

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, March 29, 1993
Volume 29—Number 12
Pages 457–501

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Atlanta, GA
 - Business community—458
 - Downtown Child Development Center—457
- Democratic Governors Association—475
- Economic plan, radio address—464
- Greek Independence Day, proclamation signing ceremony—490
- Senators Mitchell and Sasser, telephone conversation—488

Appointments and Nominations

- State Department, Ambassadors—477, 500
- Sub-Cabinet posts—466, 487, 493

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchanges with reporters
 - Atlanta, GA—457
 - Oval Office—478, 488, 489, 493
 - State Dining Room—478
- Interview with CBS News—479

Interviews With the News Media—Continued

- News conference, March 23 (No. 7)—466
- News conference with Chancellor Kohl of Germany, March 26 (No. 8)—493

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

- See Interviews With the News Media
- Russia, Foreign Minister Kozyrev—478

Proclamations

- Greek Independence Day—492
- National Agriculture Day—465
- Women's History Month—463

Statements by the President

- See Appointments and Nominations

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—501
- Checklist of White House press releases—501
- Digest of other White House announcements—500
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—500

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 26, 1993

**Remarks at the Downtown Child
Development Center in Atlanta, GA**

March 19, 1993

Well, first of all, I would like to thank Cheryl and all the people at this wonderful center for giving me a few minutes' break out of my normal schedule. The Mayor and I talked about business on the way in from the airport, and then I got to help put a puzzle together and play a drum and do some things that are more fun than what I do most days. [Laughter]

Let me begin by saying that last night the House of Representatives cast an historic set of votes. Among those in the leadership was your Congressman, John Lewis, who is here with me now, a longtime friend of mine. The House voted to do something that our country, as far as I can tell from my reading of history, has never done before at the same time. They voted to make a drastic cut in the Federal deficit and at the same time to invest some new money in the children of the country, through preschool programs and nutrition programs and education programs, and in new jobs for the American people. And I wanted to come here to Atlanta today to talk about it and to try to help to keep the American people informed of what the House has done and what the Senate must now do and what we still have to do to pass this budget. I wanted to come here to this child care center because the children who are here, the children of working parents, desperately need the kinds of opportunities that are provided here and that we're trying to provide there.

Just on the way in something happened that we couldn't have organized, Cheryl, neither you nor I, if we tried to do this. A man was standing outside this center with a child in his arms saying, "If I could afford to get my child in a good center like this, then I could take a job even at minimum wages and

support my child." It was very touching. He just happened to be in the crowd outside.

So I guess what I'd like to do is just to ask all of you to tell me what I, as President, can do to help to continue to support these kinds of projects, maybe get Federal Agencies in other cities to do the same thing you've done, perhaps work on enhancing the child care incentives in the Federal program. But I'd like to know what you think I can do to help to deal with this problem. Because as I go around the country, next to the cost of health care and the fear of losing health insurance, the availability and quality and affordability of child care are the things that working parents most often mention to me, after health care. So I just wanted to come here and listen for a while.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:05 p.m. at the center. In his remarks, he referred to Cheryl Smith, director of the center, and Maynard Jackson, Mayor of Atlanta. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Exchange With Reporters in Atlanta

March 19, 1993

Potential Supreme Court Nominee

Q. Mr. President, excuse the interruption, sir, but could you give us some feel for what you'll be looking for in a replacement for Justice White?

The President. I already said that in Washington. I used to teach constitutional law, and I think that there are few decisions the President makes which are more weighty, more significant, or can have a greater impact on more Americans than an appointment to the Supreme Court. And I'm going to try to pick a person that has a fine mind, good judgment, wide experience in the law and in the problems of real people, and someone with a big heart.

NOTE: The exchange began at 1:10 p.m. at the Downtown Child Development Center. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks to the Business Community in Atlanta

March 19, 1993

Thank you very much. Virgil, I'm glad I let you introduce me. [Laughter] I'm delighted to be here with so many distinguished Georgians, the people here on the platform with me today, including Virgil Williams, who really did do a good job. And there are some days I wish I were called Governor again. [Laughter]

People ask me all the time, is it different being President? And the truth is, it is, in ways that are wonderful and ways that aren't so good. But I had an encounter the other day which describes, better than any words I could say, what's right and what's wrong with it. I was up in the White House in the Residence part, and I had to go back down to the first floor to a big meeting. And my wife had been having a meeting there that I didn't know anything about. It wasn't public, you know. [Laughter] And anyway, so I got down to the first floor, and these throngs of people were there. And I just walked right out of the elevator into them, which was nice. They were people I didn't know, and I stopped, shook hands with them all, and talked to them. And this young man I was with, who had come to work at the White House during a previous administration, was just aghast. He said, "Oh, Mr. President, I'm so sorry that I got you in the middle of all these people." And I said, "That's okay, I used to be one." [Laughter]

I want to thank John Portman and Sam Williams and Peg Canter and Doug Miller for hosting me and welcoming me here to the Atlanta Apparel Mart. I want to say a special word of thanks to these distinguished business leaders who are up here on the platform; thank my good friend Governor Miller—I'm glad to see Governor and Mrs. Miller here—for meeting me outside; and for Mayor Jackson, who rode in with me and asked me to do more for Atlanta. [Laughter] You know, I don't know what I'd ever do

if I came to Atlanta without a suit coat because I always have the Maynard Jackson memorial list. [Laughter] And I actually got giggled today in the office before I left the White House; they said, now be sure and remember to leave Maynard's list on the desk tonight when you get back so we can go to work on it. [Laughter]

I flew down here with a number of members of your congressional delegation who had a great, great night last night. I thank them for their presence here. And I'm glad to see many others in the audience, Andy Young and Max Cleland and others who are here. I thank you all for being here.

It was just a few days ago that I celebrated—and I did celebrate; I wrote Zell a note about it—the first anniversary of the Georgia Democratic primary, when all the experts were saying that if I didn't receive 40 percent of the vote here, I would have to pack up my tent and go home. And thanks to you, some of you, anyway, who voted in the primary, I got—[laughter]—57 percent, and I didn't have to pack up my tent and go home.

This is the first opportunity I've had to come back to Georgia since your State gave your electoral votes to the Clinton-Gore ticket in November. I want to tell you how very grateful I am for that and how much I enjoy working with your Representatives and how dedicated I think the people in Washington are now to break the gridlock that has gripped our country for too long. Not only did the folks in the House delegation who flew down with me today cast some historic votes last night, but there were also some attempts to derail our program in the United States Senate last night. And they too fell short, even though they were very carefully developed to be as attractive as possible. And I thank Senator Nunn for his help in maintaining the integrity of the program yesterday in the Senate, too.

When the House of Representatives acted last night to pass the budget resolution and to pass the emergency jobs program, they did something that our country, as nearly as I can tell from my study of our history, has never before done. They actually voted at the

same time to reduce the national debt and to increase our investment in jobs and in education, in the new technologies of the future, and helping us to adjust to the defense cut-backs and to the rigors of the global economy. Reduce the deficit; increase investment. In order to do it, they had to take some very tough positions. They had to vote to reduce spending in very specific ways, not just general rhetoric but real specific commitments to reduce spending. They had to vote to raise taxes after more than a decade of being told that that was always a bad thing to do. And they had to draw clear distinctions between different kinds of Government spending.

As Virgil said in the introduction, here at the grassroots level of America, if you're running a business or if you're running a city or if you're running a State government, you know there is a difference between investing in education and job growth and infrastructure and the things that will increase productivity and wealth and employment, and just expanding programs that may or may not work or taking more people to do the same thing. For too long in Washington there has been no distinction, so we've had this unbelievable irony for 12 years in which the deficit has gone up, but our investment in the future has gone down. And we have paid a terrific price for it.

I hope and believe that the process of real renewal has begun, but only begun. On the 57th day of this administration, our economic plan is almost halfway home. The new direction is designed to meet the needs of the broad middle class of America again for jobs and for schools, for bringing a college education back within the reach of ordinary people, and bringing down the cost of health care and extending its reach. It's about giving the poor a chance to work their way out of poverty and welfare and dependence, about investing wisely again in our future, about helping all Americans and especially our children to be stronger and healthier and smarter so that they can realize their full potential and our country can maintain its economic superiority, without which we cannot hope to lead the world in this new era.

At the same time, we're actually wasting a lot less of the taxpayers' money. We've cut

150 specific programs, and there are more on the way. Tens of billions of dollars in spending have been cut. And under this budget resolution, not one penny in taxes can be raised unless we also cut spending in the amounts prescribed.

The new direction is also about changing the nature of the way Government works. The Government that I inherited, through no particular person or party's fault perhaps, is too large, too slow, too distant, and often too old in its approach to solving problems. I am committed to changing the way the Government operates, starting at the top with my own budget and taking a look at every program and every Agency. I have asked the Vice President to take 6 months to take advantage of the best talent we can find and to review the operations of every single Government Agency and program with a view toward not just cutting unnecessary spending but literally changing the whole way Government works: relying more on markets and incentives, eliminating unnecessary layers of management, pushing decisions down to the lowest possible level, taking full advantage of technology.

I discovered that in the White House alone, if we could invest \$4.7 million in new technology, in communications technology and other technology, we could save over \$10 million a year in payroll. And we could do it in spite of the fact that we are now getting 34,000 letters a day. And we are trying to set up a system where we can actually answer them. The White House operation historically has been so antiquated that at least two-thirds of the letters that came in never got answered at all. And usually they were those that, to keep faith with the American people, perhaps should have been answered first. Often letters that were critical were just thrown away as negative mail, because literally there was no capacity to handle it. Thousands of people every day want to call the White House, but the switchboard was put there when Lyndon Johnson was President, and people still pick up wires and plug them into holes when the calls are made. When I became President, I walked into the Oval Office and found the telephone system that President Jimmy Carter had operated with. And I found that I couldn't have a con-

ference call, but when the light came on on my phone, anybody in the central office of the White House could push their lighted button down and have a conference call I didn't want. [*Laughter*]

Now, that's funny, but it says something about the tendency of Government to add layer upon layer upon layer to the way things used to be, when new things have to be done, rather than stopping old things while you start new things and changing the way things work. The longer you've got a monopoly on money and a monopoly on customers, there is very little incentive out there to change. But there is no real monopoly anymore because there's a limit to how much the Government can take out of the economy and we are constrained by what we have to spend on defense, on health care, on interest on the debt, and other things. So the Government is compelled to reexamine the way we do our business. And I think we're going to have some very exciting things to show for our efforts in the weeks and months ahead.

The plan I ask the American people to embrace and to support the Congress in embracing is a thoughtful one, built piece by piece, a strategy that looks at the entire picture of America and asks what we have to do to ensure growth. It's a plan for short-term job creation and long-term prosperity, a chance to invest and prosper in a free market system, to improve education and training for a lifetime, to make health care more affordable and accessible, to make our streets safer, and more importantly, to give our people a chance to be involved in the large work of keeping our country moving forward.

One of the most frustrating things to me about the year and a half that I crossed this country in the campaign was the number of people I met who had simply given up on the system. Now if we get 34,000 letters a day and half of them are critical, I count that as a good day, because it means that people believe they can write their President and somebody will be there listening and paying attention. People believe the system will work again. There was a poll in New Jersey last week—one of two States that have elections for Governor in this off-year—saying that 18 percent of the people who are going to vote in this election this year voted for

the very first time in the Presidential election in 1992. The Los Angeles Times poll said that 70 percent of the American people had actually discussed the economic plan I presented to the Congress and to the people with one of their friends or neighbors or family members. That means democracy is on the march again in America, and people believe the system can be made to work for them. And that is in itself a victory for the efforts that we are all making.

Make no mistake. I know that there are many roadblocks ahead. I know that I'll make some mistakes along the way. And I know, too, there are still guardians of gridlock in Washington who will fight fundamental change. There are those now who say that we ought to cut the investments that I propose to make in families and children, in jobs and education and health care, make them vulnerable, and then we won't have to ask as much from others in either tax increases or spending cuts in older programs.

There are about 80,000 lobbyists in and around Washington. By some estimates, they spend nearly \$1 billion a year protecting the various interests they're hired to protect. They get a tax deduction to do it, for a while. But the kind of children I saw today in the joint public-private child care center I visited before coming over here don't have much of a lobby in Washington. Pregnant mothers or out of work or hard-working parents don't have a lot of time to hire people to roam the halls of Congress to stick up for them. Those who are neither wealthy nor organized, no matter what they're doing, are very often the most voiceless and powerless in our system, even though they may carry the day in whether our free enterprise system actually works or not. That's why it's the President's job to try to speak and fight for them. It's why we have to encourage those in Congress to stand ready to vote for change.

Yesterday's vote in the House is really a huge step in that direction. You ought to talk to John Lewis or the others who are here, Nathan Deal and Buddy Darden or Cynthia McKinney or Don Johnson, and ask them what it was like last night—Sanford Bishop—ask them what it was like when we get 218 votes and all of a sudden people say, "My God, we actually did something here for a

change. We've got something to go home and talk about. Even if somebody jumps on us, at least they'll jump on us for doing something instead of for not doing something."

A few weeks ago I went with Senator Moynihan of New York to New York. We flew into an Air Force facility, and then we drove for about 50 minutes to Franklin Roosevelt's hometown in Hyde Park. There were hundreds of people along the way—8, 10 degrees outside, people standing outside holding their signs up. One person had a sign that I thought was pretty reflective of the American public mood. It said, "Just do something." [Laughter] Just do something.

Well, the Congress has acted in a fundamental departure from the status quo. They proved that change is possible. And let me just give you one example that has already taken place. Last year when this recession started going way, way too long and no new jobs were being created, the Federal Reserve Board began to lower the Government's rediscount rate in an earnest attempt to bring interest rates down. And interest rates came down some. But there was still a huge gap between the rate that the Government charged bankers and the long-term interest rates in this country. Just since the election, since this deficit reduction plan has come out, interest rates have been down between .8 percent and one full percentage point, floating back and forth more or less in that range.

I'll bet you if I ask for a show of hands in this room, there are a lot of people in this room that, in the last 4 months, have refinanced a house or have benefited from a changing interest rate on a business loan or a car loan or credit card purchases. There are millions and millions of Americans who, in the first 6 months of this year, will save more money in interest payments than they'll pay in the energy tax I propose for the full 4 years of this administration. That is what happens if you gain control of your economic destiny, if you keep interest rates down, if you bring this deficit down, and if you have a plan for long-term growth.

I've had to put on my foreign policy hat a little bit in the last 10 days, meeting with leaders around the world. I've seen in the last several weeks the Prime Ministers of

Canada and Great Britain and then recently the President of France and the President of Haiti and the head of the European Community and the Prime Minister of Israel. And sooner or later, it always gets around to a conversation where they say, you know—particularly the Europeans say—America is on the move again. You've restored people's feeling that the Government can actually work with the people in a country and get something going again. It can make a difference again. And that is what I came here to ask for your support for today: Not to agree with everything I say or do; I'm sure I've made some mistakes, and I'll make some more. But I think we ought to get up and go to work every day, and I think we ought to make a difference.

We're working hard first to fix this economy, to bring the deficit down, and then to face the other problems ahead of us. We need to pass, and I want to emphasize this, we need to pass what is a modest but important stimulus program to create a half a million jobs in the short run. We need to do it for a couple of reasons. First of all, the program is targeted to give businesses that are creating jobs more incentive to invest to create more jobs, and secondly, to target public spending programs into projects that are ready to go and designed to be guaranteed to produce new jobs. And, secondly, in a larger sense, we need to do it because all the wealthier countries in the world, not just the United States, all of them are having great difficulty now, even in times of economic recovery, in creating new jobs. In the last decade, Europe had two big economic recovery periods, created virtually no new jobs, even though incomes were going up, profits were going up, new jobs were not coming into the economy.

In the last 2 or 3 years, that's started to happen in the United States. All during the 1980's, the largest companies in America downsized, just the way I'm trying to downsize the Federal Government. They had to do it to be more competitive. But in every year of the eighties, small business created more jobs than larger businesses lost. Then, the last couple of years, that whole trend came to a screeching halt. There were a lot of reasons: the recession, the cost of health

care, the credit crunch, the enormous cumulative cost of adding a new employee to a small-business work force.

