. Research and development resources should shift toward technologies that will translate into commercial successes. And we must work together to create a national information infrastructure.

One of the things I've been determined to do in all these budget meetings we've been having for the last 3 weeks is to make sure that every dollar by which we reduce research and development in the defense budget finds itself into an increase in the domestic research and development budget of this country, and more. We have got to do that. We also should give you more incentives to invest, as I said. I want to reform the corporate tax system to ensure that it rewards and encourages those who invest in productivity: in plant equipment, research and development, in people who will create jobs and the markets of tomorrow.

And in return, we must ask your contribution to bringing the deficit down. Let me say something I haven't said yet. We did not just cut the White House staff and the executive administrative costs of this budget. You will see there are a lot of other very real cuts in Federal spending—and they will be real, definable and measurable, not imaginary—that will be laid on the table before the Congress and the American people.

Once we do that, we must ask for greater contributions to close this deficit. And we should begin with those whose taxes were reduced and whose incomes went up in the 1980's, the wealthiest Americans and cor-

porations. I will ask for an increase, as I said in the campaign, on the income tax of the wealthiest Americans and corporations, along with the incentives that I have recommended to get people—lower their tax burden if, but only if, they make investments in this country.

Our situation is worsened, and we may have to broaden the range of revenues which we seek. But we should begin by asking those who can most afford to pay to do so.

I have also been persuaded by my Treasury Secretary that it is unwise, indeed impossible, to raise the individual income tax rate unless there is a corresponding increase in the corporate tax rate to avoid tax shifting. But the corporations should also have incentives to reinvest as their rates are raised. And so we have done both things in the plan we will recommend.

I talked a lot in the campaign about an issue which has relatively small dollar impact but great significance to the American working people, and that is the enormously increased rate of executive compensation in the last 12 years as compared with the compensation of workers. I want to make a proposal that deals with the fact that the Tax Code should no longer subsidize excessive pay of chief executives and other high executives, excessive defined as unrelated to the productivity of the enterprise.

I believe, finally, that if all of us do what we're supposed to do, if I can ask every American honestly to look in the mirror and say, what do I want this country to look like in 4 years; what do I want this country to look like in 10 years; what do I want this country to look like when my children are my age; do I really want to let yet another opportunity go by when we just wander through a year instead of really investing in our people and our future, instead of really having a technology policy, instead of really having an economic strategy, instead of really doing something about the credit crunch, instead of really doing something about health care, instead of really doing something about the deficit, just because I wish I didn't have to change my ways—I think almost every American will look in the mirror and say, no, no, this year we'll pull together and do our part.

If the business community leads the way, Congress will follow. I need your help. I hope you'll be there.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:49 a.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Exchange With Reporters at a Meeting With Arkansas High School Students

February 11, 1993

The President. This is the Close-Up program, but they're not close up. [*Laughter*]

Did you hear what I said today, Helen? [Helen Thomas, United Press International]

Q. What?

The President. When I went in from the run? I said you had a great voice. It pierced the atmosphere.

Q. Yes, but you didn't answer any questions.

The President. I know, all your questions—have any answer—

Attorney General

Q. Got a woman for Attorney General?

Q. Mr. President, are you not committed to an across-the-board business tax increase?

Q. Which one's going to be President someday?

Q. You've got 14 lawyers in the Cabinet. Which one's going to be Attorney General?

The President. Well, we thought it would be part of my productivity in Government. We have so many lawyers in the Cabinet—something I didn't know, actually, until someone pointed it out to me—that we could just rotate the job once a month among the lawyers. [*Laughter*]

Q. Mr. President, you had some tough words for the businessmen today. Will there be similarly tough words for middle class taxpayers come next week?

The President. I talked to them last night. I think they got the message. I was really pleased with that last night. I liked it because the people who were asking questions, basically, they talked to me just like they did when I was a candidate. I was glad there was no difference in their—

Q. Why do you think we're different?

The President. —questions to challenge me, I like it.

Q. Why do you think the press is not with you?

The President. Why what?

Q. You said the press is not in your world.

The President. Why, what do you mean?

Q. We think differently or something?

Q. You said we think differently.

The President. No, no, I said just on— what was I talking about? [Laughter]

Q. Washington.

Q. Press corps.

The President. No, no, no, there was a specific question.

Q. Press conferences among the White House press corps. And you said I answered that question—

The President. —the question was about. You've got to get—before you lay that on me, you've got to put it in proper context now. What was—

Q. Okay, you said we see the world differently.

The President. Well, I think sometimes you do, but that's what you're hired to do. That's your job.

Q. Is it a man for Attorney General, sir?

The President. It's a lawyer. How's that?

NOTE: The exchange began at 1:50 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Following a Meeting With Foreign Minister Michio Watanabe of Japan

February 11, 1993

The President. We just had a very serious trade talk here. We decided that when all the people came in and took all the pictures that I was contributing to the Japanese trade surplus because of all the film that was being shot.

