

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, March 15, 1993
Volume 29—Number 10
Pages 367–405

Contents

Addresses to the Nation

Economic plan—368

Addresses and Remarks

Attorney General, swearing-in ceremony—403
Children's Defense Fund—395
Initiative to alleviate the credit crunch—388
National League of Cities—371
Westinghouse employees in Linthicum, MD—392

Announcements

Forest Conference—392

Appointments and Nominations

Nominations for sub-Cabinet posts—378, 387, 402, 404

Communications to Congress

Nuclear cooperation with EURATOM, letter—386
Justice Department action on trial of Representative Ford, letter—369

Executive Orders

Nuclear Cooperation With EURATOM—387

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Old Family Dining Room—378
Oval Office—379

Interviews With the News Media—Continued

Exchanges with reporters—Continued
Roosevelt Room—378, 401
State Dining Room—391, 401
News conference with President Mitterrand of France, March 9 (No. 5)—379

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

See Interviews With the News Media

Proclamations

Irish-American Heritage Month—370
Revocation of partial suspension of Davis-Bacon Act—371
Save Your Vision Week—367

Statements by the President

See also Announcements; Appointments and Nominations
Death of Dr. David Gunn—402

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—405
Checklist of White House press releases—405
Correction to Digest—404
Digest of other White House announcements—404
Nominations submitted to the Senate—404

Editor's Note: The President was aboard the U.S.S. *Theodore Roosevelt* off the coast of Norfolk, VA, on March 12, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Week Ending Friday, March 12, 1993

Proclamation 6532—Save Your Vision Week, 1993

March 5, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Vision is a remarkable gift. Providing nearly 40 percent of all sensory input to the brain, our eyes allow us to read, drive, and experience many of life's greatest pleasures. Vision, however, is an extremely fragile gift, one that can dim with injury or the onset of disease. Moreover, it is a gift that, with few exceptions, cannot be restored once it is lost.

Thus, given the important but delicate nature of good vision in our lives, it is tragic that each year thousands of Americans suffer vision loss that might have been prevented.

Having a periodic eye examination is an effective and simple way for most of us to prevent this tragedy from occurring in our lives. A comprehensive eye examination can provide an early warning of developing eye disease and allow an eye care professional the opportunity to initiate appropriate treatment.

Both glaucoma and diabetes are potentially blinding diseases that can be controlled and treated effectively, if detected early. However, each remains a leading cause of blindness in the United States. People at high risk for glaucoma, African Americans over the age of 40 and everyone over the age of 60, should receive an eye examination at least every two years to reduce the risk of blindness.

For people with diabetes, a regular eye examination is an absolute necessity. People with diabetes who have their eyes examined through dilated pupils at least once a year take a responsible preventive measure in protecting their vision.

Children also need early and regular eye examination. Even the seemingly healthiest

child may have an unsuspected visual problem that needs prompt attention. A routine checkup can identify such disorders in time for effective treatment, sparing the child a lifetime of visual impairment.

Guarding against eye injuries is important for all members of our society. Both in the home and workplace, people should wear appropriate face masks, goggles, or safety glasses when working with chemicals or machinery that might be dangerous to the eyes. If possible, athletes should also wear protective eye wear, and children should be taught the basic principles of eye safety from an early age.

To encourage Americans to cherish and protect their vision, the Congress, by a joint resolution approved December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 629; 36 U.S.C. 169a), has authorized and requested the President to proclaim the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning March 7, 1993, as Save Your Vision Week. I urge all Americans to participate in the observance by making eye care and eye safety an important part of their lives. Also, I invite eye care professionals, the communications media, and all public and private organizations committed to the goal of sight conservation to join in activities that will make Americans more aware of the steps they can take to protect their vision.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and seventeenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:33 a.m., March 8, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 6, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on March 9.

Radio Address to the Nation on the Economic Plan

March 6, 1993

Good morning. We've come a long way together in the last few weeks. You've had the opportunity to look over my plan to give America a new direction. And from what I've heard all across the country, you like what you see, not because you agree with all of the details but because you know that this program is a fundamental departure from business as usual in Washington. It makes dramatic reductions in deficit spending, over 150 specific cuts in domestic programs, and asks a contribution from every American based on his or her ability to pay, all to get the deficit down.

I've challenged the critics of our plan to help me find more spending cuts that reduce the deficit for real, not the kind of gimmicks and not the delays of tough choices we've seen in the past. Previously, when Washington has talked about cutting the deficit tomorrow, it was a tomorrow that never comes. We're going to change that. But perhaps the biggest change we're offering is a national investment strategy to create jobs and grow our economy. Every investment we make is paid for, dollar for dollar, by spending cuts in existing programs. Every investment is designed to make us smarter, safer, and more secure, now and in the long term. These investments embraced old-fashioned ideas like education and work and self-reliance, but they meet the challenges of the new economy with an arsenal of new ideas.

But we begin by making an ironclad commitment to the safety and well-being of our families: First, to immunize every American against avoidable, preventable childhood diseases. For every \$1 we spend today, we'll save \$10 in the future. Then, to fully fund the Head Start program to give all of our children a chance to start school ready to learn. That will save \$3 for every \$1 we invest. And then, to open the doors to college education to tens of thousands of promising

young students in exchange for their work in a program of national service. In every case, they are investments that will pay dividends and strengthen our economy for years to come. We can't afford to do less.

At a time of immense global change, the price of doing nothing is persistent unemployment, shrinking wages, and workers unable to fulfill their potential. But with the advantages of intelligent investment, our workers can compete and win in this global economy. For example, changes are coming for communities and companies which defended America during the cold war. As the defense industry shrinks and adjusts to the new world, we must make offsetting investments in civilian research. And if your job has been threatened by the end of the cold war or by changes in world trade or by changes in the way we build products or provide services here in America, the United States shouldn't let you down.

This investment program includes a bold new initiative to ensure that every worker has the training to get a good job in the new economy. And the plan contains the boldest national apprenticeship program our country has ever had, so that all high school graduates who don't go to college can receive the skills and the encouragement they need to find good jobs.

For all these workers and students, their lives and livelihoods depend upon the power of investment. Overall, this plan will create more than 8 million public and private sector jobs over the next 4 years. It'll put people back to work in building roads and bridges and creating the new technologies that will employ our people and bolster our profits well into the 21st century.

We also propose the boldest package of incentives targeted to small business: a \$3 billion-per-year permanent investment tax credit, targeted to the small businesses that promote job growth in this country, and tax initiatives for small companies who will start new enterprises so that we can reward entrepreneurs who take risks to build new businesses. And next week we'll go further by announcing regulatory changes to expand the availability of credit for small- and medium-

sized businesses seeking loans, without sacrificing our abiding commitment to the safety and security of our financial system.

By making more capital available to the private sector and by lowering its costs, business will be able to expand, grow, and create jobs again. All of these investments, the new policies, and the new ideas reflect my belief, and I think yours, that the status quo isn't good enough and that we can do better.

Yesterday we saw figures showing a slight improvement in the Nation's jobless rate. We're happy whenever fewer Americans are out of work. But we certainly can't declare victory now. For while employment is edging up, unemployment is still higher than it was at the depths of this recession. And most of the new jobs being created pay part-time wages and rarely provide workers with the health care coverage families need. If this anemic recovery is the best we can do, it's further proof that real changes are needed to produce a better economy and a better life for our people.

There are those who actually lack the vision to support these investments because they say that we shouldn't spend any new money trying to grow this economy. It's not that they have a plan to make the economy grow, but they just dismiss the investment portion of our program by calling it more Government spending.

There is a profound difference between spending and investment. It's the difference between the status quo and change. And clearly, we have to change. We have to have the courage to cut spending and the wisdom to invest our new resources wisely. We can't do nothing, but we shouldn't do one without the other. The program I've offered to Congress is the only one which will offer a balanced approach to turn the economy around, and we have to do it now.

I hope you'll join me in this call for a new direction. I hope you'll enlist your Representatives and Senators in the critical cause of change. This is the American way, taking charge of our destiny, working hard, and investing today so that we might build a better tomorrow.

Thanks for listening.

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

Letter to Representative Robert H. Michel on the Justice Department Action on the Trial of Representative Harold Ford

March 6, 1993

Dear Mr. Leader:

This is in response to the March 2 letter from you and four of your colleagues. In that letter you express concern about the process which led the Department of Justice to object to the impaneling of a virtually all-white jury brought in from Jackson, Tennessee to try Congressman Harold Ford in Memphis, Tennessee.

Please be informed that when the White House received inquiries concerning this jury issue, they were referred, at the direction of my Counsel, to the Department of Justice for whatever action the Department deemed proper. I have been informed by Counsel that the White House made no recommendation to anyone at the Department of Justice as to how this issue should be resolved.

The Acting Attorney General, Stuart Gerson (who, as you know, was a senior member of the prior Administration and will be leaving office when a new Attorney General is confirmed), has informed us that he personally made the decision to object to the impaneling of the jury and that he did so strictly on the merits. When he made his decision, Mr. Gerson wrote that he was motivated by "a desire to achieve a principle of fairness and uniformity that reflects on far more than this case" and his decision was based on an "[un]willing[ness] to say on behalf of the United States, that justice cannot be obtained from a Memphis jury or, indeed, from the jury in any city." I am attaching a copy of his written statement.

I have no reason to question this statement by Mr. Gerson or his explicit assurance that political considerations played no role in his decision.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

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

Proclamation 6533—Irish-American Heritage Month, 1993

March 6, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The story of the Irish in America, of those millions of Americans who trace their ancestry back to the Emerald Isle, is typical of so many American immigrants, yet is also uniquely influenced by the rich culture of Ireland. Like so many of our forebears, they came to this land seeking a better future. In the process of becoming Americans, they changed themselves, changed America, and changed the world.

By 1776, 300,000 natives of Ireland had already emigrated to the Colonies. They fought bravely in the American Revolution and helped to establish a new Nation. Eight signatories of the Declaration of Independence were of Irish origin. In the early years of the young Republic, as workers on the canals and railroads, they played a major role in the settlement of the West.

However, it was not until the great potato famine of the late 1840s that the trickle of Irish immigration became a flood. More than one million Irish men and women came to the United States during that period. They moved primarily into our great cities, which they quickly transformed into the bustling beehives of activity that they have been ever since.

Confronted by prejudice and sign after sign proclaiming “No Irish Need Apply,” the new immigrants immersed themselves in the politics of such cities as New York, Boston, and Chicago. In fact, the political legacy of the Irish-American community may well be the most important of all its contributions to our Nation. Presidents John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan, as well as 16 other Presidents, have proudly proclaimed their Irish-American heritage. America has been blessed

by the leadership of other Irish Americans as well, including Mike Mansfield, Tip O’Neill, and Tom Foley in the Congress, and Al Smith, Ray Flynn, and Richard Daley at the State and local levels.

However, the contributions of Irish Americans go well beyond politics. In Washington, D.C., alone, James Hoban designed and supervised the construction of the White House and assisted in the construction of the Capitol; Colonel Thomas Lincoln Casey completed the construction of the Washington Monument after it had been abandoned during the Civil War; and William Wilson Corcoran founded the gallery that now bears his name.

Irish Americans have also enriched the culture of their adopted land. Whether we think of Finley Peter Dunne, who satirized politics in the early 20th century; Jimmy Breslin, who has done much the same more recently; or Eugene O’Neill, one of the great playwrights of all time, the Irish contribution to American literature is broad and deep. In the performing arts, composer George M. Cohan, dancer Gene Kelly, and actress Grace Kelly have come to symbolize America to the world.

In tribute to all Irish Americans, the Congress, by House Joint Resolution 500, has designated March 1993 as “Irish-American Heritage Month” and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this month.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim March 1993 as Irish-American Heritage Month. I urge all Americans to observe this month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this sixth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and seventeenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:34 a.m., March 8, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on March 9.

was published in the *Federal Register* on March 10.

**Proclamation 6534—To Revoke
Proclamation No. 6491 of October
14, 1992**

March 6, 1993

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

Whereas, the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1494, as amended), and the provisions of all other acts, Executive orders, proclamations, rules, regulations, or other directives providing for the payment of locally prevailing wages, which provisions are dependent upon determinations by the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act, were suspended by Proclamation No. 6491 of October 14, 1992, within specified geographic areas affected by Hurricanes Andrew and Iniki until otherwise provided;

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, do by this Proclamation revoke Proclamation No. 6491 of October 14, 1992, as to all construction contracts for which bids are opened or negotiations concluded on or after fifteen (15) days after the date of this Proclamation, whether direct Federal construction or federally assisted construction subject to Proclamation No. 6491.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this sixth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and seventeenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:21 p.m., March 8, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 8, and it

**Remarks to the Legislative
Conference of the National League
of Cities**

March 8, 1993

The President. Thank you very much, Mayor Fraser, ladies and gentlemen. It's a great honor for me to be here. This is a pretty rowdy bunch. [Laughter] A vital group, a group more interested in change than in more of the status quo, I think. I look around this audience today, and already, just walking in and looking in the crowd and saying hello to people here at the head table, I see people without whom I would not be standing here today. I thank those of both parties and those who run as independents for your support of this plan. And I say again what I always feel when I'm with a group of people from America's cities and small communities or from the States, and that is I feel very much at home.

