

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, April 12, 1993
Volume 29—Number 14
Pages 525–570

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings
American Society of Newspaper Editors,
Annapolis, MD—525
Forest Conference in Portland, OR—529
The Russia-U.S. Summit, radio address—531

Appointments and Nominations

Defense Department, Assistant to the
Secretary—568
State Department, Ambassadors—566
Sub-Cabinet posts—561
Treasury Department, sub-Cabinet posts—566

Bill Signings

Airline industry commission establishment
legislation
Remarks—561
Statement—565

Fact Sheets

See Russia-U.S. Summit

Interviews With the News Media

See also Russia-U.S. Summit
Exchanges with reporters
En route to Baltimore, MD—552
Oval Office—553, 561
News conference with President Mubarak of
Egypt, April 6 (No. 10)—554

Joint Statements

See Russia-U.S. Summit

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

See Interviews With the News Media; Russia-
U.S. Summit

Proclamations

National Former Prisoner of War Recognition
Day—566
National Preschool Immunization Week—567

Russia-U.S. Summit in Vancouver, Canada

Exchanges with reporters—532, 534, 543
Fact sheets
Democracy Corps Initiative—549
Energy and Environment Initiative—551
Humanitarian/Health Assistance and Food
Sales—547
Officer Resettlement Initiative—550
Private Sector Development—548
Trade and Investment—551
News conference with President Yeltsin of
Russia, April 4 (No. 9)—534
Vancouver Declaration, joint statement—545

Statements by the President

See Appointments and Nominations; Bill
Signings

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—569
Checklist of White House press releases—569
Digest of other White House
announcements—568
Nominations submitted to the Senate—568

Editor's Note: A quarterly index to Issues 3–13 is being printed under separate cover and distributed separately.

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, April 9, 1993

**Question-and-Answer Session With
the American Society of Newspaper
Editors in Annapolis, Maryland**

April 1, 1993

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, I support your vision and am grateful to be here for this historic speech. As a journalist and a citizen I am deeply anguished over the reports from Bosnia: deliberate, premeditated rape, the shelling of innocent civilians, families forced from their homes, children crushed to death in desperate attempts to escape. I'd like to ask two brief questions. Do we have a national interest in checking the spread of greater Serbian ethnic cleansing in the Balkans? And are we losing our credibility as a nation as this horrifying aggression in a sovereign state continues without your unrestrained, forceful, and public condemnation of it?

The President. Yes, we have a national interest in limiting ethnic cleansing. I disagree with you that I have not given a forceful and public condemnation of it. I think the issue is whether you think the United States is capable of doing what Europe has not in somehow forcing its will upon Bosnia and the former Yugoslavia. Since I have become President we have dramatically stiffened the embargo on Serbia. We have hurt them very badly economically, but the war continues. We do not have the votes in the United Nations at the present time to lift the embargo on arms to the Bosnians. If we did, it would endanger the humanitarian mission there carried on by the French and British, who oppose lifting the embargo, and they have kept many people alive.

I decided that I would support the Vance-Owen peace process when it was clear that that was what our European allies wanted to do and that that was the best vehicle for a potential peace. Now, the Bosnians and the Croats have signed on to that, the Muslims

and the Croats in Bosnia. We are waiting to see whether the Serbs will. If they do not, we will then have to contemplate where we go from there. But I would remind you that when I became President the situation there was already grave. We had a policy through the United Nations which I think was of limited effectiveness, which I have tried to stiffen as well as I could.

But the United States has many commitments and many interests, and I would just remember that the thing that I have not been willing to do is to immediately take action the end of which I could not see. Whatever I want to do, I want to do it with vigor and wholeheartedly. I want it to have a reasonable prospect of success. And I have done the best I could with the cards that I found on the table when I became President. If you have other ideas about what you think I ought to do that would minimize the loss of life, I would be glad to have them.

Q. Sir, do you condemn it here today?

The President. Absolutely. I condemn it, and I have condemned it repeatedly and thoroughly. And I have done everything I could to increase the pressure of the international community on the outrages perpetrated in Bosnia by the aggressors and to get people to stand up against ethnic cleansing. The question is what are we capable of doing about it from the United States. If you look at the responses that have been mustered so far from the European states that are even closer and that have a memory of what happened when Hitler, who was not shy about using his power, had hundreds of thousands of people in the former Yugoslavia and even then was unable to subdue it entirely.

I think you have to look at what our realistic options are for action. The question is not whether we condemn what's going on. Ethnic cleansing is an outrage, and it is an idea which should die, which should not be able

to be expanded. The question is, what can we do?

Now, I have said that the United States would be prepared to join with a United Nations effort in supporting a peacekeeping process that was entered into in good faith. If the Serbs refuse to do that, then we will all have to reassess our position. But we must be careful not to use words that will outstrip our capacity to back them up. That is a grave error for any great nation, and one I will try not to commit.

Freedom of the Press

Q. This is—[*inaudible*]
—he is one of the leading editors at Izvestia, Moscow—[*inaudible*]
—I hope you will take a question from him. My question, Mr. President: His newspaper in Russia has had deep trouble because of its criticisms of Parliament and Parliament's reaction to that. You in this country have taken some hits, some heavy hits in the campaign and as President from a critical, probative, intrusive, at times abusive press. I wonder if you could give us your feelings, perhaps, words of philosophy as to how you view press freedom given its critical and at times abusive nature?

The President. If you have in a democratic society any freedom enshrined in the Constitution, it is as certain as the Sun rising in the morning that the freedom will be abused. Think of any freedom enshrined in the Constitution. They are all capable of abuse, some in different ways than others. The freedom of speech is abused every day in the country. The freedom of the press, of course, can be abused. Other freedoms can be. People can claim to be practicing religion when perhaps they aren't. That is the price we pay for freedom, and we are stronger because of it.

I think that no one has done better for 200 years than Thomas Jefferson did when he said—and Thomas Jefferson got a pretty rough press, too, from time to time if you go back and read how people worked on him. My consolation is no one remembers the people who falsely blasphemed him in print. [*Laughter*] But Thomas Jefferson said that if he had to choose between maintaining the Government and the freedom of the press, he would choose the freedom of the press

because democracy could not exist without it. And I agree with that. And Government restraint in the face of criticism is in some ways the most important test of a true democracy.

Trade Negotiations and Russia

Q. I wish to welcome you to the Free State of Maryland. Four times during the term of your predecessor the leaders of the Group of Seven industrial democracies assembled in early July, and each time they pledged their personal prestige to a GATT agreement, the new world reform of trade regulations. Each time they failed. My question is this: When you go to the Group of Seven summit in July, are you going to renew that pledge? And secondly, and this is pertinent to what you've been talking about, if we don't have a new GATT agreement, is there any way Russia will be able to enter the world trading system in a way that will lead to its evolution from its present situation?

The President. Well, as you know—first let me answer the first question. Yes, I will renew the pledge, and I will hope to do it without having the international press corps laugh since they've now heard it four times. We got an agreement on agriculture, so-called Blair House accord, which I hope will stand up in the wake of the recent elections in Europe. If it does, I am frankly optimistic that we will be able to proceed to a GATT agreement. There are other outstanding issues, but on balance the United States would be much better off with it.

We need to maintain a commitment to global economic growth in ways that are good for the wealthy countries of the world. As I said in my speech, one of the great challenges is for a wealthy country not only to maintain its technological lead and its capacity to generate growth but also its capacity to generate jobs.

In the 1980's Europe had at least two significant economic recoveries and generated no jobs. That's the thing that's bothering me now. This recovery allegedly started a long time ago, but the unemployment rate is higher than it was at the depth of the recession, and that's because we are now finding some of the same difficulties. So, I think the GATT

agreement can help that, and I will do what I can to get it.

The answer to your second question is not so simple. I believe Russia would be better off if it could be brought into the international trading system with a new GATT agreement, but the leaders of the G-7 this year obviously are the Japanese. This is Japan's turn to lead, and the Government of Japan has issued an invitation to President Yeltsin to attend the G-7 meeting. And as you know, on April 14th and 15th the foreign ministers and finance ministers of the G-7 are meeting in Tokyo to talk about what we can do in multilateral ways to help the process of Russian reform.

So, I believe a lot can be done even if there's no new GATT agreement. Indeed, I would argue that for the kinds of things which need to be worked out for Russia to really benefit from trade and for the rest of us to benefit from it, involve more either ad hoc relationships between businesses and governments dealing with Russia or changes within Russia itself relating to property rights, privatization, the reliability of contracts, the freeing up of the ability to contract in the energy area, and things of that kind.

I should have let you answer that question.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, I am absolutely sure that millions and millions of Russians would be really proud to listen to the words you have just said about my country. Unfortunately, we have not a lot of politicians who are able to do the same. Let me just add one thing. Russians are not just settling from new changes. There are millions and millions of young people who don't care about communism at all, and they enjoy new freedom and new situations. Many of them don't know who was Stalin or who was Lenin, but they do know who is William Clinton. And so here is my question: If a future friend shows once again that the great majority of Russians are committed to democracy and free market economy, can we expect this year your visit to Russia?

The President. If I gave you the answer that I want to give you, half of my Cabinet would have a heart attack—[laughter]—simply because I haven't discussed it with any-

one. Let me say that I think I should follow the same practice I always do. I can't commit to a specific date, but if the process of reform stays alive in Russia, I want very much to go back there.

I had the honor to be in your country, briefly, 3 days before Boris Yeltsin was elected, as a completely anonymous citizen who was invited to come just for a few days. So I was able to walk the streets, to talk to people, to observe what was going on. I was immensely impressed. I had not been in Russia for over 20 years. Everybody in America now knows I went to Russia. We found that out in the Presidential campaign. I enjoyed that trip, too. [Laughter]

I would very much like to go back, very much.

Ross Perot

Q. I'd like to head back to the domestic front, if I could. Ross Perot spoke to us yesterday, and he said as he travels around the country he finds his supporters asking him about and upset about two recent events in Washington. I'd like to ask you about both of them. One is the dismissal of Jay Stephens as District attorney as he was pursuing the Rostenkowski case in the postage stamp for cash case. And the other was the story about the general who was supposedly told at the White House that he should leave quickly because the White House staff was not comfortable with uniformed military personnel. Could you comment on both of those?

The President. I will, and then I want to ask you a question. First of all, the United States attorney in Washington, DC, was not dismissed. They were all replaced, and they will all be replaced just like the Republicans replaced them all when President Carter was defeated by President Reagan. And in fact, many of them got, including the United States attorney in Washington, DC, got to serve extra time because of the difficulty in getting a new Attorney General. We did not replace any of them until we had a new Attorney General.