Q. Are you relieved, sir, that you have finally settled upon an Attorney General?

The President. I'll discuss that at 4:30 p.m.

Q. Are you asking for greater access for American goods in Japan?

The President. This is just the beginning of our relationship. We had a little talk about trade. And Minister Watanabe said that he thought that we shouldn't become protectionist in our relationship. And I agreed, but I said I thought we had to bring the trade deficit down and that I would be working with him on it very firmly.

Q. Did he agree to that?

The President. Yes, he agreed. As a matter of fact, he discussed some things that he thought would be done. So we had a good talk. But it was very preliminary. You shouldn't attach any burden on him because he came to see me today.

Q. So you're going to be friends?

The President. Well, I think we'll be friends and we'll have a few disagreements and a lot of agreements.

Q. So is this lawyer you mentioned a woman?

The President. At 4:30 p.m.

Q. At each photo op you go a little bit further.

Q. Will we see her on the way out?

The President. I hope not.

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

Q. Mr. President, will you meet with the Japanese Prime Minister by the end of March? Have any plans?

The President. I don't think a specific date has been set yet, but I want very much to meet with him in the near future. The Japanese-American relationship is very important, not only to Japan and to America but to the rest of the world. And I think it's important that we meet pretty soon, and I'm trying to set it up now.

Q. Was there a big agenda for this meeting, today's meeting?

The President. Was there a big agenda? Well, we talked for a good while, as you probably know, about a wide range of things,— everything from the AIDS crisis, to the situation in Russia, to the GATT round, to the necessity of resolving the trade differences between our two countries.

It was a good first meeting. I thought it was a good first meeting.

Q. ———diplomatic?

The President. It's my job.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:35 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

The President's News Conference With Attorney-General-Designate Janet Reno

February 11, 1992

Nomination of Janet Reno To Be Attorney General

The President. Good afternoon. One of my central missions as President is to reconnect the Government of the American people with the people who sent us here. Government cannot be an abstract, distant entity. It must be directly linked to the real lives of real people. I pledged when I ran to reach beyond Washington to bring the best from America's statehouses and courthouses to our Government. And I believe that my Cabinet and other appointees have fulfilled that pledge so far.

No agency needs an injection of innovative spirit more than the Department of Justice. Americans demand and deserve freedom from crime in their homes, at their schools, and on the streets. Talking tough is easy. Actually getting results is much more difficult and much more rare.

Thousands of prosecutors and police across America have been developing successful ways to fight crime and, just as important, to restore the sense of security that makes community possible in our Nation. I expect my Justice Department to take those lessons and apply them nationally, to be an innovator for law enforcement.

After years of political controversy and abuse, the Justice Department also needs an Attorney General who will bring a sense of pride, integrity, and new energy to that agency. The Department's dedicated career staff need leadership to help the Department pull together to focus on the urgent interests and issues of justice and law that brought the employees of the Justice Department into public service in the first place. They need an administrator schooled in the management of tough and complex problems and difficult-

to-call legal cases, things that affect matters in the office and on the streets of America.

I am proud to announce today that I intend to nominate Janet Reno, the State attorney from Miami and Dade County, Florida, to be our next Attorney General. She is a front-line crime fighter and a caring public servant. She has devoted her life to making her community safer, keeping children out of trouble, reducing domestic violence, and helping families. She has truly put people first.

She grew up as the daughter of two respected Florida journalists. She worked her way through Cornell University, graduating in 1960. Three years later, in 1963, she was one of a handful of women to graduate from the Harvard Law School, a year behind her distinguished Senator, Bob Graham. After a decade in the private practice of law, she was appointed the State attorney in 1978.

Janet Reno is ready to tackle the Justice Department's problems. Serving successfully as the chief prosecutor in a complex, diverse urban community is a really tough job. And she had done that job and done it well. She supervises an office of 900, including 230 attorneys. Her office handles over 120,000 cases per year, 40,000 of them felonies, and has won 80 capital punishment convictions for first degree murderers since she became prosecutor.

She has pioneered innovative programs to reduce crime, violence, and drug abuse. She launched a drug court program that has become nationally acclaimed that gets young first-time offenders back on track. She's piloted a community policing program, helping to reduce crime in blighted urban areas, something we want to do all across America. She began one of the first and best domestic violence programs combating spousal and child abuse. She runs a tough child support program that is at the leading edge of making deadbeat parents pay up.

She has been a fair-minded and effective prosecutor. Her balanced approach has won wide praise from across the community, from law enforcement, the bar, community leaders, civil rights leaders. People from all walks of life have hailed her achievements and her

remarkable dedication to public service. She has won election five times and is the single biggest vote getter in Dade County. The overwhelming support of the people who know her best is the most telling testament to her skills that I know of.

As an experienced law enforcement leader, she will be an effective voice in our fight against violent crime, spearheading our efforts to put 100,000 new police officers on the street, to keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of criminals, to make greater use of boot camps and other alternative means of service for young offenders, to increase aid to local law enforcement, to expand the use of community policing and to tackle the problems of violence against women and the need for tougher child support enforcement.