In the last month, we had 365,000 new jobs. That's the good news. The bad news is that more than half of them were part-time jobs, jobs that didn't contain a full income and couldn't provide for health care coverage for the family. Every month now, because of the changing mix in our economy, 100,000 Americans are losing their health insurance. So there are severe problems in this economy that we have to address to create the jobs. Let me just mention a couple of things that we're trying to do, particularly to focus on small business.

We have announced a Governmentwide program with every Agency that regulates our financial institutions to try to end the credit crunch on small business and give banks the flexibility they need to make good loans to worthy customers in the small-business sector and to drastically, and I mean drastically, cut the paperwork required to access Government programs and to comply with the regulatory requirements.

We have proposed a program that would give small businesses—90 percent of the employers employing 40 percent of the people but providing way over half the new jobs—a permanent investment tax credit so that they'll always have more incentives to plow money back into the business.

We have taken steps to pass a budget which will contain billions of dollars in funds to help to deal with these terrible, terrible economic problems caused by defense cutbacks and base closings by not only retraining workers at very high levels but also providing joint ventures in new technologies so that defense contractors will have a fighting chance to get into technologies that have both civilian and defense uses, or entirely civilian uses, to create the jobs of the future.

These are just some of the things that have to be done to keep our eye on the ball. The purpose of bringing the deficit down is to make the economy work, which means we've got to both bring the deficit down and focus on these investments. We've got to change the nature of Federal spending: less consumption, more investment.

And finally, in order to get that done, we're going to have to face the health care crisis in America. It is projected that if we do nothing to change Government spending patterns on health care, listen to this, in 5 years, adding no new benefits—adding no new benefits—in 5 years, your tax bill for paying for Medicare and Medicaid will go from \$210 billion to \$350 billion, a 67 percent increase in 5 years with no new benefits, because of the explosion of health care costs and the explosion in the number of people who will be forced onto the public health care rolls as people cannot afford anymore to insure their employees.

This is a devastating blow to our efforts to reduce the deficit. If you want us to bring the budget into balance, you must insist that after we pass this budget, we move on to find a way to bring health costs in line with inflation and provide a basic package of health care to all of our people. Every other country in the world, except the United States, has figured out a way to do that. Let me tell you what will happen if we don't. By the end of the decade we'll be spending 20 percent of every dollar, 20 cents on the dollar, on health care. And none of our competitors will be over a dime, and we will be in a serious hole in terms of trying to be competitive. We also cannot balance the budget.

The flip side of that is if by working in partnership with providers, employers, and employee groups, we can bring health costs in line with inflation without sacrificing quality, we can emphasize preventive and primary care, we can provide a way for everybody to have basic coverage, we can guarantee people that they won't lose their health insurance if somebody in their family's been sick, or if their own business goes down, if we can do that, we can free up hundreds of billions of dollars.

If you look at the projected increases in health care costs, bringing health costs in line with inflation would do more to stimulate the private economy, even in keeping interest rates down, and much more than any tax cut or any Government spending program we can hope to put out there. So that is the next big challenge for us. But first we've got to pass the economic program.

So I ask all of you today to bring to your views of the National Government the spirit that I see in Atlanta: the idea that the Government and the business sector ought to be in a partnership, the idea that there's a difference between investment and consumption, the idea that you can't run from your problems so you might as well face them and try to do something about them and make progress on them. Those are the things that I saw in that child care center here today. That is the spirit that brought the Olympics to Atlanta. That is the spirit behind the old motto you had when my State had its misfortune in the racial crisis in 1957 and Atlanta called itself "the city that was too busy to hate."

That is what you have to do as a citizen of the United States: Support the Members of the Congress that are up there trying to get something done. Support the idea that we can reduce the deficit and increase investment and create jobs. Support the idea that gridlock is not good for anybody except people who like to hear the gears squeal. Support the idea that we have to change in order to renew the American dream.

We are moving in the right direction. Last night was an exhilarating first step. But believe me, you can ask any Member of the United States Congress, they did not count that a victory for themselves last night: It was a victory for you. They know that they will do only what they believe you want them to do. The people of this country are back in the driver's seat; it's time to put your foot on the accelerator and stay in the middle of the road.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:02 p.m. at the Apparel Mart. In his remarks, he referred to Virgil R. Williams, president and chief executive officer, Williams Communications, Inc.; John Portman, chairman, Portman Companies; Sam Williams, president, Atlanta Market Center; Peg Canter, general manager, Apparel Mart; Doug Miller, general manager, Atlanta Market Center Trade Shows; Zell Miller, Governor of Georgia; Andrew Young, chief executive officer, Law International, and former Mayor of Atlanta; and Max Cleland, Georgia Secretary of State. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 6537—Women's History Month, 1993

March 19, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As we celebrate Women's History Month, we reflect on the American women who throughout history have proudly served in shaping the spirit of our Nation.

Women like Harriet Tubman, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and Sojourner Truth embraced the struggle for human freedom, dignity, and justice. They opposed slavery and inequality at critical moments in history. Their courageous leadership helped pave the way for future generations who would strive to secure equal rights for women.

We are inspired by women like Jane Addams, the first female Nobel prize winner, who at the turn of the century founded Chicago's Hull House to help newly arrived immigrants adapt to a foreign culture. We admire women such as Belva Lockwood, who became the first woman admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court in 1879. And we cannot forget the long struggle of women like Frances Perkins, whose work to protect the health and safety of America's workers culminated in her service as Secretary of Labor, the Nation's first woman Cabinet officer.

These courageous and pioneering women worked tirelessly to achieve new opportunities for all. Today, empowered by this great legacy, American women serve in every aspect of American life, from social services to space exploration. The opportunities for American women are growing, and their efforts as mothers and volunteers, corporate executives and senators, police officers and administrators, construction workers and cab drivers, and teachers and scientists enrich all of us and make our country great. Women continue to strengthen our Nation's social fabric as leaders in the home, the community, the workplace, and the government.

The challenges facing women in the next century are many. Families are increasingly called upon to care for their grown children and elderly relatives. Many women are com-

pelled to support families as single parents. The social stresses of our era demand the incredible resourcefulness, devotion, and energy of millions of women. Through their endeavors, women are producing a heightened national consciousness and more responsive public policies that meet the needs of our people.

As we honor the courageous legacy of our Nation's women, we celebrate the diversity of their backgrounds, their talents, and their contributions, which breathe life into our democracy and sustain our prosperity.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim March 1993 as Women's History Month. I invite all Americans to observe this month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this nineteenth 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, 2:23 p.m., March 22, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on March 24. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Radio Address on the Economic Plan March 20, 1993

Good morning. Today I want to give you a progress report on our plans to get the country moving again. With the support of so many Americans, including many of you listening today, we won an important victory on Capitol Hill this week. The House of Representatives approved the economic package and with it an immediate crucial investment program to create jobs that will be like a booster rocket for our economy.

It was a week that reaffirmed why I came to Washington: to deliver the kind of change you demanded when you cast your ballots

last November. It's significant, I think, that I can bring you this news on the first day of spring. It may be gloomy or even cold where you are right now, but the signs of the season are unmistakable. In Washington the snow is melting, trees are budding, and outside the window of the Oval Office birds are announcing their return. And there's something else in the air. Exactly 2 months ago at my Inauguration as your President, I said that together we could force a season of growth and renewal. I'm happy to tell you today that we're on our way to that kind of spring, too.

We thank all the Congressmen and Congresswomen who carried the day for all of us. But mostly the credit goes to you, the American people, because after all, you issued the challenge and demanded the change. Your message was loud and clear. You said no more status quo. And that message must continue to ring in the ears of all our lawmakers. It should drown out the drone of special interests who would decimate the plan bit by bit until we're back to where we began.

I know you don't want that. You didn't vote for half measures or excuses or business as usual. Because you demanded change, we've begun to turn our back on the long winter of trickle-down economics, moving toward investing in people and their jobs and education and health care and in the future. The price of doing nothing is too high. You've already seen what more than a decade of neglect can do. We're losing our competitive edge in the world. At home, our highways and mass transit systems were falling into disrepair; cities deteriorating; rural areas suffering; and most important, families, especially middle income families, were feeling enormous strains.

On all these fronts there is ground to be regained and advances to be made. Every part of our program is aimed at making lives better across the Nation. And it does it with investments paid for dollar by dollar by cuts in spending.

With our plan, we'll build up our job base. Small businesses, the source of more than half the jobs held by Americans, will get the help with freer access to credit, with invest-

ment tax credits and urban enterprise zones and special capital gains for new enterprises. At the same time, we'll invest more in research and development for new technologies and to convert defense technology. And that will help us stay competitive globally. With our investment in lifelong learning, we'll give Americans the tools they need to stay sharp in the changing job market.

Our plan takes care of our children, too. We want to immunize every child against infectious diseases, to get them off on the right foot with Head Start, to help mothers and infants to get the nutrition they need. It's the smart thing to do and the right investment to make. Every dollar we invest today will give us back many more dollars tomorrow. Just yesterday I saw what investments in children can bring. I was in Atlanta where parents, teachers, and business leaders have joined forces to create a Downtown Child Development Center. In every direction I looked, I saw small faces with big smiles. It's a nurturing environment that produces happy kids, productive parents, and satisfied employers. In many ways, it's a microcosm of what we want for America.

Our economic recovery package may be the boldest economic plan that Congress has ever seen. In addition to the investments, the plan passed by the House will reduce the Federal deficit by \$510 billion in the next 5 years. If we can make these changes, our children will live better, more prosperous lives.

Make no mistake about it, this is a bold plan, because we need bold change. You know it; that's what you asked for. The American people are, by their very nature, people of action. It's been very frustrating to have more than a decade of policies that run up the deficit and ran down morale and investment. And it's been more frustrating still to see Government in gridlock where nothing profoundly important ever happens.

Our plan to cut spending and increase investment in the future of our country is now being considered in the United States Senate. In Washington, your voices are being heard, so I urge you to raise them. We need to enlist the Senators now in our cause to break gridlock and get the economy moving. Please encourage your Senators to support

the economic plan, to create jobs and boost incomes and reduce our national debt.

The sooner our plan becomes a reality, the sooner we'll be shifting the gears of our economy out of neutral and into drive. You're in the driver's seat now. I urge you, make sure your foot's off the brake, step on the accelerator, and help move this country forward.

Thanks for listening.

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

Proclamation 6538—National Agriculture Day, 1993

March 20, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

On this first day of spring, it is appropriate that we reflect on America's agricultural heritage. Our history and our future are intertwined with the farmland and the farmers who help nourish and clothe us. Farming, an integral and pervasive aspect of our economy, is critically important in the daily lives of all Americans.

In our markets, farmers offer us the world's safest and most diverse food supply. But agriculture also touches every other facet of our lives: from shirts to schoolbooks, from prescription drugs to the lumber in our homes. The quality of our lives is due in large measure to the efficient productivity of agricultural workers.

Agriculture, America's number one industry, provides 21 million jobs and is the single largest contributor to our net trade balance. The average American farmer produces enough every year to feed and clothe 129 other people.

As efficient and productive as they are in meeting our citizens' basic needs, our farmers have contributed just as much to our culture. They helped found and build our Nation, and our calendar and holidays still reflect the seasons around which they weave their lives. When American food alleviates the hunger of starving children at home or

abroad, we are all enriched. Farmers and farmworkers have always exemplified the virtues of patient hard work, of respect for the land, with an understanding of our responsibility as stewards of the Earth, of careful management of limited resources, and of resiliency in the face of natural disasters.

On this day, I ask all Americans to consider our reliance on agriculture—the farmers, scientists, processors, shippers, grocers, and others who spend their days providing us with the basics of a good life.

The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 36, has designated March 20, 1993, as “National Agriculture Day” and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim March 20, 1993, as National Agriculture Day. I urge the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth 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, 2:25 p.m., March 22, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on March 24.

Announcement of Nomination for Two Sub-Cabinet Posts

March 22, 1993

President Clinton announced today his intention to nominate George Weise, the staff director of the House Ways and Means Committee’s Subcommittee on Trade, to be Commissioner of the U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury; and Stephen Kaplan, the former city attorney of Denver, to be General Counsel for the Department of Transportation.

“George Weise,” said the President, “is one of this country’s leading experts on customs matters, with experience that few can

match. I am confident that he will work to make the Customs Service a model of effectiveness and efficiency.”

“As Denver’s city attorney,” the President added, “Stephen Kaplan served Federico Peña with unparalleled dedication and professionalism. He will, I am sure, do no less here in the Federal Government.”

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

The President’s News Conference

March 23, 1993

Russian Reforms and U.S. Economy

The President. Good afternoon. Before taking your questions today I would like to speak very briefly about some foreign and domestic issues.

First, I want to reiterate that the United States supports the historic movement toward democratic political reform in Russia. President Yeltsin is the leader of that process. He is a democratically elected national leader, indeed, the first democratically elected President in a thousand years of Russian history. He has United States support, as do his reformed government and all reformers throughout Russia. At this moment, Russia is in a constitutional and political crisis. President Yeltsin proposes to break the logjam by letting the people of Russia decide on April 25th. That is an appropriate step in a democracy. Our interest is to see that this process unfolds peacefully.

We’re encouraged that President Yeltsin is committed to defend civil liberties, to continue economic reform, to continue foreign policy cooperation toward a peaceful world. Russia is, and must remain, a democracy. Democratic reform in Russia is the basis for a better future for the Russian people, for continued United States-Russian partnership, and for the hopes of all humanity for a more peaceful and secure world.

The United States has great responsibilities abroad and at home. To meet these responsibilities, we must not only continue to

support reform and change abroad but also the revitalization of our economy here at home. We need to fundamentally change as our times require it. On February 17th, I offered an economic plan to provide for that kind of fundamental change. Just 5 days ago, the House of Representatives took a giant step toward breaking the logjam and the gridlock here in Washington in approving the economic plan. And in just 1 or 2 days, the Senate will have the opportunity to demonstrate that it too has heard the people's call for change. Make no mistake about it, our people too have demanded a new direction in our economy: cutting the deficit, investing in our people, and creating high-skill, high-wage jobs for working men and women and for our children.

Our plan does reduce the Federal deficit now by about \$500 billion over the next 5 years. And just as important, it will grow the economy by investing in our people, their skills, their technological future, their health, and by offering new incentives for businesses to create jobs. In helping the economy to create millions of new jobs, the great majority of them in private business, we are building the foundations of a future prosperity, from world-class transportation and communication networks to safer streets and smarter schools. Each of these elements, reducing the deficit, asking the wealthy to pay their fair share, investing in the future, and creating jobs, will work as a package, and Congress should pass the package.

Just as the best social program is a job, the best deficit reduction program is a growing economy. This plan sets our country on a new course that honors our oldest values, moving away from gridlock to action; away from a Government that serves only privileged interests to a Government that serves the public interest; away from paying for the mistakes of the past and the expediciencies of the present toward investing in the needs of the future.

The work has only begun. The Vice President is heading our effort to reinvent Government. Cutting back programs that don't work or whose work is already done, we're going to do what the smartest companies have already done in our country: streamline our operations, eliminate wasteful levels of

management, and empower our frontline workers to take initiative and to take us on a better course. We're going to make Government less expensive and more effective. And as we pursue fundamental change in our economy, our health care system, and our schools, we will ask all our people to do their part.

The change the American people voted for is now beginning. We have a rare moment in Washington's history when people's voices are being heard and a rare opportunity to get things done. With the continued involvement of our people and the support of Congress, we can deliver the changes the people demand here at home. We can give the country the best years it has ever had, and we can have the United States still on the side of freedom and democracy and market reform around the world. Those are the objectives of this administration.

And I'll be glad to answer your questions. Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Q. Mr. President, would you be willing to hold the summit meeting in Moscow if it would be best for President Yeltsin's political health? Have you spoken to President Yeltsin? And don't you think that if you did go to Moscow, it would engage the U.S. too closely in the power struggle in the capital?

The President. You've got me on both sides of the issue before I even started. Well, let me say, first, I have not talked to President Yeltsin, but I have sent him two letters, one in response to his statement and the other, of course, a letter of condolence on his mother's death. I am going to meet in the morning with Foreign Minister Kozyrev to get a direct firsthand appraisal of where we are, after which it might be appropriate for us to have a telephone conversation. But I thought I should have the Kozyrev meeting first.