There is a provision now for appointing interim U.S. attorneys from people who are of long service within each office. There is no reason to believe that any particular case will be pursued in a different manner. But

I think you could make a very compelling case that that United States attorney and others served longer than they would have normally because there was not an Attorney General confirmed on the day I became President. Everybody else in my Cabinet was confirmed. So to say that that person was singled out is absurd.

The real flip side is some of the people in the other party are saying, why didn't we leave him in there all by himself because this is the most important case in America and no one else can pursue it. I just dispute that. I just don't agree with that. There is no evidence to support that. We followed a uniform policy that was exactly like the one followed by previous administrations, except we started later in time.

Secondly, the other story, like all those military stories, was an abject lie. And thank God some people in the press have finally started pointing it out and have even expressed some shame that they were guilty of printing those kinds of rumors. Some of the press have begun to print letters from people at the Pentagon who have been disputing some of these specific stories like the lieutenant general that was allegedly told by someone on the White House staff that she didn't speak to people in the military. Those kinds of stories they are all just made up out of whole cloth. And people who run them based on gossip or people who talk about them from podiums ought to be ashamed of themselves, without knowing they're true.

You know, Mr. Perot came to Washington the other day and attacked my Chief of Staff as not being a real business person, and he had to call him on the phone and personally apologize the next day. I mean, people can say anything from the podium. I'd be more interested in why my economic program, which is 85 percent what Ross Perot recommended in the campaign, except we raised taxes less on the middle class, more on the wealthy, and don't have unspecified health care savings, hasn't been endorsed since it's almost identical to the one he ran on.

I don't think we ought to be out here rumormongering myself. I think it does very little to support the public interest.

Public-Private Partnership

Q. Mr. President, in your speech you alluded to a global economy and also to the Marshall plan in the days in which this country stood alone as an economic power without competition. What, sir, do you feel is your responsibility and that of the Federal Government in assuring that this country's industrial might remains competitive in an intensely competitive environment in which competitors enjoy a different and more supportive relationship with their government?

The President. Well, I'm trying to change that in this country, as you know, by changing the whole nature of the relationship between Government and business. I want to have a Tax Code which rewards investment more. I want to have a strategy of partnership in the new technologies which will produce the lion's share of the jobs for the 21st century.

I think that it is imperative. If you look at what works, if you look at the high-wage, high-growth economies, Government must be a partner with the private sector. There should be limitations on the partnership. The Government can't pick winners and losers, but there are plainly some functions that if not embraced by Government will not be done properly.

And I might point out that most of the countries of the world with advanced economies are governed by what would be called their Republican Parties, if we used the Democratic-Republican parlance in other countries. And yet, every one of them has a more aggressive public-private partnership than we do when it comes to educating and training the work force, when it comes to investing in civilian technologies for jobs for the 21st century, when it comes to maintaining competitive policies that will guarantee at least that they'll have a chance to generate high-wage, high-growth jobs. And I think my responsibility is to try to implement an American version of that kind of policy.

Press Coverage

Q. Mr. President, how would you assess the coverage of your administration by the Nation's news media, particularly newspapers?

The President. Good. [Laughter]

Q. It doesn't have to be that short an answer. [Laughter]

The President. Well, first of all, it's different in different places, but let me say on balance I think it's been remarkably fair and thorough. The only frustrations that I feel since I've been President relate far more to what I would call almost the commercial imperatives that are on the press that have nothing to do with anybody trying to be unfair in their coverage. If I might, let me just give you one example.

I saw a survey recently that was reported somewhere, I'm embarrassed I don't remember where. They were asking the American people, this survey, is the President spending enough time on the economy, is the President spending enough time on health care, and a bunch of other questions. Only half the people said I was spending enough time on the economy even though that's what I spend all my time on. By two to one the people said I was spending enough time on health care. Why is that? Because the effort of the health care task force, chaired by my wife, to come up with a health care program is the subject of intense speculation because it hasn't been presented yet. So, given the propensity of people in Washington to leak, there's a new story every day about some little paper or another that's come out and all that. And then they have these public hearings, so there's a lot of anticipation.

The economic program was announced one month into my Presidency, and then I went to work on it in Congress. And what really is news is sort of around the edges; is he losing this or winning that or whatever. It becomes a process debate, and the American people tend to lose sight of what is the major focus of my every day, which is how to pass that jobs program and the economic program. That is simply a function of the way the news works.

The other thing I think is different about the news today than maybe 20 years ago, particularly for the coverage around Washington, is this: Because of CNN and others who now give virtually continuous direct access to the facts of whatever is going on to wide numbers of people, there is even more pressure than there used to be on everybody in the media to find an angle to the story, a

unique angle, an insight, you know, a twist. And sometimes that's good, and sometimes it's not. But it always presents a different challenge to me than perhaps the President might have had 20 years ago in trying to keep the focus of the public on the big issues that I'm trying to deal with.

But I say that not as a criticism but simply as an observation. That is simply the way things are. On balance we're better off. People are getting more information more quickly than ever before, but it's changed the dynamics of how we relate to each other.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:07 p.m. in Dahlgren Hall at the U.S. Naval Academy. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at the Conclusion of the Forest Conference in Portland, OR *April 2, 1993*

I want to thank all of you for being here and for sitting through this long day, and all of the participants for everything you've done. I'd like to thank the Cabinet for coming and participating and the Vice President and our staff for all the work they did to put this meeting together.

One of the things that has come out of this meeting to me loud and clear is that you want us to try to break the paralysis that presently controls the situation, to move and to act. I hope that as we leave here we are more committed to working together to move forward than perhaps we were when we came.

I tell you, I'll never forget what I've heard today, the stories, the pictures, the passion from all of you. In a funny way, even when you were disagreeing, every one of you was a voice for change. Every one of you was saying we can't possibly do any worse than to stay within the framework which has now undermined our ability to work together and to build a sense of common community. Too many people are being hurt, and too many resources are being threatened. And we're going to do our best to turn this away from

at least the short-term politics of just trying to avoid the tough decisions.

I intend to direct the Cabinet and the entire administration to begin work immediately to craft a balanced, a comprehensive, a long-term policy. And I will direct the Cabinet to report back to me within 60 days to have a plan to end this stalemate.

In the meanwhile, I want each of our Cabinet to look within the Departments to determine which policies are at odds with each other. It is true, as I've said many times, that I was mortified when I began to review the legal documents surrounding this controversy to see how often the Departments were at odds with each other, so that there was no voice of the United States. I want the Cabinet members to talk with each other to try to bring these conflicts to an end, which at their extreme have had our own Agencies suing one another in courts, often over issues which are hard to characterize as monumental. I want everyone to examine his or her approach to existing legal and administrative proceedings to see if inadvertently any of us are hampering the march toward a solution of the larger issues or even toward the particular ones now in litigation.

Regardless of what we are doing, our efforts must be guided, it seems to me, by five fundamental principles: First, we must never forget the human and the economic dimensions of these problems. Where sound management policies can preserve the health of forest lands, sales should go forward. Where this requirement cannot be met, we need to do our best to offer new economic opportunities for year-round, high-wage, high-skill jobs.

Second, as we craft a plan, we need to protect the long-term health of our forests, our wildlife, and our waterways. They are, as the last speaker said, a gift from God, and we hold them in trust for future generations.

Third, our efforts must be, insofar as we are wise enough to know it, scientifically sound, ecologically credible, and legally responsible.

Fourth, the plan should produce a predictable and sustainable level of timber sales and non-timber resources that will not degrade or destroy our forest environment.

And, fifth, to achieve these goals, we will do our best, as I said, to make the Federal Government work together and work for you. We may make mistakes, but we will try to end the gridlock within the Federal Government. And we will insist on collaboration, not confrontation. We will do our best to do our part. We will act with a single purpose and a single agenda once we have a chance to get all these Departments working on their respective responsibilities.

But I want to say, too, that all of you have demonstrated to me today your willingness to do your part. I ask you not to let this be the end of it. This conference has established a dialog. Even when it was somewhat funny between Mr. Kerr and Miss Mater, it was still a dialog. And it's got to continue between us and you, and among yourselves. You have got to be a part of this solution. Even if we make the most enlightened possible decisions under the circumstances, they will be all the more resented if they seem to be imposed, without a continuing mechanism for people whose lives will be affected here to be involved.

So when you leave here today, I ask you to keep working for a balanced policy that promotes the economy, preserves jobs, and protects the environment even as you may disagree, as Mr. Thomas said, over how the word "balance" should be defined. When you hit an impasse, I plead with you not to give up. And don't turn against your neighbors. You don't have to fight in a court of law anymore. You can work with us to try to have a long-term solution. If you feel frustrated at times—all of us will—I ask you to stay at the table and to keep talking and keep trying to find common ground. I don't want this situation to go back to posturing, to positioning, to the politics of division that has characterized this difficult issue in the past. I hope we can stay in the conference room and stay out of the courtroom. If we don't give up or give in to deadlock or divisiveness or despair, I think we can build a more prosperous and a more secure future for our communities and for our children. And I think we'll be proud years from now that we were here today.

I thank you for caring and for coming, for speaking out and for reaching out. And I ask

you to continue to work with us so that this Forest Conference is the beginning, not the end, of a solution. But we will move. We will move. And I will do my best to assume the responsibility the American people have given me to try to break this deadlock in a responsible way. I just ask you to remember that this listening cannot be a one-shot deal. We've got to continue to work together. And I think, if we do, we'll all be pleased with the results.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:10 p.m. at the Oregon Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Andy Kerr, conservation director, Oregon Natural Resources Council. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Radio Address on the Economy and the Russia-United States Summit

April 3, 1993

Good morning. There's much wisdom in these words from the Scriptures, "Come, let us reason together." This week we've seen a good example of what happens when people talk to each other instead of shout at each other. And unfortunately, we've also seen what happens when some people go to unreasonable lengths to prevent reasonable discussion and decisionmaking.

I'm speaking to you from the Pacific Northwest where we've just concluded the Forest Conference. For years, the good people of the Northwest have been divided by a difficult argument over important values: how best to preserve jobs and protect the forests in this beautiful and productive region of our great Nation.

Yesterday, in Portland, Oregon, timber workers, business people, environmentalists, and community leaders sat down together in a conference room, not a courtroom. We discussed how to achieve a healthy economy and a healthy environment. And I directed my Cabinet to come back within 60 days with a plan for a balanced policy.

Grassroots Americans want to end the gridlock and get the economy moving. They want to follow the same practice that we followed in Oregon yesterday. Unfortunately,

some people in Washington, DC, haven't gotten the message that the people want fundamental change. Yesterday the minority party in the Senate used procedural tactics to prevent the entire Senate from voting on our jobs and economic recovery package, which has already been passed overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives.