A lot of times my friends ask me what's the difference from being President and having any other kind of job or the life you used to have. The following thing occurred to me the other day in the White House. I was down on the ground floor; I had been out running or something, and I was going back up to get ready to start the day's work. And a group of people were coming out who had been at a meeting there, at another meeting with other people. And I ran into them and stopped and shook hands with them. It was totally an impromptu thing. And this man who worked at the White House said, "Mr. President, I'm really sorry that you had to confront those people." And I said, "That's all right. I used to be one once." [Laughter] I look forward to being one again someday. [Laughter]

The work of this White House has been very much influenced by many of you in this group. And I assure you that you will be represented in the future. We have a strong intergovernmental affairs group that works every day with leaders at the city and county and State level, including Regina Montoya

and Loretta Avent, who used to work for you. [Applause] Now, we had a bet coming over here. I said, "Loretta, if I mention your name, will they boo or clap?" She won. [Laughter]

I came here today to ask you to translate the support you have given to the program I have presented to the Congress and to the American people from support to a commitment to secure its approval in the Congress and to make the change that we seek inevitable and return to the status quo impossible.

All of you are on the frontlines of change. Every day in every way you have to struggle with the things which now confront me as your President. For a long time you've been making tough choices, struggling to balance your books, trying to spend less on yesterday's mistakes and more on tomorrow's needs. You try to put common sense into practice. And now I would like you to ask to help make common sense more common here in your Nation's Capital.

I think everyone now recognizes that we cannot continue on the past course. If we keep on doing just what we've been doing with no fundamental changes, then by the end of the decade the Government's annual deficit will be \$650 billion a year. We will be spending 20 percent of our Nation's income every year on health care, and our nearest competitor will be spending about 10 percent, and we'll be insuring fewer people than any country with which we compete. And over 20 cents of every dollar the American people pay in taxes to the United States Government will be expended just paying interest on the vastly accumulated debt.

We've been spending too much and investing too little for quite a long while now. And the result has been slow growth and weak job creation. We've had our private sector handcuffed by high interest rates and inadequate investment, a work force inadequate to the needs of the 21st century and an economic program equally inadequate. If we keep on doing business as usual, we'll just stumble into the next century burdened by the baggage of the past. But if we have the courage to change, the next 20 years could be the best in our Nation's history.

When I introduced my plan to the Congress just 19 days ago, I asked all of us to

ask of this plan not what's in it for me but what's in it for us. And people have responded in astonishing ways but I suppose predictable ways if you look at the history of the American people. All across this country people have been taking off their special interest hats and putting on their thinking caps. Business and labor, Republicans and Democrats, people from every walk of life and all points on the political spectrum have rallied behind this plan as a vehicle to move this country forward. I think everybody who seriously thinks about it understands that the great issue now is no longer Republican versus Democrat, urban versus rural, liberal versus conservative. It is whether we will stay in this gridlock that you have buttons campaigning against, or have the courage to change in ways that allow all our people to live up to the fullest of their potential. Even if I start preaching, I promise not to pass the plate. [Laughter]

You would be amazed how many times in the last year I would be in a little town or along some country crossroads and people would say to me they were worried about what happened in Los Angeles. You would be amazed how many times I was in a community that was 99 percent one ethnic group and somebody would say they wished that we could work out a way for the ethnic diversity of America to be a source of our strength. You would be amazed how many times I was in groups of people, all of whom had incomes above \$150,000 a year, when they said to me, isn't there something we can do about homelessness in America. I think the people of this country are dying to come together again and make this country work again.

Nonetheless, let us be clear on this: There are people who are honestly debating whether this three-pronged plan is the right thing to do for the country. There are some who say, "Well, of course, I want you to cut spending. And as a matter of fact, if you'll cut her spending more, you could cut mine a little less." [Laughter] And there are others who say, "Well, I know you have to raise taxes, but I wish you wouldn't raise this one or that one so much. Raise the upper income taxes less," or "Do away with the energy tax," or "Put it all on gasoline," which is harder

on the rural States and the western States, “but let natural gas and oil off the hook.”

And then there are those—and I want to talk to you about them today because you are not among them, but I need your help to deal with it—who say, “Well, if you cut the spending and raise the taxes and didn’t invest any new money in anything, you’d have more deficit reduction,” or “If you cut the spending and didn’t invest any new money in anything, you wouldn’t have to raise quite so many taxes,” and “After all, if the Government spends a dollar, it’s Government spending.”

One of the central debates now raging in this Capital is whether there is any difference in the kinds of Government spending. Is there a distinction to be made between, for example, spending more for the same health care every year and accelerating the funding of the Surface Transportation Act? Is there a distinction to be made between a subsidy that was justified 50 years ago because we needed more wool in our uniforms and a subsidy that might be justified tomorrow to give to people who start new businesses and new high-tech enterprises to grow jobs for the future?

The people who say we do not need this economic stimulus plan and we do not need so much investment either argue one of two points. They either say, “All Government spending is bad, and there is no distinction to be made,” something until recent times every Republican and Democratic officeholder in America, from the top to the bottom, would have disagreed with. Dwight Eisenhower knew there was a difference between the interstate highway system and paying to maintain the status quo of Government programs that didn’t work. Everybody always recognized that distinction before, but there are a lot of people who have had a lot of sway in this town for years now who really argued that there are no distinctions to be made. There are others who say, “Well, the economy is recovering anyway and everything is going to be hunky-dory. So all you have to do is worry about reducing the deficit.” Now, their view of what we ought to do might be characterized as “Status quo-lite.” [Laughter] That is, “Yeah, I know you’ve got to change on the cutting side, and

maybe we have to have a little tax increase, but there is no distinction between kinds of Government spending. And besides, the economy is in great shape. We just don’t know it yet.” [Laughter]

Now, let’s be candid. We do have some good economic news in the aggregate. And last month, for the first time really in a very, very long time, we had a significant number of new jobs. But if you look behind those numbers, you see that while employment is edging up, an awful lot of those jobs were part-time jobs with part-time wages which rarely provide the health care benefits that families so desperately need today.

To build a stronger recovery with real jobs and rising incomes, we’ll have to break the gridlock that has paralyzed public action, cut the deficit, and invest more in the future. If you look at our economic performance over the last dozen years and you say, describe the ways in which America has not been competitive with other nations that are growing faster, and you had to list them, you just think of what you would list. You would say, well, the deficit grew more rapidly than it did in Japan, for example. And America spent a higher percentage of its income on health care than any other country in the world by far, even though we did less with it in terms of covering people.

You’d also have to say, however, our investment in the things that make a country rich and strong actually went down in several areas, in our infrastructure, in K through 12 education. Nine nations in the world invest a higher percentage of their income in K through 12 education than we do, even though we have more diversity by race and income, which would argue for greater efforts in our Nation.

If you look at the United States budget just over the last 4 years, you will see we spent more on Medicaid and Medicare and food stamps, with over 1 in 10 Americans on food stamps, and more on interest in the debt, and relatively less on everything else, the investments which would make us richer as a country, which will grow the economy, which will put people back to work, which will reduce our reliance on public assistance and increase our ability to support each other.

So I would argue to you, my fellow Americans, that we have to argue in this community where the ultimate decision will be made: number one, that we need to pass the whole program; number two, there are jobs still begging to be created out there; number three, there are differences in the quality and character of government spending, whether it is in the smallest community of this country or the United States budget. There are differences.

The stimulus plan I have asked the Congress to adopt, along with the spending cuts, the investment increase, and the tax increase itself, will create a half a million new jobs in the short run. The economic program, if it is fully enacted, will create 8 million jobs over the long run—that is, in this 4 year period—the vast majority of them in the private sector.

This plan is based on values that are central to what makes America work and what has always made America work: work and family and faith, responsibility and community and opportunity. I think the change obviously has to start at the top. I have presented a budget which in the next fiscal year will cut the White House staff by 25 percent and save \$10 million in privileges and perks and payroll. I have reduced the administrative costs of the executive branch by 14 percent over 4 years and, by attrition, payroll, 100,000 over 4 years, saving \$9 billion.

I have asked the Congress to freeze the pay of Federal employees next year and then to lower it by one percent less than would otherwise be the cost of living for the succeeding 3 years, saving billions more dollars and asking a substantial, a very substantial sacrifice from the Federal work force because I thought that was important before I could ask the taxpayers to contribute more.

And last Wednesday, I asked the Vice President to head a national performance review of every Government agency and every Government program, not simply to identify more specific spending cuts but also to identify services that don't work and things that can be done better, to do what the smartest private companies and the best local governments are already doing: streamlining operations, eliminating unnecessary layers of management, empowering frontline workers

in holding our investments up to the clear light of day to see whether they make sense.

I have proposed already 150 specific spending cuts, saving \$247 billion. And that's much more than the cost of the net new investments I have proposed. I ask you to join me now in fighting for these investments and in cutting back the spending, but not in doing one without the other.

For example, our plan calls for ending the designated project program at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It spends over \$100 million a year without any published selection criteria or competitive procedures or basic accountability. But if you join me in cutting that program, I also ask that you support what I know you believe in and what we have to say to the Congress is worth doing: doubling the number of housing vouchers for working people on moderate incomes, creating a network of community development banks, bringing new opportunities to our communities through enterprise zones, and doing something to reinvigorate the housing programs of this country. These things can be done together.

I ask you to help me reduce low-priority highway demonstration projects by \$1 billion; but also for calling in the new investments we need, we ought to fully fund the Surface Transportation Act, and do it quickly. And we should recognize that transportation offers enormous economic opportunities to increased productivity and jobs. So we have to look at mass transit, high-speed rails, smart cars, smart highways, and commercial aviation as we move toward the 21st century. If we want this economy to grow, we have to do those things.

This plan calls for cutting \$300 million in earmarked small business loans but also calls for the most dramatic effort in the history of America that I can determine, at least, from our research, to help small business create jobs: a permanent investment tax credit for small businesses, 90 percent of the employers in this country with 40 percent of the employees creating the vast majority of the new jobs; a new venture capital gains tax for people who will start new businesses and have the courage to begin being on the cutting edge of change; and real steps which we will announce in a couple of days to try

to end the credit crunch and the lack of availability of credit to small businesses who have to provide the jobs of today and tomorrow.

In short, we have to cut, and we have to invest. We have to reject trickle-down economics, and we have to reject tax-and-spend economics. We have to stop spending money on things that don't work, but we have to continue to invest in things that do.

A lot of the things that we propose to do are literally direct investment incentives to the private sector. I mentioned a couple already: the \$3 billion permanent small business investment tax credit; some significant changes in the way taxes are computed for our larger businesses so that when they do invest in new plant and new equipment and new jobs for our people, they will be rewarded, not punished, by the tax system. If people do what's right, they should be supported. We should make a distinction between how private companies spend their money. And when they invest to grow and to create jobs, they should be rewarded for that. And that's what we're trying to do in the tax system.

In addition to those things I have already mentioned, I recommended a significant increase, about \$2.5 billion—the first one in a very long time, as all of you know—in the community development block grant program. I can say with confidence as a Governor that that program was absolutely critical to helping many of the smaller and moderate-sized communities in my State attract new jobs in the tough decade of the 1980's and that without it I do not know if we would have been able to do so. There are people in this audience from my State who know that is true because they have personally experienced it. And I think that is true all across the country.

We simply cannot afford not to invest what it takes to make our communities attractive to new businesses and new jobs. And if anyone here in this community tells you that the economy is fine in America, tell them where you live there's still a little work to be done.

I want to hammer this home as hard as I can. This is the first recovery, economic recovery, in my lifetime where if you look at the overall numbers, it really does look like a recovery is underway. Productivity is

increasing. American businesses are doing a better job. A lot of things are going on, but the jobs themselves are not yet being created. And we are facing other problems which may further put pressure on some communities, including the imperative of continuing to reduce the defense budget. We have got to follow a jobs strategy. We have got to do that.

Now, one of the things that I've tried to do, as all of you know, is to reduce the deficit, because if we do we'll reduce interest rates. And if you keep interest rates down and people go out and refinance their businesses, their homes, their cars, their credit cards, they'll have more cash. They can invest it and make this economy grow. That is also happening.

Interest rates just since the election have gone down, long term, almost one full point. If we can keep them down and everybody, all of you and all of the people you represent, will go out and refinance all the debt they've piled up in the 1980's, that will free up another \$80 billion to \$90 billion to \$100 billion this next year to grow this economy. That's important, but we also have to get some real investment incentives, public and private. Unless we create jobs, we cannot claim to have done anything to promote an economic recovery that affects the lives of the people that you see on the street every day.

Let me also say, in addition to creating an economic environment in which there is investment, we also have to do what we can in common to prepare our people for those challenges. And we have to recognize the fact that, in many ways, America has not done a good job of preparing its people. Example number one, to begin with children, all the nations in this hemisphere, only two, only two, Haiti and Bolivia, have lower immunization rates against preventable childhood diseases than the United States of America, where all of the vaccine is made. Only two. We have proposed in this program, starting with the stimulus package, an effort that will permit us over the next few years to immunize all the kids in this country against preventable childhood diseases.

The estimates are that for every \$1 we spend immunizing children against those diseases, we'll save \$10 down the road in the care that will otherwise be spent on them.

But in order to make those estimates right, you have to have a critical core threshold of young children who are immunized. And we are running the risk of falling dangerously below that threshold in many areas and having new epidemics of disease break out among our children simply because we do not provide either the infrastructure in order to do that or the affordability and availability of the vaccines. We must do that.

Let me give you one other example. The Head Start program, where it is fully and firmly implemented along with other support services, plainly saves more money than it costs in the terms of keeping kids in school and making them successful, in helping them to graduate and do well. And yet for years we've all talked about fully funding the Head Start program and supporting other efforts like in-school preschool programs or parent-based preschool programs, yet we've never really done it. Congress and the previous administration did expand the Head Start program some, but there are still enormous numbers of children who are not able to access those services. This budget starting this summer fully funds the Head Start program. And we ought to pass that.

If we begin this summer and we work for the next 3 years, just think what it will be like. Wouldn't it be nice to be able to say we've actually done something so we can go and work on a new problem? Wouldn't it be nice if in the next election cycle in 1996, no one could argue about Head Start or immunization; they had to argue about something else? *[Laughter]* I mean, somebody asked me one time what my goal as President was, and I said that I'd like to leave my successor a new set of problems. *[Laughter]* You think about it.