As of this time, we have not received any indications that the Russians, specifically President Yeltsin and his government, have any desire to change the site of the meeting or the time. So we are working very hard; indeed, I'm going to have a long session tonight to try to prepare for the summit at the

appropriate date in Vancouver. I expect to spend a good deal of time this week consulting with the congressional leaders of both parties and others who might have ideas about what we ought to put in our package. And I intend to go there with an aggressive and quite specific plan for American partnership. So that's where we are now.

Q. Would you go to Moscow if it was called for?

The President. Well, let me say this. If they were to express an interest in that, then it's obviously something that we would have to consider. But that has not been done yet. There were some conversations this morning between the Secretary of State and Mr. Kozyrev—that has not been done yet. If that were to happen, then we would cross that bridge when we come to it.

Q. Mr. President, what would the U.S. policy be if the Soviet legislature votes to impeach Mr. Yeltsin, as appears increasingly likely? Would you continue to view Mr. Yeltsin as the duly elected leader of Russia?

The President. Well, I view him as such now. He is the only person who has been elected. The others are proceeding under a constitution that goes back to the Communist era. What I would do under those circumstances, I don't want to speculate about.

First of all, let me say, we have to appreciate, I think, the unique character of the events going on in Russia. It is a Russian experience. I myself have been, I think, in a way, most interested by the television interviews of the people in the street in Russia. You know, just talking about it, they sound almost like our people might sound talking about some fight we were having here. They've been remarkably level-headed about it and of different opinions, obviously. I think we just have to let this play out. I don't want to speculate about what the position of the United States would be in a hypothetical situation.

Yes.

Russian Nuclear Weapons

Q. Mr. President, have you received any assurances about the command and control of Russian nuclear weapons in this crisis?

The President. We are monitoring that very closely, and we will continue to monitor that very closely. At the present time, we

have no reason to be concerned that the command and control procedures that are appropriate have been interrupted or face any imminent threat of interruption. We feel good about it at this time, and we will continue to monitor it closely.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

U.S. Role in Russian Reform

Q. Mr. President, I wonder what your view of the American possibilities are. How do you see the U.S. role? Can the U.S. play a decisive role, or are we really just ultimately bystanders?

The President. I think somewhere in between. I think in the end the Russian people will have to resolve this for themselves, and I hope they'll be given the opportunity to do that in some appropriate fashion. I have only the same access, in a way, that you do in terms of all the possible developments that are in the air. I do not believe that we can be decisive in the sense that we can determine the course of events in Russia or, frankly, in the other Republics of the former Soviet Union, with which we also have a deep interest. But I do believe that we are not bystanders. For one thing, I don't think that this country can do what it needs to do in any acceptable timeframe in moving to a successful economy unless we move to act across a whole broad range of areas. And over the next few days, I should have more to say about that as I work hard on this package.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

Defense Budget Cuts

Q. Mr. President, the former Secretary of State, Dick Cheney, and the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Sam Nunn, have both suggested that your proposed Pentagon budget cuts would perhaps be inappropriate at this time of uncertainty in Russia and elsewhere around the world. Are you taking another look at all of those cuts to perhaps revisit the whole issue?

The President. I'm not taking another look at the cuts at this time. Let me remind you that basically I think we have still presented a responsible defense budget. But what I am doing is trying to make sure that we can fulfill the missions that we have to fulfill based on any projected developments

within the confines of that budget as it's staged over the next 5 years. And we'll be able to constantly review that. Obviously, these budgets are passed every year for 5 years in the future. And I expect, to whatever extent the world is uncertain, we'll have to be more vigilant in reviewing what our commitments are.

Aid to Russia

Q. Mr. President, you've made clear that you support both Russian reform and Yeltsin as the embodiment of that reform movement. But if President Yeltsin is removed either constitutionally or unconstitutionally, would it affect the package of aid, both the size and the specific package that the United States would offer Russia, without a President Yeltsin? Should the conservatives, the nationalists in the Parliament be on notice that it could affect the kind of aid we'd contribute?

The President. Well, let me say again, I don't want to get into hypothetical situations because I don't want anything I say or do to either undermine or rigidify the situation there. I mean, this is something the Russians are going to have to develop.

The United States has three interests in our cooperation with Russia. One is to make the world a safer place, to continue to reduce the threat of nuclear war and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Two is to support the development of democracy and freedom for the people of Russia—it is a vast and great country—and indeed, for all of the Commonwealth of Independent States. And three is to support the development of a market economy. At every step along the way, with or without President Yeltsin in authority, from now, I suppose, until the end of time or at least for the foreseeable future, the United States will have those interests, and we will be guided by those interests.

Gays in the Military

Q. Mr. President, you seem to be having some difficulty with the Pentagon. When you went to the U.S.S. *Theodore Roosevelt*, the sailors there were mocking you before your arrival, even though you are the Commander in Chief. The services have been undercutting your proposal for permitting gays to be

in the military. There's been no Pentagon creation of the task force that was supposed to be created. The hearings are to start a week from now, and Congress has not gotten any advice from the Pentagon or from the services as to what to propose. Do you have a problem, perhaps because of your lack of military service or perhaps because of issues such as gays in the military, in being effective in your role as Commander in Chief, and what do you propose to do about it?

The President. No. No, I don't have a problem being Commander in Chief. You knew that a lot of the service officers disagreed with the position on gays in the military before I ever took office. The Secretary of Defense has not been in the best of health; I think he is either fully recovered now or on the verge of it. And I asked him to give me a report on June 15th. Senator Nunn said back in January that he would have hearings sometime probably in March, so I think we're at the outer limits of the time that he was going to have hearings. And his schedule to have hearings, in my view, has nothing to do with the fact that I asked the Secretary of Defense to present to me on June 15th a report, which I expect to receive.

Q. Can I follow, sir? The task force was supposed to be created by now. The Pentagon has not created the task force, and there has been no report to the Hill. And in fact, Senator Nunn has indicated that he thinks some of the compromises that might have been possible, such as not having gays go to sea or be in combat, are not constitutional. Does that give you pause?

The President. Not constitutional?

Q. Would not pass constitutional muster.

The President. Well, I don't want to get into a constitutional debate, but if you can discriminate against people in terms of whether they get into the service or not, based on not what they are but what they say they are, then I would think you could make appropriate distinctions on duty assignments once they're in. The courts have historically given quite wide berth to the military to make judgments of that kind in terms of duty assignments.

Yes.

Potential Supreme Court Nominee

Q. Mr. President, on another topic, you've laid out some of the criteria you're going to use to choose the next Supreme Court Justice: a fine mind, experience in the law, experience dealing with people, and a big heart. Does Governor Mario Cuomo fit that criteria, and do you think that he would make a good Supreme Court Justice?

The President. Well, I'm on record on that, but the last time I said it, he wound up in the midst of a lot of conversation that I don't think either he or I intended. I will stay with my criteria. I will make the appointment as soon as I reasonably can. Justice White, I think, tendered his letter at this time, before the end of this term of Court, in order to give me a significant amount of time to make a judgment. This is a very busy time around here, as you know, because of all the foreign and domestic activities, but I intend to spend a lot of time on that.

Yes?

FBI Director Sessions

Q. Mr. President, aides suggest that you've made a preliminary decision to remove William Sessions, the FBI Director, from office; you're only waiting for a recommendation from Janet Reno. Can you deny that?

The President. Yes, that's not correct. I've not had a decision about that. I have asked Janet Reno to look at it. My review of the Director and the issues surrounding his appointment is largely confined to what has already been in the press. I wanted to wait until I had an Attorney General and until she could make a review. I have not made a decision, and I am going to wait for her judgment on it.

Yes, Susan [Susan Spencer, CBS News].

Health Care Reform

Q. Americans are eagerly awaiting May 1st to find out what you have in mind for health care reform. Are you ready to stand here now and make a pledge that by the end of your first term all Americans will have health insurance? And how much latitude do you think you have politically to raise taxes to be sure that that happens before the end of your first term? And I have a followup.

The President. Well, I'm ready to tell you that I will present a plan which would provide the American people the opportunity to have the security of health care coverage by the end of my first term. Whether or not that plan will pass the Congress in the form I will propose it, you know, that's a matter for conjecture. But I think we've got an excellent chance of passing it. In terms of how it will be paid for, let me say that no decision has been made on that. All the surveys show lopsided majorities of the American people willing to pay somewhat more, a little more, if they were guaranteed the security of health care coverage when they change jobs, when someone in their family's been sick, when other things happen, when their company can no longer afford it under present circumstances.

But what I'm trying to do now is to reconcile—the key financial conflict in the health care issue is this: We've got to give the American people the right to know they're going to be covered with health insurance, that they're not going to have their costs going up 2 or 3 times the rate of inflation, and they're not going to lose the right to pick their doctor. And we know that if we do it in any one of three or four ways, it will save literally hundreds of billions of dollars, between now and the end of the decade, of tax money and more importantly of private money. Massive amounts of money will be saved. So the question is: How much do you have to raise now in order to save all that money later? Those are the judgments we'll be making in the next month. We've still got about 5 weeks to make the decisions.

You had a followup.

Q. I did. I wanted to ask you if long-term care would absolutely be included in that package of benefits that you're talking about everybody having by the end of the first term.

The President. To what extent it will be hasn't been resolved because of the cost questions there.

Mark [Mark Miller, Newsweek].

Gays in the Military

Q. Are you prepared to support restrictions, to follow up on Andrea's [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News] question, prepared to

support restrictions on the deployment of homosexual members of the service? And if you are, do you think that fulfills the criteria that you laid out that discrimination should be on the basis of conduct, not orientation?

The President. That depends on what the report says. That's why I'm waiting for the Secretary of Defense to issue the report. But I wouldn't rule that out, depending on what the grounds and arguments were.

Yes.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, your own advisers have said that your health care reform might cost from \$30 billion to \$90 billion more a year, cost the Government more. That's in addition to the tax hikes you proposed for your economic program. Are you saying you cannot tell the middle class and working people that you will not seek higher taxes for health care reform?

The President. I'm saying that I have not made a judgment yet about how to recover what monies it would take to provide the security to all families that they would have some health insurance. That's right, I have not made that decision yet. I have sat through now probably 10, 12 hours, maybe, of intense staff briefings on the health care issue, and I would say we have 12 to 15 hours to go before I will be in a position to make some of these calls.

I can tell you this: I will not ask the American people to pay for a health care plan until the people who will be making money out of the changes that we propose are asked to give back some of the money they will make. Keep in mind, these changes will save massive amounts of money immediately to some of the health care providers.

Yes.

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Q. Thank you, sir. Mr. President, if I may return to Russia for a moment. As your spokespersons have told us over the past few days, there are other reformers there. Is there a danger in putting too much American weight behind Boris Yeltsin?

The President. I don't think so. Some people say, well, what's the difference in this and the Gorbachev situation before, and is this the same sort of problem? I tried to an-

swer that question earlier about what the United States interests are and how we would pursue them. And I've tried to be supportive of reformers throughout Russia and, indeed, throughout all the former Communist countries and the former Republics of the Soviet Union. But he is, after all, the first elected President in a thousand years. He has the mandate of having been voted on in a free and open election where people were free to vote and free to stay home, something that was not true previously. And that is something you would expect me to do.

Let's put it in a different context. Well, we just had the Prime Minister of Great Britain here, right? And the United States and Great Britain have had historic ties and shared values. You expect me to work with the Prime Minister of Great Britain, even if he is of a party that was openly supportive of my opponent in the last election. [Laughter] Boris Yeltsin is the elected President of Russia, and he has shown a great deal of courage in sticking up for democracy and civil liberties and market reforms, and I'm going to support that.

Yes, in the back.

Support for the Economic Plan

Q. Mr. President, you congratulated the House of Representatives for a speedy action on your economic plan last week, but you face some tougher hurdles in the Senate in part because some members of your own party, like Senator Breaux, are not on board with you. Why haven't you been able to get some of these Democratic Senators on board, and are you prepared to make some compromises in breaking the gridlock there?

The President. Well, let me just answer you this way. There were two big problems that we confronted when we got here in terms of how the people's money was being spent. One problem was the deficit had exploded. It had gone from \$1 trillion, the debt had, to \$4 trillion in 12 years. The other problem was we'd managed to explode our national debt while reducing our investment in the future.

Now, there are a block of people in the Senate, including some Democrats, who believe that the only thing that matters is to

reduce the deficit. Now, believe me, that's a big improvement over the past, but I just disagree with them. I don't think that's the only thing that matters. I believe that investing in the future matters, too. And I believe if we don't change the spending patterns of the Government and invest and put some of the American people back to work to create millions of jobs, that we're not going to have an economic recovery. So we just have a difference of opinion.

Now, Senator Breaux is much closer to me than many others are in the sense that he basically wants to phase in this spending. But the problem with phasing it in is if you delay the investment, you also delay the impact of the investment, which means you put off the effective date of the jobs being created. That's my only argument with him. He, to be fair to him, has said, "This is an acceptable stimulus package and an acceptable level of investment, but I think we should, in effect, slow down the rate of spending until we have the whole package passed." And my position is, if the United States Senate will adopt a budget resolution like the House did, the American people will know we are not going to raise their taxes until we cut spending, and we are going to create jobs. And this is a plan where 70 percent of it's paid by people with incomes above \$100,000, \$500 billion of deficit reduction, but millions of jobs over the next 4 years, including a half a million in this program. So that's my argument, and I hope I'll be able to persuade enough to get the vote.

Yes.

Russian Nuclear Weapons

Q. Mr. President, could you explain, please, the situation on nuclear weapons in Russia?

The President. This is self-selection over here. It's impressive. [Laughter] Go ahead.

Q. Mr. President, given the fact that both the START I and the START II treaties are hostage to the political outcome in Moscow, and given also the potential for conflict, armed conflict between Russia and Ukraine, are you prepared to draft contingency plans, at least, that would either restore funding or add funding to the Strategic Defense Initiative, if not the space-based part, at least the

ground-based element, as a hedge against the worst possible outcome?

The President. Well, we're not in a position to make a judgment about the worst possible outcome now. Let me say, I've talked to President Kravchuk twice about the Ukraine's position on START I, and I'm very concerned about the very issues you raised. But let me say that even as we speak I'm not ready to say that there is a strong likelihood that we can't proceed with both START I and START II and that we can't resolve the conflicts between Russia and Ukraine. If that becomes apparent that we can't, then we will obviously assess our position and all of our options.

North American Free Trade Agreement

Q. Mr. President, on April 2, the Free Trade Agreement negotiators are going to meet again to talk about the additional agreements. Now, there has been a lot of talk that your administration plans to be very tough. How do you characterize being tough? Do you agree with that statement, and is there any room for compromises? How are you seeing those negotiations?

The President. Well, I wouldn't call it being tough. I would say that I intend to try to get a trade agreement that will be in the best interest of both the United States and Mexico. And keep in mind, this is not simply a trade agreement, this is also an investment agreement. And the issue is whether, when we make it much more attractive for the United States to invest in Mexico and much more secure, shouldn't we also, in the interest of both the economies of Mexico and the United States, see that basic environmental standards and labor standards are observed, and shouldn't we have some protections greater than those embodied in the present agreement in the event that there is severe economic dislocations because of unintended consequences? I believe that we should. And I believe that's in Mexico's interest. And I would just point you to a much smaller example. We had examples in our aid program where the United States spent taxpayers' money to encourage American companies to invest in Central America, who then went down there and actually lowered wages instead of raising them in the host country. So

what I'm trying to do is to promote market reforms and the benefits of them to both countries.

Second thing, let me say, I have enormous admiration for President Salinas and for what he's doing. I want to support that. And I want to remind all of you that insofar as to the trade portion of the NAFTA agreement goes, just look at the unilateral reductions by the Salinas government in trade barriers; took the United States over the past 5 years from a \$6 billion trade deficit to a \$5 billion-plus trade surplus with Mexico. So I have no quarrel with the trade provisions. But the investment provisions need to be used in ways that will raise wages on both sides of the border instead of lower wages on both sides of the border and pollute the environment. That's what I want to avoid.

Cuba-U.S. Relations

Q. Among the people you have charmed, it seems you have charmed President Fidel Castro because—[laughter]—in a recent interview with a TV network, he wanted to meet with you. Would you be willing to meet with him? And a Democratic administration might change the approach towards Cuba, versus a Republican?