Yesterday we also learned why our jobs package is even more urgent than ever. After 3 years, when America lost one million jobs in the private sector, the unemployment rate remained unchanged in March, and the total number of jobs in our economy actually declined. Now, some folks in Washington may think everything is fine, but all across America the people understand there won't be a real recovery until our working men and women can look forward to a secure, high-wage future for themselves and their children. The people know that America needs our plan to put 500,000 Americans back to work by beginning the investments we need in a stronger, smarter economy.

It's time to move beyond the old politics of partisanship, posturing, and procedural delays and start working together to solve problems. Good things can be accomplished when we reason together. And just as this works in our own country, so too can it work between ourselves and other nations.

That's why I'm taking my first trip out of the country today to meet with Russia's democratically elected President, Boris Yeltsin. Nowhere is progress toward democracy and free markets more important to us than in Russia and the new independent states of the former Soviet Union. Their progress presents a great security challenge and offers great economic opportunities. Russia's rebirth is in the economic interests of American taxpayers, workers, and businesses and the security interests of all of us.

We spent over \$4 trillion to wage the cold war. Now we can reduce that spending because the arms and armies of the former Soviet Union pose a greatly reduced threat to us and to our allies. If Russia were to revert to its old ways or plunge into chaos, we would need to reassess our plans for defense savings. That could mean less money for creating new businesses and new jobs, less for pre-

paring our children for the future, less for education. Our economic program at home, more jobs and greater incomes for Americans, could be jeopardized if the reforms in Russia fail.

My discussions with President Yeltsin involve measures intended to help the Russian people make the difficult transition to a market economy by helping themselves. I want America to act, but America cannot and should not act alone. Just as we mobilized the world on behalf of war in the Gulf, we must now mobilize the world on behalf of peace and reform in Russia. Most of this effort will have to come from the Russian people themselves. They will chart the path to their own future. These efforts to offer an historic chance to improve our own security, however, require some action by ourselves, too.

Russia still holds over 20,000 strategic and tactical nuclear warheads. We are implementing historic arms control agreements that for the first time will actually reduce the level of strategic nuclear weapons. By supporting Russia's reforms we can help turn the promise of those agreements into reality for ourselves and for our children and for the Russian people and their children as well. And we can make life in America more safe and prosperous.

For too long, work in Washington on issues like economics, the environment, and foreign policy took place in isolation. The interests of the American people weren't amply protected because their voices weren't adequately heard. The change we want is this: to bring men and women of good will together so that we can put people, the American people, first. We need you to stay active and informed and involved.

Now, I ask you to call or write your Senators. Ask them to take action on our jobs and economic recovery package. I ask for your best wishes as I go into this meeting with President Yeltsin and your understanding that here there is no clear line between our interests at home and our interests abroad. We cannot withdraw from the world even as we work to make America stronger. Together we can change America and change the world.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 8:00 p.m. on April 2 at the Benson Hotel in Portland, OR, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 3.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters in Vancouver

April 3, 1993

The President. Thank you very much. I want to begin by thanking the Prime Minister and Canada for hosting this meeting between President Yeltsin and me. I want to thank also the Prime Minister for his leadership in support of the process of democracy and reform in Russia and the Canadian effort to support that process, which has recently been announced. We have worked together very, very closely in the last few weeks to mobilize support among the G-7 for the process of democracy and reform. And he deserves a good share of credit for many of the positive actions which will be taken in the days and weeks ahead. I thank him for that and for hosting this. And I look forward to the meeting with President Yeltsin.

Aid to Russia

Q. Mr. President, there's some concern that any U.S. aid or any Western aid that may pour into Russia now could be wasted. Is there a danger at this point that you could actually give Russia too much Western aid?

The President. Well, I guess there are two concerns that you might have. One is that any aid itself might not be well spent. The other is that future political events might undermine the impact of the aid. As far as the second risk is concerned, that is there, it is clear. But you could say that about any effort we might make anywhere, including in our own country, that future events might undermine the impact of present action. We are proposing to take action to support democracy and to support economic reform.

Now, in terms of making sure the money is spent properly, that it's the right kind of aid, I have spent a significant amount of time on this. We have put together a very good team. I will be consulting in significant detail with President Yeltsin about this. I think that the kinds of things we propose to do are likely

to have lasting and tangible impact, and the way we propose to do it will minimize the chance that the money will be squandered.

Q. Does that mean control, sir, control on how the money is spent?

The President. No. You'll see. We're working on it. I think you'll like it.

Q. Mr. President, on the way over here, President Yeltsin mentioned a figure of \$100 billion in connection with the cost that Germany had to pay for East Germany. Is that a realistic figure in your mind?

The President. Well, he didn't mention it. I know what he said when he got here, and he went out of his way to say that the amount of money wasn't as important as the kind of support. Germany had to spend a lot of money on Germans to integrate their country. It's a different and I don't think entirely analogous situation.

I believe what you will see building up over the next few weeks is a very significant effort by the G-7 and perhaps by other countries as well to support a long-term process of development in Russia. To go back to the first question, it is important that the efforts that are made be targeted and be designed to produce and support reform and lasting and tangible benefits to the people in Russia in ways that help the security and the economy of all the countries that are helping. So I think I look at this as a long-term effort, and I think it would be a mistake to put a short-term dollar figure on it.

Yes, Mark [Mark Miller, Newsweek].

The Summit

Q. How much pressure do you feel under going into this two-day event? And what are the big unanswered questions in your mind, the things that, despite all your preparation, you still don't know the answers to?

The President. I don't feel under any pressure. I'm glad that this day has arrived. I welcome the chance that the United States has to support the millions of courageous people in Russia who have stood up for democracy and have had the courage to go through some very difficult times and, I might add, to support the people in the other newly independent states of the former Soviet Union who are going through equally dif-

ficult economic times and striving hard for democracy. I welcome that opportunity.

The only unanswered questions I have are the same ones that you have. I don't know what's going to happen. None of us do. But I think that, I would just remind you all—it's something I said in my speech at Annapolis—in 1776 the United States adopted the Declaration of Independence. It was well over a decade before we actually settled on a Constitution and got around to electing a President.

And the Russians are trying to undertake three fundamental changes at once: moving from a Communist to a market economy; moving from a tyrannical dictatorship to a democracy; and moving to an independent nation state away from having a great empire. And these are very difficult and unsettling times. But I think that the direction is clear, the direction that they ought to take, and I think we ought to support the direction. And I'm not troubled by the fact that I can't control that process or that I don't know the outcome of it. We just need to weigh in and do what we can to do what's right.

Aid to Russia

Q. Mr. President, why don't the majority of Americans think we should be sending more aid to Russia?

The President. I think there are probably two or three reasons. First of all, historically in our country, foreign aid has never been popular. And that's why I have gone out of my way to show that this is the establishment of a partnership which will be mutually beneficial. This is not in any way an act of charity that we are engaged in. It doesn't have anything to do with that.

Secondly, the American people are preoccupied with their own problems. We've got one million fewer jobs in the private sector than we had 3 years ago. Unemployment is high. Incomes have been stagnant for years. We have serious challenges at home, and they want to know that we're putting those first.

Then I think the third thing is the question that you asked in the beginning. They want to know that if there were efforts to make sure that the money is well spent and is in the long-term benefit of both countries.

Q. Are both of you confident that you can get Japan on side with some big bucks for this venture and to ignore the Northern Islands issue?

The President. Well, let me say this. I had a very good talk with Prime Minister Miyazawa last night. The Japanese have been very forthcoming as the leaders of the G-7. This is their year to lead, and they are leading. They are hosting this meeting of the finance and foreign ministers on the 14th and 15th, and I believe that they will fulfill their leadership role. I'm encouraged.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:39 a.m. at the Mackenzie House at the University of British Columbia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Vancouver

April 3, 1993

Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. President Yeltsin, will American aid make a difference to the political situation in Russia?

President Yeltsin. You know, it's always useful to help a friend, especially if a friend goes through a difficult period. And we are partners, and we are friends.

Q. Go ahead, Mr. President, you can talk.

President Clinton. I just was going to say, I don't view this as a—this is not a talk about aid; this is a talk about a long-term partnership. The United States has a great deal to gain from a strong, successful, democratic Russia. It is in our interest. And I'm very encouraged by the things that President Yeltsin has stood for, and the fight that he's waging now.

President Yeltsin. And the rest of the world, too.

NOTE: The exchange began at 1:55 p.m. at the MacKenzie House at the University of British Columbia. President Yeltsin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President's New Conference With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Vancouver

April 4, 1993

President Clinton. Good afternoon. I have just completed 2 days of intensely productive discussions with President Boris Yeltsin. I want to join him in thanking Prime Minister Mulroney and the people of Canada for their hospitality. The beauty of Vancouver has inspired our work here, and this weekend I believe we have laid the foundation for a new democratic partnership between the United States and Russia.

The heroic deeds of Boris Yeltsin and the Russian people launched their reforms toward democracy and market economies and defended them valiantly during the dark days of August of 1991. Now it is the self-interest and the high duty of all the world's democracies to stand by Russia's democratic reforms in their new hour of challenge.

The contrast between our promising new partnership and our confrontational past underscores the opportunities that hang in the balance today. For 45 years we pursued a deadly competition in nuclear arms. Now we can pursue a safe and steady cooperation to reduce the arsenals that have haunted mankind. For 45 years our Nation invested trillions of dollars to contain and deter Soviet communism. Now the emergence of a peaceful and democratic Russia can enable us to devote more to our own domestic needs.

The emergence of a newly productive and prosperous Russia could add untold billions in new growth to the global economy. That would mean new jobs and new investment opportunities for Americans and our allies around the world. We are investing today not only in the future of Russia but in the future of America as well.

Mr. President, our Nation will not stand on the sidelines when it comes to democracy in Russia. We know where we stand. We are with Russian democracy. We are with Russian reforms. We are with Russian markets.

We support freedom of conscience and speech and religion. We support respect for ethnic minorities. We actively support reform and reformers and you in Russia.

The ultimate responsibility for the success of Russia's new course, of course, rests with the people of Russia. It is they who must support economic reforms and make them work. But Americans know that our Nation has a part to play, too, and we will do so.

In our discussions, President Yeltsin and I reached several important agreements on the ways in which the United States and the other major industrialized democracies can best support Russian reforms. First are programs that can begin immediately. I discussed with President Yeltsin the initiatives totaling \$1.6 billion intended to bolster political and economic reforms in Russia. These programs already are funded. They can provide immediate and tangible results for the Russian people.

We will invest in the growth of Russia's private sector through two funds to accelerate privatization and to lend to new small private businesses. We will resume grain sales to Russia and extend \$700 million in loans for Russia to purchase American grain. We will launch a pilot project to help provide housing and retraining for the Russian military officers as they move into jobs in the civilian economy.

Because the momentum for reform must come upward from the Russian people, not down from their government, we will expand exchanges between American farmers, business people, students, and others with expertise working directly with the Russian people. And we agreed to make a special effort to promote American investment, particularly in Russia's oil and gas sectors. To give impetus to this effort, we will ask Vice President Gore and Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin to chair a new commission on energy and space.