This plan will create about 700,000 summer jobs for people in this country. And we are attempting to mobilize private sector employers to match what we're doing with the goal of creating over a million jobs. Think about it. Think about how many young people in this country have been surrounded by devastating economic conditions year in and year out for the last several years. They flip on the television, and they see another ad telling them what they ought to say no to. Well, I'm all for telling them what they ought

to say no to. But I think we should set an example and give them something to say yes to as well.

This plan will give our country the most ambitious system of lifelong learning we have ever had: programs for high school dropouts and others to learn to read adequately and get their high school equivalency; programs for young people to be able to borrow the money they need to go to college and pay it back on far more favorable terms or with service to our country here at home as police officers or teachers or in other forms of community service; programs for adults who lose their jobs because of defense cutbacks or because of sweeping changes in the global economy to get serious, serious opportunities to retrain in areas where there are jobs available, tied to incentives to getting investments for those new jobs in their communities. Not just talking about it; this plan gets serious about it. We have almost \$5 billion for the retraining of adults in the work force alone in the next 4 years in this program, and it needs to pass.

And anybody who says that this recovery will just do fine without a serious attempt to retrain the work force has not been to California lately to see what's happened in the industries where the defense cuts occurred; have not been in the rural parts of America to see what has happened when a lot of those low-wage, low-skilled, high labor-intensive manufacturing plants closed down and moved overseas with no plans to retrain or reinvest in those communities; or all the places in-between.

There is too much work to be done. We need a partnership, and it has to begin with making sure the people of this country can compete and win in the global economy. And that requires some investment. And there is a difference between whether you spend money making people stronger and smarter and safer and more secure and more able to compete, and whether you just keep spending more money on the same thing. There is a difference. And this program is different.

This plan will enable us over the next couple of years to work with you to put 100,000 more police officers on the streets of the cities of this country. There are cities which

have actually seen a reduction in the crime rate, either in specific neighborhoods or in the cities as a whole, in the last few years, cities here represented in this room, when they've gone to community policing strategies. You know it works. I know it works. And we know most cities don't have enough money to do it right. We're going to help you through giving people incentives who are coming out of the service to be police officers, through giving people incentives to be police officers as a way of paying for their college education, and through, I hope and pray, passing the crime bill, which didn't quite make it through last year, to put these police officers on the street.

One of the most remarkable aspects of this program is one that hasn't received a great deal of attention and doesn't involve you directly, but it will shape the communities you lead and govern indirectly. And that is the astonishing increase in this program in the refundable earned income tax credit for working people, not only to offset the impacts of the energy tax on families with incomes under \$30,000 but also so that we can finally say in this country, if this earned income tax credit passes as it will be presented, that if you work 40 hours a week and you have children in the home, you should not be in poverty. And the tax system will lift you out and reward work. It will reward work. Imagine it! Just imagine, politicians for years have been saying they wanted to reward work, not welfare. Now, by adopting a simple bill that says the tax system will reward work, not welfare, we can give people something new to argue about. It would be a great thing to do.

I ask for your help again. The big issue is, should we do all these things: Should we cut spending; should we raise revenues; should we increase investment so that the deficit goes down while investment goes up. This country has never tried to do this before. You've got to be fair to the Members of the United States Congress. We are asking them to do something our country has never tried to do before, which is to hammer the deficit down and increase investment significantly at the same time. But you know where you live, you can see it every day that we have to do both. We have to do both.

And so I say again in closing, I thank you for your endorsement of this program. It made me feel great. I want every Member of the United States House and Senate to know that you not only endorsed it but that you believe in it, not just because of what you get out of it but——

Audience member. What about drugs?

The President. You want to talk? I'll be glad—this program has a lot in it, actually, about drugs. It has a significant increase in funds for drug treatments and gives you, through providing 100,000 more police officers, the power to combat drugs on the street. It does both things. It increases enforcement and treatment, which I would think you would want.

But that makes a good point: Is that spending, or is that an investment? You have to decide. But you have got to give the Congress courage to do this. And you have to help people understand that in this group there were Republicans and Democrats and city people and country people, people from the frost belt and the sun belt and the rust belt and the Bible belt, people like me that have to get bigger belts every year. [Laughter] You can do that. And if we can do that, we've got a real shot to sit here in honest discussion year in and year out and face these problems.

You know, how many years have you been coming up here and listening to this debate, and it doesn't bear any relationship to the life you live when you go back home? How many, really? I mean, whether it's a discussion about drugs where somebody just talks about getting tough on crime and nobody ever gets down to what they're going to do to help you deal with the problem where you live; or jobs, and somebody rails against taxes and the deficit, and then every year the deficit goes up and so do taxes. Or just how many years have you been coming here listening to these debates when nothing ever changed?

And I just want to tell you, as I said to the Congress, there is plenty of blame to go around; this is not about party. And I don't care who is to blame. I'm prepared to take responsibility. I'm more than willing to face the heat, and if something goes wrong, I'll take responsibility for that and change it. But let's do something, and let's do it now.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:15 p.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to Donald M. Fraser, Mayor of Minneapolis, MN, and president of the National League of Cities; Regina Montoya, Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs; and Loretta Avent, Special Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With the Congressional Black Caucus

March 8, 1993

Spending Cuts

Q. Mr. President, do you agree with the extra \$50 billion in cuts that the House and Senate leaders want?

The President. I agree that we will have a budget resolution which will be roughly conforming to the reestimates of the CBO in general terms. And that will still contain the investment strategy that I wanted to do.

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:11 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Announcement of Nomination for Eight Sub-Cabinet Posts

March 8, 1993

The President continued the process of filling the sub-Cabinet today, expressing his intent to nominate eight senior officials at the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Housing and Urban Development and at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations. Named today were:

Michael Stegman, Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development

Everett Ehrlich, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce

Eugene Moos, Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, Department of Agriculture

Richard Rominger, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture

Wardell Townsend, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture

Francis Vacca, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of Agriculture

Victor Marrero, U.S. Representative to the Economic and Security Council, United Nations

Karl F. (Rick) Indefurth, U.S. Alternative for Special Political Affairs, United Nations

“The people I am asking to serve in my administration today combine academic achievement with real world experience,” said the President. “I am particularly pleased to be naming two family farmers to help run the Department of Agriculture.”

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

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With the Senate Budget Committee

March 9, 1993

Q. Mr. President, are you going for non-military domestic spending cuts across the board?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say I think both the Senate and the House committees deserve a lot of credit. They've come forward with further spending reductions consistent with what the CBO group calculations would indicate. They are consistent with the direction of my plan to reduce the deficit and increase investment. And I think that eventually all the committees will get together, and the two bodies will get together, and we will work out a budget that the American people can be proud of that does the things that we're all trying to do. I'm encouraged by it.

Q. So you are going to accept the across-the-board cuts?

The President. We haven't worked out the details on how it's going to be done. The two committees have slightly different positions, as you probably know. But I think that in the end there will be further cuts and there will be, I'm convinced, a much more substantial reduction in the deficit than the estimates show. I feel good about it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 9:17 a.m. in the Old Family Dining Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With President François Mitterrand of France

March 9, 1993

Russia

Q. Mr. President, are you going to accept Russia into the G-7 and hold an emergency summit meeting of heads of state involved also on the economy?

President Clinton. Well, I intend to discuss the Russian situation with President Mitterrand today. And obviously, whatever the United States does, we hope it will be part of a coordinated effort. But in terms of mechanics, no decision has been made.

Q. Do you think a compromise is possible on a special meeting of the G-7, discussing maybe Russia and the economy both together?

President Clinton. I don't think it's a—we're at a point even to make that decision yet. As you know, the Japanese have been somewhat reluctant to have any kind of special meeting, looking toward their own meeting they're hosting in Tokyo this summer. But I think that we will—let me say this, I think we will all, the G-7, be dealing with the issue of Russia before July in some form or fashion. How that will happen, I can't say yet. That's one of the reasons I was looking forward to this meeting with President Mitterrand.

Q. Did President Nixon talk you into talking Japan out of opposing Russia's participation?

President Clinton. No, we had a great meeting. But we were pretty much on the

same wavelength. And we have been pretty much on the same wavelength on this issue for more than a year now. And he gave me a lot of very good ideas. It was a good meeting.

Q. So you forgive him for Watergate?

President Clinton. Is there another round?

Q. The French.

President Clinton. Now, Mr. President, it's your turn. I'm going to smile and look wise. [Laughter]

Q. Did you have a good trip?

President Mitterrand. All is well.

Q. How's the first contact going?

President Mitterrand. As you can see, you will know later.

Q. Do you speak some French, Mr. President?

President Clinton. No, but I understand a little. I can pick up the questions a little.

Q. What's the first order of business with President Mitterrand?

President Clinton. Well, we want to get acquainted and talk about some matters of mutual concerns. We'll discuss that later.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:35 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With President François Mitterrand of France

March 9, 1993

President Clinton. Good afternoon. It is a great pleasure for me to welcome President Mitterrand to the White House at this early date in our administration.

Our two nations share a friendship which dates back to the revolutionary birth of both countries, rooted in common values of equality, liberty, and democracy. These bonds of culture, of history, and of common purpose have made possible a remarkable amount of cooperation in recent days in meeting the challenges in Iraq and Somalia and Bosnia.

Today President Mitterrand and I discussed the global partnership that we must bring to the post-cold-war world, new uncertainties and new opportunities. Both our nations and both our continents are renewing institutions of security and economic growth for this era.

I salute President Mitterrand and the French people for their leadership. Their exemplary contribution to the United Nations peacekeeping operations around the globe is just one of many examples of the contributions they have and will continue to make.

This morning we discussed Russia, Bosnia, and the progress toward European union. Over lunch we will discuss other issues including the Uruguay round of trade talks. We have differences on some issues. Clearly, we need French leadership to resolve some outstanding differences but also to make common cause in the areas in which we agree.

Both our nations are great trading nations and have much to gain by resolving the differences between us and moving the world toward a growing global economy. I am very, very hopeful that the United States and France can be partners in updating our common interests and in leading the G-7 toward coordinated policies of global economic growth and especially toward action in dealing with Russia.

President Mitterrand is going to Russia soon, and he will be there and back before I have an opportunity to meet with President Yeltsin in April in Canada. I look forward to closely consulting with him about that again after his trip to Russia.

We talked a little bit about the Vance-Owen peace process today, and you might want to ask President Mitterrand about his views on that. Let me say that I have been very pleased with the comments that he has made today and with the possibilities that we might have toward working together to secure a peace in Bosnia.

There are many challenges facing the great democracies of the world today. We have to reaffirm our support for the difficult transformations to democracy now taking place in the former Soviet Union and in central and eastern Europe, to reaffirm our interest in closely cooperating to advance peace in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world, and

to promote democracy and economic growth throughout the world.

We made a very good beginning this morning, and I want to publicly thank the President, as I have privately, for the enormously helpful conversations we had this morning. He has been at this work longer than I have by several years. I learned a lot today. I appreciated his candor and the insights which he brought to our discussion. I look forward to continuing over lunch and to continue a long and significant relationship between the United States and France.

And I thank you, Mr. President. And the microphone is yours.

President Mitterrand. Ladies and gentlemen, I think everything that needs to be said has been said. At least everything has been said about what we talked about and about what we will be talking about during the time that remains for our meeting. So I haven't really anything to add, while waiting for questions that you may wish to ask.

On the other hand, I would like to recall, just as President Clinton has just done, I'd like to recall that for Frenchmen it's always a very important moment, it's a real event, and it's a very happy moment to be coming to Washington in order to meet with the President of the United States of America. And so it is with the same keen interest that today I'm here in this capital city in order to meet a President whose fame has already encompassed the world several times but whom I'd never met.

And now we have had useful conversations. And the subjects that we've talked about, as mentioned by President Clinton, these subjects have given us the opportunity of seeing that our positions were very similar. And it is pleasant to note, particularly as the subjects are very difficult subjects, Bosnia, former Yugoslavia, the revolution that is taking place in Russia and in all the countries of the former Soviet Union, and all this is very important.

President Clinton has shown a keen interest in the future of the European unity. And I gave him my feelings and what I was committed to myself. We still have matters to talk about. There are interests of which oppose us, which is perfectly natural, between our countries. That's in the nature of things.

But there is a real determination to reach agreement. And that is, I think, which is the leitmotiv of all our conversations. And I'm delighted with the hospitality extended to me. I appreciate this very warmly, very much.

And I wish to express my warm thanks, at the same time, to the members of the press who have been good enough to be present here today. Now, I am at your disposal, as you are, doubtless, yourself, Mr. President, at the disposal of the curiosity of the ladies and gentlemen of the press. I'm sure they'll be very discreet. They won't ask much.

Bosnia

Q. President Clinton, did you discuss at all the specifics of a possible American contribution of ground troops in the enforcement phase of a peace agreement in Bosnia?

President Clinton. Only in the most general terms. I restated the position of the administration, which is now well-known in the public, that we were opposed to the introduction of American ground forces to try to mandate an agreement or to in any way engage in the present conflict, but that if an agreement could be reached, that the United States would be interested in being part of a United Nations effort to secure the agreement.

Q. Mr. President, you said that both of you have reached some sort of agreements on new efforts in Bosnia. Can you tell us what they are?

President Clinton. No.

Q. And also, I would like to ask President Mitterrand how can European leaders ban the slaughter, in view of the lead-up to World War I and World War II, similarities of the hatreds and abuses that have led now to these conflicts?

President Clinton. Shall I go first? The only agreement we made with regard to Bosnia was that it would be an error for France to increase its troops or for the United States to introduce troops to become embroiled in the conflict but that we both should be prepared to make our contributions to securing the agreement if the Vance-Owen process could produce one.