The President. I have no change in Cuba policy except to say that I supported the Cuban Democracy Act, and I hope someday that we'll all be able to travel to a democratic Cuba.

Debra [Debra Mathis, Gannett News Service]—

Q. Would you meet with President Castro?

The President. I said "democratic Cuba"—elections.

Go ahead.

Deaths in Mississippi Jails

Q. A totally different subject, although it is south of here. I wonder about, in Mississippi, where as you know, civil rights and human rights groups are asking for your help in investigating the 40-plus hangings, suicides supposedly, in Mississippi jails. Some of the civil rights groups say that they are asking you, in fact, to order a Justice Department investigation. Have you heard from them directly, and are you amenable to that request?

The President. Well, I'm very much concerned about the deaths in the jails. I have not had a—if they have communicated with me directly, my staff has not yet discussed it with me, although they may have done so. What I would always do in a situation like that is to first discuss it with the Attorney General after an assessment of the facts and to see whether it is appropriate. But obviously, if we were asked to look into it, I would certainly at least discuss it with the Attorney General.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, on another trade issue, during your campaign last year in Michigan and other States, you criticized a Bush administration decision which allowed foreign-made minivans, MPV's to come into the country at low tariff rates. This led the auto industry and auto workers to believe that you would take action early in your administration to do something about this. Have you changed your mind on that subject, or do you still intend to take action?

The President. No, I haven't changed my mind on that subject. That issue is now under review, along with a number of others relating to our trade relations with Japan. And let me just say this: I had hoped, and still hope, to engage the Japanese Government in an ongoing dialog across a whole broad range of these issues. If you look at the history of American trade relationships, the one that never seems to change very much is the one with Japan. That is, we're sometimes in a position of trade deficit, but we're often in a position of trade surplus with the European Community. We once had huge trade deficits with Taiwan and South Korea, but they've changed now quite a bit; they move up and down. But the persistence of the surplus the Japanese enjoy with the United States and with the rest of the developed world can only lead one to the conclusion that the possibility of obtaining real, even access to the Japanese market is somewhat remote. And I will say again, I was astonished that the Bush administration overruled its own customs office and gave a \$300 million a year freebie to the Japanese for no apparent reason. And we got nothing, and I emphasize nothing, in return. So, no, I haven't changed

my position about that. I did hope to put it in the context of a larger set of trade issues to be raised first with the Japanese Government before acting unilaterally. But my own opinion about that has not changed.

Yes, Randy [Randy Lilleston, Arkansas Democrat-Gazette], go ahead.

Q. Mr. President, you've been——

The President. I'm going to come back to the right. I'm left-handed, you know, and I—[laughter]—sometimes discriminate. No, go ahead.

Potential Supreme Court Nominee

Q. Mr. President, during the campaign you gave some pretty strong indications that your Supreme Court nominee—you would certainly consider their position on abortion. Is that still the case?

The President. Thank you for asking, because I want to emphasize what I said before. I will not ask any potential Supreme Court nominee how he or she would vote in any particular case. I will not do that. But I will endeavor to appoint someone who has certain deep convictions about the Constitution. I would not, for example, knowingly appoint someone that did not have a very strong view about the first amendment's freedom of religion, freedom of association, and freedom of speech provisions. And I strongly believe in the constitutional right to privacy. I believe it is one of those rights embedded in our Constitution which should be protected.

Yes.

Q. Mr. President, on the issue of the Supreme Court, is your commitment to a Government that looks like America, does that also extend to the Supreme Court to the extent you can influence that through your appointments? Will you be taking age into consideration? And given what you just said about the right to privacy, do you think it's appropriate and will you or members of your administration be asking potential nominees if they support the right to privacy and whether they think that right includes the right to abortion?

The President. I'll answer the question. I will not ask anybody how they will vote in a specific case. I will endeavor to appoint someone who has an attachment to, a belief in a strong and broad constitutional right to privacy. And on the age issue, I will not dis-

criminate against people who are older than I am. [Laughter] Yes. I won't discriminate against people who are of a different gender, of a different racial or ethnic group.

Q. How about a Government and the Court that looks like America, sir—on diversity?

The President. I don't know how many appointments I'll get to the Supreme Court; I don't know what will happen there. I'm going to appoint someone I think will be a great Justice.

Go ahead.

Campaign Finance Reform

Q. Mr. President, on campaign finance reform, could you tell us how you plan to end soft money contributions to State and national parties?

The President. First let me say that I intend to come forward with a proposal that will end the use of soft money in Presidential campaigns in the next few days. We're working on it now. We're working on trying to hammer it out with the friends of campaign finance reform in both Houses of the Congress. I will attempt to do it in a different way that will at least enable the parties to raise sufficient funds to involve grassroots people and empower people to participate in the political process, but I think that we should do away with this soft money issue and make a lot of other changes as well, and we're working on it. We should have a bill out that has the support of the administration quite soon. We've been working very hard now for the last couple of weeks on it.

Press Secretary Myers. Last question.

Forest Conference

Q. Mr. President, you're going to the forest conference in a couple of weeks, looking for a solution to an issue that has dragged on for a long time partly because both sides are unwilling to compromise or share the pain and, some say, the previous administration's unwillingness to obey the law of the land. How do you propose to find a solution where so many have failed or been unwilling to find a solution?

The President. Let me say, I would like to begin by having the United States have one position, and let me come back to the

larger issue. The forest summit involves, as you know, what will happen to the old growth forest and to adjacent forests in the Pacific Northwest which are the habitat of the spotted owl, but which also are now a very small part of what once was a massive old growth forest up there. Thousands of jobs are at stake, but the very ecostructure of the Pacific Northwest is also at stake. The parties on both sides have been paralyzed in court battles, and all timber sales have been frozen, including many timber sales that virtually all environmentalists think should go forward, because of the impasse. One of the problems has been that the United States itself has taken different positions across the Agencies. So the first thing I hope to do is to be able to at least adopt a uniform legal position for the United States.

The second thing I want to do is go out there along with the Vice President and listen, hammer out the alternatives, and then take a position that I think will break the logjam. The position—it may be like my economic program—it'll probably make everybody mad, but I will try to be fair to the people whose livelihoods depend on this and fair to the environment that we are all obligated to maintain. And let me say, I live in a State that's 53 percent timberland. I have dealt with a lot of these timber issues for many years. The issue is, in this case, what is the right balance, given some facts that are inevitable about what's going to happen. And I think we can hammer out a solution. And as I said, everybody may be somewhat disappointed, but the paralysis now gripping the lives of the people out there is totally unacceptable.

Economic Stimulus Package

Q. Sir, did you screen those projects in the economy stimulus package before you sent them to the Hill? The Republicans are saying there are so many things in there that are totally unnecessary. I can't believe that you sent those up there; and maybe somebody did it for you. [*Laughter*] But there are—[*inaudible*—]in there and swimming pools and copying statues—

The President. No.

Q. —and even a project on studying the religion in Sicily.

The President. No—[*laughter*]—let me say, you will read those bills for years in vain and not find those projects. The—

Q. Well, the—

The President. Let me say, I have a letter here, dated on March 22d, to Senator Byrd from Leon Panetta about those alleged projects. What Mr. Panetta points out is to say that none of the specific projects referenced are actually in the legislation proposed by me. What they have done is to go to these Departments and say, if you had this much more money, give me every absurd thing you could possibly spend the money on. I am not going to let those things be done.

The other thing they have done is to go to some isolated parts of the country and pick atypical examples of community development block grant funds. I would remind you that it was the Republicans who've always supported the community development block grant proposal on the theory that we ought to rely more on the States and local governments to make judgments about how best to create jobs. So, I will do everything I can to keep undue waste and abuse from coming into this process. I do not support it.

We've got to quit. Thank you. We'll do it again sometime. I like this. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President's seventh news conference began at 1:02 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Remarks to Democratic Governors Association Members and State and Business Leaders

March 23, 1993

Thank you very much. Governor Walters, thank you for that introduction. That was spoken with a fervor that could have only been mustered by someone who, a year and a month ago, was freezing to death in the Super 8 Motel in Manchester, New Hampshire. [*Laughter*]

I also want to tell you that we just had a press conference at the other end of the hall, and I was upstairs on the telephone, and

I didn't know you were here yet. And I was told that I had been introduced, so I rushed downstairs, only to find that I would be introduced twice or thrice. *[Laughter]*

I'm delighted to see you all. I thank you for being here. I thank the leaders of business and labor and State and local government for coming along with my colleagues in the Democratic Governors group to endorse this program.

Last week was a remarkable week here in this Capital. The House of Representatives took a strong stand for the most credible deficit reduction program in anybody's memory. At their request and based on the Congressional Budget Office estimates and based on what the Governors asked, we took another \$60 billion-plus in deficit reduction spending cuts so that now we'll have \$500 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years; a significant amount of tax increases, most of them on upper income people whose incomes went up the most in the 1980's, but a broad-based BTU tax that we think will both preserve the environment, promote energy conservation, and raise money in a fair way; big spending cuts; and finally, some very significant but very targeted investment increases.

The debate moves to the Senate this week, and I want to tell you a little about that, because there is an honest philosophical debate going on, as well as an underlying political one that I need your help on. In the last 12 years I think you could argue that your Government had two big problems: one is that the deficit literally exploded, and the public debt quadrupled. We started the decade of 1980 with a \$1 trillion debt; we in 1992 had it up to \$4 trillion, with huge projected annual operating deficits. That is a massive problem. It led to a big gap between short- and long-term interest rates, and it clearly had a major contributing impact on our trade deficit, our ability to save and invest, and our long-term economic growth. We had to do something about it.

The other big problem was that we were actually seeing reductions in investment by the National Government even as all of our competitors were increasing their investment. And that may seem inconsistent. I mean, how could we be making a relatively smaller contribution at the national level to

the education, for example, of people who graduate from high school but don't go to college and need apprenticeship programs? How could we be retrenching in our commitment to the education of our young children and to dealing with the problems of poor children? How could we be retrenching in our commitment to develop new technologies and new partnerships in the public-private sector and new partnerships for dual-use technologies between defense and domestic technologies?

Well, the answer is pretty clear. We're spending more and more money every year, first on defense in the first part of the 1980's. And then the latter half of the 1980's, while we have cut defense, we spend even more on interest on the debt and more money for the same health care. And then as all of you know, those of you who are employers in particular, about 100,000 Americans a month are actually losing their health insurance; and many of them, the lower wage working people, are coming onto the public rolls.

So that's what's happened to us. So we run the deficit up. We run investment down at the same time. That is a huge problem. Our plan seeks to address both of these.

There are those who really don't want a change. They don't want any tax increases, or they don't really want the cuts that I have offered. And they're going to maneuver this process for political paralysis.

But underneath that or over that, if you will, there are a group of people who do want to reduce the deficit but just don't agree that an investment strategy is important. And they are the people that I urge you to reach out to, because it is important to reduce the deficit. But it's also important to increase investment. And if you do one without the other, you won't get the full benefits of this plan.

I would argue to you that we have gotten a major benefit out of deficit reduction. Look what has happened to long-term interest rates: down almost a full point since the election. You have millions of Americans refinancing business debt, consumer debt, home mortgages, getting the benefit of variable interest rates on various kinds of debt payment. That will unleash billions of dollars, tens of billions of dollars into this economy this year, which in turn will be reinvested, which will

create new jobs. That is very important. I don't think the marginal amount of deficit reduction you would get by killing this investment package or killing our emergency jobs program would bring interest rates down any more. You just can't get them down much more. But we would, if we killed it, forgo the chance to jumpstart the job engine of this economy by half a million jobs. And that is a serious thing. That's about a half a percent on the unemployment rate. That's a very substantial impact.

Now, let me make one other comment that, again, the employers here as well as the employees will not find surprising. There has been a dramatic restructuring of our economy and of the global economy which has been going on for the better part of 20 years, and we've been clearly aware of it for a decade now, where the biggest companies in America have been forced to restructure their operations here, either because they're going global and they have to put production overseas or because they just have to increase productivity and do more with less through technology. But many of them have also provided for outsourcing or contracts with smaller businesses, and the American entrepreneurial economy for the entire decade of the 1980's was able to create more jobs in the small business sector and the medium-size business sector than big business lost.

Two years ago, it stopped. And it started slowing down about 4 years ago, so that over a 4-year period we had almost no net job growth in the private sector. Virtually all, not quite all but almost all the net job growth for the previous 4 years was, believe it or not, in State, local, and national government.

Job growth was canceled out by job reduction in the private sector. Now, why did that happen? The truth is, no one knows all of the answers. It's an international phenomenon. In Europe during the 1980's, where they didn't have the vital small business sector that we had and all the entrepreneurial culture, there were two major economic recoveries where the economy was growing like crazy and no new jobs were created. So this is a global phenomenon.

But we also know that part of the problem here has been the credit crunch, the general recession, the cost of hiring new workers be-

cause of the back-breaking costs of health care as well as other attendant costs. So more and more people are relying on part-time workers or asking their existing work force to work overtime.

I say that to make this point: We have gotten the maximum short-term benefits we can get now out of a very, very tough and vigorous deficit reduction program. We are going to get long-term benefits out of it. The time has come to put in the other piece to create jobs and to lay the foundation for an educated work force and for a high-technology future. And that is what the rest of this program does.

So I ask those of you who are living out there at the grassroots, in the private sector or at the State and local level, to go make that honest policy argument in the United States Senate. We've done our work on deficit reduction. Let's do our work on investing in our people and putting them back to work, too.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:38 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. David Walters of Oklahoma, chairman, Democratic Governors Association.

Nomination of Pamela Harriman To Be United States Ambassador to France

March 23, 1993

President Clinton announced today his intention to nominate Pamela Harriman to be Ambassador to France.

"Anyone who has been involved with the Democratic Party for any length of time is certainly familiar with Mrs. Harriman's talent for diplomacy," said the President. "Her many years of dedicated service to the United States and her unceasing devotion to the cause of world peace are only two of the many qualifications that she will bring with her to Paris."

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

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev of Russia

March 24, 1993

Russia

Q. Will you answer a couple of questions? Do you have any reaction to what Mr. Kozyrev suggested this morning as to the future economic relations between us and Russia?

The President. Well, we haven't had a conversation about it yet. Let me just say that I'm delighted to have him here. I'm glad to have a firsthand account of what's going on in Russia. And I want to reaffirm my support for democracy and for reform and say I'm looking very much forward to the Vancouver summit with President Yeltsin.

Q. Mr. President, apparently you seem to oppose aiding Russia. What will you do to try to sell your program for Russian aid?

The President. Well, I would tell the American people what I've been saying for well over a year now, that it is very much in our interest to keep Russia a democracy, to keep moving toward market reforms, and to keep moving toward reducing the nuclear threat. It will save the American people billions of dollars, in money we don't have to spend maintaining a nuclear arsenal, if we can continue to denuclearize the world. It will make the American people billions of dollars in future trade opportunities. And it will make the world a safer place. So, I think this is a good investment for America. I've always believed that. And I hope I can persuade the American people and the United States Congress that it is.

Q. Do you think there's still a chance for a compromise in Russia?

The President. That's something the Russians will have to work out among themselves. I presume there is, but that's obviously something that has to be decided by the Russian people. The United States can't dictate that.

Q. Mr. Kozyrev, can you tell us, did the meetings go poorly this morning, because it seems as though the line was harder when they came out from those meetings?

Foreign Minister Kozyrev. [Inaudible]—well, I think the people will pass final judgment. As President just said, it is for Russians and Russian people to pass final judgment, and President calls for vote, popular vote. And I think this will be the decisive event. But on the—President, as always, is open to compromise where there are those political forces who are not apt to just reverse the reform and advance the democracy.

Q. Will you support the idea of Russia joining G-7 as soon as possible?

The President. I wouldn't rule out or in anything particular. We're going to be dealing with a whole broad range of issues between the United States and Russia and with the G-7. And let's just see what happens.

NOTE: The exchange began at 1:10 p.m. in the Oval Office 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 Members of the Council of Churches

March 24, 1993

Russia

Q. Mr. President, did you and Mr. Kozyrev reach any kind of agreement on the type of aid package that might be most helpful for Russia?