Second, beyond these immediate programs, the President and I agreed that our partnership requires broader perspectives and broader cooperative initiatives, which I will discuss with the Congress when I return home. We expect to do more than we are announcing today in housing and technical assistance, in nuclear safety and cooperation

on the environment, and in important exchanges.

Third, this challenge we face today is clearly not one for the United States and Russia alone. I have asked our allies in the G-7 to come forward with their own individual bilateral initiatives. Canada and Britain have already done so, and I expect others to follow.

President Yeltsin and I also discussed plans for the G-7 nations to act together in support of Russia's reforms. The foreign and finance ministers of the G-7 are meeting in Tokyo on April 14th and 15th. Coordinated efforts are required to help Russia stabilize its economy and its currency. The President and I agreed that Russia and the G-7 nations must take mutually reinforcing steps to strengthen reform in Russia. And those will be announced on the 14th and 15th in Tokyo.

Beyond these economic initiatives, the President and I discussed a broad agenda of cooperation in foreign affairs. We reaffirmed our commitment to safe dismantlement and disposal of nuclear weapons. We discussed the need to strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to assure that Ukraine along with Belarus and Kazakhstan ratify the START Treaty and accede to the NPT as non-nuclear-weapons states. I stress that we want to expand our relationships with all the new independent states.

We also agreed to work in concert to help resolve regional crises, to stem weapons of proliferation, to protect the global environment, and to address common challenges to international peace, such as the tragic violence in Bosnia, advancing the promising peace talks we have cosponsored in the Middle East, and continuing our cooperation to end the regional conflicts of the cold war era.

Many of the dreams Americans and Russians hold for their children and for generations to come rest on the long-term success of Russia's reforms and, thus, on the long-term partnerships between our two nations. Our new democratic partnership can make an historic contribution for all humanity well into the next century. Both of us know that it requires effort and vigilance to make progress along the path toward democracy's ideal. And I believe we both see those ideas as rooted deeply in the human spirit.

I think of the words of one of the great poets of democracy within our own country, Walt Whitman. In a poem about crossing the East River in New York where the Brooklyn Bridge now stands, he commands, "Flow on, river; flow on." Of course, the river hardly required his permission. It has flowed on for centuries and will continue to, whether old Walt Whitman decreed it or not. Yet, he belated his enthusiastic support for the river's timeless journey.

Russia's struggle for democracy and America's support are much the same. We know that the attraction to freedom that animates democracy flows powerfully through the human spirit like a river. Our words do not cause that river to flow, and history has now proven that in the long run no tyrant can cause the river to stop. Yet, we bellow our support because it is right and because democracy's river can carry both our nations toward a better future.

As we have looked out across the Pacific to the shores of Russia and its far east over the last 2 days, we have committed ourselves anew to that journey. I now return to the United States with a reaffirmed commitment to that course and a determination to engage Members of Congress in both parties and the American people in a rededication to the prospect that a successful and strong and democratic Russia is very much in the best interest of America and the world.

President Yeltsin. First of all, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for your kind words addressed to Russia. I should like to thank Canada's Prime Minister, Mr. Mulroney, for the excellent way in which this summit of two Presidents of two great powers was organized. I'd like to thank the people of Vancouver for being so hospitable, for having so warmly welcomed our delegations and us personally, the Presidents. I should like to thank the journalists, who, it seems to me, kept a round-the-clock watch at their posts.

I am fully satisfied by the results and by the spirit and atmosphere of my encounter with President Bill Clinton. It was in all senses out of the ordinary. But it was made extraordinary by processes transpiring in the United States and Russia, conditioned by very special relationships developing be-

tween ourselves and Mr. Bill Clinton. We met for the first time but yesterday, but became partners back at that meeting in Washington.

When Bill Clinton became President, we rapidly established good working contacts over the telephone. We candidly discussed the most intricate issues and stated at the outset that there would be no pauses in our dialog and that we would rapidly manage to find time to meet and established that right at the beginning, as I say, several months ago.

We had no right to further postpone personal encounter in the face of this world emerging from a wounded past, its thoughts preoccupied by what has occurred in two great countries, the United States and Russia. We immediately found common language in Vancouver, probably because we're both businesslike people and at the same time, to some extent, idealists, both.

We also believe that freedom, democracy, and freedom of choice for people are not mere words and are prepared to struggle for our beliefs. We understand that everything that happens in the world is interlinked, that cooperation is not concession-making but a vital necessity, a contribution to our future.

At previous meetings, the nations' leaders discussed primarily the disassembly of confrontational structures, but here in Vancouver, we talked about building the new, laying the foundations of a future economy. This was the first economically oriented meeting of the meeting of the two great powers. We adopted some signal decisions in the interests of the people of the Russian Federation, in the interests of the people of the United States of America, in the interests of the world's people.

We decided to eliminate discriminatory limitations on trade with Russia. We, in fact, said that we were simply hurt. Russia had embarked upon the path of democracy, whereas America was still treating us as though we were a Communist country. In fact, we're struggling against communism. I stated that quite clearly, and Bill Clinton agreed. We are prepared to compete but compete honestly. We decided to alter our approach to trade in Russian uranium, space technology, access to Russian military technology. We decided to do away with the Jack-

son-Vanik amendment and to resolve other legislative issues. There is considerably greater interest on the part of American investors in the fuel sector, in Russia space technology. We decided to cooperate in this area and decided to join forces, the U.S. and Russian administrations.

The economic package of Bill Clinton—this is what it's going to be called from here on in—Bill Clinton's economic package is predicated on the fact that America wishes to see Russia prosper with a blooming economy. America intends to support Russian entrepreneurs, particularly small and medium farmers, Russia's youth. It's going to cooperate in housing construction for the military and in other areas. All of this is in support of Russian reforms, a part of the strategic form of cooperation between us, stressed Bill Clinton. Now, that figure, the figure that reflects that cooperation is a \$1.6 billion. We're looking forward to other steps to be undertaken by the United States of America and other major industrial countries to support real reform in Russia.

The linkage between that set of measures and other political measures was avoided. Of course, military and political problems could not be skirted. We discussed what might be done to see to it that all participants in the Bosnian conflict support the U.N. position. Here, our positions match as to the main points. We devoted quite a lot of attention to problems of nonproliferation. We decided to extend our agreements on the avoidance of accidents, such as the near accident involving submarines very recently. We decided to strengthen cooperation between various areas of the military. All of this is reflected in the Vancouver declaration, some of the principal elements of that declaration.

Members of our delegation felt that the U.S. side did appreciate that support for Russia had to be timely. Our partners make it their goal to support Russia's reforms, which are not yet yielding major results as far as ordinary Russians are concerned.

The meeting in Vancouver signals a shift from general assurances of support to Russia to pragmatic, specific, nitty-gritty projects. What we see dominating here are economic and not military strategic issues dominant.

Another very important result is that we, with President Bill Clinton, did establish

some pretty close personal contacts. Bill Clinton is a serious partner. He is prepared to tackle the major problems confronting our two countries in the interest of our two countries, in the interest of all free people throughout the world. I have invited Bill Clinton to visit Moscow, to render us an official visit at a time convenient to himself.

Thank you very much.

Nuclear Disarmament

Q. President Clinton, after 45 years of deadly competition in nuclear arms and now a new spirit of democratic partnership, in this new spirit of democratic partnership, did you discuss whether Russia and the United States—[inaudible]—

President Clinton. We did discuss that, and we discussed that within the framework of the START agreements and the timetables established—[inaudible]—and we agreed that we would reexamine that at an early, early time. We did not resolve that issue, but we agreed to take it up again.

Aid to Russia

Q. A question, Mr. President, for you and President Yeltsin. Much of Bill Clinton's economic package is old wine in new bottles, and it's money that was previously authorized and appropriated by Congress. Why will it make a difference now, more of a difference now than it would have when it was approved last year? And what guarantees are there that it will be delivered this time, when it was not, when originally approved?

President Clinton. I'd like to make two points. First of all, the nature of this package is, I think, somewhat different than the one which was discussed last year. First, three-quarters, three-quarters of this money will be distributed not government to government but will go to benefit the private sector, the emerging private sector in Russia, and will go outside of the central apparatus in terms of supporting privatization, helping to start new businesses, establishing a democracy corps at a really significant level.

If you look at all the things that are down here, they are very specific; they are tangible; they are designed to develop concrete benefits for the people who will be involved. And

as President Yeltsin reiterated to me in our last meeting, in each of these categories we have a proven mechanism for distributing the assistance so that we know how to get the money to its intended purpose.

The second point I would like to make is that we intend for this to be leveraged in two ways: first, because I intend now to go back to the Congress, to the leaders of both parties with whom I met extensively before I came here, and discuss a second package of bilateral assistance which will be more aggressive in the areas of energy and environmental cleanup, areas which will be dramatically helpful in supporting the economy of Russia, and more aggressive in the whole issue of housing for returning soldiers, which is a very important issue socially and politically as well as economically in the country, and in several other areas. And we have asked the other G-7 countries each to do something on their own. And those messages are coming in now.

And finally, I would remind you that we want a different kind of multilateral agreement to come out of Tokyo. That is, last year when the figure \$24 billion was floated all across the United States and the world and Russia, a lot of it was contingent on all kinds of things which never happened and could not reasonably have been expected to happen. We are going to try to make sure that anything we say will be done, in fact, will be done. And that will be a big difference.

President Yeltsin. I should like to stress a major difference between that which was decided upon in the past and that which was decided upon, economically speaking, in Bill Clinton's economic package: first, a close linkage to specific sectors in terms of sums earmarked, which will enable us to monitor the expenditure of each and every line item; second, a close connection to deadlines, which had never been done in the past. The figure of \$24 billion was moot at, say, by the year 2000, but now we've stated the 25th of April, 27th of April, 1st of May, the month of May, the month June, the month of September, the month of October, and throughout the remainder of 1993. That is the principal set of differences.

Russian Reform

Q. You somewhat anticipated what I had intended to ask. I see here a clear break in the type of assistance being rendered to reform, about which so much had been said by way of lipservice in the past. So what do you expect of the G-7 meeting in Tokyo, then?

President Yeltsin. Reform, of course, is proceeding, but it's a young reform process. It's really only a year old. It's only for a year that we have reform underway in Russia. Now, in that one year we have had 60,000 private enterprises set up. In over 70 years not a single one was established. We must remember that over 50,000 major stockholding companies in that one year. These are perhaps minor successes, but they are signal successes nonetheless.