She will join with local leaders and environmental advocates to make sure that those who pollute our air and our water pay for their actions and take responsibility for the needed clean-up. She will work to invigorate our civil rights laws and to ensure that every person has an equal chance to contribute to and to participate in all our country has to offer. And she'll lead the fight against crime in the suites, as well as crime in the streets, ensuring that every possible penny is recovered from people who have bilked the S&L's and other white-collar criminals.

Finally, I want to say to you that every one I know who knows and has worked with Janet Reno agrees that she possesses one quality most essential to being Attorney General: unquestioned integrity. She's demonstrated throughout her career a commitment to principles that I want to see enshrined at the Justice Department. No one is above the law. Our legal system must protect the innocent and punish the wrongdoers. That the promise of equal justice under law must be a reality for every American.

This remarkable public servant still lives in a house in Florida that her mother built with her own hands. She has a listed phone number; and she's told me many times that people who find that their ex-spouses are delinquent in their child support call her at home because they believe that she can go collect their child support. She has lived the kind of life, in real contact with the toughest

problems of this country, that I think will serve her very well as the Nation's chief law enforcement officer.

Janet Reno.

I want her to give a statement first.

[At this point, Attorney-General-designate Janet Reno made a statement.]

FBI Director William Sessions

Q. Does this mean you're going to have a house-cleaning of the Justice Department, and that Sessions is on his way out as FBI Director?

The President. Well, first of all, I think it's important that we put the new Attorney General in and get our leadership team in at Justice. And I don't want to speak for her, but I think the appropriate thing is to wait until the final report is in on the FBI Director and give the Attorney-General-designate a chance to review that before we say anything else about that.

Q. Do you have any ideas on that subject?

Selection Process

Q. Mr. President, how much was your selection guided by a determination to have a woman as the first Attorney General?

The President. Somewhat, but not entirely. I also reviewed a large number of men for this position. And in the last several weeks, actually, I decided that I would just do it as if I were doing it all over again. I would go back to ground one. I reviewed a large number of potential candidates, both men and women.

I have to tell you, if I might be permitted a little personal moment, I've had a high regard for Janet Reno for some time because my brother-in-law is the defense attorney in the drug court about which I spoke so I've known about her exploits for some time. And I considered her even in the beginning, even though she and I never had a conversation. So I think it's fair to say that in my mind at least she prevailed in a fleet of very fine candidates, both men and women.

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us what role Mrs. Clinton had in this selection because we know that Janet Reno has a great deal of experience in child issues and that she's come to Mrs. Clinton's attention last year at least?

The President. None except to say that she liked her a lot. I mean, that she knew her and liked her a lot. And of course, Hillary's brother had been in the drug court. So I knew that from my own direct knowledge, though she didn't even talk to me about that.

Q. Did she participate in the interviewing?

The President. No, not at all.

The Inslaw Case

Q. Mr. President, will she clean up the Inslaw case, that case where Meese and others stole a great system for using computers and didn't pay for it, and the House Judiciary Committee has recommended that there be an independent counsel to clean this up. It's a scandal on the face of the United States Government.

Attorney-General-Designate Reno. What I will do is what I do in each of these instances. I'll make sure that we review it carefully, look at the evidence, look at what should be done based on the evidence and the law, and take appropriate action.

Death Penalty

Q. Ms. Reno, could we get your views on the death penalty, and is there a difference between your view and the President's view? And if there is, is that significant and how will that affect your policy at the Justice Department?

Attorney-General-Designate Reno. I'm personally opposed to the death penalty, as I've told the President, but I've probably asked for it as much as many prosecutors in the country and have secured it. And when the evidence and the law justify the death penalty, I will ask for it as I have consistently. I will advocate for it as the law of the land in particular situations if we can secure such penalties.

Q. Will you move to reverse the death penalty?

Nominee's Qualifications

Q. Mr. President, can you assure us today, sir, that of all the candidates you either reviewed or could have reviewed for this job, that the one you have chosen is the absolute best-qualified person possible?

The President. I can assure you that based on my criteria I think she's the best.

Somebody else might have other criteria. My criteria were the ones that I outlined. I wanted to bring someone to the Justice Department who had had both management experience and legal experience. I want to bring someone to the Justice Department who had dealt with a wide range of real-world problems and who had a keen eye for excellence and talent, to restore a sense of movement and energy and vitality.

There are an awful lot of good people at the Justice Department who want to be part of a Department on the move and feel good about it. And the one thing I thought, I can tell you this—this is ironic since I'm now naming Janet Reno. I want to be forthright and answer the question fully.

In the beginning of my deliberations weeks ago, the one reason that I did not pursue this more was because Janet Reno had always been a State prosecutor and not a Federal U.S. Attorney, or not a higher Justice Department official. But the more I dug into it and the more I talked to people about it, the more I realized that you couldn't be the State's attorney in Dade County for 15 years without having enormous exposure to a wide range of issues that the Justice Department deals with, and without working with the United States Attorney. You might want to ask her for some specifics.