The President. No, we discussed what I was thinking about and what our people are working on. And I told him it would be a good and specific package, and I was looking forward to having the opportunity to discuss it with President Yeltsin.

Q. Did he give you any encouragement, sir, that the current political crisis could be resolved?

The President. I think he's hopeful.

Q. Any specifics as to how it might be resolved, sir?

The President. No, he's been here with me.

NOTE: The exchange began at 3:50 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. A tape

was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Interview With Dan Rather of CBS News

March 24, 1993

The President's Schedule

Mr. Rather. How's your golf game?

The President. Not very good. I've only played twice. The first time it was about 35 degrees with a whipping wind, and the second time, I had a very good second nine holes. But I haven't gotten to play very much.

Mr. Rather. We were talking about your sleep or lack of same over in the Oval Office. You mentioned something about a nap. Are you trying to nap these days?

The President. If I can take a nap, even 15 or 20 minutes in the middle of the day, it is really invigorating to me. On the days when I'm a little short of sleep, I try to work it out so that I can sneak off and just lie down for 15 minutes, a half an hour, and it really makes all the difference in the world.

The White House

Mr. Rather. We're in the Library now, where President Roosevelt made his fireside chats. Is this among your favorite rooms?

The President. I love this room. And this is a highly public room. It is actually a lending library. People who work around here can come in here and check out these books just like any other library. It's also a public room that's open to everyone who comes in the White House on a tour. So people get to see this wonderful library of America, great old portrait of George Washington, and as I was telling you a moment ago, the little-known anonymous design for the White House by Thomas Jefferson. He tried to become the architect of the White House anonymously, and his design was rejected in favor of this one.

Mr. Rather. You were mentioning that certain Presidents dominate this house, as opposed to how they may be viewed in history. What did you mean by that?

The President. What I meant was most of the Presidents who are dominant here were very important Presidents, or all of

them. Lincoln is plainly the dominant presence here: a bedroom named for him, the room where he signed the Emancipation Proclamation, his statues and portraits everywhere. But Andrew Jackson is very important here. He put both of the round porches on the White House and changed the front to the back of the White House and the back to the front. Theodore Roosevelt built both the wings, and his portraits are everywhere and his vigor and youth. Franklin Roosevelt lived here longer than everyone else, but he has just a couple of portraits here in the house and a very modest presence, considering the fact that he was plainly the dominant personality in terms of the length of time that he dominated here. So it's just sort of interesting who dominates, because of the contributions they made to the house itself, I think.

Mr. Rather. What are the chances that Bill Clinton can be one of those dominant Presidents in this house?

The President. Well, I don't know. Probably not much. I think this house is in good shape; I don't know that I can do anything to it that would improve it. I imagine that I will enjoy living here and that I will reverse the responsibility about as much as anybody who's ever been here.

The Presidency

Mr. Rather. What's been your biggest disappointment so far?

The President. How hard it is to do everything I want to do as quickly as I want to do it, that the pace of change, although they say we're keeping quite a brisk pace—the House of Representatives adopted the budget resolution and my jobs stimulus package last week in record time—but I still get frustrated. I have a hard time keeping up with everything and keeping it going forward. I'm an impatient person by nature, and I want to do things. That's been disappointing.

But I've been pleased that my staff has worked like crazy, my Cabinet's worked hard. We've had a minimum so far of the kind of backbiting and factionalism and all that you hear about.

Economic Plan

Mr. Rather. What would you count as your biggest success so far?

The President. I think moving the economic program as quickly as possible and developing a big consensus for the idea that we need to make a serious attempt to both reduce the deficit and increase investments in jobs and education and technology. We've got to do both at the same time.

I've been very worried that I wouldn't be able to convince the American people or the Congress to do both at the same time because we've never done it before in the history of the country. But the competition we're in in the world and the problems we've had for the last 12 years absolutely require us to invest in our people and their jobs and to reduce the deficit at the same time, I believe.

Mr. Rather. Now, it's my information, I want to check it with yours, that what you call the job stimulus part of your economic plan is in trouble in the Senate. One, you may not have the votes. Senator Byrd said this afternoon that he saw trouble on the horizon. Does that match your information?

The President. We plainly got the votes to pass it as it is or with very minor modifications. What most Americans don't know is that of the 100 Members of the Senate, if you have one more than 40 you can shut everything down. And you know, there's been some discussion that the Republicans may try to filibuster the stimulus program and may try to stop us from trying to create any new jobs. They have 43 Republican Senators, and they may be able to hold 41 of them. And if they do, you know, they can indefinitely postpone a vote. Well, there's some speculation about that. I would hate to see that happen, and I think it would not serve them well. The American people did not elect any of us to perpetuate the kind of partisan gridlock we've had for the last several years, and particularly to have a minority of one House do that. So, I'm hopeful that that won't occur. I do hear that.

You know there's some argument around the edges among the more pro-deficit reduction Democrats that we should make some minor changes in the jobs stimulus program, but they're not great, I don't think.

Mr. Rather. Two things strike me, not just about what you said but the way you said it. Correct me if I'm wrong, it sounds to me like you're really worried about the possibility that it will be slowed if not stopped, the stimulus part.

The President. I think in the end we will pass it because, first of all, I think the public would just be outraged at the thought that we have a chance here to create half a million new jobs and to do things that are good that need to be done and that it would be slowed up. I'm just pointing out that if the minority in the Senate can get 40 votes plus one, they can stop anything from happening.

And that's what happened when they tried to gut the motor voter bill last week. That would have really been a big—it's a major piece of political reform, makes it easier for all kinds of people to register and vote. And they were willing to pass the motor voter bill, which allowed people to register when they license their car but not allow people, low-income people, to register when they pick up their Medicaid or Social Security benefits or something else. I've seen it. It can happen. All I'm saying is it can happen. I hope it won't, and we'll do our best to avert it.

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, let me come to what I and, I think, a lot of Americans perceive to be the gut of this. The economic indicators are looking good. Do we really need this, what you call stimulus package now? Doesn't it or does it present a real threat to inflation and increasing the deficit? Why not either reduce it or call it off since the economy seems to be moving?

The President. Because we're not producing jobs and because it doesn't present a threat to inflation, nor does it present a threat to the deficit. I agreed over the next 5 years to reduce the deficit by 4 times as much as the stimulus package over and above the deficit reduction that I've proposed, \$500 billion of deficit reduction. So, we have blown away the amount of the stimulus package over the next 4 years in extra deficit reduction. So, we're not adding to the deficit.

Secondly, the financial markets have already discounted the prospects of this being inflationary.

Third, and most important of all, unemployment in America is too high. Unemploy-

ment in all the rich countries except Japan is too high. We have to prove that we can generate jobs in America again. And there is no indication that we are doing that. Now, last month we had a lot of new jobs, but way, way over half of them were part-time jobs with no health care benefits and no security of lasting. So, we need this to create jobs. This program invests in community, invests in people and their education. I think it's very important.

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, I want to talk to you about Russia. Time for us to take a break. Stay here with us for our special edition of 48 Hours, an interview with President Clinton. We'll continue with conversation about Russia in just a moment.

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

Aid to Russia

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, just right off the top of your head, what percentage of this day have you spent dealing with the problems in Russia?

The President. Probably 30 percent today.

Mr. Rather. That's a lot.

The President. A lot.

Mr. Rather. Why? And let me ask a specific question. If I'm a trying-to-do-right American, lost my job, trying to support my wife and kids, tell me why I should pay for spending foreign aid to help the Russians?

The President. Because it's in your interest. And let me tell you why it's in your interest. For one thing, America needs good customers for its products. And Russia, a free Russia with a free economy, would prefer to do business with America over any other country. And they prefer to buy our farm products and other products, and we have to look ahead. Every year we have to be looking ahead to find more and more markets for our products because as we get drawn into the global economy, we've got to sell more to other people to keep our incomes high.

Secondly, we have a real interest in keeping Russia democratic and keeping them committed to reducing their nuclear arsenals. Why? Because otherwise we have to turn

right around and rebuild our defenses at very high levels, spend huge amounts of taxpayers' money on nuclear arsenals, raise our children in a more dangerous world, and divert needed resources which ought to be spent on education and training and investment here at home.

So a safe, a democratic, a free market-oriented Russia is in the immediate economic interest of every working American and very much in the interest of those folks and their children over the long run. If we let Russia revert to a country which will never be able to do business with us, that's bad business. If it reverts to a nationalist, even if not a Communist, a highly nationalist nuclear power that forces us to spend more of our money keeping our guard higher, then that's money that will be diverted from the future of the working families and their children.

Mr. Rather. What about the theory that whatever money we try to give to the Russians, it would be money down a black hole, just disappear because chaos and pandemonium are hour by hour?

The President. First of all, we don't have enough money to, on our own, affect the course of events. Ultimately the Russian people will have to work out their own future. But there are some specific things we can do which will not hurt us; in fact, will help us, and which will send a clear signal to the forces of freedom and democracy and market economics in Russia that we and the rest of the West will help them.

You know, for example, if we provide more food aid, that helps our farmers, and we can do it at relatively low cost to ourselves. If we can find a way to help to privatize more businesses and to make those work, that helps us. If we can find a way to help them run their energy business better so they don't lose as much of their oil or their gas in the pipeline, that helps them without hurting us. It gives us a market for our pipeline products. If we can find a way to help them convert their nuclear power plants that are built on the Chernobyl model to a different energy source, that could put a lot of our folks to work, put a lot of their people to work, and make them safer environmentally and economically. So there is a zillion things we can do.

Now, over the long run, they're going to have to do some things for themselves. They're going to have to get control of their rampant inflation. They're going to have to make sure that they can get out of the bureaucracies that don't work anymore, that clog up all reforms. They're going to have to make a lot of decisions themselves. But there are some targeted, limited commitments we can make that, no matter what happens, won't hurt us very much and carry the potential of helping us a great deal while helping to keep good things alive in Russia.

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Mr. Rather. Now you've met with the Russian Foreign Minister this afternoon.

The President. I did.

Mr. Rather. Did you come out of that with increased confidence that Boris Yeltsin will survive?

The President. He's a very resilient fellow, you know. He's like all of us in public life; he's not perfect. I'm not perfect; we all have our problems. But he is a genuinely courageous man, genuinely committed to freedom and democracy, genuinely committed to reform. And I think now he is more open perhaps than in the past at trying to work out some kind of accommodation with others who would negotiate with him to keep reform going, even though they may have some different ideas. Well, that's what I have to do here. I have to work with the Senate and the House, the Democrats and the Republicans. I think he's got to work on all that. But I think he's got a fair chance to survive. And I think not only the United States but I think the major Western countries ought to do what they can to be supportive of his elected Presidency now because he represents the ideals and the interests of our Nation and our way of life.

Vice President Alexander Rutskoi of Russia

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, correct me if I'm wrong, but you've said a couple of times, I think, recently that Boris Yeltsin is the only democratically elected leader in Russia. In fact, his Vice President—

The President. That's right.

Mr. Rather. —Alexander Rutskoi is also democratically elected. I just want to go over

that. If Boris Yeltsin is impeached because he's tried to suspend the constitution and Alexander Rutskoi, who has now broken with Yeltsin and is also committed to democratic reform, comes into power, would you, would the United States Government consider him a democratically elected leader and swing in behind him?

The President. First of all, it is true that he was elected on the ticket with Yeltsin. But when Yeltsin was elected, he won an overwhelming popular victory. If you go back and look at the distribution of votes, there's no question that that's what happened.

I don't want to get into what might happen or what-if questions. The constitution under which these proceedings might take place was one that came in 1978 under the Communist government. The only popularly elected President ever is Yeltsin. Yeltsin and Rutskoi were elected together on a ticket. And we'll just have to see what happens. I think in the end the Russian people will resolve this one way or the other by what they do or don't do in the referendum in April.

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, I would love to spend hours talking foreign policy. We have such a short time here. Let me try to do something reasonably brief, and that is mention some countries and potential problems out on the horizon and just have you respond briefly.

The President. Sure.

Iran

Mr. Rather. Iran: Particularly if it is proven that Iranian-sponsored terrorists had anything to do with the World Trade Center bombing, would you be prepared to retaliate?

The President. First, let's note that even as we speak, we were just given notice that another major arrest was made and someone brought to the United States from Egypt where the apprehension was made. That's very good news. I don't want to speculate about who was behind it until I know. That would be a very dangerous thing to do.

Let me say that I'm more concerned about the Iranian government maintaining its militance, perhaps supporting, in general, terrorists organizations or engaging in unsafe proliferation of weapons of mass destruction for

its own use or for the benefit of others. I wish Iran would come into the family of nations. They could have an enormous positive impact on the future of the Middle East in ways that would benefit the economy and the future of the people of Iran. I am very troubled that instead of trying to contribute to alleviating a lot of the problems of the Islamic people to the region, they are seeming to take advantage of them. I hope that they will moderate their course.

Mr. Rather. I want to move on, but I want to make sure that I understand. I asked the question, should it be proven they had anything to do with the World Trade, would you be prepared to retaliate? So far, you're on the record as not answering.

The President. That's right. I want to be on the record as not answering. I want to maintain all options in dealing with terrorists, but I want to be on the record as not answering because I don't want the inference to be there that I'm accusing them of something that I have no earthly idea whether they did or not.

Iraq and Saddam Hussein

Mr. Rather. I understand.

Iraq and Saddam Hussein: Just before you came into office, you were quoted as saying words to the effect, well, if Saddam Hussein goes a certain way, I, Bill Clinton, could see relations getting better. Do you regret having said that, or is that a fair quotation?

The President. I think the inference was wrong. What I said was, I cannot conceive of the United States ever having any kind of normal relationship with Iraq as long as Saddam Hussein is there. I can't conceive it. What I said was that I did not wish to demonize him; I want to judge him based on his conduct. And in that context, I will be very firm, and the United States will remain very tough on the proposition that he must fully comply with the United Nations requirements, which he has still not done, in order for us to favor any kind of relaxation of the restrictions now on him through the U.N. That's my position.

Bosnia

Mr. Rather. What used to be called the Balkans, what once was Yugoslavia, is now

referred to in shorthand as Bosnia. You seem—and I say this respectfully, but I want to say it directly—you seem to have been all over the place in terms of policy toward Bosnia. One, tell us exactly what U.S. policy toward Bosnia is at the moment and what we can expect in the future.

The President. Well, first, let me respond to your general comment. And like most Americans, I am appalled by what has happened there; I am saddened; I am sickened. And I know that our ability to do anything about it is somewhat limited. I'm convinced that anything we do would have to be done through the United Nations or through NATO or through some other collective action of nations. And I am limited also not only by what I think the United States can do or should do but by what our allies are willing to do.

Now, against that background, we have done a number of things. We have been instrumental in tightening the embargo against Serbia. It's much tighter than it was when I took office. We have pushed for enforcement of the no-fly zone against the Serbians. I think we will get that in the United Nations sometime in the next couple of weeks. We have begun the airlift operation, which was initially criticized and is now universally recognized as having done an awful lot to alleviate severe human suffering and to meet profound needs. We have determined that we should support the Vance-Owen peace process to try to bring an end to hostilities there. But we've also been very clear that if the Bosnians will sign off under the Vance-Owen plan and the Croatians sign off on it, and the Serbs don't, that we think that we're going to have to look at some actions to try to give the Bosnians a means to at least defend themselves. I'm very concerned about this.

But my view is that we ought to try to get the Vance-Owen peace process working. If the parties will good-faith agree to a peace process, then I would be willing to have the United States participate with other nations in trying to keep the peace in Bosnia.

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

North Korea

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, before I get away from foreign policy, very quickly—North Korea, nuclear proliferation: one of those things people's eyes glaze over. Important, of course, but is it something that consumes a lot of your time?

The President. Well, it's caused me a lot of concern in the last few days. Just for the benefit of our viewers, the North Koreans have refused to allow the International Atomic Energy Agency's inspectors to look into sites where they might be illegally producing nuclear weapons under the non-proliferation regime. And because they wouldn't allow our inspectors in and because the United Nations continued to insist that they do so, the North Koreans have now given us notice that they are going to withdraw, which means they're going to put themselves outside the family of nations seeking to contain nuclear weapons. That would be a great mistake, and I hope they don't do it.