President Mitterrand. Madam, no more than you do, we just do not accept violence, violence of any kind, the violence that is tak-

ing place in particular in Bosnia. A problem for us—and we have the responsibility of defining the policies of our countries—our problem is to know how, by what means, what means do we have and what means should we employ in order to get the results that we all want, which is peace or at least the end of violence.

And in that respect, may I remind you that France is participating in the United Nations efforts. France is actually the country that is at present supplying the most numerous troops, military contribution to the U.N. efforts, more than—well, almost 5,000 men right now. And we already have lost 12 people killed and more than 100 wounded.

Our position is very simple to express but, of course, difficult to implement. We approve the Vance-Owen plan. We want it to be successful. We see in what way it is not perfect, but this instrument, well, we know of none better. And as it is the best of the possible plans, right now, as of today, we support the Vance-Owen plan, and we want it to be the basis of an agreement.

So if it does succeed, if it gets the agreement of the three parties concerned—one might almost say four parties or five even—in other words, if you include the three countries which are Croatia, Serbia, and Bosnia, but there are also the Serbs in Bosnia and perhaps the Croats in Bosnia, et cetera. So if the agreement is reached—and for the moment it is under discussion, as you know, as a whole series of discussions that are taking place and will take place, and I'll have occasion to take part in them myself in the next few days. And the purpose of all these discussions is to get the Owen-Vance plan accepted, agreed. If it is agreed, thanks to discussions and possibly modifications, but if it ends up by being agreed, accepted, then we think that immediately it will be necessary to set up without the transition taking too long—and if it could be immediate transition, it would be even better—we think we must ensure military presence in order to ensure the full respect for the agreements reached, so that the passions and local animosities should not immediately prevail. And in that respect, France is prepared to participate in this force of peace under the authority of the United Nations.

Russia

Q. [*Inaudible*—have an emergency meeting of the G-7 sometime before the July summit in order to deal at the clinical level the question of Russian aid? And, if not, how do you propose breaking what seems to be the gridlock between the Russian Government and the international lending institutions?

President Clinton. The short answer to your question, I suppose, is yes. I think it is entirely possible that such a meeting might be useful. Whether a meeting is possible or not depends in part on the response of the other members of the G-7. The Japanese, as you know, have territorial disputes outstanding and also have put a lot into the upcoming meeting in July. Perhaps there is some other way that we can engage the G-7 in trying to address the Russian situation.

I guess the important point I'd like to make is, I don't believe we can wait until July for the major countries of the world who care about what happens in Russia and who would like very much to keep political and economic reform on track there to move. And President Mitterrand is going to Moscow, and then we'll talk when he gets back. Then I'm going to Canada. And at the conclusion of that meeting, if not before, I will try to move to mobilize others to act in this regard whether or not it is possible to have a formal G-7 meeting.

Bosnia

Q. Did you get the impression that President Clinton would be prepared to, in fact, move in, in former Yugoslavia once an agreement is reached?

President Mitterrand. Yes, well, he has just expressed himself on this a moment ago. He said that he did not want to engage in a military campaign on the basis of a disagreement among the parties concerned. And that is exactly the same position as France.

But the President also indicated that he was prepared to examine the possibility of having an American presence in the framework of all the steps that will be taken for the implementation of an agreement, once an agreement is reached, if the agreement is reached.

Russia

Q. Did you specifically talk about Russia?

President Mitterrand. Well, I am glad you asked me the question, too, because it was already a question for President Clinton. I'm in favor of what you are suggesting, an earlier G-7. I think it's even necessary, because there are problems specifically in Eastern Europe and in Russia that are urgent, quite apart from many other problems. I also know about the Japanese opposition to the idea. Perhaps Japan is not having sufficient regard in this respect to the importance of events that are taking place mainly in Europe. I have already given my agreement to Mr. Delors anyway.

Middle East Peace Talks

Q. Did you discuss with the French President at all the Middle East peace process? And are you optimistic, for the next round of talks, that Syria comes to an agreement with Israel?

President Clinton. We have not discussed the Middle East yet. We will over lunch. Yes, I am hopeful.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, may I ask, regarding your health care reform, now that you're so deeply involved in trying to find more budget cuts, what is your expectation for when you would start seeing some savings from health reform? And should Americans expect that they will have to settle for reduced core benefits unless they can pay more, of course—

President Clinton. No.

Q. —for some sort of reduced services in order to achieve these savings?

President Clinton. No, I don't necessarily accept that. Of course, we have 400 people working on this now and consulting widely with all the people involved in the health care issue.

Let me answer your first question pointedly. I believe, under all the scenarios I have seen that I think are possible, we would see immediate savings in the private sector if we were to adopt a comprehensive health care reform package. That is, private employers and employees would see the rate of their insurance premium increases drop rather dramatically and there would be really sig-

nificant savings immediately in the private sector.

Because those savings in the public sector would have to be used to provide some insurance at least to the unemployed uninsured, who are about 30 percent of the total population of uninsured—at least to them—it might take 4 years or so before we would start seeing significant taxpayer savings. But interestingly enough, that's about the time we need it. That is, if you look at all the scenarios, the deficit can be brought down under our plan for 4 years, and then if health care costs are not brought under control, it will start up again in the latter part of this decade. So we certainly believe that the health care plan would bring the deficit down virtually to zero over the next 8 to 10 years.

Now, will people have to accept a lower quality of health care? I just dispute that entirely. We're already spending 30 percent more of our income than any country in the world. I don't think that—

Steel Subsidies

Q. Yesterday the United States imposed some tithes, additional tithes on some products of steel. The argument is that the subsidies are unfair. But the other side says that the subsidies are not unfair. What is the middle ground? What do you think can be negotiated? And, also, I would like to hear the response of President Mitterrand.

President Clinton. First of all, I want to make it very clear that the steel case was a case which was made on the basis of the facts, and waiting for me when I took office as President and waiting for our Trade Ambassador. So the real question was whether we would act consistent with the work that had been done before we took office, based on the evidence that had been amassed then. And we decided that we had to proceed with that to provide the continuity of the enforcement of our trade laws.

I think the ultimate resolution of all these things is to continue to work for a more open trading system. I am strongly committed to a successful completion of the Uruguay round this year and to taking other measures which will open markets all around the world and reduce trade barriers. And I'm going to do everything I can to be instrumental in that

regard. In order to get there, every nation has to have some mechanism to protect itself if there is uneven treatment. And we'll always have factual arguments about what is even and uneven, but I think the key is, are we moving toward a more open trading system or not?

International Arms Sales

Q. How can we stop wars as long as the United States permits the sale of arms around the world by our CIA agents and by bringing in arms from China? And now, faced with the proposition from the Soviet—Russia that we let them sell conventional arms around the world to aid their economy, how can we get wars to stop under those conditions?

President Clinton. I think both of us should answer that question. President Mitterrand will be the company misery loves on that question. [Laughter]

I believe the United States has an obligation to try to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to slow the proliferations of weapons generally throughout the world. It is not a simple or an easy thing to do. And our ability to do it is limited by the sovereignty of other nations and by the policies they pursue. But I can assure you just since I have been in office, and on more than one occasion, I have done what I could within the means available to me to try to limit proliferation, and I will continue to do that.

Since you brought up Russia, let me say again, one of the reasons I think it is so important for us to try to move aggressively to give the Russians the means to restore some economic growth and opportunity and preserve political liberty is that as other options close to them, they will be more and more and more forced to look upon their capacity to sell arms as the only way they can earn foreign currency, the only way they can keep the economy going, the only way they can keep a lot of their factories open. So I think the case you have made and the question is a powerful argument for the policies we are attempting to undertake with Russia.

Mr. President.

President Mitterrand. Well, I might simply recall to the lady who spoke that it was

in Paris at the end of an international conference—well, it was the largest ever number of participants. It was in Paris, then, that there was the signature of the convention on the prohibition of chemical and biological weapons; furthermore, that France has always approved the various plans for limiting nuclear weaponry signed between the United States of America and the Soviet Union in the past and more recently with Russia. And France took the initiative of stopping nuclear testing precisely in order to give everyone time to reconsider the possibility of bringing them to a definitive end, with the end of over-armaments in this area.

So I think that there is a very favorable ground here. The reduction of armaments, though, can only be conceived with the ending of sales of armaments. This can only be conceived in the framework of an international negotiation. No country otherwise could afford to place itself in a situation of danger, in fact, if the other countries don't do likewise and make the same effort. But we're certainly prepared to move ahead in this direction.

Trade

Q. Mr. President, you heard President Clinton and his administration in recent months challenging Europe on steel, on agriculture, on civil aircraft. I know that that part of your discussion will be for lunch, but what is your viewpoint?

President Mitterrand. Well, we decided to talk about this later on, so it's difficult for me to accelerate things all alone just of my own accord. I can't jump the gun. But President Clinton probably knows as much as you do about my frame of mind and the frame of mind of France, in this respect, which can be summed up in a word: international negotiations of GATT is trade negotiation so as to eliminate protectionism, precisely. And it's an overall comprehensive negotiation, global negotiation which doesn't touch all sectors but many, many sectors and, therefore, not only farming and agriculture.

If one, therefore, looks at the discussion solely from the point of view of agriculture, then it can't work. If, however, it is looked at in the form of a balanced negotiation, covering the various sectors that are involved,

of industries, services, intellectual property, and so on, then there's no reason not to be able to succeed. And in that respect, what France wants is that there should be a success of this, because I share the view expressed by President Clinton a moment ago which is that it is better we will be able to succeed in this respect, then the sooner we will get out of the present recession, the present crisis, the present problems. But at the same time, we mustn't isolate and separate off subjects and just deal with them piecemeal. No, we mustn't do that, which is what happens only too often nowadays.

Spending Cuts

Q. Several questions have been raised by your agreement to cut spending further here. First among them is why you've agreed to general budget cuts without the specifics when you have for so long been demanding specifics of others who wanted to cut the budget further. Also, Senator Sasser said outside that while you have not agreed to necessarily \$90 billion in further cuts, that is about as far, he suggested, that you feel they could go without harming the economy. Is that the case, that \$90 billion is it and no more suggestions need be made?

President Clinton. There are two different questions there. First of all, in this budget resolution there is an attempt to deal by both the Senate and the House Budget Committees, an honest attempt to deal with the so-called reestimates of the Congressional Budget Office; that is, to get even more deficit reduction. And I believe it will produce far more than we even estimate. They have to decide to get the budget resolution passed by category. But I assure you that we will be very specific before the process is over.

It is true that I think that we have cut the deficit in a 4-year period about as much as we should with these new numbers. But that doesn't mean we don't need more specifics, because we have to define how we're going to cut. And since I also strongly believe we have to increase our investments in education and training and in new technologies and in the things which will make our economy grow, it means we need all the suggestions we can get about other places we can

cut the budget, and we will need to do that until the budget is finally passed.

So I strongly support that. The Vice President, as you know, is heading the performance review audit of the entire Federal Government. And the more specific suggestions we can come up with that everyone agrees with, the fewer controversial and potentially damaging cuts we'll have.

Let me just make the economic argument. Our deficit reduction package—and Senator after Senator said today, you know, that this is the most credible budget I've seen in 15 or 17 or however many years—it is producing the desired results: low interest rates, stock market back up and doing well.

We have to deal with that against a backdrop of a Europe that's had slow growth, Japan with some serious economic problems and no political consensus about what to do about it in Japan. So we want to do what our European and Japanese friends have been telling us for years we should do, get our deficit under control. But we want to do it at a moderate pace so that we don't throw the United States back into recession and further complicate the economic problems of Europe, which will be helped by a growing American economy. So I think we've struck the right balance, and that was the point I was making to them.

Middle East Peace Talks

Q. President Clinton, concerning the Middle East, you said that your country intends to play the role of a full partner in the peace process. How do you intend to translate this? And what would you tell Israeli Prime Minister Rabin when you receive him next week so that to resume the talks, especially concerning the Palestinian deportees?

President Clinton. Well, I think that what we mean by a full partnership was evidenced by the fact that the Secretary of State's first trip abroad was to the Middle East and that he made aggressive efforts there to try to get the talks back on track and to involve as many parties as possible. In terms of what I will tell Prime Minister Rabin when he comes back, I won't say anything I haven't said in public about the deportee issue or anything else. We are working together. I feel comfortable and confident that he very much

wants the peace process back on track, and I will support that.

Civil Aircraft Agreement

Q. What specific revisions do you want in the agreement on civil aircraft? And are you prepared to abrogate last year's agreement?

President Clinton. No, no, absolutely not. I think to some extent my remarks in that regard have been misunderstood, and they may be my fault. I support last year's agreement. The point I was trying to make is this: The United States had a big lead in civilian aircraft. Arguably, it was contributed to by the massive investments we made in defense and the spinoff benefits. That was always the European argument for their own direct subsidies in the airbus program, that we had indirectly done the same thing through defense.

It costs a great deal of money to develop new aircraft, to break into new markets, and to go forward. The argument I was trying to make to the Boeing workers last week, and I will restate it here, is that the adversity they have suffered in the market is through no fault of their own. That is, they have not failed by being unproductive or lazy or asking for too much but that Europe was able to penetrate this market because of the airbus policy. And the blame I placed was on our Government for not responding, not Europe's for trying to get in. That was their right; it was legal under international law, and they did it. Now, we chose instead to try to convince them to stop doing as much as they were doing, which produced the agreement to which you just alluded. I strongly support that agreement. I do not want it abrogated; I want it enforced.