So finally, I said, "Well, why don't I just call and explore this." And I did, and I was fully satisfied that she had more than enough familiarity with the Federal system to do the job.

Q. Mr. President, can you outline for us—when you say "somewhat" that her gender was somewhat of a factor, can you explain to us how big a role that played, and why? And I'd like to ask Ms. Reno how she feels about taking a position that seems to have been set aside for a woman.

The President. It was not set aside. I'll tell you again, I considered a significant number of men for this position. And as I said before—someone asked me about this double standard issue—there were also a significant number of men who couldn't go forward in this process because of some of the same problems that you all have written about.

I thought it was important not to disqualify women just because of what happened be-

fore. And I really believe—I'm not sure you could find anybody around the country that would get any more favorable and broad-based support than I have been given in spontaneous comments. I just left a Member of the House of Representatives who doesn't live within 200 miles of Janet Reno, who heard that I was going to name her and just went out of his way to tell me that it was a great appointment, what a wonderful thing it was that I had done. I feel very comfortable with this appointment on the merits.

Law Enforcement

Q. Mr. President, given the tight budget constraints that you have been focusing on over the past weeks, how do you and this Attorney General plan to go about fulfilling your campaign promise to hire 100,000 police officers for this country?

The President. Well, I think there are three things that I would point you to, and keep in mind we don't have to do it in the first year. We have—when you all talked to me about my campaign commitments, remember I've got a 4-year term—[laughter]—at least that.

I want to do that from three sources:

Number one: I hope we can bring that crime bill back up that almost passed but didn't last time and have some funds for local law enforcement to hire more police officers.

Number two: I want to proceed at a pace with the national service program, which will give priority in every State to people who want to pay their college loans back by working as police officers.

Number three: I want to pursue the idea that Senator Nunn first raised, at least he was the first one I ever heard raise it, of helping people who are going to be mustered out of the military service to qualify to move quickly into careers as police officers or teachers.

And so, we believe from those three sources, with the funding that I have set aside in the budget I will recommend, and the other things that we will do over the next 4 years, we will be able to meet that goal.

Susan [Susan Spencer, CBS News].

Selection Process

Q. Is it safe to assume that Ms. Reno has, a, never hired an illegal alien, legally or ille-

gally; b, paid all her Social Security taxes? And finally, as you look back on the soap opera that has led to this, how do you assess whatever political damage you may or may not have incurred?

The President. Oh, I don't think there is much. I think what happened—I just would remind you, though, I nominated one other person for this, Zoe Baird, and I took responsibility for that fact that our vetting procedure was inadequate. It was my personal responsibility. Since then, all the other things that you have written about are things that you found out about in ways that I don't know, but our procedure worked and worked quite well. And I didn't discuss anybody or anything until I got ready to nominate somebody else. So I think they did a good job.

If there were any mistakes made in the interim, it was people who worked here, worked around here, or were talked to by us who said things to you they shouldn't have. But otherwise, the system worked pretty well as it was supposed to have worked.

Q. First question: we can assume that all of these other matters are not a problem?

The President. Well, why don't you ask her?

Attorney-General-Designate Reno. I've never hired any illegal aliens, and I think I've paid all my Social Security taxes. Certainly in the vetting process in the last week we've covered everything.

The Vice President. She made sure that a lot of others have, too.

Q. Mr. President, to the extent that you wanted to fulfill these commitments, did you feel hamstrung by the pledge or the perception of a pledge that you had set aside this job for a woman?

The President. No.

Q. And part two, if we can ask Ms. Reno, we never got an answer to Ruth's question about how she feels about being appointed to a job in which there is that perception of a pledge.

The President. No. As I said, I interviewed—I even talked to—I don't know how it didn't get into the paper, but it didn't—both men as well as women about this job. And I seriously considered, seriously considered, at least four men for this job. I really concluded in the end that Janet Reno would

be best. I never felt hamstrung by any commitment, even though I did want to name a woman Attorney General. I thought it would be a good thing. There are a lot of women lawyers in the country, a lot of women judges in the country, a lot of women prosecutors in the country. And I thought it would be a good and interesting thing to do. But I never felt hamstrung by the commitment.

Attorney-General-Designate Reno. I think this is one of the greatest challenges that any lawyer could have in America. And I want to try my level-best. I have been so impressed with members of the administration and with the vetting team and with the approach to Government, the approach that Government can work to put people first. And I'm just delighted to be here, and I'm going to try my level-best.

Nominee's Qualifications

Q. Are you a feminist?

The President. You want to answer that?

Q. Are you a feminist?

Attorney-General-Designate Reno. The question is whether I'm a feminist. My mother always told me to do my best, to think my best and to do right and consider myself a person.