It's deeply troubling to us and to the South Koreans. You know, Seoul, which is now a teeming city of well over 8 million people, is very close to the 38th parallel, very close to North Korea. And over the last few years, relations between those two nations have been warming, and people began to dream of reunification in the same way that it happened in Germany. So this is a very sad and troubling development. I don't want to overreact to it. The North Koreans still have a couple of months to change their mind, and I hope and pray that they will change their mind and return to the family of nations committed to restraining nuclear proliferations.

Health Care

Mr. Rather. There's no easy transition to make to health care, but we need to move on. So, if I may. As I understand it—correct me if I'm wrong—you are telling the American people that their health care coverage will be increased, that the deficit at the same time will be cut. The translation of that is that there's going to be yet another significant increase in taxes, isn't it? How can it be avoided?

The President. Not necessarily. And we're looking at the options to do it. If I might,

let me try to describe the problem. And I know we don't have a lot of time, but let me be as brief as I can.

There are the following problems in health care: The average person who has health insurance is pretty satisfied with the quality of health care, but terrified of losing the health care coverage. They're just afraid that either through higher deductibles, higher copay, or just outright loss of the insurance, or they had to change jobs but they've had somebody in their family that's sick, they won't be able to keep their health insurance. That's one big problem. The average business is terrified about the cost of health care. We're spending 30 percent more than any other country and getting less for it. So more and more people lose their health insurance every year. And then there are a lot of people who don't even have access to health care. They never see doctors or dentists or go to a medical clinic.

So we've got the most expensive health care system in the world. For the people that can afford it and stay with it, you get to choose your doctor, choose your providers of all kinds, and it's good stuff. But millions of people live with insecurity, and the cost of it is really breaking the economy.

Now, here is the dilemma. In order to fix this cost problem and the security problem, you know, to tell people you can still choose your doctor but you're never going to have to worry about losing your health insurance, you have to find a way to pay, to cover everybody who doesn't now have health insurance, and to stop the loss of coverage for people that have it. That costs money.

But if you do it, that permits you to cut out literally tens of billions of dollars of excess paperwork and administrative cost, stop a lot of other things that are driving up costs in the system. And you literally save, between now and the end of this decade, hundreds of billions of dollars, of both private dollars and taxpayer dollars. So the issue is, how do we make people secure so you can still pick your doctor; you're never going to lose your health insurance, you're always going to have it, no matter whether you change jobs or lose your job; you're always going to have access to health care. It's going to be good. How do we do that? Bring the cost down, and do it within a time that is acceptable.

Mr. Rather. How are you going to pay for that?

The President. We are looking for a lot of different options, but the last thing I think we ought to do, the last place we ought to look, is to ask the employers and the employees of America who are paying too much for their health care right now to pay more to solve this short-term problem.

But the dilemma is this, quite simply—100 percent of the people who studied this problem say this—you may have to pay some more in the short run or find some more money in the short run, but over the long run it's going to save a massive amount of money. I can do more to save money on the Government deficit and to free up money in the private sector by bringing health costs in line with inflation and solving this problem than any other single thing I can do.

What we're trying to find a way to do is to cover all the people who don't have coverage and to guarantee the security to the working people who are afraid of losing it without raising their taxes. And we're looking for ways to do it. And there may be some options. We've got 400 people, including doctors, nurses, health economists, experts from all over America working on this, and they've done good work. I think we've got a chance. And I've got another month to do it.

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

Gays in the Military

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, at your news conference yesterday, correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought you got a little testy when you were asked about gays in the military, respect for you in the military. Am I wrong about that?

The President. No, I didn't feel testy. I thought it was an unusually worded question, but that's all part of it. No, I don't mind talking about it. Let me say, I talk on a regular basis with General Powell. I have met with the Joint Chiefs. I have a whole schedule of things that I'm working through now to continue to work with the military. This is a very difficult time for them.

Mr. Rather. Well, is it correct that you have reversed your position? You say we now—

The President. Absolutely wrong.

Mr. Rather. Did you misspeak yourself?

The President. No, I didn't misspeak myself. Nothing I said yesterday is in any way inconsistent with anything I've ever said before about this.

First, let's review this issue. Half the battle is over. Half the battle is over. The Joint Chiefs agree that they should stop asking enlistees whether or not they're gay. So they have already said, we won't ask you to lie, and we won't use your forms against you. And if you get in and you perform well, that's fine.

I agree and everybody else agrees that any kind of improper sexual conduct should be grounds for dismissal or other appropriate discipline. There's no difference in opinion on that. There is a very limited argument here, which is if you do not do anything wrong but you do acknowledge that you are gay, should you be able to stay in the military and, if so, should you be able to do anything anyone else can do?

The question I was asked yesterday was as follows: Would you consider any restrictions on duty assignments? And the answer is, I am waiting for the report of the Secretary of Defense made in conjunction with the Joint Chiefs. I think they're divided among themselves on this issue. Other nations which admit gays into the military, some of them have no differences in duty assignments, and some do. What I said was, if they made a recommendation to me, would I review it and consider it? Of course I would. I mean, I asked them to study this. I can't refuse then to get the results of the study and act like my mind's made up. This is not an area where I have expertise. I have to listen to what people say. I will consider the arguments. I have a presumption against any discrimination based on status alone, but I will listen to any report filed.

Potential Supreme Court Nominee

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, time is running out on us here. I want to give you an opportunity on this program before this tremendous audience to indicate who your

choice on the Supreme Court is going to be. This is a great opportunity for you to do it. I want to give you an opportunity.

The President. I thought you'd never ask. [Laughter] I must tell you I have not reached a final decision. The problems in Russia and just the stuff I've been doing on the economy have kept me from spending quite as much time on it as I would have. But Justice White, to his everlasting credit, gave me his letter now for his resignation in June, and his successor can't take office until October, so he gave us some time.

I love the Constitution of the United States, and I believe in the Supreme Court as an institution. I used to teach constitutional law. There will be few things that I will do in this job that I will take more seriously, few responsibilities I will cherish more. And I will try to appoint someone that I think has the potential of being a magnificent Justice, someone who will be a defender of the Constitution, but someone who has good values and common sense and who understands the real life experiences of Americans as well as the law.

Mr. Rather. Let's talk about this for a moment. I think you were just starting college when the last Democratic President had a chance—

The President. That's right.

Mr. Rather. —to choose someone for the Supreme Court. If you think about it, it's been a long time.

The President. A long time. President Johnson put Thurgood Marshall on the Court, and I just went to his funeral. It was a long time ago.

Mr. Rather. If you're not going to reveal who it's going to be—I'll give you another opportunity to do that—tell us in what directions you hope to take the Court? I mean, you make an appointee hoping that he will at least bump the Court in some other direction. Let's talk philosophically about the Court.

The President. Well, there was a lot of talk, as you know, during the last 12 years when the Republicans held the White House, about trying to move the Court in a sort of a rightward direction. Indeed, the political platforms of the Republicans were repeatedly filled with litmus tests and spe-

cific requirements and everything, and pushing the Court to the right. In fact, as has always been the experience with Presidents, some of the appointees did, in fact, move to the right. Others turned out to be much more complicated people. You know, they had different views. I would like to put someone on the Court who would make sure that there was a certain balance in the debate, that there was a real feeling for the rights of ordinary Americans under the Constitution, but that also someone who was hard-headed, who understood that the criminal law had to be enforced, that you didn't want to over-legalize the country. There's a nice balance to be formed.

I'd also like to put someone on there who was a very cogent and powerful arguer and who could show respect for the other Justices, who could be a good colleague, and who could engage people in honest dialog. I mean, I think the Supreme Court is no different, really, in that sense from a lot of other units. I can't help but believe that when they're all talking together and working together and honestly trying to pick each other's brains, that they're not only free to act on their own convictions but they'll learn from one another and maybe make better decisions.

Mr. Rather. During the campaign, you campaigned as one who would be a President tough on crime. There became this opening on the Supreme Court. You talked about wanting to appoint a Justice with a "big heart." What do you mean "big heart"? Does that mean trouble for prosecutors and law enforcement officers?

The President. No, not at all. As a matter of fact, I think—there may be differences about capital punishment, for example. I've supported capital punishment, and I still do. And I wouldn't necessarily make that a litmus test, because there's a big majority on the Supreme Court that support capital punishment. So whatever my appointee turns out to do on that, it won't change the majority. The majority agree with me on that issue.

But I think that being big-hearted is not the same thing as being soft-headed. I mean, we need an administration that takes an aggressive approach to the crime issue. But we need to be smarter about it. I mean, we can't

talk tough on crime and make sentences tougher and refuse to pass the Brady bill and make people wait 7 days before criminals can buy handguns. We ought to take automatic weapons out of the hands of kids in the streets of our cities. If we're really going to be tough on crime, we ought to be not only tough in the traditional ways but also to change the environment some.

Academy Awards

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, it's my unfortunate duty now to ask the tough questions you don't want to hear. Number one, do you have a favorite in the Oscar race for the Academy Awards? Have you seen these movies? Which one do you favor?

The President. I haven't seen them all, so I can't say. The ones I have seen I enjoyed. I thought Clint Eastwood's western was very good, "The Unforgiven," and a remarkable departure from a lot of his past movies. I thought Jack Nicholson was brilliant in "A Few Good Men." I try to see all the Oscar movies every year. I still haven't seen "Scent of a Woman." I'm working on that. I'm trying to have that brought into the White House. And when I see them all, then I'll have my favorite, but I don't think it's fair until I give them all a shot.

NCAA Basketball Championships

Mr. Rather. I know you don't follow basketball, but I'm willing to make you an off-hand wager that North Carolina slaughters Arkansas.

The President. I bet they don't. I don't think they can slaughter them. We haven't lost too many games by a lot of points. Arkansas doesn't have any tall players. As you saw in the St. John's game where they played an incredibly talented, well-disciplined team, they often win by never quitting, a philosophy that I try to follow myself.

Mr. Rather. Mr. President, you're very generous. We appreciate your hospitality. Thank you very much.

The President. Thank you.

dent referred to Gen. Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Announcement of Nomination for Nine Sub-Cabinet Posts

March 24, 1993

President Clinton intends to nominate his longtime adviser Rodney Slater as Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, San Francisco port executive Michael Huerta as Associate Deputy Secretary of Transportation for Intermodalism, and investment banker Aida Alvarez as Director of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, the White House announced today.

In addition, the President announced his approval of the appointments by Transportation Secretary Peña of Jane Garvey to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration; by Energy Secretary O'Leary of John Keliher to be Director of the Office of Intelligence and National Security; and by Health and Human Services Secretary Shalala of four officials: Wendell Primus, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; Kimberly Parker, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation (Congressional Liaison); Karen Pollitz, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation (Health); and James O'Hara, Associate Commissioner for Public Affairs.

"Rodney Slater has been one of my most trusted advisers for many years and played a major role in getting me to this position," said the President. "Rodney, Michael Huerta, and Aida Alvarez are the kind of innovative leaders that we need in public service. I am very pleased that they and the people chosen by Secretaries Peña, O'Leary, and Shalala are joining me here in Washington."

NOTE: The interview began at 5:25 p.m. in the Library at the White House, and it was broadcast nationwide at 10 p.m. In his remarks, the Presi-

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

**Remarks in a Telephone
Conversation With Senators George
Mitchell and Jim Sasser and an
Exchange With Reporters**

March 25, 1993

Russia

Q. Does the situation now appear to have eased in Russia to you, Mr. President?

The Vice President. I don't think this is a press conference.

The President. I don't know. I hope so.
[At this point, the telephone call began.]

Senator Mitchell. Hello?

The President. Senator?

Senator Mitchell. Yes.

The President. How are you doing?

Senator Mitchell. We're doing fine. How are you doing?

The President. Well, I'm doing a lot better, thanks to you.

Senator Mitchell. No, thanks to Jim Sasser, who is sitting right here with me and on the line, too.

Senator Sasser. Hey, Mr. President, I'm on this party line, also.

The President. Hello, Senator Sasser.

Senator Sasser. How are you doing? We're doing terrific here.

The President. The Vice President's here with me, and we just wanted to thank you for the work you've done. This is a great, great day.

Senator Sasser. It certainly is. And we want to thank you, I do, particularly, for the help that you gave us in moving this resolution through the committee and off the floor. We had 56 amendments, and the truth is that not a single number changed in that budget resolution on any of those amendments. And we couldn't have done it without your help.

The President. Well, we were glad to do it. I believe, and I think the American people believe, that this is really an historic moment. Finally, we've done something to break the gridlock and to bring the deficit down and to create new jobs through investment. It's a remarkable achievement. And I know we've got a lot of work still to do, but the fact that the Senate and the House have both passed these budget resolutions, it's really astonish-

ing this early. And I'm just amazed, because we all know what a hard road you had to hoe. I can't tell you how much I admire you and how grateful I am to both of you.

Senator Sasser. You're very kind to say that, and I very much appreciate it. I might say that this is the earliest time in my memory—the majority leader may know another time—but this is the earliest time in my memory that we passed a budget resolution here in the Senate. And we're proud of that and proud of your help on getting it done.

And tell the Vice President we sure appreciate him coming over here and giving us encouragement.

The Vice President. Well, I'm on the line, Jim, and thank you very much. You did a fantastic job. George, I think Jim is right. This is the earliest in history that a new budget has passed. And I've been hearing from a lot of people about how effective you all were in the caucus meeting in the conference a couple of days ago. The unity among Democratic Senators has been just remarkable and has made this whole thing possible. So, Mr. Leader, congratulations to you, and to you, Jim.

Senator Mitchell. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. We really do appreciate your help, not just your physical presence but the leadership you gave in talking to Democratic Senators. I know many of them were impressed with the fact that you took the time to come up here, meet with them, talk with them, express support for and explain the President's position. I think that was extremely helpful in getting that kind of unity. So we're very grateful to both of you.

And now, of course, there's no rest for the weary. I'll have a list of people for you to call on the supplemental—

The Vice President. I'm ready.

The President. We're ready to go. Give us our next assignment.

Senator Mitchell. Well, that's it. We've already started on it, and we'll be in touch with you on that later today.

The President. Thank you very much, George.

Senator Mitchell. Thank you. Bye, Mr. President.

[At this point, the telephone call ended.]

Economic Stimulus Plan

Q. Do you feel you now have the votes on the stimulus package, Mr. President?

The President. Well, I haven't gotten a late count, but I feel good about it. We worked hard on it, and I feel good about it.

Q. What does it do to your package if Breaux and Boren were to prevail? Is that a killer amendment?

The President. All I can tell you is, we're going to try to pass it. Let's just see what happens. I feel pretty good about it. We're working hard

Russia

Q. Mr. President—contact of Boris Yeltsin today? Have you heard anything?

The President. No. I would say I've gotten reports and I've spent about, oh, I don't know, an hour and half on it this morning, working, trying to get ready for Vancouver and trying to make sure we know what's going on. But I don't have anything to add to what you already know.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:22 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Dorsey High School Students

March 25, 1993

Ukraine-U.S. Relations

Q. Mr. President, did anything come out of your meeting with the Ukrainian Foreign Minister as far as the START Treaty?

The President. I just told him how important it was to us, that I realize that there was some opposition at home in Ukraine because of uncertainty in Russia, but we had to have them sign on. And I would encourage them to go ahead and do it, while I realize there are some implementation issues that we would have to work with them on. And I was glad to work with him on that but that the United States wanted very much to be close to the Ukraine. We have a big stake in their success, and we've got a lot of commercial potential there and they here, as well

as a lot of ties. We have a lot of Ukrainian Americans, as you know.

But I think this START Treaty is a precondition to a long-term, successful relationship. And I think they should go into the non-proliferation regime and give up nuclear weapons. We don't need any more nuclear states. The United States is trying to reduce our nuclear arsenals, and we need to continue to push in that direction.

It was a very good meeting. And I think over the long run, the United States will have a good relationship with Ukraine if we get the START issue resolved.

Q. Mr. President, did he say the crisis in Moscow is having repercussions back home for him?

The President. Well, he said it was adding to a sense of uncertainty in this country, which you would expect it would. I mean, they're right next door there. But I hope, of course, as every day goes by there seems to be an attempt by President Yeltsin and others, frankly, to confine the dimensions of the process, to regularize it and to let it play itself out in a vote of the people on April 25th. Of course that's the most democratic way you could do that to resolve that crisis.