My policy now on this—and I don't want to prejudge the work that the commission we're about to appoint—Congress is going to pass a bill in the next few days—we're going to appoint a commission on the future of our commercial airlines company and our airline manufacturers. I don't want to prejudge that, but my policy basically has two points: Number one, the agreement must be honored and strictly adhered to. And, number two, the agreement leaves the United States as well as Europe the opportunity to significantly invest in the development of

new technologies for new generations of aircraft, and we have to take that opportunity in order to be competitive. And I appreciate your asking the question because it gives me the opportunity to clarify my position.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's fifth news conference began at 12:20 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. President Mitterrand spoke in French, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Nuclear Cooperation With EURATOM

March 9, 1993

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

The United States has been engaged in nuclear cooperation with the European Community for many years. This cooperation was initiated under agreements that were concluded over 3 decades ago between the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and that extend until December 31, 1995. Since the inception of this cooperation, the Community has adhered to all its obligations under those agreements.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 amended the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish new nuclear export criteria, including a requirement that the United States have a right to consent to the reprocessing of fuel exported from the United States. Our present agreements for cooperation with EURATOM do not contain such a right. To avoid disrupting cooperation with EURATOM, a proviso was included in the law to enable continued cooperation until March 10, 1980, if EURATOM agreed to negotiations concerning our cooperation agreements. EURATOM agreed in 1978 to such negotiations.

The law also provides that nuclear cooperation with EURATOM can be extended on an annual basis after March 10, 1980, upon determination by the President that failure to cooperate would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of U.S. non-proliferation objectives or otherwise jeopardize the common defense and security and after

notification to the Congress. President Carter made such a determination 13 years ago and signed Executive Order No. 12193, permitting nuclear cooperation with EURATOM to continue until March 10, 1981. President Reagan made such determinations in 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1988, and signed Executive Orders Nos. 12295, 12351, 12409, 12463, 12506, 12554, 12587, and 12629 permitting nuclear cooperation to continue through March 10, 1989. President Bush made such determinations in 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992, and signed Executive Orders Nos. 12670, 12706, 12753, and 12791 permitting nuclear cooperation to continue through March 10, 1993.

In addition to numerous informal contacts, the United States has engaged in frequent talks with EURATOM regarding the renegotiation of the U.S.-EURATOM agreements for cooperation. Talks were conducted in November 1978, September 1979, April 1980, January 1982, November 1983, March 1984, May, September, and November 1985, April and July 1986, September 1987, September and November 1988, July and December 1989, February, April, October, and December 1990, and September 1991. Formal negotiations on a new agreement were held in April, September, and December 1992 and are expected to continue this year.

I believe that it is essential that cooperation between the United States and the Community continue, and likewise, that we work closely with our allies to counter the threat of proliferation of nuclear explosives. Not only would a disruption of nuclear cooperation with EURATOM eliminate any chance of progress in our negotiations with that organization related to our agreements, it would also cause serious problems in our overall relationships. Accordingly, I have determined that failure to continue peaceful nuclear cooperation with EURATOM would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of U.S. non-proliferation objectives and would jeopardize the common defense and security of the United States. I therefore intend to sign an Executive order to extend the waiver of the application of the relevant export cri-

terion of the Atomic Energy Act for an additional 12 months from March 10, 1993.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

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

Executive Order 12840—Nuclear Cooperation With EURATOM

March 9, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including section 126a(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2155(a)(2)), and having determined that, upon the expiration of the period specified in the first proviso to section 126a(2) of such Act and extended for 12-month periods by Executive Orders Nos. 12193, 12295, 12351, 12409, 12463, 12506, 12554, 12587, 12629, 12670, 12706, 12753, and 12791, failure to continue peaceful nuclear cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of United States non-proliferation objectives and would otherwise jeopardize the common defense and security of the United States, and having notified the Congress of this determination, I hereby extend the duration of that period to March 10, 1994. Executive Order No. 12791 shall be superseded on the effective date of this Executive order.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 9, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., March 10, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on March 11.

Announcement of Nomination for Eight Sub-Cabinet Posts

March 9, 1993

The President made eight senior personnel announcements today, expressing his intention to nominate a group of experts from around the country to posts at the Departments of Agriculture, Education, and Housing and Urban Development.

Named today were the following:

Department of Agriculture

James Gilliland, General Counsel

James Lyons, Assistant Secretary (Natural Resources and Environment)

Bob Nash, Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development

Department of Education

Judith Heumann, Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Dr. Augusta Kappner, Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education

Dr. Thomas Payzant, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education

Dr. Marshall Smith, Under Secretary

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Nicolas Retsinas, Assistant Secretary (Federal Housing Commission)

“I am committed to bringing people into the Federal Government who’ve made a difference in States and communities around the country,” said the President. “This is a group of people who truly meet that standard.”

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

Remarks Announcing the Initiative to Alleviate the Credit Crunch

March 10, 1993

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Secretary Bentsen, other members of the Cabinet and distinguished Members of the House and Senate of both parties, and the business men and women and the bankers who are here today.

I am in debt to many people in this room and throughout this country who raised to me in many ways, over the 16 months in which I was engaged in the campaign for the Presidency, the question of the credit crunch. From the beginnings of that campaign in New Hampshire, across the country to Illinois and Michigan, down to Florida, across to California, and in all points in between, I repeatedly ran into small-business men and women, I repeatedly met bankers themselves who said they wished that something could be done to open up credit again to creditworthy loans, to generate jobs in the private sector.

Today we are taking a step to speed the economic recovery that will increase jobs by increasing access to credit for the main engine of our economy, small and medium-sized businesses. At the same time, by strengthening our banking system, our plan will move us beyond the banking problems of the last decade. The initiative avoids the regulatory excess and duplication we've seen and focuses on real risks within our financial institutions and on fair lending, equal opportunity, and credit availability.

Every day, small business is a big part of all of our lives. It's the coffee shop on the corner, the florist down the street, the stationery store that carries office supplies, the dry cleaner, the contractor who will remodel a kitchen. Many are businesses with fewer than 100 employees. Many more employ fewer than 20 people. But they keep communities and neighborhoods vibrant and vital. They are the industry in a cottage, in a garage, in a spare bedroom. They are downtown in every town, and sometimes they grow into very large enterprises indeed.

Small business includes small farms, the agricultural community. Their contribution is evident every day on our tables. But it is

much more. They are the cultivators of an essential part of our history, our heritage, our culture. Small business is also high tech, the industries of tomorrow, from computer software to communications, to biotechnology and environmental testing, all enterprises that create high-wage, high-skill jobs for Americans today, and they will be there tomorrow.

And small business has been the route to a better life for immigrants who set up a family business, for men and women who save as they work for others until they can venture off on their own. Often a small business is actually an outgrowth of the global economy. As larger firms downsize to remain competitive, they contract out to smaller firms. And many talented people who once worked for large companies are now going off on their own to seize opportunities in smaller enterprises, building businesses for themselves.

Owning one's own business is a cornerstone of the American dream, fortified by hard work, determination, and creativity. My first experience in life with business was in my grandfather's little grocery store. He was the symbol of hope and opportunity to many people with whom he dealt in many ways, 6 days a week at all hours of the day and night.

Today's small businesses are a barometer of the economic recovery. And as the strength of this recovery has been diluted by the inability to create jobs, it is clear that it's largely because small companies are still having a hard time. If you look at this chart here, you can see the number of small-business failures, just since 1985: 119,000 in '85-'86; 118,000 the next year; 111,000 in the next 2-year period; but in '91-'92, almost 185,000 small-business failures.

These businesses have been hit especially hard by the recession and by a problem not of their own making that can be summarized by two fearsome but now well-worn words: credit crunch. Small companies are simply unable in too many cases to get loans from banks. And I want to show this—they turned it, and I didn't see—if you look here, the growth in commercial and industrial loans, '85-'86, in billions of dollars; and the last 2 years, down to a negative \$36 billion. Now, if these businesses can't begin or expand or

try new ventures, that means stagnation for our economy, lost opportunity, and sometimes ruin for entrepreneurs. Indeed, I've met business people in this country in the last year and a half who've never missed a payment on a loan and still had the loans canceled.

These problems are America's problems. When small businesses aren't prospering, they create fewer jobs, and that means fewer jobs for America. If you look at this last chart, you will see the real essence of why this has turned out to be, so far, a jobless recovery. In '85-'86, there was a positive change in small-business employment of 2.4 million; '87-'88, 2.8 million; '89-'90, 3.2 million; but down in '91-'92, 400,000. Now, in every year of the 1980's the Fortune 500 companies have reduced employment by several hundred thousand people a year in the United States. But all during the eighties that reduction was more than offset by the creation of new jobs in the small-business sector, until the last couple of years.

If you had to put in a sentence why this has been a jobless recovery, it's because small-business job creation hasn't offset big-business job losses. And that is the central challenge we face. As we take advantage of the incredible things going on now in the big- and small-business sector with productivity increases, with the aggregate indications that we're in an economic recovery, we have to look for ways, all of us together, to try to help to spur small business and medium-size business job growth so that we can put some jobs back into these impressive economic figures of the last quarter.

Nearly two-thirds of all of our workers are employed by small businesses. And as I said, millions of jobs in the last decade were created by them, even as larger employers were downsizing, contracting out, or moving employment offshore. We cannot afford not to try to resume this trend in the 1990's. We know that if we create a reliable and secure system of credit for America's small businesses, they'll create jobs for Americans and profits for themselves. That's why we have offered incentives like investment tax credits for small employers, the new business capital gains tax, urban enterprise zones, and a net-

work of small business community development banks.

In our country you can become successful if you have a better idea that you can turn into reality. But that reality can only occur if credit is available, for most Americans. And we think we have a better idea for getting lenders and creditworthy borrowers together. What we propose does not involve any changes in legislation. These steps can be taken quickly because they have been agreed to already by the four Federal bank and thrift regulatory agencies: the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of Thrift Supervision. Today I'll outline the basics of the plan, but the four bank and thrift regulators are issuing a joint inter-agency policy statement today that sets out more of the details. It will be available to all of you, and most of you will understand it. *[Laughter]* I don't know if I left the implication that I didn't. *[Laughter]*

What we have done, first of all, is to reexamine our examination system, a system that bankers often felt has become too excessive in the wake of the banking and savings and loan failures of the eighties. With this plan our examiners will be directed to do what they do best and not to spend endless hours on pointless paperwork. It will strengthen our oversight by shifting our regulatory attention from unproductive and repetitive procedures, redirecting our resources to better use so that bank examiners will be able to seek out the real risks in today's environment. They'll go after bad loans and troubled banks. That means improved safety and soundness. But they will reduce the credit crunch because they will reduce attention to things that do not deserve them.

We will not, I will say again, we will not reduce attention to important regulation or to proper reserves for problem loans. The plan will not lower the capital requirements established in accordance with international standards. It will not cause a single bank to fail. And it will not cost the deposit insurance funds one dollar.

Through a proper allocation of our regulatory resources, we will be able to focus more on examination procedures to further meaningful compliance with the Community

Reinvestment Act and to promote fair opportunities for all of our people while reducing the hassles for all creditworthy loans.

Above all, borrowers can go to their banks expecting fair and equal treatment and a reasonable application process. Fairness is a goal for many good reasons, including the fact that women and other minorities have been very bullish for small business and for America. Female-owned companies now employ 11½ million Americans.

A side effect of the savings and loan disaster was a reaction that forced many banks into a thinking mode that didn't distinguish between a good risk and a bad risk where small businesses were concerned. They were afraid to. This was a problem, especially for community bankers who frequently had to decide whether they could loan money to other members in their own community. Even if a banker could personally vouch that an applicant was a person of good character with an unblemished credit record and a good business track record, a loan might still be turned down because the banker felt his hands were tied by tight restrictions.

So while we ask bankers to give the small-business men and women credit, we'll give the bankers some credit too, as they consider loans to small and medium-size companies in their own communities and neighborhoods. They'll be encouraged to use their judgment to determine whether a borrower is creditworthy. And we're telling bankers that as long as their institutions and their practices are sound, they shouldn't be afraid of the regulator. If they disagree with a decision by a regulator, they'll now have a recourse, a workable and prompt appeals process.

To bankers across the Nation we say, you are a pillar of our neighborhoods and communities. We know the demands of rebounding from the last decade have often been painful for many of you. Your comeback has been nothing short of amazing. But there is more work to do. And we need you to get it done. And if it gets done, there will be something to show for it, the kind of broad-based economic growth that benefits all of us.

And we further say to bankers across the land that if you make sensible loans, the Gov-

ernment should not come down on you. That's why we're taking this action today. We want bankers to get back into the business of lending money, and we're going to work with them to make it happen.

We're also making clear that taking collateral as part of a business loan should not be so burdensome or costly to discourage borrowers or lenders from making sound credit decisions. Often the only collateral a would-be borrower can offer is real estate. Of course, we learned the hard way in the eighties that we had to be careful where loans involving commercial real estate are concerned. But care has been confused with regulatory excess that has been too much of a burden for everyone. The changes we propose will strike a balance so that we can have both safety and credit availability.

These changes will also address the paper crunch in getting a small business loan. It simply shouldn't be as burdensome to get a \$25,000 loan as it is to get a \$25 million loan. It makes no sense for a small or medium-sized business borrower, or for an individual for that matter, to be required in every case to produce a pile of paper like this one—pretty thick—when a loan can be made safely in many cases, particularly by banks who have demonstrated judgment in their business practices, with merely a promissory note and a financial statement and possibly a short credit application like this.

So under the current system, the paperwork—and I expect every one of you to come back and show me your measured envelopes here. We've got to prove that the difference is what we're asserting it is today. *[Laughter]* Under the current system, the paperwork is often daunting to the applicant and discourages banks from making smaller loans. Streamlining the process will make it easier to free up credit without compromising security. This is action that everyone, conscientious regulators, community-conscious banks, and growing businesses, can embrace.