The President. I do think I need to make one factual disclosure and then I promise to call on Mr. [inaudible]. There was one factor which affected me about Janet Reno, which is that Senator Gore and I carried—when he was Senator and I was Governor—we carried Dade County in the Presidential election by 4 percentage points. The last time Janet Reno had an opponent she carried it by 40 percentage points. [Laughter] That had a lot more to do than gender with convincing me that she could handle things at the Justice Department. If you know anything about Dade County, you know that is a truly astonishing achievement.

Q. If I could ask Ms. Reno, the President mentioned that he was attracted to your experience as a State prosecutor which gave you a lot of experience on the criminal law side. But you obviously haven't had direct experience with a number of Federal issues that will come up, constitutional issues that will come up. Do you feel that you'll have

a substantial learning curve that you'll have to get over in order to be able to deal with those Federal law issues that you haven't been dealing with in your career, certainly for the last 15 years?

Attorney-General-Designate Reno. I think one of the splendors of the law is that it covers so many areas and that if you're going to be Attorney General, it's going to be very difficult for any one person to be skilled and to be experienced in every area that the Attorney General must cover. I think I can do the job, and I think I can do it by building a team dedicated to excellence, to professionalism, a team where the hallmark is integrity. And using the base of the tremendous career lawyers that exist in the Department of Justice, I think we're going to have a great team.

Q. Mr. President, this has been a frustrating process for you in some ways. If you had it to do all over again, what would you do differently?

The President. Oh, I would have called Janet Reno on November the 5th. [Laughter]

Immigration Law

Q. Ms. Reno lives in an area which is full of immigrants, legal and illegal, and a lot of things about the confusing laws of immigration came out in the past few weeks, as we all know. What will she do to clear up all these problems?

Attorney-General-Designate Reno. Again, what I would like to do is work with members of the administration, members of the Department of Justice, to look at the problem, to consult with the President, and to make recommendations based on a thorough study of the matter.

Abortion

Q. Can you tell us your views on freedom of choice?

Attorney-General-Designate Reno. I am pro-choice.

Florida Corruption Investigation

Q. Ms. Reno, could I ask a question? The county—Dade County—some of the critics have said that you have passed along questions of local corruption, government corruption, to the Federal courts and the Federal

system. The question is why did you choose to do that?

Attorney-General-Designate Reno. Let me give you a classic example. My office was responsible for investigating and putting together a case against a significant number of corrupt officials. Florida has very liberal discovery rules that give defense attorneys the right to question all the witnesses, somewhat far more liberal than Federal court. The Federal authorities also have the Internal Revenue Service. It seemed to us as the case progressed that it would be best handled in Federal court. I didn't ship the case over there. I shipped the case with my prosecutors, who were cross-designated to the Federal court.

One of the things that interested me when I asked the U.S. Attorney to work with us in this effort is that he said, "Janet, that's political suicide. People will think you're ducking." And I said, "Mr. Kellner, I want to do what's right for the case and right to see that justice is secured." Our prosecutors participated in that prosecution. I think it gave me an understanding of Federal process, Federal procedure, Federal law. And I think it's an example of what State and Federal officials can do working together, without everybody being concerned about turf and taking credit for something.

Confirmation

Q. Mr. President, how long do you think it's going to take to get this nominee confirmed?

The President. Well, I talked to Senator Biden today, and he said that he would proceed in an expeditious way. So I think that you should ask Senator Biden about that. I think that the committee will take it up in an appropriate fashion. I don't expect them to race it through or anything, but I think they will do it in a prompt way when they come back.

Q. Can you think of any issues at all that might complicate the confirmation process? Anything that will have to be explained?

The President. I don't. I think that she may have to—she just explained one issue here. I can tell you this: If you've been a prosecutor for 15 years, it's like if you've been a Governor for 12 years. Not every call

you make is right; not every case you pursue is won. But I can just tell you, I have been literally amazed at the quality of the recommendations that I received for Janet Reno.

Justice Department Staff

Q. Mr. President, have you make any decisions yet on any other top positions at Justice, and what is Webb Hubbell's role going to be at Justice?

The President. Well, we'll have to discuss that with the Attorney General now. But I will say this for the hometown press: He has done a magnificent job for the last 3 weeks under rather adverse circumstances, just trying to keep things together there and to keep the morale up and help at least to do the things that had to be done. I hope he will be staying there. And the answer to your other question is, as you might imagine, we have done an enormous amount of work on top-flight candidates for other positions, and I would expect that if this nomination goes as I expect it to, we will be able to fill out the Justice Department with first-class lawyers very, very quickly. Thank you.

Q. Are you sure you're not troubled by the fact that her parents were both journalists? [Laughter]

The President. No, actually, I thought the fact that her parents were both journalists and she still was a surviving elected politician made her doubly qualified to be Attorney General. [Laughter]

NOTE: The President's third news conference began at 4:40 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters at the Fenwick Center in Arlington, Virginia

February 12, 1993

The President. Thank you. We are delighted to be here today. I want to thank all of you for hosting us and coming out in such wonderful numbers, and I want to especially thank the young people who are here.