Q. Did you get a sense—

The President. I don't know that. I know what you were going to say. I don't know that. I hope so. I feel better about it, but I don't know that for sure.

U.S. Attorneys

Q. Are you afraid that firing all the U.S. attorneys at once will be seen as political?

The President. Absolutely not. We waited longer than most of our predecessors have. Go back and look and see when they tried to replace them under Bush, under Reagan, under—particularly under Reagan. Anytime when you change parties—it took us longer to begin the process because of the delay in getting an Attorney General confirmed. But all those people are routinely replaced, and I have not done anything differently. The Justice Department is just proceeding from essentially a late start. And I think the blanket decision is less political than picking people out one by one.

Q. Do you think Jay Stephens should stay on at least to the end of the Rostenkowski—

The President. I support the Attorney General. She made the decision about what the best way to handle this was, since we were behind. And support her decision.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:10 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. Jay Stephens is the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on Signing the Greek Independence Day Proclamation

March 25, 1993

I just wanted to ask Mr. Stephanopoulos to come up here so I could remove all doubt about how I know what to do. *[Laughter]* Please sit, ladies and gentlemen, Archbishop.

I have a few remarks, but before I do, I want to formally sign this proclamation for Greek Independence Day and present it to the Archbishop.

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

Thank you. Please be seated. I'd like to welcome all of you here to the White House and say a special word of welcome to Archbishop Iakovos, the spiritual leader of the Greek American community, with whom I have just had a wide-ranging discussion of many of the issues that I know that concern you. I'd also like to welcome the political leader of the Greek American community, my friend Senator Paul Sarbanes of Maryland, and to say how delighted I am to sign this proclamation recognizing Greek Independence Day and celebrating the democracy that we share in the United States with Greece.

It is particularly timely that we celebrate democracy today at the very moment that our friends around the world who have been deprived of democracy are working hard against great odds to bring it to full flower. And I know, Archbishop, that our prayers are with the people in Russia today and throughout the world who are working hard to preserve and enhance their own democracy.

Greece, the birthplace of democracy, and the United States have long had a history of friendship and cooperation. The authors of our Nation's Declaration of Independence and our Constitution were inspired by Greece's commitment to liberty, to freedom, and to democracy. Indeed, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton wrote in the *Federalist Papers*, and I quote, "Among the confederacies of antiquity, the most considerable was that of the Grecian republics." Today, those ideas continue to strengthen the United States. And working together, Greece and the United States have worked to advance the cause of freedom around the world.

It is against that backdrop of longstanding and close cooperation between the United States and Greece that I want to say a brief word about two issues that I know concern this audience greatly: Cyprus and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

On Cyprus, I want to give you my personal assurance that I and my administration will stay fully engaged in the U.N. process of negotiations, that we will give our full energies to helping reach a fair and permanent solution to the Cyprus dispute, and that we will not rest until a solution is found. Already, in the first 2 months of my Presidency, I have had the opportunity to raise the issue of Cyprus in serious discussions in person with President Özal of Turkey and by a long telephone conversation with Prime Minister Demirel. You can count on the United States to be there until this issue is resolved.

On Macedonia: Here, also, I take seriously the concerns that have been raised by Greece. Like Athens, we believe that a solution to the dispute over the name of the former Yugoslav Republic must be found rapidly to avoid the spread of further instability. I have admired the steady hand of Prime Minister Mitsotakis, and I want to work closely with him to find an appropriate solution to this problem. Progress has already been made on this issue, as I'm sure you know, and I believe we can find a just solution with broad vision and flexibility. Again, you can be sure that the United States will not allow the security of such a close friend

and ally as Greece to be threatened in any way.

You know, I come from a State where Greek Americans make up only one-tenth of one percent of our population, and about half of them are in this room today. [Laughter] But their contributions to our State and to my life have been enormous.

Last night, my good friend from the time I was 9 years old, David Leopoulis, spent the night with me in the White House. He campaigned with me all over America. He became the symbol of an ordinary American who was for me. Think of it: Here I was, a WASP, not ordinary, supported by a Greek American who was ordinary. [Laughter] He appeared on television all over the country and worked with our campaign basically to talk about a lifetime of friendship and shared values. And our relationship, in that sense, is a mirror image of the relationship between the United States and Greece.

My personal health for many years has been in the hands of Dr. Drew Kampuris, whose father, Dr. Frank Kampuris, is an appointee of mine to the University of Arkansas board of trustees. There are others here in this audience and back home in Arkansas without whom I would not be here today.

My campaign and my administration have gained much from the talents of Greek Americans, including my close assistant and Director of Communications, George Stephanopoulos, who came up here a moment ago, who has become the heartthrob of the teen set of America. George's parents are in the audience today, and they did such a good job raising him I would like to ask them to stand up.

We did a little search for Greek Americans on the President's staff, and we discovered, notwithstanding some of their last names, the following fully qualify: my staff secretary, John Podesta; Sylvia Mathews, on the National Economic Commission staff—she hails from a little town in West Virginia, which just proves that you really are everywhere; Peter Pappas, my Associate Counsel; and George Tenet, my Special Assistant and Senior Director for Intelligence Programs at the National Security Council. Indeed, you might argue that I could have a reverse affirmative action suit for the over-representa-

tion of Greeks on the White House staff. [Laughter]

My good friend from New Jersey, Clay Constantinou, is here, who was with me from the beginning. There are others here in the audience who helped so much in the election. I want to note the presence of Angelo Zicapulous and many others who worked in the campaign for whom I'm very, very grateful.

And I also would like to ask us all to remember in our prayers my most formidable opponent in the Democratic primary, Paul Tsongas, as we pray for his recovery.

American politics has benefited greatly from the involvement of Greek Americans. In the Democratic Party, we had last year two great State party chairmen: Phil Angelides in California and Chris Spirou in New Hampshire. They each played an integral part in that election. And I can't help but say, and I hope the Republicans in the audience will forgive me, that it was rather unusual for a Democrat to carry either California or New Hampshire, and at least they think it was the Greek influence that put us over the top.

The Greek American community has always taken pride in and has been known for its commitment to the values that our country desperately needs more of today: commitment to family and neighborhood, to education and hard work, to freedom and the rule of law. These are the values that built America, shared still by the vast majority of Americans. But we know that for America to go where it needs to go, all Americans will have to embrace them again.

And so even as we look beyond our Nation's borders to the problems around the world, I ask those of you here in this wonderful house and those whom you represent throughout the country to lead our Nation in a re-embrace of these values born in the democracy of Greece, nourished in the democracy of the United States, now desperately needed in every city and hamlet in this country.

To Greece, the Nation that first shaped the political ideals we cherish, and to Greek Americans who help us every day, we are greatly indebted. And as I turn to the Archbishop for his remarks, let me say, courtesy

of my distinguished language instructor, Mr. Stephanopoulos, *Zeto e Hellas*.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:38 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Proclamation 6539—Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy, 1993

March 25, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The people and Government of the United States join the people and Government of Greece in celebrating Greek Independence Day. The close and cordial ties between our nations are built upon the solid foundation of a common love of democratic values, strong cultural ties between our peoples, and a respect for human rights. Greek influence on American culture extends from the ideas of the great Hellenic thinkers to the many important contributions of Greek Americans today. These ties continue to strengthen the relationship between our nations and provide a solid and promising basis for the future.

Two thousand and five hundred years ago, Cleisthenes succeeded in instituting a series of reforms in Athens and across the Peninsula of Attica that expanded the rule of government to a much broader group of citizens. The concept of democracy was thus created and embodied in a series of rights and laws. The personal freedom that resulted from these reforms sparked a period of cultural growth in philosophy and the arts to which Western culture is eternally indebted.

The United States is proud to acknowledge the enormous debt it owes to the Greek philosophers and politicians. In creating a new Nation, the American Founding Fathers drew upon the Greek writings for inspiration as to the purpose of government and in order to define the common good of society. Hellenic ideals have also shaped our democracy through architecture. Across our Nation and

especially in the Nation's Capital, the seats of representative government are housed in buildings inspired by the grand proportions and beautiful lines of Greek temples. In both nations, these buildings remind us of the ideals of truth, justice, and faith in the human ability on which our societies are founded.

Our nations share not only the common bond of democratic philosophy but also the willingness to fight for self-determination and freedom and to be vigilant in protecting these hard-won rights. The Greek struggle for independence 172 years ago has long been admired by American citizens. In this century, the United States and Greece joined together to oppose threats to our democratic values from fascism and communism.

It is fitting, therefore, that our two great democracies pause to realize how much they have benefited and continue to benefit from each other. As part of this effort, the National Gallery of Art in Washington, the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, and the Ministry of Culture of Greece have gathered a landmark exhibit of sculptures from the 5th century B.C. These sculptures, many of which have never left Greek soil, document in art the birth of the concept of the individual. In return for these gracious loans from Greece, the two American museums have lent more than 70 major paintings from their permanent collections for an exhibit at the National Gallery of Greece in Athens. This summer the National Archives will also display artifacts from the 5th century B.C. which demonstrate the great degree of participation of Athenians in their government. It is appropriate that our own Constitution will be juxtaposed against these artifacts.

In recognition of the close bond that has been forged between the nations and peoples of the United States and Greece, the Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 22, has designated March 25th as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim March 25, 1993, as Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American De-

mocracy. I call upon all Americans to observe this day, the 172nd anniversary of the beginning of the Greek revolution against the Ottoman Empire, with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities in honor of the Greek people and Greek independence.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-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, 11:38 a.m., March 26, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on March 29.

Announcement of Nomination for Five Sub-Cabinet Posts

March 25, 1993

President Clinton added five senior members to his administration today, announcing his intention to nominate Alan Blinder and Joseph Stiglitz as members of the Council of Economic Advisers, Kathryn Sullivan as Chief Scientist at the Commerce Department's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Arati Prabhakar as Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology at Commerce, and Marilyn Davis as the Assistant Secretary for Administration at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

"I am asking these people today to fill roles which are absolutely essential for the effective workings of this Government," said the President. "Providing sound economic advice, developing better models to understand environmental change, working to ensure an American edge in high technology, and finally bringing the operations of HUD under control are the kinds of actions that the American people need. The people that I am nominating will get the job done for them."

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

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany

March 26, 1993

Russia

Q. Mr. President, are you going to brief Mr. Kohl about your aid package, what your plans are?

The President. Well, we're going to discuss Russia and what we might both do. But we haven't met yet, so I can't say any more.

Q. Mr. President, have you received any word from Moscow how Yeltsin is doing? Are you further encouraged today, sir?

The President. Things look pretty good today. I think—they seem to be making progress toward—

Q. Are you comfortable speaking in German, Mr. President?

The President. No, but I understand a lot of what the Chancellor says. Perhaps not as much as what he understands what I say.

Serbia

Q. Mr. President, how long should the Serbs be given before you push to lift the embargo?

The President. Well, let me say I just hope the Serbs will sign the agreement now.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:40 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 Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany

March 26, 1993

U.S.S. Theodore Roosevelt

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Before we begin the press conference, I have a sad announcement to make. I have just been informed that five United States servicemen on a routine training flight with the United States ship *Theodore Roosevelt* have crashed at sea within a mile of the carrier. I want to express my deep concern over the accident. Just 2 weeks ago,

I visited the U.S.S. *Theodore Roosevelt* and met the fine sailors and marines serving their Nation at sea there. I was profoundly impressed by their commitment, their dedication, and their professionalism. They made America proud. And I want to say that my thoughts and prayers are with the relatives and the shipmates of those five servicemen who are missing at sea.

Chancellor Kohl's Visit

I want to begin by extending a warm welcome to Chancellor Kohl. We have had a wonderful visit. The personal chemistry between us, I think, was quite good. Helmut Kohl, over more than a decade of service in his present position, has proved himself time and again to be a true friend and staunch ally of the United States. Our peoples are closely linked with longstanding ties and common values. Our common bonds ensure that our two federal systems can learn much from each other. And indeed, I told the Chancellor that notwithstanding the persistent problems of cost in the German health care system, my wife had found a lot to learn from Germany.

We are working, our two countries, on the establishment of a project conceived by Chancellor Kohl and very close to his heart, the German American Academic Council, which will promote exchanges of people in the areas of science and technology and about which he might want to speak more in a moment.

During the cold war our two nations stood shoulder to shoulder in the common effort to contain communism in Europe. Today we must be leaders in the great crusade of the post-cold-war era to foster liberty, democracy, human rights, and free market economics throughout the world. If the world is to progress and prosper, the United States and Germany must work closely together. Our bilateral relationship is invaluable. Our relations are at the same time important in the context of the North Atlantic Alliance, the European Community, and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. In these three institutions, Germany serves as both an anchor of stability and a source of fresh initiatives to meet the challenges of our changing world.

A paramount challenge for the West in our generation is helping to ensure the survival of democracy and economic reform in Russia and the other republics of the former Soviet Union. Germany, as the largest single donor of assistance to Russia, has demonstrated its firm commitment to this historic cause. The United States and Germany must now strengthen our partnership on this effort and work both bilaterally and multilaterally to support Russian reform. The Chancellor and I discussed this issue at great length today.

I discussed with him the approach that I plan to take in the meeting with President Yeltsin at Vancouver. And I believe we are in agreement on the general approach. I know that we are committed to doing everything we possibly can to keep alive democracy and reform in Russia, and we believe it is in the immediate interests and the long-term interest of all of our people.

We also believe that the rest of the G-7 countries must cooperate with us and with each other to vigorously produce a program of support for Russia. We discussed in depth the troubling situations in Bosnia and elsewhere, and we conferred on trade and economics. We agreed that we must work hard to conclude the Uruguay GATT round this year, and we committed to work closely together in this endeavor.

As two of the world's leading exporting nations, the United States and Germany have a powerful interest in expanding global trade. I assured the Chancellor that the United States intends to remain politically and strategically engaged in Europe and to maintain a significant military presence on the Continent. The budget that I am fighting for in the Congress now would permit us to maintain a troop contingent on the order of 100,000 troops in Europe. We believe that American and European securities remain indivisible, and that the common threads of the post-cold-war era require common action. At the same time, we also recognize that each of us are reducing our defense budgets and must be increasingly responsible for our own defense needs.

Thirty years ago during his famous trip to Germany, President Kennedy toasted another great leader of the Christian Democratic Union and the German people, Konrad

Adenauer, saying, "These are critical days." The President's pronouncement reflected his concern then for the survival of freedom and even humankind at the height of the cold war.

Today, thankfully the nuclear shadow is receding from both our lands. And the wall that divided the German people is gone. But I would say again, these are critical days, for the actions we take together now will help to determine the fate of democracy, the prosperity of our people, and the peace of the world. In that work I could not ask for a better partner than Chancellor Kohl or the German people. And I want to say to him, I am delighted with this first visit, and I look forward to working with you in the days ahead.

Chancellor Kohl. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. First, Mr. President, allow me to express my heartfelt sympathy on the loss and the fear, because we don't have any detailed information about the loss of life of five American officers. I hope very much that these soldiers may be able to return to their families safe and sound, because they serve the freedom and the security of their country, the United States of America. And without that service, there would be no freedom and peace and no reunification for Germany. And this is why I am very sad about the things that you have just had to present to us. And I should like to ask you to convey to the families of the people concerned my feelings of sympathy.

Ladies and gentlemen, today I had my first meeting with the President of the United States of America. It was a friendly exchange of views. It is something that can be easily said in English; the chemistry is right. You said so, and I am pleased to take it up, indeed, the chemistry is right. We touched upon many issues, issues, many of which are very close to our hearts, at an important point in time of international politics, of European politics. And I was also able to present many things that are important to German politics.

American-German relations, to put it in a nutshell, are for us, Germans and for me personally, today equally important if not more important than 30 years ago. More than 30 years ago, when I was for the first time elected to the German Parliament, the alliance between the Americans and Germans, the

European-American alliance, was much more matter of fact, because we lived under the threat and in the fear of the war. Remember the Berlin blockade, the Berlin Wall, many challenges that we had to master together, down to the things that happened under John F. Kennedy in Cuba.

Today, many of these people have been released. They're free again. But in Europe and in Germany, too, there are quite a few who believe that there were no dangers existent anymore now that the times are changed. For these reasons, American-German relations have become ever more important. The psychological environment has changed.