But of course, certain quarters are putting on brakes on the process. Russia tends to run out of breath from time to time. It needs a transition period, a breather of, say, 2 years. And in that period of breather, we need this kind of support; not aid, I would stress, not in assistance but support, because in supplying food, technologies, goods, et cetera, et cetera, you do create additional workplaces, additional jobs in the United States of America, additional use of American industrial plant capacity, a fuller use of U.S. economic potential. So these are not Christmas presents, I put it to you, not at all. This is policy and major policymaking, I put it to you. Thank you.

Aid to Russia

Q. President Yeltsin, President Clinton, you've all indicated your devotion to democracy, but that you're both idealists at the same time. But what we're hearing about right now is a very pragmatic, a very down-to-earth set of measures, a very down-to-earth program. Now, President Yeltsin, how is this assistance to be rendered to particular sectors? You've indicated that there is a definite time, a place for delivery of the assistance. Now, you've also indicated that jobs will be created in America. But what will actually happen on the ground, so to speak, in Russia?

President Yeltsin. Let's say we're going to spend 300 billion rubles on health in Rus-

sia, that will reach every single Russian—100 million in medicines that will reach every Russian. Technology—after all, new technologies will generate new consumer goods for each and every Russian. Everything is people oriented. This is Bill Clinton's policy. It is Yeltsin's policy. That is, that we work for people's benefit, for the benefit of each and every free individual.

Aid Coordination and Trade Restriction

Q. What assurances do you have from President Yeltsin that this medicine, this food, these housing guarantees, that any of this can really be delivered through a system that we've been told is very bureaucratic and somewhat corrupt? What assurances have you given him that there won't be logjams on the American side? And could you tell us, do you agree with his opening statement that there is agreement here between the two leaders about ending the Jackson-Vanik amendment and about the technology transfers thru COCOM?

President Clinton. Let me answer the first question first. On the delivery systems, we have reached a tentative agreement, pending the acquiescence by other G-7 countries—I say that because I have not had a chance to discuss this with any of them—that there were logjams in the past, both within the Government Agencies of the United States and other countries and within Russia itself, and that we have now asked in a very carefully coordinated fashion all the G-7 to do two things: to commit to more bilateral assistance in terms of development and partnership and to work for a multilateral development package.

So we have tentatively agreed, the two of us have—but again, I say nobody else has agreed to this—that we should establish a coordinating office in Moscow to make sure, number one, that each of us in the G-7 does what we promise to do on time, without delay, and number two, that our efforts are coordinated within Russia, both so that we are not in conflict with each other and so that the money can actually go where it's supposed to go. So we devoted quite a bit of time to the whole business of implementation.

As to your second question, we discussed Jackson-Vanik, COCOM, and a number of other issues. And I told President Yeltsin that in my meetings with the Congress before I left, we agreed that certain Members of Congress with an interest in this—I might add, in both parties—would actually compile a list of every one of the cold war legislative and other restrictions that are still being applied to Russia, even though it is now a democratic state, that I would listen to President Yeltsin on these issues, and that I would then return home and we would make as many changes as we could.

But with regard specifically to Jackson-Vanik, I think the issue there is whether—it's a fact question from my point of view: Are there any more people who wish to emigrate who have not been allowed to? The President says he doesn't think so. He's going to look into that. I'm going to go back and raise that issue with Congress, along with the COCOM issue and a whole range of others. And I would expect within a matter of a few days, we'll be able to give to the American press and public a comprehensive answer to what the position of the administration on that will be.

Q. COCOM?

President Clinton. Including that. We are reviewing that, too.

Go ahead.

Areas of Cooperation

Q. My question is directed both to President Yeltsin and to President Clinton. It goes as follows: The elimination of restrictions on trade with Russia, if that does happen, what perhaps should be the harbinger of the establishment of those relations of partnership which we've been talking about for so long. Now, I'd like to ask you, gentlemen, what particular priority areas are up for partnership and cooperation? And President Clinton, how do you feel? Are there particular areas which the U.S. might like to stress in building up business cooperation with the Russians?

President Yeltsin. On that first point, I should like to say that we discussed something like 50 issues yesterday and today, and practically all of those issues had to do with partnership. We would not manage to tackle

any one of those issues if we were not partners, if we were rivals in each other's eyes, adversaries in each other's eyes. No, we are partners and future allies. That was the way our relationship unfolded. That's the way the negotiations went. That's the way we went about resolving issues. And in discussing those approximately 50 issues, we didn't sweep anything under the table; we didn't set anything aside. We decided either to pass them on for further investigation and analysis, or else we resolved them on the spot.

President Clinton. I'd like to answer the question also, and respond to what President Yeltsin said. Among the areas in which the United States sees real opportunities for joint activity are energy, space, the environment, nuclear safety. These are some of the areas that we believe we can work together on in ways that would benefit Russia economically in a very short time and also be beneficial for the United States. Over and above that, we discussed but did not settle on a range of possible actions that we could take to make private investment in Russia more attractive to American investors because, after all, in the end a market economy is built by private investment and not just public investment alone.

The second point I'd like to make in response to the comment by President Yeltsin: We did discuss a phenomenal number of issues. I think it's fair to say we discussed more issues than either one of us thought we would when we came here. We did not agree on everything. You would not expect the leaders of two great nations, even in partnership, to have total agreement. But we did come to agreement on how we would handle these issues, how we would try to work through our disagreements, and what we would do in the future. And I appreciated the extreme candor with which President Yeltsin treated all our discussions, including those areas where there is still some gap between our two positions.

Submarine Incident and Baltic States

Q. I have a two-part question, one for each of you. Mr. President, on another irritant in the U.S.-Russian relationship that was pointed out to us yesterday by your Communications Director, George Stephanopoulos, the

patrolling off the Russian coast by U.S. submarines: What have you agreed to now to prevent these kinds of accidents from recurring down the road? Is this another case of old habits dying hard, that the U.S. still finds a need to keep these kinds of submarines off the Russian coast?

And for President Yeltsin: An irritant in the U.S.-Russian relationship is the slow withdrawal of Russian troops from the Baltic States and from Eastern Europe. Are you committed to withdrawing the Russian soldiers as quickly as possible from those independent nations?

President Clinton. Let me answer first. I don't mind saying to this whole assemblage that I told President Yeltsin I very much regretted the submarine incident, and that I had ordered a thorough review of the incident as well as the policy of which the incident happened to be an unintended part, and that as soon as that review was completed, I would engage Russia at the appropriate levels to discuss whether the policy should be changed and where we should go from here. That was a regrettable thing, and I don't want it to ever happen again.

President Yeltsin. On the first point I'd add just a couple of words. We did agree that somewhere late in May or early in June the Minister of Defense of the Russian Federation, Grachev, would visit the United States of America to discuss the entire gamut of issues of this sort, including close passage of submarines, so that such incidents might be avoided in the future.

Now, with regard to withdrawal of troops from the Baltic States, we are adhering very closely to the schedule on troop withdrawals from Lithuania, and we are completing work on that schedule since Lithuania does not violate human rights and treats the Russian-speaking population fairly. If Latvia and Estonia violate human rights, if their laws are presently so structured that in fact some national minorities continue to be persecuted, and that involves basically Russians, we have, on the whole, adopted a political decision, a policy decision to withdraw troops from those states. We will be scheduling the actual withdrawal in line with what they decide in the human rights area.

Russian Referendum

Q. I have a question that I would like to address to President Yeltsin and also to President Clinton.

President Yeltsin, you indicated that Bill Clinton's economic package lays the groundwork for partnership between the United States of America and Russia and will provide considerable impetus to the reform process in Russia. In April, we're going to have a referendum in Russia. How, here today in Vancouver, would you forecast the situation unfolding on the basis of agreements reached here in Canada?

Now, President Clinton, the personal factor is a major element in politics. Now, what would you indicate by way of your personal contact with President Yeltsin in regard to the referendum?

President Yeltsin. That's our internal domestic issue. Whether it will be impacted directly or indirectly is another issue, but it's up to us to deal with the referendum issue. It's up to us to work with our people. It's up to us to persuade the citizens of the Russian Federation that if they do not vote in favor of confidence on the 25th of April, they will be dealing a major blow not only upon Russia but also upon the United States of America, upon the other countries of the world. This would be a loss to democracy, a loss to freedom, a rollback to the past, a return to the Communist yokes, something which is entirely inadmissible.

President Clinton. My personal reaction to President Yeltsin based on these 2 days is, first, that he is very much what he seems to be—he's a person who rose from humble beginnings, who has never forgotten where he came from—and second, that his enduring virtue is that he trusts the Russian people.

The great courage involved in all democracies is that in the end you have to trust the people, including you have to trust the people if they decide to throw you out. You have to trust the people.

Boris Yeltsin has put the fate of the Government of Russia into the hands of the people of Russia. That is a unique thing in your history. There are few nations in the world that have the spirit, the culture, the richness that the Russian people can claim. And yet, for too long, they were never given control

over their own destiny. My belief is that deep down inside he actually does trust all the people who live in those communities in the 12 time zones that make up Russia. And that is a very great thing.

Yes.

Exchange Programs

Q. Mr. President and Mr. President, definitely we are interested if there is any part of the package which deals with Russia's far east and Pacific Northwest of the United States of America as far as economic reform and development is concerned and people-to-people relationships in particular.

President Clinton. Yes, we agreed to have a substantial increase in the exchanges of people, particularly in the area of increasing the number of people we might bring to this country for training in business management, and big increases in student exchanges and a whole range of other things, including agriculture and other areas that we are still going to identify.

Let me say that it is easy to minimize such things because they often do not cost as much money as some other parts of a long-term development package. But no one who has lived through the second half of the 20th century could possibly be blind to the enormous impact of exchange programs on the future of the countries.

You know, when I was a young man I worked for the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright. There is a scholarship program that carries his name that, literally, in my judgment, has changed the whole direction of policy in country after country after country. So I believe this is a very important thing, and I'm going to do everything I can to see that there is a major, major increase in the number of broad-gauged exchanges. And I might say I think that has great support in the United States Congress.

President Yeltsin. I'd like to add a few words to that. This package, which I would like to call a very large and wise package which is going to make history, involves yet another question mark, and that is that of assisting the native populations in the northern reaches of Russia. It's a very, very important issue to tackle that one.

Russian Referendum

Q. I would like to know what is your deep feeling, because everybody tries to help you, and I think everybody is right to help you because you represent democracy. But the question I will ask you is that, after you, do you think there is an alternative that maybe our American friends, President Clinton, has been obliged to think about in case your enemies, your adversary oust you from power after the referendum on the 25th of April?

President Yeltsin. My first point to that would be this: I intend to do everything I can in my power—and, by the way, I do believe in the Russian people making its proper choice on the 25th of April. At the moment, today I say there is no alternative to Yeltsin. Perhaps there will be one tomorrow, but certainly not one today.