With this approach we want to marry the ingredients for a thriving business climate. Right now banks are healthier than they've been in years; 1990 was a record year for bank profitability. And these profits have

been used to put banks in the strongest position they've been in, in a quarter of a century. At the same time, interest rates have gone down. Just 3 years ago the average interest rate on a small-business loan was 12 percent. So far the average is 8 percent. The climate for business ventures has been made even sunnier by economic growth that we've seen in the last quarter. That's a byproduct of the optimism for the growth that we are pressing for now with all the economic initiatives that are before the Congress and the country.

So both supply and demand for business loans are there. And would-be small-business owners are right to feel they have the wind at their backs. Now that we have banks in the strongest positions they've been in in a quarter century, they ought to be able to give us the strongest economic boost we've had for small business in a quarter century. Until now the problem has been that everyone has had to face a 10-foot wall called the credit crunch. This action that this administration is taking today should take a big chunk out of that wall. The result should be a flow of billions of dollars of economic stimulus that doesn't cost the American taxpayers one red cent. The payoff will be in new jobs and in reversing the charts that I have shown you today.

At the same time, by encouraging new small-business ventures, we'll be laying the groundwork for a smarter work force that can compete more effectively in the global economy. Getting financing to these businesses is absolutely essential to the future growth of America. We'll see the benefits, and so will our children.

This administration is firmly and unequivocally committed to the private sector as the engine of economic growth in America. We have no illusions, no abstractions, no preoccupations; we know that this is what works in this country. In America we put people first, first by having a prosperous economy founded on a thriving private sector. What's good for America is good for business, and we are determined to make the climate for business and for growth better and better and better, beginning today where so many of you have told me for so long we

ought to begin, with a real assault on the credit crunch.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:43 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With California State Legislators

March 10, 1993

Health Care Task Force

Q. Mr. President, can your health care task force proceed in public?

The President. Well, I understand we got a ruling from the judge today.

Q. The judge ruled that the meetings have to be open.

The President. He's ruled that they had to have some open meetings, but in the briefing I got was that he ruled that some of the assertions that were made were absolutely unconstitutional. The briefing that I got was that we got a very good ruling from the judge today.

Military Base Closings

Q. Are the bases going to close in California, sir?

The President. I don't know. We don't know what's going to happen. I don't know what—you all have published lists. I've not seen the lists. You know how it works: The base closing commission has to make a recommendation. Then they give it to me, and I have to evaluate whether I think it's right or not. And then, after that, after those two things are reconciled, the Congress gets to vote up or down on it. So I don't know what's going to happen.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:45 p.m., in the State Dining Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Announcement on the Forest Conference

March 10, 1993

Beginning the critical work to craft a balanced and comprehensive policy that will save jobs and the unique, precious resources of the old growth forests in the Northwest and northern California, President Clinton today, March 10, announced he will convene a Forest Conference in Portland, OR, on April 2.

“Planning and good long-term management can help us protect jobs and the unique, old growth forests that are as much a part of our national heritage as the Grand Canyon or Yosemite,” President Clinton said. “It is time to break the gridlock that has blocked action and bring all sides together to craft a balanced approach to the economic and environmental challenges we face.”

The Forest Conference fulfills a commitment by President Clinton to the American people and to the residents of the Northwest and northern California to confront these issues with a thorough review and balanced policy. President Clinton will convene the conference with Vice President Al Gore and members of the Cabinet, including the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

“We have to take action to protect jobs and recognize the important economic contribution Federal forest lands make to supporting local communities. We owe it to our children and to every generation that follows to preserve this unique treasure with a balanced, long-term policy that recognizes we don’t have to sacrifice jobs to protect a unique natural resource,” Vice President Gore said.

The President has directed his staff to work closely with the Cabinet Agencies to involve representatives of all parties affected by the management of forests in the Pacific Northwest and California. This will include but not be limited to the Governors of California, Oregon, and Washington, and Members of Congress from the affected States and from the leadership of key congressional committees. And the President has asked the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, and

Labor to begin collecting information central to developing comprehensive, long-term policies for forest management and worker and community assistance.

Remarks to Westinghouse Employees in Linthicum, Maryland

March 11, 1993

Thank you very much. I want to say a special word of thanks to the people from Westinghouse who greeted me when I arrived: Gary Clark, who introduced me, Dick Linder, Gladys Green, Rich O’Leary, and Gary Eder. And thank you to all of you who made this tour possible.

I want to thank the Members of the United States Congress who are here, who have worked very hard for a long time and before I became President to help to design a plan to strengthen our economy even as we reduce military spending. Your Senators, Barbara Mikulski and Paul Sarbanes, are here. Your Congressman, Ben Cardin, is here. Senator Jeff Bingaman of New Mexico; Senators Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein of California; Senator Bill Cohen of Maine; Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island; Congressman Martin Frost of Texas; Congresswoman Jane Harman of California; and Congressman Tom Foglietta of Pennsylvania. I think that is the entire delegation here, along with Mayor Kurt Schmoke of Baltimore and Governor Schaefer. I’m glad to see all of them. I have to note here, you can tell who the best politician is. Of all these people I’ve introduced, only Senator Mikulski found a seat. *[Laughter]*

I’d also like to thank the members of my Cabinet who have helped to work on the statement that I will announce today who are here: the Defense Secretary Les Aspin, Labor Secretary Bob Reich, Veterans Affairs Director Jesse Brown, Energy Secretary Hazel O’Leary, Commerce Secretary Ron Brown. I want to thank all of them for their work.

All of you know from personal experience how much American industry has been changed by the cutbacks in defense. Defense spending peaked in 1985. And by 1997, it

will have been reduced approximately 40 percent, perhaps more, from its 1985 peak. These changes have led not only to reductions in military personnel abroad and closings of bases at home but dramatic changes in military contracting that have affected companies like this one and which have affected the economies of the States of California, Connecticut, Texas, and many others.

It has been said that while change is certain, progress is not. And that certainly is true when it comes to the challenge of meeting the national economic goals that we have in the face of cutbacks in military spending. As I said, these cutbacks have been made since 1985; more are to come. They are essential in a world in which we need funds to be reinvested in the domestic economy and in which the security threats we meet today, while very serious, are different and clearly less expensive than those we faced when the Soviet Union and the United States faced each other across the Berlin Wall with the barriers of the cold war and the imminent prospect of nuclear war. So these changes had to come. But if we do nothing in the face of change, we have learned the hard way that we are its victims. If we take bold action, we can be the beneficiaries of change.

All of you here at Westinghouse Electronic Systems Group are proof that you can make change your friend. In 1986, just 16 percent of the work done here was nondefense. Today, it's 27 percent. By 1995, half or more of your work will be nondefense. What you have done here is what I wish to do nationally: take some of the most talented people in the world who produce some of the most sophisticated military technology and put that to work in the civilian economy.

The military surveillance technology I have seen here can now be used to help commercial airlines avoid wind shears. Military security technology can now be used to help police officers on the streets and in their patrol cars to be safer and to solve crimes and to find missing children more rapidly. State-of-the-art batteries is helping here to develop an electric car which may well provide an enormous opportunity for America to become more energy-independent and to dramatically reduce the pollution of our atmosphere, at a time when we have been re-

minded anew that there really is a hole in the ozone layer and there really are problems with unlimited emissions of CO₂.

Clearly, defense conversion can be done and can be done well, making change our friend and not our enemy. But in order to do it we must act, act decisively, act intelligently, and not simply react years after the cuts occur.

Last year, when a candidate for President, I outlined a plan to create new jobs in the civilian economy. Anticipating this challenge, farsighted Members of Congress appropriated approximately \$1.5 billion for defense conversion last year, including ideas that literally came from the minds and the efforts of some of the Members of Congress who are here with us today. They've demonstrated aggressiveness in adapting to change. But until today, in spite of that act, none of the money appropriated by Congress was released, and there was no comprehensive plan for what to do with it.

Today I want to explain how we're going to put your money to work to put Americans to work and how we're planning for the future by investing in our people, encouraging our companies, and assisting our communities. Our first priority has to be investing in our people. Keep in mind, as you all know here, when the defense budget is reduced, that affects, obviously, contracts and therefore the jobs of people who work in the private sector. It also affects the size of the military force itself, the configuration of our defense forces abroad and here at home, and the people who will be affected by the reductions.

Our defense reinvestment and conversion initiative will rededicate \$375 million right away to help working people affected by defense reductions with employment services, job training, and transition assistance; \$150 million of that will go to Government and employer-sponsored job training programs; \$112 million will help members of the Guard and the Reserves make the transition to civilian life and to provide severance pay and health benefits to civilians who are leaving Government employment.

There's also initiative to provide early retirement benefits for military personnel with 15 years of service or more, to start a new

program to encourage them to put their skills to work in vital areas like teaching, law enforcement, environmental restoration, and health care. Under a provision offered by Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia, any member of the military who is being mustered out with 15 years or more of service can go to work in law enforcement, for example, and earn a year of military retirement for every year they were in law enforcement, so that these people who have committed their lives to the service of our country and could not reasonably have known that this reduction would occur and would affect them can still earn their military retirement by serving their country here at home.

We must also recognize the ripple effect of defense adjustment and target assistance to our communities. In 1993 alone, we will triple the budget of the Defense Department's Office of Economic Adjustment. The \$30 million we've committed to this task will be invested in helping our communities find the tools and the expertise to adjust to the changed nature of their local economy. It will be an investment that pays off in the long-term.

In addition, through the Commerce Department, we'll invest another \$80 million in a revolving loan and grant program to directly and immediately aid communities hit hardest by defense cuts.

Finally, the Secretary of Defense has assured me that he will do everything he can to speed the environmental cleanup on bases that are closed so that they can be turned over either to commercial purposes or to local government at the earliest possible time so that there will be a minimum loss of economic activity in areas where bases are closed.

But all the worker training in the world and all the community assistance in the world will do no good if there are no jobs for those workers and no businesses for those communities. The private sector is the engine of lasting economic growth in our system, and therefore, our plan must help our companies to make these transitions to compete and to win.

We seek to go beyond the debate of the past in which some thought Government alone could do everything and others claimed

Government could do nothing. In this area there are two things Government can do to aid companies like this one: promote dual use research and promote civilian use of technology that was formerly developed for military purposes. That is what you have done here. We want to speed and expand that process all across the United States.

One of the success stories of the cold war was the Defense Advanced Research Agency, or DARPA. DARPA helped keep America on the cutting edge of defense research. To meet the new challenges of the new world, we're giving DARPA a new mission and restoring its old name, because before 1972 that Agency was known simply as the Advanced Research Products Agency. By going back to that name and refocusing the Agency's efforts on dual use technologies, such as that which you have demonstrated to me here today, rather than strictly military applications, we'll be better able to integrate research to strengthen defense and to promote our economic security here at home.

Starting now, this Agency, ARPA, will allocate more than \$500 million to technology and industrial programs like the ones we've seen here today. We'll support industry-led consortia and dual use technologies and promote efforts to break through with commercial uses of formerly defense technologies. Programs will be selected on the basis of merit and will require matching funds from the corporations affected. We're even going to set up a toll-free number to attract good ideas from good companies. And you will like this. The number is 1-800-DUAL-USE. The hotline will be hooked up tomorrow, so don't call today. [*Laughter*]

To help walk companies through their new opportunities, ARPA will provide them with this book, which puts together programs from the Defense Department, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Energy, NASA, and the National Science Foundation. It is a remarkable coalition of Agencies finally putting all the information together for defense technology conversion, reinvestment, and transition assistance.

To further coordinate assistance, ARPA will work with four other Agencies, the ones I just mentioned. And we're going to have a series of regional outreach meetings all

across this country, again, to try to mobilize other companies to get involved in this initiative so that they can save or create jobs instead of lose jobs in the face of defense reductions.

We want Government-industry partnerships to help develop advanced materials. We want companies to form regional technology alliances so they can share information and develop new products and new markets. Our manufacturing extension programs will help bring state-of-the-art technology to companies in much the same way as the Agricultural Extension Service helped our farmers more than two generations ago begin to become the most productive in the world. And through the Small Business Innovation Research Program, we'll help small businesses in their efforts to develop dual use technology.

But dual use technology is just the beginning. We have to explore also new opportunities in purely civilian technologies. This year alone, we'll invest \$300 million in emerging nondefense technology. The Department of Energy will speed the transfer of technology to private industry from our national labs. And when Congress passes the stimulus package I have proposed, we'll have millions more to invest in research and development partnerships, in advanced technology programs, and in computer networks for schools and libraries around the country.

As with every aspect of the program for change I have asked the American people and the Congress to embrace, defense conversion will require us to literally reimagine and reinvent the way Government works. I've asked the National Economic Council to take the lead in our efforts to streamline and coordinate our conversion efforts so that you don't have to deal with a big bureaucracy where all the information is in many different places and sometimes seems to be operating at cross purposes.

Shifting to a civilian economy is of obvious concern to the Defense Department, but it's also the business of the Commerce Department, the Labor Department, the Energy Department, NASA, and many other agencies, including the Department of Veterans Affairs, which will have even more veterans now as people are coming out of the service

and going into the civilian work force. Our National Economic Council will cut through redtape, break through turf battles, and help to deliver services to our customers quickly and efficiently.

I don't pretend that this will be easy, and all of it will take some time. But the choice we face is between bold action to build a stronger and safer and smarter America, or continuing to cut defense with no appropriate response or with one that is too localized and too limited.

The soldier-statesman Dwight Eisenhower once observed that the resourceful American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. Our challenge is now to reverse the process. You have given us a stunning example of just how brilliantly that can be done here in this fine facility. I know today that the world's finest makers of swords can and will be the finest makers of plowshares, and they will lead America into a new century of strength, growth, and opportunity.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:29 p.m. at Westinghouse Electric Corp. In his remarks, he referred to Dick Linder, president, Westinghouse Electronic Systems Group; Gary Clark, acting CEO, Westinghouse Electric Corp.; Gladys Green, president, IBEW; Rick O'Leary, president, IVE; and Gary Eder, president, Salaried Employees Association.