I want to begin my introducing the First Lady, my wife, Hillary. As many of you know, she is the chair of the President's Task Force on Health Care and came today to review the work of this wonderful clinic in anticipation of our presenting to the Congress a program to provide affordable health care for all Americans in the next several weeks.

We've had a wonderful time here today. And I want to introduce the person to my left who will speak in a moment, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Donna Shalala. I also want to introduce two United States Senators who came with us today: first, the chair of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts; and Senator Don Riegle of Michigan.

I'd like to thank Jim Hunter, the Arlington County Board chair, for meeting us here. I know we have members of the Virginia Senate and House here, and the school board chair, Frank Wilson. I thank all of them for being here. But the two people I'd like to thank most today are the two fine public servants who showed us around. I'd like to ask them to stand and be recognized: Dr. Susan Allan, the Arlington County health director—where is Susan?—and Sue Adams, the Family Health Bureau chief. Thank you, Sue.

We've had a wonderful time today. We got to walk through the process of what it was like for a parent to have a child immunized here. We saw the good news, which is that this place is doing a wonderful job of reaching people. We also saw some of the bad news, which is it's still pretty cumbersome to have a child immunized. And we did get to see a young woman of 20 months, get her a polio vaccine, which is an oral vaccine. So it was nice to see someone be vaccinated without pain. [*Laughter*]

We came here today to make this day a landmark and to fight to protect the health of millions of our children. I can think of no better place to announce a new immunization policy than right here on the front lines of the fight to provide accessible, affordable health care to every family in this area.

I'm pleased to be joined here by the children's advocates whom I have introduced. And I do want to say again our thanks to Sue Adams, the director of this clinic, and

all the wonderful staff that came out and said hello to us and encouraged us along the way.

This week I was startled to read of the case of a young boy named Rodney Miller, a 20-month-old child who lives in Miami, currently being treated for meningitis in the Jackson Memorial Hospital. He's there because he did not receive a meningitis vaccine that cost \$21.48. The bill for his stay in the hospital has already topped \$46,500.

In the health care policy that our national task force is developing, nothing will be more important than preventive care. Today, American taxpayers are being hit with \$10 in avoidable health care costs, avoidable health care costs, for every \$1 we could be spending on immunizing our young people. The recent resurgence of measles in our country afflicted over 55,000 people, most of whom were children. The epidemic cost this country \$20 million in avoidable hospital costs alone. Prevention would have cost \$1 million. And those figures don't begin to take into account the terrible human cost, the agony of a young man like Rodney Miller with his joints swollen, with his ankles so swollen they have to be relieved with needling to get the pus out, that the pain and problems that he and many others will take throughout their lives simply because we don't immunize our children.

Lest you think that this is a problem that every country has, I want you to know in this beautiful health care building that the United States has the third worst immunization record in this hemisphere. Of all the nations in this hemisphere, only Bolivia and Haiti have lower immunization rates for their children than the United States of America.

Over the past 10 years, while immunization rates have been declining in many important areas, the price of vaccine has risen at 6 times the rate of inflation. Immunizing a child cost about \$23 10 years ago; it costs more than \$200 today. In a public clinic, the cost of fully immunizing a child has leapt from \$7 to more than \$90. Manufacturers of these vaccines cite the cost of research and development to defend the rising prices. Well, nobody wants research to slow down, but let's look at what's really happening.

The pharmaceutical industry is spending \$1 billion more each year on advertising and

lobbying than it does on developing new and better drugs. Meanwhile, its profits are rising at 4 times the rate of the average Fortune 500 company. Compared to other countries, our prices are shocking. Listen to this: The polio vaccine in the United States currently costs close to \$10. In England, the same drug is available for \$1.80. In Belgium, it costs 77 cents. The problems of having an adequate delivery system, plus the spiraling costs, are putting America's children and America's future in jeopardy.

To make matters worse, the makers of these vaccines have refused to make their products available to States at more affordable cost. I should tell you, those of you who don't know, that the Federal Government buys vaccines from the manufacturer and distributes it through the States and ultimately the people through the Center for Disease Control. We buy the vaccines at a much lower cost than a doctor can. The States often directly buy vaccines. They buy the vaccines at a higher cost than the Federal Government, but still at a lower cost than doctors. States can order large quantities and therefore should receive lower prices.

But listen to this: While 10 States have succeeded in negotiating agreements with the vaccine manufacturers that allow them to immunize all the children they can reach, manufacturers are now balking at starting talks with other States. In fact, just recently Texas, South Carolina, and Hawaii were all turned away. They were told that their efforts to get cheaper vaccines for their children were against public policy.

Today we must tell the drug companies to change those priorities. We cannot have profits at the expense of our children. These practices have got to stop.