President Clinton. If I were on the ballot, I would make exactly the statement. The answer to your question is simple, I think. I have made it clear that the United States is committed to democracy, to human rights, to market economics, to reducing the nuclear threat, to respecting national sovereignty of the other newly independent states. We have interests and values. They are embodied by the policies and the direction of President Yeltsin. They are enduring. He is the duly elected President of Russia. And as long as he is, I intend to work with him and support him because he reflects those enduring values.

Specifics of the Aid Package

Q. I have a question to the President of Russia. The overall sum of this is that this is perhaps not so great. For example, when we had the Los Angeles riots we had a package twice that size set up. Now, what sort of projects in Russia do you think will yield the most immediate results and will have the greatest impact socially in the short run?

President Yeltsin. I feel that we do not need astronomical figures, headline-making figures. What we need are real figures. These are real figures which are do-able, which are implementable in terms of things that we can do.

Q. Well, what specific projects would you regard as the most effective ones?

President Yeltsin. Well, the first priority would be fuel, which would enable us to re-

plenish, to top off our hard-currency reserves. I'm talking about oil and gas, its revitalization, and we addressed that topic in very specific terms. The next issue would be immediate delivery of goods to the people.

Cuba

Q. I have a two-part question, one for Mr. Clinton and one for Mr. Yeltsin, please. Before leaving the United States, Hispanic Congressmen requested that you talk about the nuclear plant of Cienfuegos in Cuba, trying to get the commitment of Mr. Yeltsin not to continue or not to help in continuing the construction of that plant. Did you get that commitment?

And for Mr. Yeltsin: I would like to know if you have a timetable for finishing the withdrawal of troops, Soviet troops, from Cuba?

President Clinton. First of all, let me say that the day of massive subsidies between Russia and the Government of Cuba is over. The lion's share of the trade which exists now between Russia and Cuba is a market-based trade. There is a nuclear facility being constructed there. The United States is concerned about it. We've expressed our concern about it. That was basically the extent of our discussions here at this meeting.

President Yeltsin. In regard to troop withdrawals, we have already initiated that withdrawal and are now finalizing a schedule for the final withdrawal of troops; nothing in terms of a specific timetable.

Characterization of Summit

Q. I have a question for President Clinton. Mr. President, even today, I think we can foretell that President Yeltsin's opponents will certainly be accusing him of making unilateral political concessions in exchange for Clinton's package. Perhaps we could anticipate their commentary and respond to that question even today.

President Clinton. First of all, I do not believe it would be fair to say that President Yeltsin made a lot of political concessions in return for the commitments made by the United States. We did clarify some positions on some issues. And I felt better about it. But basically everything President Yeltsin said in our private meetings was consistent

with the direction in which he has tried to lead Russia since he has been President.

Secondly, I would remind you that the United States also has taken some steps that have nothing to do with money to try to reinforce the fact that we consider this a partnership of two great nations, that we want to work in partnerships. That's why I agreed to a comprehensive review of all the cold war statutes and other limitations on our relationships with Russia. That's why I went out of my way to tell the President in our very first meeting how much I regretted the incident of the submarine bumping and how I was committed to reviewing our policy and to getting back with him on that.

So I would say that President Yeltsin's opponents might want to characterize this meeting in that way, but it would not be a fair characterization. In fact, it would be a distortion of the conversation that we had.

President Yeltsin. I am not frightened of possible reprimands or reproaches from the opposition because I see no single matter upon which it could hang such an accusation. There's nothing in any of the documents; there's nothing in what was said between us.

President Clinton. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's ninth news conference began at 1:45 p.m. at Canada Place. President Yeltsin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Question-and-Answer Session With Russian Reporters in Vancouver

April 4, 1993

Aid Package

Q. I had two questions for both Presidents, so you could probably answer for Boris, too. [Laughter]

The President. I'll give you my answer, then I'll give you Yeltsin's answer. [Laughter]

Q. The first is that this is the meeting of the Presidents. So the money that's being promised is Government money, and naturally it's going to be distributed through the Government. But you've indicated that three-quarters are going to be going to businesses. So the question is how the Russian businesses themselves are going to be con-

sulted, if ever? What are the priorities, because there are several association of Russian businessmen existing already. So will they be invited to participate in setting up priorities for investment? This is the first.

And second, to you: We know that polls, public polls in America do not show that Americans are very enthusiastic about giving this aid. Like Newsweek polls say that about 75 percent don't approve it, and New York Times published that 52 percent support if it just prevents civil war, 42 percent if it fosters democratic reform, and only 29 percent if it just personally supports Yeltsin. How are you going to sort of handle this problem that Americans themselves are not very enthusiastic?

Thank you.

Q. I have a question. I'm sorry, is there going to be a translation of everything into Russian? No, just the answers. Just the answers. Okay.

The President. The answer to the first question is, it depends on what kind of aid we're discussing. For example, the funds that will be set up for financing new businesses will obviously go to those businesses who apply and who seem to be good risks and make the application. The privatization fund will be used to support the privatization of existing public enterprises. Then there are some other general funds in the Democracy Corps and other things which people in Russia will have some influence over the distribution of.

With regard to your second question, let me say that I would think that there would be people in both countries who would not feel too warmly toward simply the American Government giving money to the Russian Government. There's opposition to that in Russia. And in our country, throughout our whole history, there has been an opposition to foreign aid of all kinds. That is, this has nothing to do with Russia. If you look at the whole history of America, any kind of aid program has always been unpopular.

What I have tried to tell the American people is, this is not an aid program, this is an investment program; that this is an investment in our future. We spent \$4 trillion, trillion, on armaments, on soldiers, and other

investments because of the cold war. Now, with a democratic government in Russia, with the newly independent states, the remainder of them, working on a democracy and struggling to get their economies going, it seems to me very much in our interest to make it possible to do whatever we can for democracy to survive, for the economy of Russia to grow because of the potential for trade and investment there, and for us to continue the effort to reduce nuclear weapons and other elements of hostility on both sides, on our side and on the Russian side. So I don't see this as an aid program. This is an investment for the United States. This is very much in the interest of the United States. The things I announced today, the second stage of the program which I hope to put together next week, in my view are things that are good for my country and for the taxpayers and workers of my country.

Russia is a very great nation that needs some partnership now, some common endeavor with other people who share her goals. But it would be a great mistake for anyone to view this as some sort of just a charity or an aid issue. That's not what it is. It's an investment for America, and it's a wonderful investment. Like all investments, there is some risk. But there's far less risk with a far greater potential of return than the \$4 trillion we spend looking at each other across the barrier of the cold war.

Ukraine

Q. Mr. President, first of all, thank you very much indeed for coming here and talking to us. In the memory of the living correspondents, this is the first time an American President is doing this to the Russian press corps, so it's kind of a very measured breakthrough.

I have two questions. One, in your introductory remarks of the other press conference, you mentioned in brief that you discussed the START II and START I issues. Could you tell us, did you reach an agreement with President Yeltsin as to what might be done in order to have Ukraine join the ratification of START I and the NPT regime? And my second question is, how confident you are that the United States Congress would be eager to support you in lifting Jack-

son-Vanik and other restrictions inherited from the cold war?

The President. First, we discussed the issue of Ukraine with regard to START I and NPT and generally with regard to the need to proceed to have the other independent states all be non-nuclear but also to have the United States develop strong relationships with them. We know that one thing that we could do that would increase, I think, the willingness of the Ukraine to support this direction is to successfully conclude our own negotiations on highly enriched uranium, because that would provide not only an important economic opportunity for Russia but also for Ukraine, and it would show some reaching out on our part. But we agreed that basically the people who signed off on the Lisbon Protocol have got to honor what they did, and we agreed to continue to press that.

I, myself, have spent a good deal of time trying to reassure Ukraine's leaders, specifically the President and the Foreign Minister, that I want strong ties with Ukraine, that the United States very much wants a good relationship with Ukraine, but that in order to do what we need to do together to strengthen the economy of Ukraine and to have the United States be fully supportive, the commitment to ratify START I and to join the NPT regime is critical.

What was the second question?

Trade Restrictions

The President. With regard to Jackson-Vanik and COCOM, I would make two points: First, I have agreed with the Republican and Democratic leaders in the Congress that we will, as soon as I return, have a list of all the legislative and other restrictions, some of them are regulatory in nature, imposed on relations between the United States and Russia, that are legacies of the cold war. And we will see whether they're—how many of them we could agree to do away with right now, at least among the leadership of the Congress.

With regard to Jackson-Vanik, I think there will be an openness to change the law if the Congress is convinced there are, in fact, no more refuseniks, no more people who wish to emigrate who are not being allowed to. If the fact is that there is no one there

who would have been—who the law was designed to affect, then I think that the desire to keep the law will be much less.

With regard to COCOM, my guess is, and it's nothing more than a guess, that the leadership of Congress and indeed my own advisers might prefer to see some sort of phased movement out of the COCOM regime. But I think they would be willing to begin it in the fairly near future.

President's Interest in Russia

Q. Mr. Clinton, when I read your speech in Annapolis, I got the impression that you have a completely different personal—and I stress that, personal, not political—approach towards Russia, compared to the approach of Mr. Bush. Could you formulate in a few words what is the difference between you as a personality and your approach—the difference between your approach to Russia and the approach of Mr. Bush? And who made you—why did you cite Akhmatova in the last part of your speech?

The President. Let me say, first, I do not wish to compare myself with President Bush or anyone else. I can't say what was in his heart about Russia. I can say that since I was a boy, I have been personally fascinated with the history, the music, and the culture and the literature of Russia. I have been thrilled by Russian music since I was a serious student of music for more than 30 years now. I have read major Russian novelists and many of your poets and followed your ballet and tried to know as much as I could about your history.

And I went to the Soviet Union, but it was then the Soviet Union. You may know, it was a big issue in the last Presidential campaign that I spent the first week of 1970 alone in Moscow, and did not return again until 3 days before Mr. Yeltsin was elected President. But all that time I was away, I was following events there very closely and hoping for the day when we could be genuine partners. So I have always had a personal feeling about Russia.

I remember, for example, a lot of you know I like music very much. One of the most moving experiences for me as a musician was when Leonard Bernstein took the New York Philharmonic to Moscow and

played Shostakovich's Fifth Symphony to the Russians. And he played the last movement more rapidly than anyone had ever played it before because it was technically so difficult. That is something I followed very closely when it occurred.

These are things that have always had a big impact on my life. And I had just always hoped that someday, if I ever had the chance to, I could play a role in seeing our two countries become closer partners.

NOTE: The question-and-answer session began at 2:46 p.m. at Canada Place.

Vancouver Declaration: Joint Statement of the Presidents of the United States and the Russian Federation

April 4, 1993

Having met in Vancouver, Canada on April 3–4, President Bill Clinton of the United States of America and President Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation declared their firm commitment to a dynamic and effective U.S.-Russian partnership that strengthens international stability. The two presidents approved a comprehensive strategy of cooperation to promote democracy, security, and peace. President Yeltsin stressed his firm commitment to fostering democratization, the rule of law, and a market economy. As the United States moves to reinvigorate its own economy, President Clinton assured President Yeltsin of active American support for the Russian people as they pursue their own chosen course of political and economic reform.