Remarks to the Children's Defense Fund Conference

March 11, 1993

The President. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, distinguished members of the Children's Defense Fund board, Secretary Reich, and Secretary Riley. Did you see the way Secretary Reich rushed out when they said the President of the United States? [Laughter] That's not true. I pushed him through the door so I could get a laugh out of it. [Laughter] My dear friend, Marian Wright Edelman, as usual, your introduction has left me nothing to say. [Laughter]

I will say this: I know a lot of people will come here and tell you how much they ap-

preciate people who are children's advocates. Not very many people appreciate it enough to marry one, and I did. [Laughter] I also have savaged the ranks of the CDF board. My wife had to resign because she was married to a Presidential candidate. And then Donna Shalala had to resign because I gave her a job—[laughter]—which on Sunday she'd probably rather swap for being chair of the Children's Defense Fund board.

I am delighted to be here. I look out on this crowd and I see many old friends. You know, a lot of people ask me what it's like to be President. And I don't know if I can explain it, but it is different. [Laughter] People either want to walk around on tippy-toe or take a baseball bat and whack your head off. There seems to be nothing in between. The other day Hillary had a number of people into the White House on the first floor to some sort of meeting, and I got off on the floor, and I had to go someplace else. And all of a sudden, all these people were there. And I walked out into this crowd, and I started shaking their hands. And the guy who was with me said, "Oh, Mr. President, I'm so sorry that you had to deal with all those people." I said, "That's all right, I used to be one." [Laughter] I hope I will be again some day. Meanwhile, I'm going to depend on you and the American people to keep me just as close to humanity as I possibly can.

I've just come from a remarkable event in Maryland with a number of Members of the Congress who are friends of the Children's Defense Fund. We were there; Secretary Reich was there with me; we flew back. And we were at a plant that belongs to Westinghouse. It used to be a defense plant, and it is increasingly becoming a domestic technology plant. And we went there to announce an economic conversion program to try to help more people who are losing their jobs from military cutbacks either in the private or the public sector find new opportunities moving toward the economy of the 21st century.

This is a very important thing. We've been reducing defense since 1985, and no nation would so reduce one sector of its economy that provided so many high-wage, high-growth jobs, that was on the cutting edge of new technology—no other nation would

ever have done what we've done with no clear strategy but what to do with all those resources, all those people, to try to help to build our economic base. So we will continue to reduce defense, as we must, but we're trying to plan for the future of those people and those incredible resources.

I saw military technology turn into an electric car that will drive over 80 miles an hour and which may hold the promise of ending our dependence on foreign oil and cleaning up our atmosphere. I saw a police car with a computer screen with visual imaging developed for defense technology, which can now be used immediately to transmit to police officers who have it pictures of missing children, immediately, while they're in their car. I saw a plane with radar technology which just came back from dealing with the difficult incident in Waco, Texas—defense technology—another plane with a different sort of technology now which can be put on all of our commercial air flights to detect wind shears, which is one of the major causes of airline misfortunes now among commercial airlines.

I say all this because everybody says, well, that's a great idea, and it's self-evident, and why haven't we been doing this? But it is simply reflective of a problem we have had in this country for some time, which is that we have undervalued the importance of increasing the capacity of our people. We have talked a lot about a lot of things in America. But when you strip it all away and you look at where we have been, sort of out of sync with many other countries and with where we have to go in the future, it is clear that on a broad range of areas, we have simply undervalued the importance of making a commitment to the idea that we don't have a person to waste, that everybody counts, and that what you can do affects not only your future but mine as well.

These, of course, are the arguments that the Children's Defense Fund has been making since its inception in its struggles to get a better deal for America's children. They have become far more important arguments in the last decade.

In 1985 a remarkable thing happened, a thing altogether laudatory in our country: Our senior citizens became less poor than

the rest of us, a thing we can be proud of. People used to have to live in absolute agony wondering what would happen to their parents. You still do if you have long-term care problems. But most elderly people now, because of Social Security and supplemental security income and Medicare and because of the pension reforms of the last several years, can look forward to a security in their later years that 10 or 20 or 30 years ago was utterly unheard of. And it is really a testimony to the farsightedness of our country.

However, at the same time, in the same decade, we began to experience a new class of poor people who were dramatically undervalued. They were little children and their poor parents, usually their single poor parents. And they had no advocates in many councils of power. If it hadn't been for the Children's Defense Fund and a few others who walked with them through life, many of the good things which have been done would not have been done. And all the things which were done were not enough to reverse the trends of the 1980's, when the elderly became less poor and the children became more poor.

Now, because many of you in this room have continued this fight, and because of the decisions the American people made in the last election, we once again have a chance to invest in the hopes and the dreams of our children.

I have asked the United States Congress to embrace a program that recognizes, as was said earlier, that we have two big deficits in this country. We have a huge budget deficit, but we also have a huge investment deficit. It was a cruel irony of the last 12 years that we not only took the Government debt from \$1 trillion to \$4 trillion, with annual deficits now in excess of \$300 billion projected for the next few years unless we change it, but we found a way in all of that to actually reduce our investment in our future at the national level.

How could it happen? Well, it happened because of a big military buildup. It happened because of a big tax cut early. It happened because health care costs have been completely out of control. It happened because an underperforming economy didn't produce many revenues. But it happened

also because there were not enough people who said we must constantly invest in the most important thing in a modern society, the capacity of the people to be healthy and strong and good.

So you have all these anomalies. The United States, the world's strongest economy, has the third worst record in the Western Hemisphere for immunizing its children against preventable childhood diseases. The United States, a country that has dominated the economy of the world for the last half a century, has higher rates of adult illiteracy and school dropout and dysfunction among adults than most of its major competitors, and the highest rate of incarceration of any country in the world, something we rank first in.

That bespeaks our inability to make the diversity of our country a source of strength instead of weakness, and to deal with the stark dilemmas of poverty in ways that at least give the children a chance to do better. Well, now we have a chance.

The good news is we know a lot about what works. We've known for years through clear studies that, though not perfect, Head Start and WIC and immunizations really do make a difference. We know that if you give children a better life and you strengthen their families, you make the economy stronger and you free up money to be spent on things like that economic conversion program I just visited today.

We know that if we focus on people and their capacities, it really does work. That's why I was really pleased that the first bill I signed was the Family and Medical Leave Act because it will, even to those who oppose it, make their businesses more productive, not less, by securing family life and making it possible for people to be good parents. That's why the long-term economic plan and the short-term economic stimulus I asked the Congress to embrace includes funds to put our people first: for 700,000 summer jobs for young people; for the beginnings of summer Head Start programs where they don't exist; for beginning to set up the infrastructure of immunization where it isn't, so that we can start to do the work that has to be done.

We have simply got to invest in our people in ways that work. Marian has already said

it, but I will reiterate. This budget, if funded by the Congress, will fully fund Head Start and WIC, will create a network of immunization efforts which will permit us to finally immunize our little children against preventable childhood diseases, something that will save, over the long run, 10 bucks for every dollar we put into it. How do you explain, I mean, how can you possibly justify to anybody that our country, with the power of its economy, that produces the vast majority of vaccines produced anywhere in the world, is better only than Bolivia and Haiti in this hemisphere in immunizing our children?

And you know, you have to have a certain core of immunization to make sure that there will be no outbreak of diseases. We are dangerously, perilously close to falling below that core of immunized children in many different areas. This is a big deal, folks.

So I hope that we will have this attitude now that we ought to invest as we cut the deficit. The plan that I presented to the Congress reduces the deficit dramatically, has 150 specific budget cuts, starts with an example from the White House staff. We cut the staff in the next fiscal year 25 percent below the staffing levels that I found when I came. We cut \$9 billion out of the administrative costs of Federal agencies. And I mean they're real cuts; they're going into the budget. They cannot be escaped. *[Applause]* I'm glad you're clapping for that, you know, because the people that are attacking me act like anybody that wants any money from the Government just loves all that bureaucracy you have to put up with. I know better. *[Laughter]*

We also raised some tax money. I saw the proof of an article by David Stockman coming out in a magazine soon which talked about how the clear problem is that the tax base of this country was dramatically, fundamentally, and permanently eroded in 1981, that Social Security's about the same percentage of gross national product today it was back in 1981.

So we have to raise some more money if we want to reduce the debt. But we also try to reverse the investment gap in things that you didn't come here to talk about, like transportation and clean water and better sewage systems, in things that will strengthen the environment and put people to work and in-

crease our productivity, in things like community development operations to add jobs to high unemployment areas, in national service, which Marian mentioned, and in other areas that will increase the capacity of people to work, to grow, to learn, to flourish.

Now, there are people, believe it or not, who, number one, don't want to pass a stimulus package at all because they say the economy's great—that's because most people in Washington are employed; talk to them about that, will you—*[laughter]*—and who think that this program would be even better if it didn't have any new investment at all.

Now, to be fair to those people, there are basically three lines of attack. You're going to the Hill. I want you to know I need your help. I need your help because there are a lot of people without jobs; there are a lot of people without adequate jobs. Most of the new jobs created in this last round—365,000 last month—hallelujah, that's great, but more than half of them were part-time jobs that don't have health care benefits for the kids and the families.

You need to know what they are saying, the people against whom you must argue. They will say, number one, "We can cut the deficit even more if we just didn't have any investment," or "If we didn't pass any of the President's spending programs, we could cut the deficit as much and raise taxes less."

The problem with that argument is those people think there is absolutely no difference between putting another child in Head Start and keeping somebody working in an agency when the job is no longer needed and can be phased out, in supporting a regulatory apparatus that has long since lost its justification, in funding a pork barrel project that can't possibly be justified. In other words, these people think anything the Government spends is equally bad. Educating a kid to go to college is the same as continuing the subsidy for sheep or any other program. No difference. Government spending is Government spending. There is no difference.

Now, do you believe that in your own lives?

Audience members. No-o-o!

The President. No. I mean, in your lives, if you take home a check every month, is

it the same whether you spend it on making a house payment, making a car payment, saving money for your child's education, or just paying for an extra helping at dinner? Of course not. There are distinctions in the relative impact of how you spend your pay, how your business invests its money, and how your Government invests your money. And so when people tell you there's no difference, tell them that's wrong.

And then there is a crowd that say, "Well, these programs don't really make any difference. Head Start doesn't work, and there's no proof Head Start works." Now, this is an interesting argument. [Laughter] Most of those who think there's no proof Head Start works still believe trickle-down economics did.

Until I proposed phasing in the full funding of this program, many of those who themselves objected had previously voted to expand it. To be fair, President Bush praised Head Start at every turn. A few years ago, Senator Dole introduced his own legislation to expand it. Sure, there are serious criticisms rooted in the fact that this is now not a new program. There are people who say it's not evenly good across the country. That is true. There are people who say it could be managed better. That's true. There are people who say that cognitive improvements don't always last more than 2 years after children stop attending, depending on where they are. That's true. One big deal is how strong the parents' involvement really is. There are those who say there ought to be more school-based programs or more home-based programs, and we've worked hard on that at home. All that's true. That is not an excuse not to fully fund Head Start.

Our program will serve more children, but it will also strengthen the quality of Head Start and put some flexibility back into the program so that it can meet the needs of the different communities that are served. But those who choose to ignore the overwhelming evidence of the program's success have an obligation to tell us why more children with high self-esteem and better grades and better thinking skills and better predictable long-term performance is such a bad idea. I think it's a great idea.

But we must, in fairness to the criticisms, become our own most severe critics. That's where you come in, because all of you live out there where these programs work. You could give a better criticism of what's wrong with most of these public programs than those who don't want to fund them. Most of you could. So tell them you know it is up to us to be our own most severe critics.

I just asked the Vice President to review every program in the Government, come back to me in 6 months with all kinds of other things that we can stop doing or that we can modify or that we can push back to people at the grassroots level. If we who believe in Government don't have the courage to change it, we cannot expect those who don't to help us in our efforts.

And this is just the beginning. Just 2 days ago I asked Secretary Shalala to draft a new child welfare initiative to combine family support and family preservation services, to do more to build on the work of Senator Rockefeller and Congressmen Matsui and Congresswoman Schroeder and to do more for families at risk, especially those at risk of foster care placement, even as we try to strengthen our efforts to enforce child support enforcement for those who have been abandoned by one parent.

Now, there is a third argument against this effort. There are those who say, "Yes, Head Start's a good deal; WIC is a good deal; the immunization's a good deal. And yes, we ought to invest as opposed to consume. There is a distinction to be drawn in the way this money is spent, and investment is better, investment in our children, our future. But we still ought not to do it because we need even more deficit reduction."

And let me say, that is an argument you must treat with respect. We have gone from a \$1 trillion deficit to a \$4 trillion deficit in 12 years. We have imposed a crushing burden on the present and a bigger one on the future. And if you think about it, it's really an income transfer. Now that we're spending 15 cents of every dollar you pay the Government—most of you are middle class people, and we spend 15 cents of every dollar you pay the Government paying interest on the debt. Those bonds are largely held by upper income people. So there are now a lot of

liberals in the Congress who are rethinking their old positions on things like the mechanisms by which we move to balance the budget on the theory that we're spending all this money having an income transfer from middle class taxpayers, lower income taxpayers to people who hold the bonds because we didn't have the discipline to run our budgets better.

And if we don't do something about the deficit, we just keep on spending like we are, by the end of the decade your annual debt will be \$653 billion a year. The interest service will be about 22 cents of your tax dollar. Twenty cents on the dollar of every dollar in America, public and private, will go to health care. So we have to change.