But I want to make it clear: Dealing with the cost of vaccines will not be enough. We also have to improve the delivery of preventive care. I want to say to the members of the press and to all the people who are here, we should be under no illusion that every family and every child in America has access to a health clinic as good as this one. We should be under no illusion that every family and every child in America has access to a health clinic that opens at 7 a.m. in the morn-

ing and closes at 7 p.m. at night so that working families can bring their children.

Even here, where there has been a dramatic increase in the number of children immunized, we are still seeing rates of 70 percent immunization when the national goal, and what is necessary to assure that there will be no outbreak of communicable diseases, is 90 percent. Without an outreach program to go out and reach people where they are, in the languages they speak, in the homes and in the neighborhoods and in the organizations that they frequent, we will not be able to reach this goal.

So today, I am announcing a three-part policy to protect our children's future and to save the taxpayers millions of dollars. It will require changes on the part of all of us. And as I have in the last 3 weeks, I want to begin with the Government so that we do our job first before we ask anyone else to change what they are doing.

I am pleased to announce that the job stimulus program that I will outline on Wednesday evening to the Congress will include \$300 million to make vaccination services more widely available to all Americans. These funds will help public programs buy more vaccines. They will improve community services and personal outreach efforts. They will mean extended clinic hours all across America, more staff, and increased education efforts in conjunction with the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services, and the resources necessary to create a national tracking system so we know what is happening to these children. These folks here are having a terrible time getting good and accurate records because we don't have a national tracking system.

These are the kinds of things that the National Government owes the American people and owes these fine public health professionals if we're going to do what we should be doing to help protect our children. And we will begin with that.

Second, I'm directing Secretary Shalala to begin negotiations with our drug manufacturers to assure that other States who do not have the arrangements that 10 do can buy the vaccines they need at affordable prices. There is no reason in the world why a child

in Texas is unable to receive vaccination while a child in Massachusetts can. We can't stand this kind of inequality simply because of the economic priorities of the manufacturers of the vaccine. It's wrong.

Finally, the administration will prepare an initiative for my review in cooperation with key congressional health leaders, such as Senator Kennedy, Senator Riegle, Senator Bumpers, Senator Pryor, Congressmen Dingell, Waxman and others that will guarantee the immunization of every child in America.

And I want to challenge the manufacturers of these vaccines to work with us. We cannot possibly justify financing research and development in future vaccines based on prices that will assure that children will not receive the vaccines that are available today. We can do better than that, and we have to.

Our Nation is the only industrialized nation in the entire world that does not guarantee childhood vaccination for all children. It ought to be like clean water and clean air; it ought to be a part of the fabric of our life. Look at these children. We should not risk losing one of them, and we should not waste one dollar on our already over-bloated health care system that we could do away with vaccinations.

The cruel irony is that we are the Nation that develops and produces the majority of the world's vaccines. But we don't have an effective or an affordable mechanism for distributing them, and we charge more for vaccines in this country than are charged in other countries for the same vaccines that are manufactured here. That is an irony that we cannot permit to continue.

So the steps we're taking today will go a long way towards solving that dilemma. We'll make sure that excessive profits do not stand in the way of children's health. And I want you to know that we will not stop until preventable childhood diseases no longer threaten the families, the children, and the future of the United States.

[At this point, Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna E. Shalala spoke.]

Thank you very much. Thank you very much. We're going to shake hands, but I promised the press we'd answer a couple of questions. Does anybody have one? Where

are they? I was listening for a familiar voice. Go ahead.

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us what you hope to achieve? What makes you think that the health costs—

The President. Well, for one thing, there has been—the drug companies are used to selling drugs on a bulk basis at a discount rate to the Federal Government and to some of the States. I think that the position they have taken, that we should continue the status quo, is untenable. But if they have legitimate arguments on research and development, maybe there's some other ways we can try to address those.

I think we ought to let Secretary Shalala and the White House folks meet and deal with them and see what position they take. I cannot believe that anyone seriously believes that America should manufacture vaccines for the world, sell them cheaper in foreign countries, and immunize fewer kids as a percentage of the population than any nation in this hemisphere but Bolivia and Haiti. I can't believe that that is their position. But that is the inevitable consequence of what we have not done.

Yes?

Q. —Congress is going to go along with any—

The President. Well, I'm going to present a program to the Congress to provide for the immunization of all children at a reasonable price. I hope they will be a part of developing that program. Whether they are or not is up to them. But this is unconscionable. We are running the risk of new epidemics spreading out in this country. We cannot do it. We were supposed to have 90 percent of our kids immunized in 1990. That's what Dr. Koop wanted when he was Surgeon General. We missed the deadline. They put it off to the year 2000. And unless we do something about the delivery system and the price, we're not going to get there in the year 2000. I want to get there sooner, and I think we can. I believe they'll be a part of this. I think the public outpouring on this is going to be so strong that they'll come along and do it.

I'm still going to try to pass a bill that will permit us to immunize all the children of the country.

Q. *[Inaudible]*

The President. Well, let me say in my State the public health department does 85 percent of the immunizations done. I'm very proud of that. And there are a lot of Southern States that, because of our legacy of poverty, have had to develop very elaborate public health networks. So this is something that we've been sensitive to for a long time.