The Presidents agreed on a new package of bilateral economic programs and measures to address Russia's immediate human needs and contribute to the building of necessary structures for successful transition to a market economy. They recognized the critical importance of creating favorable external conditions in which the Russian economy can realize its maximum potential. In this connection, the Presidents expressed their determination to promote access to each other's markets, cooperation in defense conversion,

removal of impediments to trade and investment, and resumption of U.S. food exports to Russia on a stable long-term basis.

President Yeltsin informed President Clinton about the Russian program of economic reforms. In particular, President Yeltsin stressed such key questions of the Russian reform as the necessity of combatting inflation and achieving financial stabilization by improvement of the banking system. He also emphasized the importance of privatization, encouragement of entrepreneurship, structural policy, and social support. In this context, the Presidents discussed the role of the international community in supporting specific elements of the reform program.

The Presidents agreed that Russia's harmonious integration into the community of democratic nations and the world economy is essential. They therefore called for accelerated G-7 development of substantial and effective new economic initiatives to support political and economic reform in Russia. In this connection, the Presidents welcomed the extraordinary meeting of the foreign and finance ministers of the G-7 countries and the Russian Federation scheduled for April 14-15 in Tokyo. Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin also expressed their satisfaction with the successful conclusion of negotiations in Paris on the rescheduling of the international debt of the former USSR. The United States announced its support for Russia's intention to become a full member of GATT and to begin, in the near future, official talks on the conditions of Russia's accession to GATT.

The Presidents agreed to give fresh impetus to development of the U.S.-Russian relationship in all its dimensions. To coordinate and direct this effort and to activate a comprehensive and intensive dialogue, they agreed on measures to improve the mechanism for mutual consultations. In particular, working groups will be set up involving high-level officials of both governments with broad authority in the areas of economic and scientific and technological cooperation. The Presidents agreed to establish a United States-Russian Commission on technological cooperation in the fields of energy and space. They intend to designate Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and Vice President Gore to head this commission.

The leaders of the United States and Russia attached great importance to the prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. They reaffirmed their determination to strengthen the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), make it universal, and give it an unlimited duration. The Presidents stressed their expectation that all countries of the former USSR which are not already NPT members will promptly confirm their adherence to the treaty as non-nuclear weapon states. They urged the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea to comply fully with its IAEA safeguards obligations, which remain in force, and to retract its announcement of withdrawal from the NPT.

The Presidents agreed that efforts of the United States and Russia will be directed toward the entry into force of the START I Treaty and the ratification of the START II Treaty as soon as possible. They affirmed that the United States and Russia intend to cooperate, on the basis of their mutual interest, in environmentally safe elimination of nuclear forces pursuant to relevant arms control agreements, in construction of a storage facility for nuclear materials and in the controlling, accounting, and physical protection of nuclear materials. The United States reiterated its readiness to provide assistance to Russia for these purposes. The Presidents called for prompt conclusion, on mutually acceptable terms, of the negotiations on an agreement on the conversion and sale for peaceful purposes of nuclear materials removed from nuclear weapons.

The Presidents underscored their determination to broaden interaction and consultations between Russia and the United States in the areas of defense and security. They instructed their Ministers of Defense to explore further possibilities in that direction.

The Presidents noted the progress achieved at the recent United States-Russian talks on chemical weapons in Geneva. They welcomed the progress made in preparing the protocols necessary to submit the "Agreement on Destruction and Non-Production of Chemical Weapons" of June 1, 1990 for approval by the legislative bodies of the Russian Federation and the United States. They also

welcomed progress achieved in developing agreement on the preparation and implementation of the second phase of the Wyoming Memorandum of Understanding of September 23, 1989 regarding a bilateral verification experiment and data exchange related to prohibition of chemical weapons.

The Presidents agreed that it is necessary to achieve the earliest possible resolution of questions about cooperation in non-proliferation of missiles and missile technology in all its aspects, in accordance with the principles of existing international agreements. They also decided to work together to remove obstacles impeding Russia's access to the global market in high technology and related services. The Presidents agreed that negotiations on a multilateral nuclear test ban should commence at an early date, and that their governments would consult with each other accordingly.

Mindful of their countries' responsibilities as permanent members of the UN Security Council, the Presidents affirmed that U.S.-Russian cooperation is essential to the peaceful resolution of international conflicts and the promotion of democratic values, the protection of human rights, and the solution of global problems, such as environmental pollution, terrorism, and narcotics trafficking. The United States and Russia stressed their determination to improve the effectiveness of peacemaking and peacekeeping capabilities of the United Nations, the CSCE, and other appropriate regional organizations.

Recognizing that the problem of mistreatment of minorities and ethnic communities is increasingly a source of international instability, the Presidents stressed the critical importance of full protection for individual human rights, including those of ethnic Russian and all other minorities on the territory of the former Soviet Union. They affirmed their commitment to the peaceful resolution of conflicts in that region on the basis of respect for the independence, territorial integrity, and security of all member states of the UN and the CSCE.

The Presidents announced their intention to expand and improve their joint work in the area of environmental protection. They agreed to coordinate on joint ecological measures to be taken and research to be

done, and on support for financing agreed programs. The Presidents agreed that the level of mutual openness achieved makes it possible to proceed with new forms of cooperation in science and technology, including programs in the field of outer space. The two countries will further develop bilateral cooperation in fisheries in the Bering Sea, the North Pacific, and the Sea of Okhotsk, including for the purpose of preservation and reproduction of living marine resources and of monitoring the ecosystem in the Northern Pacific. The Presidents further agreed to expand significantly their contacts, exchanges, and cooperation in the areas of culture, education, the humanities, and the mass media.

The joint efforts of both countries have succeeded in establishing a new character for Russian-American relations. The Presidents reaffirmed the principles and provisions of the Camp David Declaration of February 1, 1992 and the Charter of U.S.-Russian Partnership and Friendship of June 17, 1992 as a basis for relations between the two countries.

Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin expressed their deep appreciation to Prime Minister Mulroney and the people of Canada for hosting their meeting in Vancouver. With a view to accelerating the development of U.S.-Russian partnership, the Presidents agreed to meet regularly at the summit level. President Yeltsin invited President Clinton to visit Russia. President Clinton accepted the invitation with appreciation.

Fact Sheets From the Russia-United States Summit

April 4, 1993

Humanitarian/Health Assistance and Food Sales

Purpose

To respond to the need for humanitarian food and medical assistance and to help develop the proper infrastructure for health care delivery, the United States will provide grant food and medical assistance, health

technical assistance, and concessional sales of U.S. agricultural commodities to Russia.

Program

Grant Food Assistance: The United States will provide an additional \$194 million in grant food aid to Russia, bringing total grant food assistance for Russia to \$425 million in FY 1993. This is provided under the Section 416(b) and Food for Progress programs administered by USDA. Some of the commodities will be provided directly to the Russian Government for direct distribution or sales to needy individuals, while other commodities will be auctioned on private commodities exchanges. A certain amount of the commodities will be provided through American and Russian private voluntary organizations. (\$194 million)

Food for Mothers and Children: The United States will provide infant formula, whole fat milk, cereals, and nutritional powdered beverage to needy infants, children, and mothers in Magadan, Khabarovsk, and Vladivostok. (\$10 million)

Medicines and Medical Supplies for Russian Hospitals: The United States will provide medicines and medical supplies to hospitals in the Moscow area and medical supplies to hospitals and clinics in the Magadan region of the far east. (\$15 million)

Medical Partnerships: In an effort to increase contacts between American and Russian medical professionals, the United States will establish an additional four medical partnerships in Russia over the next several months. This will make a total of nine partnerships in Russia. (\$3 million)

Health Care Finance: An integral part of transition to a market economy will be the reform of the health care system. To assist in this transition, the United States will work with the Russian Government to promote private health care alternatives. The United States will provide training and seminars and seek to establish replicable models of health care finance in reform-minded communities of Russia. (\$2.5 million)

Food for Progress Credit Sales: The United States will make available \$700 million in agricultural credit sales to Russia under the Food for Progress program. These sales are an interim measure designed to restore Russia's access to U.S. agricultural mar-

kets for grains and other needed commodities in the short term. The commodities will be delivered for the next several months, until Russia's domestic harvest begins to become available.

Total Funding for Humanitarian/Health and Food Sales: \$924.5 million.

Private Sector Development

Purpose

The U.S. private sector assistance program supports Russia's historic transition to a market-based economy, expanded trade and investment opportunities, and emergence of an indigenous private sector. U.S. assistance reinforces Russia's strategy to transfer state assets to productive private sector use and to catalyze small and medium business development to create new jobs. Whenever possible, the U.S. assistance program links American businesses with Russian counterparts to transfer skills and create lasting market relationships.

Program

Russian-American Enterprise Fund: The fund will target loans and investments to create and expand small and medium enterprises. It will support Russian businesses and joint ventures with U.S. firms that disseminate Western business know-how and practices. Loans and investments will seek to increase employment, develop capital markets, generate foreign exchange, encourage private foreign investment, and support privatization. The fund will also seek to demonstrate that good business investments are compatible with sound environmental practices. (\$50 million in 1993)

Privatization: Privatization is the driving force behind economic reform in Russia. This initiative reinforces nearly every aspect of the privatization program that is giving all Russians their first opportunity to become private shareholders. U.S. assistance supports enterprise auctions, privatization manuals, public education on private ownership, and legal, economic, and logistical advice to local privatization committees. Technical assistance for investment funds, stock exchanges, prudent regulation, and business support organizations will help create a fair and competitive marketplace. (\$60 million in 1993)

Bankers Training: A modern banking system and stable financial markets are indispensable to enterprise restructuring. Officials of U.S. commercial banks, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and other specialists will train at least 250 Russian banking executives. American experts will work with Russian counterparts to introduce new deposit mechanisms for business and household savings, functioning checking accounts, inter-bank credit and reserve lending systems, and an auction market in government securities that will facilitate relatively noninflationary financing of public deficits. (\$5 million)

Fiscal Sector Reform: Effective decentralization and privatization will require new tax and expenditure systems for local and regional governments. Technical assistance in the fiscal area will help local and regional governments design and implement fiscal structures, including revenue systems needed to finance social services and other budgetary requirements currently financed by state enterprises. Assistance will start with Moscow oblast and will be targeted at regions making significant privatization progress. (\$4.4 million)

Russian-American Agribusiness Partnerships: This activity pairs U.S. agribusinesses with Russian partners to help private farmers, enterprises, and reform-oriented institutions create a market-driven food system. Technical assistance and training by U.S. agribusinesses will help break bottlenecks between producers and consumers and create efficient input delivery systems. U.S. agribusinesses will introduce U.S. standards for harvesting, processing, and distribution. Under the project, they will invest approximately \$60 million of their own funds. (\$20 million)

Farmer-to-Farmer Program: This activity will link over 300 American volunteer farmers with farmers in Russia in order to provide direct, practical agricultural marketing experience and know-how. These volunteers will build on the work of 80 volunteers already in Russia. Their technical expertise will help new private farmers learn the skills needed to operate in a market economy, improve crop quality, reduce losses, and respond to consumer demand. (\$5 million)

Eurasia Foundation: The foundation is a new, independent grant-making and tech-

nical assistance fund established with U.S. Government financing. It will encourage collaboration with and contributions from private funding sources. The foundation will support innovative, field-based programs throughout the N.I.S. in areas such as management training, economics education, public policy advice, independent print and broadcast media, and science and technology development. (\$4 million for Russia)

Total Private Sector Development Program: \$148.4 million in 1993.