I said to you, Mr. President, and I should like to repeat this here and now, in this house of Europe that we are in the process of building right now—and I should like to go into greater detail on that later on—it is of existential importance for me, a German, that the Americans have a flat in this house; that the American soldiers and troops, the presence in Europe and in Germany, documents that they're not there for decorative purposes but to defend freedom and security of people. The fact that we can further develop the relations in the economic field, and that includes that despite the problems that we have, we bring about a speedy and successful conclusion of the GATT round. This is something that we touched upon, too. We agreed on that we want to work on this.

You were so kind, Mr. President, to mention that in the cultural and scientific field, we have the intention to intensify relations between both our countries. You mentioned the German American Academic Council which is to be founded this year. I am very happy that you have agreed that once the necessary decisions have been taken in the next few weeks, we will found this economic council. This is important for the public in both our countries. It is for me very important that young Americans, that young Germans visit the other country, vice versa, that they get to know the people and their culture. To put it differently, Mr. President, that we plant many young trees so that we have a forest later on of things that we share, that we have in common.

I should also like to add for those who might have heard different reports on this

here in the United States, there is no alternative for the Germans to a policy that makes progress with European unification—and we are the engine of this development—and at the same time, places great care and value on American-German relations. This is never an either-or; it has to be a this-as-well-as-the-other. Both include each other and do not exclude one another.

And I should like to say this. Because we are now confronted with a common challenge and major task, that is: We have to see to it that the spirit of reform, the willingness to establish democratic structures and a pluralist society, market economic structures in Russia and the CIS, is continuing.

I'm very grateful to you personally, Mr. President, for the determination and the courage that you have documented in the last few weeks in standing by Boris Yeltsin. I underline and subscribe to every single word that you said on this one, that reforms are successful in Russia. And both of us are aware of the fact that any type of setback will in the end turn out to be much more expensive than any type of assistance we have the intention of granting right now.

We have discussed many issues and items on our plate. The members of our staff will continue prior to the meeting with President Yeltsin and the American President to continue to discuss these matters. Then we have the G-7 finance and foreign minister's meeting in Tokyo, the 14th and 15th of April. We want to send a message to the people of Russia that the West, under the leadership of the Americans and the American President, will do everything in its power to see to it that Russia and other successor states to the Soviet Union stand a chance to walk on their own path towards freedom.

We, the Germans, and I outlined this earlier on to you Mr. President, as far as this question is concerned, are very committed, not only because we are neighbors of the former Soviet Union and the threat, if there was a relapse to form a dictator structures, would effect us first and foremost, but we do so because we have made our own experiences.

We were standing in the Oval Office looking at the sculpture of Harry S. Truman, and I was reminded of the importance that the

activities of George Marshall and Harry S. Truman had for Germany when the zero hour when we were outlawed in the world. These two stood up, stood by us, and assisted us. These were the fathers of the Marshall Plan, of a moral gesture of coexistence and cooperation. And this, to my mind, is fair to say: A flourishing industry and country has developed, the former Federal Republic of Germany.

And if the Americans at that point in time had stood back and said, "Well what do we care? The Germans shall see what will become of it. And if something good comes out of it, we'll be proud to say we assisted, and if not, we will say, we've always told you so didn't we, and therefore we stood back."

This kind of policy, a policy pursued by Harry S. Truman and George Marshall rules a successful recipe for the whole of Europe, West Europe. And this is why I should like to tell my American listeners here that you can learn lessons from history. And with a view to what is happening right now in Moscow, I think the message is what counts. The message indicating in what way the big countries of the western democracies and market economic systems feel committed to assist.

Allow me also to say that we discussed *in extenso*, Mr. President, the developments in the former Yugoslavia. The Bosnian President happened to be here this morning, and we met briefly in the White House. We would wish to see that use is being made of all opportunities to see to it that a cease-fire occurs, that then peace can be reached. What is happening to the people there, day-in, day-out, belongs in numbers amongst the most terrible experiences of this very century. And here again, I'm happy and grateful, Mr. President, that you and your administration have taken a clear position on this.

Once again, thank you very much for this friendly reception, for the friendly and open talks that we had.

May I perhaps just briefly announce, Mr. President, that I repeat my invitation to you and to your wife to come and to visit in Germany, and that you were so kind, Mr. President, to follow that invitation.

Russia

Q. Do you think that President Yeltsin emerges from the constitutional crisis that seems to be easing there, weakened or strengthened? And how would that affect the aid that you would propose to send to him?

The President. First of all, I think it's important that we not place too much importance on the momentary event, the day-to-day events, not because they're not heartening today, they are, but because it's difficult to know what's going to happen from day to day now. I have said always that I am proceeding to the summit with President Yeltsin with the firm intention of working with him and trying to propose some things that the United States can join with Germany and the other G-7 countries. And doing that will be helpful in the short run and in the long run in promoting democracy and market economics and an improvement in the difficult economic situation they face. So I feel pretty good about where we are with it now.

Bosnian Peace Agreement

Q. Mr. President, how long would you give the Serbs to respond to the peace overtures, to the peace pact that's been signed by the two other parties? Would you favor imposing a deadline prior to lifting an arms embargo? And given the carnage in this place and the amount of arms that are there already, why would you even consider that to be a good alternative?

The President. First, let me say that you heard the Chancellor say President Izetbegovic was here with us today. He met with the Vice President; then I went back to visit with him briefly. The Chancellor wanted to see him, too, so we just had an impromptu brief meeting.

This signing by the Bosnians has just occurred. We're going to do everything we can now to put on a full-court press, first diplomatically, to secure the agreement of the Serbs. We will do what we can if there is any delay whatever in trying to strengthen the embargo. The embargo has already been quite effective in causing some economic difficulty. We expect the United Nations to take up the enforcement of the no-fly zone within the next few days. We will discuss a number of other measures, including the arms em-

bargo, with our allies. As you know, it's not simply a decision for the United States. But I think that the main thing is that we now have two of the three blocs having agreed that we ought to have this. The Croats have signed; the Bosnian Government has now signed. We need to keep the pressure on, and we will do what we can. I don't want to rule in or rule out a specific timetable or a specific action, because the developments are recent and the decision has not been made on the specific timetable.

Q. Mr. President, do you have any more reason to believe today than you might have earlier that our allies, particularly those who have troops on the ground there, would be more willing than they've been to see the arms embargo lifted?

The President. I'll say this. Our allies are now more eager to see the no-fly zone enforced. And I think that the international impatience is going to grow rather rapidly with the Serbs if they want to continue the carnage in Bosnia, when not very long ago they acted as if they thought this was a pretty good deal.

Aid to Russia

Q. Mr. Chancellor, you've seen or you've heard—the President presented his—or gave you a good idea what's going to be included in his Russian aid package. Do you see it as being adequate, sir, or do you think it will make a difference over there?

Chancellor Kohl. I think that indeed we have a possibility to cooperate. You may know that the Federal Republic of Germany has provided, by far, more than 50 percent of financial assistance to the states of the former Soviet Union. And I am very happy that the President has again taken a new initiative in the framework of the G-7, but going beyond that to wrap up a package of assistance to Boris Yeltsin and the reformist forces in the country.

And I believe that this package should contain three to four elements to put it in a general matter: bilateral assistance, multilateral assistance, then questions to provide relief goods to the country, but also specific types of assistance by way of providing help towards self-help. Let us think of the safety of civilian nuclear power plants in the former

Soviet Union. In Munich, at the G-7 summit, we discussed that issue, too. And I'm very happy that the American President is taking up that idea to the question of the safety, you know, based on the experiences of Chernobyl, has turned out to be a central question touching each and every one of us; not a question that is restricted to Russia and the Ukraine but is addressed to all of us.

And if we take all these issues together and wrap them up in a package, I think we stand a good chance to be successful. And I would like to express my support to the President on this.

[At this point, a question was asked in German, and an interpretation was not provided.]

Chancellor Kohl. Well, the only thing that we did was that we exchanged the information on that—the Federal Government in case a decision of the Security Council will be taking—what the Federal Government will do.

German Constitutional Conflicts

Q. —satisfied with that report to solve the German constitutional conflicts that way?

The President. I think he's been remarkably deft in his dealing with the issue so far.

Aid to Russia

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. Will you go further than President Bush did in your aid package to Russia, such as including long-term concessional financing or government guarantees? And can we expect the size of the package to be larger or less than the \$24 billion that was attempted last year but not completed?

The President. Well, of course, the package was not quite a \$24 billion package. It was in theory that, over a long period of years. But if you go back and look at what was actually released, the Congress specifically appropriated \$650 million in aid and an \$800 million appropriation under the Nunn-Lugar bill to help to denuclearize Russia and the other nuclear Republics. Most of that money has not been spent yet. And I say that not as a criticism.

Let me back up and say one of the places where we started this discussion, in-house

here, is to ask ourselves, what happened to the policy that was announced last year? What money has been appropriated and spent? What has been approved, but not spent? What are the problems? Are there any problems where the United States has not followed through? Are there problems where there are bottlenecks or failures in Russia? Are there problems because we said in theory we would support a few billion dollars in aid through international institutions, but Russia can't comply right now with the eligibility requirements for the IMF, for example? We analyzed all that.

And so, when we finally put together this package, which has not been done yet—I'm in the middle of congressional consultations and talking with people outside as well as inside the Government—we will have made an honest effort to assess what happened to the last proposal, what the problems were, how to get around them. And I can't yet tell you—we've not yet made a final decision on the dollar value, but I expect it will be broadbased and comprehensive.

Sanctions Against Serbia

Q. The sanctions so far have just about wrecked the Serbian economy, yet there doesn't seem to be any deterrent effect on the military aggression. With the developments in Srebrenica and related communities, what makes the administration think that further sanctions will have any impact on Serbian behavior?

The President. I think the real issue is whether the cumulative impact of the events of the last few days will bring the Serbs to the signing table. That is, whether or not they really want so desperately to cleanse the Bosnian Muslims out of all their living space that they will defy now what is now for the first time, for the first time, the virtually unanimous opinion of all the governments that they will be in the wrong if they do not sign this agreement, which they had previously complimented. I don't know what's going to happen, Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News]. If I did, I would tell you.

But let me say I think we have a chance to get a good-faith signing. I think we have to try. We have to give that a few days before we up the ante again.

Q. Mr. President, well, what if the Serbs do sign this agreement? Are we still committed to sending U.S. ground forces in to enforce the agreement within 72 hours? And what happens if there are some Serbs who don't honor the agreement and U.S. troops and other troops, peacekeeping forces, get in the way? That sounds like it's a prescription for some potentially bloody fighting to continue.

The President. Well, all those decisions obviously would have to be made. We have not made those decisions yet. All I have said is that the United States would be prepared to participate in a multinational effort to help keep the peace. We believe that we'll be able to tell whether there is or is not a good-faith signing and whether there is or is not a peace. Of course, the whole reason you have peacekeeping forces is that from time to time the peace may be broken, but you hope it will be a general commitment to the peace. I still feel that that is an appropriate approach.

The GATT Agreement

Q. Mr. President, both you gentlemen mentioned the GATT agreement and voiced optimism that a solution could be reached fairly shortly. As I recall, a little over a year ago, Chancellor Kohl was here and had been optimistic that perhaps it would be resolved before the Munich economic summit. Obviously that didn't happen. Currently there seems to be more tension between the U.S. and its trading partners than there was a year ago. What is it that makes you both optimistic that a breakthrough can be reached?

Chancellor Kohl. Well, for me, there's no doubt about the fact that it was a mistake not to conclude it prior to Munich. And then we had many reasons after the summit had taken place. But I said to the President today that there is a convincing argument when we meet in Tokyo and read to the public the final document of the G-7 meeting, and Prime Minister Miyazawa stands up in front of 1,800 journalists and reads to them that the G-7 participants' countries are convinced that the successful conclusion of the GATT Uruguay round is an important precondition for fighting the recession, there would be an uproar of laughter greeting him. And some of you will take up the document from Lon-

don and the document from Munich and hold it up in the air and wave it at the gentlemen. And in describing this to you, I think, and I said luckily so, luckily you know in what position we find ourselves in.

But as I said, I have a serious argument in favor of a successful conclusion which people tend not to mention in the discussion. We all believe in a free international trade, and we need it if we want to get out of the recession. The Americans luckily are, as is clearly visible, on a good path out of it. But hardly ever do we talk about the third world countries. The economic situation in the third world countries is miserable. It is devastating, and the present recession affects the third world country far more than it affects the industrialized countries.

And in the talks that I had with the President and Vice President Gore, we talked about the work that has to follow the conference of Rio, the UNCED. One cannot expect from us that in the question of the damage done to the tropical rain forest that we make progress on these issues if countries who undergo recessionist development are not being assisted by opening up the GATT Uruguay round and bringing it to a successful conclusion.

I, however, do not believe that things have improved in the course of the last 2 years, and they will be even worsened if we wait another year for a conclusion. Therefore, I think that the Tokyo meeting and the threat of having about 2,000 journalists standing there laughing at us is quite a positive thing.

The President. Let me make one other point. It is true that there have been a couple of points of contention since I became President. Both of them arose out of cases which developed well before I took office. But I also think you have to look at the upside in terms of the last 10 years. Just take our relationship with Europe: We have an agreement now on agriculture, if it can be held. We have an agreement on airline manufacturing and to what extent subsidies can be permitted and what is it not, if it can be held. We have experience now of the last 2 years of what happened without a GATT agreement when we've had very low economic growth in Europe and a very persistent and lagging recession in the United States. And now with the

United States making an effort to come out of this recession but the projected growth rates in Europe low, I think that there is an understanding that it is very difficult for one country to grow without more general growth throughout the world; and that Europe, the United States, and Japan, all in different ways, have a big stake in getting a GATT agreement that will set a framework that will permit us to promote global growth. That's why I think we've got a good chance to make it, and I hope we do.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's eighth news conference began at 2:31 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. Chancellor Kohl spoke in German, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Announcement of Nomination for Three Ambassadorial Posts

March 26, 1993

President Clinton named three senior Foreign Service officers to key Latin American ambassadorial posts today, announcing his intention to nominate John Maisto to be Ambassador to Nicaragua, James Cheek to be Ambassador to Argentina, and William Pryce to be Ambassador to Honduras.

"Our relationships with our Latin American neighbors are among the most important we have," said the President. "I am very glad to be putting them into steady hands today."

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

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.

March 21

In the morning, the President traveled to Little Rock, AR.

March 22

In the evening, the President returned from Little Rock, AR.

March 24

In the afternoon, the President met with Gov. Pedro J. Rossello of Puerto Rico.

March 25

In the afternoon, the President had lunch with the Vice President. He then met with:

—Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko of Ukraine;

—Easter Seal Society representatives;

—the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team.

In the evening, the President hosted a working dinner for Members of the House of Representatives.

March 26

In the afternoon, the President hosted a White House tour for Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany.

In the evening, the President hosted a working dinner for Members of the Senate.

The White House announced that the President has assigned Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown to lead a Cabinet-wide effort on the application of the President's National Economic Strategy to the specific economic problems of California.

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 22

Jack R. DeVore, Jr., of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice Desiree Tucker-Sorini, resigned.

Frank N. Newman, of California, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury, vice Jerome H. Powell, resigned.

Leslie B. Samuels, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice Fred T. Goldberg, Jr., resigned.

George Edward Moose, of Maryland, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Herman Jay Cohen, resigned.

Thomas P. Grumbly, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Restoration and Management), vice Leo P. Duffy, resigned.

Submitted March 25

John M. Deutch, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, vice Donald Jay Yockey, resigned.

Submitted March 26

Eugene Allan Ludwig, of Pennsylvania, to be Comptroller of the Currency for a term of 5 years, vice Robert Logan Clarke.

Jamie S. Gorelick, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense, vice David Spears Addington, resigned.

Statement on President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Released March 22

Transcripts of two press briefings by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released March 23

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Released March 24

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released March 25

Transcripts of two press briefings by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released March 26

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

List of members of the working groups for the President's Health Care Task Force

**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 20

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved March 20

S.J. Res. 22 / Public Law 103-8
Designating March 25, 1993, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy"

S.J. Res. 36 / Public Law 103-9
To proclaim March 20, 1993, as "National Agriculture Day"