I've also been interested in buying the vaccinations. But everything that I've done on public health since—well, ever since we got into public life, Hillary's been a part of. So she's been pushing this, but so has Secretary Shalala. I don't know who to give credit to. But I don't care who you give credit to, as long as we get it done.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:07 a.m. at the Arlington County Career Center.

Nominations of Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries of Commerce

February 13, 1993

The President today announced his choices for four top leadership positions at the Department of Commerce, expressing his intention to nominate:

James Baker to be Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere;

Doug Hall to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere;

Sheila Anthony to be Assistant Secretary for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs;

Larry Irving to be Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information.

Baker and Hall will serve as the Director and Deputy Director of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), one of the Federal Government's key environmental research agencies.

"Secretary Ron Brown is putting together a superb leadership team at the Department of Commerce," said President Clinton. "I am looking forward to working with them to turn Commerce into one of our administration's most vital agencies."

"We have found the perfect balance to lead NOAA," the President added. "With Jim Baker and Doug Hall, we have a team that will bring great scientific skills, laboratory

management experience, a strong commitment to environmental protection, and the savvy required to deal effectively with sensitive issues."

As Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Clarence L. (Larry) Irving will direct the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). "One of the most important missions that I have charged the Commerce Department with is nurturing the key industries of the future, in areas like telecommunications," said the President. "Larry Irving has a clear vision for turning telecommunications innovations into high skill, high wage jobs."

"In addition," said President Clinton, "with his experience on Capitol Hill, Larry will be invaluable in moving legislation swiftly through the Congress. He will be joined in that effort by Sheila Anthony, someone with the political and management experience to strengthen the lines of communication between Commerce and Capitol Hill. I am so pleased to have a native of Hope, Arkansas, working closely with Congress to get our plans enacted."

NOTE: Biographies of the nominees were attached to the press release.

Nomination of James Lee Witt To Be Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency

February 12, 1993

President Clinton today announced his intention to nominate James Lee Witt, the head of Arkansas' State Office of Emergency Management and a former county judge, as Director of the Nation's Federal Emergency Management Agency.

"The devastation wrought by Hurricane Andrew last year was a sober reminder that we need to provide strong, organized, and effective help to American families whose lives are dramatically affected by disaster," President Clinton said. "James Lee has done an outstanding job in Arkansas, and I am con-

fidest he will do the same for the country in his new role.”

The director of Arkansas' chief disaster assistance agency for the past 4 years, Witt was responsible directly to the Governor for all State and local disaster/emergency planning and response and recovery operations. He also served as the Governor's liaison to the national Director of FEMA. Prior to his tenure as Arkansas State director, Witt served for 10 years as county judge and chief elected official of Yell County, AR.

Witt is a member of the board of directors of the Central United States Earthquake Consortium and sits on subcommittees for international arms reduction projects. He is also a member of the Arkansas Governor's Task Force on Flood Prevention and the past chairman of the nuclear response advisory board for Arkansas Power and Light Company's nuclear power plant.

Witt, 49, is married to Lea Ellen Hodges Witt, and they have two sons.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

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

February 7

In the afternoon, the President attended a meeting of environmental leaders and a meeting of the President's Task Force on National Health Care Reform. He then met with economic advisers.

February 8

In the morning, the President participated in a CIA and national security briefing at the White House.

The President appointed Kathleen McGinty as Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of the White House Office on Environmental Policy.

February 9

In the morning, the President participated in a CIA and national security briefing at the White House.

February 10

In the morning, the President met with economic advisers and participated in a CIA and national security briefing at the White House.

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Detroit, MI. Following the town meeting, the President attended private receptions at WXYZ-TV before returning to Washington, DC.

February 11

In the morning, the President participated in a CIA and national security briefing at the White House.

Later he met with:

- the Washington, DC, Mardi Gras queen;
- the Vice President, for lunch;
- congressional leaders;
- Secretary of State Warren Christopher;
- economic advisers.

In the evening, the President had telephone conversations with President Fidel Ramos of the Philippines and Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri.

February 12

In the morning, the President participated in a CIA and national security briefing at the White House.

Later in the morning, the President toured the Fenwick Center health clinic in Arlington, VA, with Hillary Clinton.

After returning to the White House, the President met with Senator Bill Bradley.

In the afternoon, the President met with congressional leaders and later with economic advisers.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

**Checklist
of White House Press Releases**

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

Released February 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Text of a letter from Kimba Wood to the New York Times

Released February 8

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Background information on unemployment insurance extension

Fact sheet on the new environmental policy

Released February 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Chief of Staff Thomas McLarty on White House Reorganization

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Fact sheet on White House reorganization

Released February 10

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Released February 11

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Released February 12

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved February 8

S. 202 / Public Law 103-4

To designate the Federal Judiciary Building in Washington, D.C., as the "Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building"