But my answer to those who say, "Well, let's just don't invest because this deficit is such a big problem," is: Number one, we got into this mess over 12 years, and we have more than 4 years to get out of it. Number two, we are reaping the benefits of the clear and disciplined and determined effort that the congressional leadership has now agreed to make with me to bring the deficit down. We have interest rates at very, very low rates. We have the stock market back up. People say, "Hey, this thing is going to work." All of you can now look at whether you should refinance your home or your car. Businesses should refinance their debt. If we get all this debt refinanced in the next year, that will add \$80 to \$100 billion back in our economy. We are reaping the benefits of a disciplined program to reduce the deficit today. But if we do not also at the same time recognize that for 12 years we have ignored our obligations to invest in our jobs, in our people, in our education, if we don't do that, we will pay for that neglect tomorrow, just like we're paying for yesterday's neglect today. We can do both things.

There's another argument you need to make—and I'm speaking for my wife now, as well as for me—which is that if you just cut out all these programs that we believe in, if you just cut them plumb out, you'll still have an increase in the deficit again, starting in about 5 years, because of the explosion in health care costs. The real, ultimate answer to the deficit problem is to bring health care cost in line with inflation and provide

a decent system of health care for all Americans.

And we can do that. So, with discipline, with a willingness to both cut and tax, with a willingness to reduce consumption expenditures and increase investment in our future, we can do the things that we have to do. But we can't walk away from any of our challenges and expect the results America needs. If we walk away from the health care challenge, it doesn't matter what they do on all these other cuts; you'll be swallowed up in debt 5 or 6 years again, if we walk away from the health care challenge.

If we walk away from the challenge to raise some more revenues and cut the spending we must, we'll lose control of our economic destiny even if we spend more money on the programs you want. You'll be raising and educating healthier, more well-educated kids to a weaker economy.

But if we reduce the deficit and we forget about the fact that in the world we live in the only thing that really counts is people, every factory can be moved overseas. Three trillion dollars in money crosses national lines every day. Everything is mobile except us. We're here. We don't want to move. [Laughter] All we've got's each other now in America.

That's what we've got. And if we ignore that, we don't think those little kids that live in the Mississippi Delta, in my home State, many of whom never see a dentist the whole time of their childhood, need a better shot in life because of us as well as them; if we don't believe that those kids that are sitting out there in the barrios in Los Angeles, in the black community, in the Hispanic community, in the Asian-American community, waiting for the resolution of the Rodney King trial only because it stands for everything else that ever happened to them, not because of the trial but because of what it stands for; if we don't think that we need to prove that a county like Los Angeles County with people from 150 different racial and ethnic groups can live together and learn together and grow together, and if they play by the rules can have the right to earn a decent living, and we don't think that affects the rest of us, we haven't learned very much in the last 12 years.

And so I ask you to do this: I ask you to go to the Congress and ask them to support this program. And go with respect, because I promise you most of these people are trying to come to grips with the dilemmas of this time. And they have gotten one big message: that is that we made a horrible mistake to let the deficit get out of hand like we did in the last 12 years. And they deserve respect for getting that message. And they now have a President who will take the lead and fade some of the heat for the unpopularity of the decisions which have to be made. Go with respect for that. Say, "You had to do that, and we respect that."

But remind them that out in the country where you live, bringing down the deficit is important if it gives people jobs and raises people's incomes and if there are people out there who can seize the opportunities of the future. And what you represent is the future. You represent the needs of the people who will not be able to perform even with a sensible economic policy unless we do better in health care, in education, and in dealing with the needs of our poorest children. That is what you represent. None of this other stuff will amount to a hill of beans unless we put the American people first in all of these decisions. That is the message I plead with you to bring to the Congress.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:52 p.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to Marian Wright Edelman, president, Children's Defense Fund. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With the National Conference of State Legislatures

March 11, 1993

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Q. Mr. President, do you think Yeltsin's going to survive?

The President. I think that he is the duly elected President of Russia and a genuine democrat, small "d," and that he is leading a country that is trying greatly to do two things: one, escape from communism into

market economics, a world they never lived in before; and second, to preserve real democracy. That's a tough job. Pretty hard to do here. [*Laughter*]

I intend to do what I can to be supportive of that process and to be supportive of him while he serves as President of Russia. I don't know what else to tell you. I'm not a seer. I don't know what's going to happen to him or me tomorrow. I have confidence in him. I want to work with him as long as I can.

Attorney-General-Designate Janet Reno

Q. What about Janet Reno?

The President. I'm elated by that. I told—I had some Senators in the office, and I said, that may be the only vote I carry 98 to 0 this year. [*Laughter*] She's a very good person, and I think she will do well.

Q. When is she going to be sworn in?

The President. When?

Q. When?

The President. Soon, I hope. I've been waiting for someone to—[*laughter*].

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:15 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With the Congressional Caucus For Women's Issues

March 11, 1993

Abortion Clinic Shooting

Q. Mr. President, do you have any reaction to the shooting of Dr. Gunn in Pensacola?

The President. Yes. I was outraged by it. We have got to create a climate in this country where people do not think that is acceptable. And I think that's—how could someone have thought that they could take civil disobedience and carry it one extra step? Dr. Gunn was exercising his constitutional rights. And what happened was awful.

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Q. —Yeltsin apparently had informed you that he plans to dissolve or may have to dissolve the Parliament. Have you gotten word of that, and what's your reaction to it?

The President. I have had no communication from him today, or if it has, it hasn't been communicated to——

Q. Thank you.

Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany

Q. How about Mr. Kohl? Has Mr. Kohl called you about a summit?

The President. If he has, no one on my staff has told me he's called me today.

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:35 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on the Death of Dr. David Gunn

March 11, 1993

I was saddened and angered by the fatal shooting in Pensacola yesterday of Dr. David Gunn. The violence against clinics must stop. As a nation committed to rule of law, we cannot allow violent vigilantes to restrict the rights of American women. No person seeking medical care and no physician providing that care should have to endure harassment, threats, or intimidation.

Announcement of the Continuation of Foreign Service Officers in Three Sub-Cabinet Posts at the Department of State

March 11, 1993

The President announced today that three career Foreign Service officers will continue serving in State Department positions that they currently hold. The three are Genta Hawkins Holmes, Director General of the Foreign Service and Director of Personnel, Robert Gallucci, Assistant Secretary for Politico-Military Affairs, and Anthony Quainton, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Diplomatic Security.

"I am very pleased with the team that Secretary Christopher and I are assembling at the Department of State," said the President. "I am particularly gratified that we have been able to put a number of people into senior

positions who have devoted their careers to the Foreign Service."

Genta Hawkins Holmes became the Director General of the Foreign Service and Director of Personnel in September of 1992. Prior to that, she was the first U.S. Ambassador to Namibia. She has also served as Deputy Chief of Mission at American Embassies in South Africa, Haiti, and Malawi, and at posts in the Bahamas, Switzerland, France, and the Ivory Coast.

Ms. Holmes is also a former Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs of the Agency for International Development and has worked in the State Department's Bureau of Congressional Relations, Office of International Finance/Bureau of Economic Affairs, and Office of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Refugees. She holds a B.A. in international relations from the University of Southern California and attended the London School of Economics on a graduate fellowship.

Robert Gallucci will be continuing in a position that he assumed in July 1992. Immediately prior to that, he was the Senior Coordinator responsible for nonproliferation and nuclear safety initiatives in the former Soviet Union. From April 1991 to February 1992, he was the Deputy Executive Chairman of the U.N. special commission overseeing the disarmament of Iraq.

Dr. Gallucci began his foreign affairs career at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1974. He has also served as a division chief in State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, as a member of the Secretary's Policy Planning Staff, and as an office director in both the Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs and in the Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs. From 1984 to 1988, he was Deputy Director General of the Multinational Force and Observers in Rome. He has also served on the faculty of the National War College.

A native of Brooklyn, NY, Dr. Gallucci holds a B.A. from the State University of New York at Stony Brook, and master's and doctoral degrees from Brandeis University. He taught at Swarthmore College, Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and Georgetown, and is the author

of a number of publications, including “Neither Peace nor Honor: The Politics of American Military Policy in Viet-Nam.”

Anthony Quainton has been Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security since September 1992. Prior to that, he had served as Ambassador to Peru and as the Department’s Deputy Inspector General. He has also been Ambassador to Kuwait, Nicaragua, and the Central African Republic, and Director of the Office for Combatting Terrorism.

From 1973 to 1976, Mr. Quainton was Deputy Chief of Mission in Kathmandu. He has served as political officer at the U.S. Embassy in Paris and was the Bureau of Near East and South Asian Affairs senior political officer for India. He has also been the political/economic officer in New Delhi and an economic officer in Rawalpindi and Karachi. He joined the Department in 1959 as vice consul and commercial officer in Sydney.

He is a graduate of Princeton University and attended Oxford University as a Marshall scholar and a research fellow.

Remarks at the Swearing-In Ceremony for Janet Reno as Attorney General

March 12, 1993

Thank you very much. Please be seated. We are honored here in the White House to be joined today by distinguished Members of the Senate and the House: Senator Biden, Senator Hatch, Senator Kennedy, Senator Sarbanes, one of Janet Reno’s Senators, Senator Connie Mack. Senator Graham called me last night. He’s in Florida today with the First Lady at a health care hearing. And he said he had an excused absence from the Attorney General. *[Laughter]*

The Speaker and Congressman Edwards are here, and we’re delighted to see all of them. I also would say we’re delighted to be joined by Mr. Justice White and Mrs. White. Thank you very much for coming. Let me say that it is a great honor for me to be able to be here at this ceremony today with Janet Reno, her family, and a few of her many friends.

I’d like to say a special word of thanks to Stuart Gerson, who has served ably and hon-

orably as Acting Attorney General since the Inauguration. I think we owe him a round of applause. *[Applause]*

Somehow I don’t think any of my other proposals will pass the Senate by the same vote margin—*[laughter]*—that Janet’s confirmation did. I especially want to thank Senator Biden and Senator Hatch and the members of the Judiciary Committee for waiving the normal waiting period between hearings and the confirmation vote, making this event possible today and making it possible for us to proceed immediately with the urgent tasks at hand.

But more than anything else, I think it is clear that Janet Reno made her own swift confirmation possible, showing the Senate and all who followed the hearings the qualities of leadership and integrity, intelligence, and humanity that those gathered in this room have recognized for a very long time.

You shared with us the life-shaping stories of your family and career that formed your deep sense of fairness and your unwavering drive to help others to do better. You showed us that your career in public service, working on the frontlines in your community, fighting crime, understanding the impact on victims and on neighborhoods, mending the gritty social fabric of a vibrant but troubled urban area, is excellent preparation for carrying forward the banner of justice for all the American people.

You’ll help to guide the Federal Government to assist State and local law enforcement in ways that really count. You demonstrated that you will be a formidable advocate for the vulnerable people in our society and especially for our children.

Most of all, you proved to the Nation that you are a strong and an independent person who will give me your best legal judgment whether or not it’s what I want to hear. *[Laughter]* It’s an experience I’ve already had, I’m glad to say. That is the condition upon which you accepted my nomination and the only kind of Attorney General that I would want serving in this Cabinet.

As Janet Reno begins her work at the Justice Department, she will enter a building that symbolizes our Nation’s commitment to

justice, to equality, to the enforcement of our laws. On the side of that building, carved above one of the portals, is the inscription, "The halls of justice are a hallowed place." With Janet Reno serving as our Nation's Attorney General, those words will have great meaning for all Americans.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:21 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. Following the President's remarks, Justice Byron White administered the oath of office.

Announcement of Nomination for Two Sub-Cabinet Posts at the Department of Health and Human Services

March 12, 1993

President Clinton today announced his intention to nominate an expert on health care and a renowned doctor and administrator to two Assistant Secretary posts at the Department of Health and Human Services.

The President named Kenneth S. Apfel as Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget at HHS and Dr. Philip R. Lee as HHS Assistant Secretary of Health.

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

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.

Correction

The Digest entries of January 28 and February 7 (pp. 113 and 201) were incorrect in stating that the President attended meetings of the President's Task Force on National Health Care Reform.

March 8

The President had a telephone conversation with former President George Bush to discuss the situation in Russia.

In the afternoon, the President met with members of the House Budget Committee.

In the evening, the President met with former President Richard Nixon.

March 9

In the afternoon, the President met with Democratic Senators.

In the evening, the President attended a birthday party for Senator Strom Thurmond at the J.W. Marriott Hotel.

March 11

In the morning, the President traveled to Linthicum, MD, where he toured the Westinghouse Electronic Systems plant, and he returned to Washington, DC, in the afternoon.

Later in the afternoon, the President met with:

- departing White House military personnel;
- Special Olympics international athletes;
- recipients of the Presidential Secondary Awards for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching.

March 12

In the morning, the President traveled to the U.S.S. *Theodore Roosevelt* where he toured the ship, and he returned to Washington, DC, in the afternoon.

The White House announced that Prime Minister Giuliano Amato of Italy will visit the White House on April 26 to meet with the President.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

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

Submitted March 8

James B. King,
of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of 4 years, vice Constance Berry Newman, resigned.

Jean Nolan,
of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, vice Mary Shannon Brunette.

Withdrawn March 9

The following named persons to be Commissioners of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal for terms of 7 years, which were sent to the Senate on January 5, 1993:

Edward J. Damich, of Virginia.
Bruce D. Goodman, of Pennsylvania.

**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 March 8

Transcripts of two press briefings by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released March 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released March 10

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcripts of two press briefings by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released March 11

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Transcript of a press briefing on defense conversion by Gene Sperling, Deputy Assistant to the President for Economic Policy; Dorothy Robyn, Special Assistant to the President for Technology Policy; Steve Jones, Director for Defense Policy, National Security Council; Don Gessaman, Deputy Associate Director for National Security at the Office of Management and Budget; and David Lane, Director for Defense Conversion Policy, National Security Council

**Acts Approved
by the President**

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.