Democracy Corps Initiative

Purpose

Russia is embarking on the transformation of its political and legal framework from an authoritarian foundation to one based upon the rule of law, with emphasis on rights and responsibilities of individuals, popular participation in political and economic decision-making, open competition among interest groups, governmental accountability, transparency of political and legal processes, and predictability in social and economic relations.

Program

To assist this process, the President is mobilizing the Democracy Corps, a broad coalition of American people and institutions devoted to expanding the momentum for democratization in Russia. As the Coordinator for all U.S. assistance efforts with the former Soviet Union, Ambassador Tom Simons will oversee Democracy Corps activities in Russia. Specific U.S. Government-funded activities in FY 1993 will include:

Democracy Summer: The summer of 1993 will be designated "Democracy Summer," with the startup of a \$25 million program of intensive people-to-people contacts between Russians and their American hosts. Approximately 3,000 Russians will be brought to the U.S. for exchanges and training in 1993. Two types of contacts are envisioned:

Exchanges: Exposure of Russians to life in a democracy can foster grassroots understanding and attitudes supportive of democratic development. About 1,700 high school students will arrive this summer for a variety

of programs: Over 300 will participate in short-term thematic group projects in areas ranging from culture and the arts to youth leadership, 650 students will participate in year-long exchanges during the 1993–94 school year, and 750 students will participate in month-long school-to-school linkages. About 450 undergraduate and 200 graduate-level Russian students will receive training in economics, business, public policy, government, education, and law. Another 200 government officials and professionals will participate in short-term education programs designed to introduce them to their American counterparts.

Training: In addition to exposure to democratic systems, visits by citizens of Russia to the United States can demonstrate U.S. methods of solving technical, managerial, and other problems that are key to Russia's successful adoption of a free market system. About 400 Russians will be brought to the U.S. for study tours and short-term training programs in key technical areas such as banking, energy, environment, health, and agriculture.

Rule of Law: These programs will mobilize a broad range of U.S. legal resources to assist the Russian reform of their legal structure to reflect democratic and free market principles, and to institutionalize support procedures and practices in the areas of commercial law, criminal law and procedure, and legal education. In particular, the U.S. will directly support President Yeltsin's Legal Experiment, an innovative plan to advance legal reform, including the creation of a jury system in five regions. (\$5 million)

Effective Local Governance: The U.S. will assist reform-minded local governments in generating, managing, and expending financial resources in ways which foster the private provision of social services and broad private sector growth. The first two cities targeted are Moscow and Nizhni Novgorod. (\$7 million)

Strengthening Civil Society: The U.S. will mobilize private U.S. organizations (political and civic organizations, free trade unions, and advocacy groups) to work closely with counterparts in Russia—reformers, grassroots organizers, regional interests—to expand their participation in Russian political

processes and in the dialogue on economic reform. (\$2 million)

Strengthening Independent Media: This program will allow the U.S. media and journalism community to share professional journalist techniques and business and managerial skills essential for functioning of a free and open democracy. (\$2 million)

Developing Russian Volunteerism: A wide slice of the U.S. private voluntary organization community will assist private Russian groups to meet emerging social service needs during this period of economic dislocation. (\$4 million)

Developing University Partnerships: The U.S. will mobilize the U.S. education community to develop linkages and exchanges between American universities and partner universities in Russia that focus on areas critical to the creation of free market and democratic institutions. The administration will establish an American Institute at the Institute of Foreign Languages in Nizhny Novgorod for study of American studies and language. (\$3 million)

Total Democracy Corps Initiative: \$48 million in 1993.

Officer Resettlement Initiative

Purpose

The United States and the West have an historic opportunity to facilitate the return of troops to Russia by providing housing and job retraining for Russian officers who are being demobilized and returning to Russia. This officer resettlement initiative responds to a direct appeal from the Government of Russia.

Program

This initiative will focus on facilitating the resettlement of officers who are being demobilized upon return to Russia. In addition to building houses for these returning officers, it will provide employment retraining. Specifically it will, on a demonstration basis, build 450 houses within 12–16 months for officers who are being demobilized and returning to Russia, and provide employment training for the participating officers to facilitate their transition to civilian life.

Houses will be built in areas where local authorities are committed to market economic reforms. These sites also will be se-

lected based upon availability of land, adequate infrastructure, and proximity to good transportation routes. To the extent possible, we will seek to use local labor and locally available materials in the construction of these homes.

Providing housing and job retraining for troops returning to Russia is a visible sign of Western support for the Russian people and the Russian Government. The United States will seek to encourage other donors to implement similar or complementary programs. We will also seek to expand this initiative in the future.

Total FY 93 funding: \$6 million.

Energy and Environment Initiative

Purpose

This initiative will assist in the transformation of the Russian energy economy into a market-oriented, end-use efficient, and environmentally protected system. Reform of the energy sector is essential to the viability of the overall reform program, particularly enterprise restructuring and the overall macroeconomic balance. Structural reform of this sector should help remove some of the worst environmental excesses by eliminating obsolescent production techniques and encouraging energy efficiency.

Program

This initiative represents a balanced approach targeted on several critical leverage points:

Gas/Oil/Coal Production and Delivery Systems Improvement: U.S. assistance will promote efficient use of gas and oil. Reform in these areas will increase hard currency exports and, in the long run, provide alternative fuel sources needed to decommission unsafe nuclear reactors. In addition, our programs will promote coal mine safety, productivity, and cleaner coal technologies. Funding will include engineering and financial analyses to help catalyze and accelerate substantial World Bank and EBRD loans to revamp production, transmissions, and distribution systems. (\$10 million)

Efficiency and Performance Improvement: This program will focus on improving energy efficiency in electric power, refineries, industries, and residential buildings. Funding also will support the Moscow Energy Efficiency

Center which provides information on technology available from U.S. companies as well as training. (\$2 million)

Pricing, Policy, and Institutional Reform: Market-driven approaches for energy supply and demand balance in Russia will be introduced. The program will focus on privatizing energy supply entities, supporting reform of the price and tariff structure, and improving institutions to raise efficiency standards and introduce a regulatory framework. (\$5 million)

Nuclear Power Plant Safety and Regulation: The U.S. will fund short-term operational safety improvements, risk reduction measures, and regulatory assistance for nuclear power plants. (\$15 million)

Environmental Policy and Technology Cooperation: This program will assist in the development of clearer national environmental policies and programs. The U.S. will implement high-impact demonstration projects to reduce severe pollution problems, including minimizing use of ozone-depleting substances. The first activity will focus on air pollution control in the Volgograd region. (\$5 million)

Environmental Non-Governmental-Organization Consortium: The U.S. will mobilize a consortium of public and private sector actors to strengthen collaboration between American and Russian NGO's. The consortium will finance joint U.S.-Russian NGO projects that promote community environmental quality initiatives, resource conservation, public awareness, and training. (\$1 million)

Total Energy and Environment Initiative: \$38 million in 1993.

Trade and Investment

Current U.S. bilateral trade with Russia is only \$3.4 billion, and even though American companies are the largest investors in Russia, total U.S. investment is estimated at only \$400 million. A significant expansion in bilateral trade and investment is among the best ways to assist Russia in making the transition to market democracy. Creating the necessary business climate is a task that basically rests with Russia, but the U.S. Government can play a catalytic role in helping to remove obstacles blocking projects already under dis-

cussion, improve the environment for business, and develop the commercial infrastructure.

Business Development Committee: President Clinton is making bilateral trade and investment growth with Russia a major priority. Implementation is centered in the U.S.-Russia Business Development Committee (BDC) cochaired by Secretary of Commerce Brown and Deputy Prime Minister Shokhin. Secretary Brown will travel to Moscow to begin the process in May. The BDC will be the primary vehicle to help identify and remove impediments to trade and investment, unblock specific U.S. investment projects, press for Russian Government policy reforms, and improve the commercial infrastructure for bilateral commercial growth. The BDC meeting will focus on eliminating obstacles to investment in the energy sector and will include a high level session of the Defense Conversion Subcommittee.

Generalized System of Preferences: President Clinton seeks to extend the U.S. Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) to Russia to provide duty-free treatment for a broad range of Russian exports. Over 440 million of Russian goods will benefit.

GATT: The United States will support Russia's application to become a member of the GATT and will help build the institutions necessary for Russia to become a full GATT member.

American Business Centers: The administration will open four American Business Centers in Russia this year to help American and Russian companies do business with each other and to serve as business incubators.

Export Control Development: Technical assistance will be provided to Russia to improve its export controls development. An effective Russian export control system would allow the sale of higher levels of technology to Russia to assist the reform and modernization of the Russian economy.

Eximbank Loan: The Export-Import Bank of the United States has just finalized an \$82 million loan to finance sale of Caterpillar pipeline construction machinery for Gazprom. This equipment will be used on construction of a gas pipeline in the Yarnal Peninsula region of Russia.

OPIC Investment Support: The Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) has approved its first loan and major insurance coverage to a private commercial venture in Russia, a \$150 million package consisting of a \$50 million loan guarantee and \$100 million investment insurance coverage to support CONOCO's \$300 million Polar Lights project.

TDA Feasibility Study Grants: The U.S. Trade and Development Agency (TDA) is granting \$1.4 million for oil and gas feasibility studies as part of a package of TDA grants totaling \$3.8 million.

Special American Business Internship Training (SABIT): 300 additional internships with American companies are being created for business executives, entrepreneurs, and scientists under the Commerce Department's highly successful business internship program. This doubles the number of Russians who will acquire on-the-job experience in a market economy. (\$2 million).

Total Trade and Investment Development Program: \$9 million in direct program expenditures; trade and investment loans and guarantees; expanded trade and investment.

Exchange With Reporters En Route to the Opening Day Baseball Game in Baltimore, Maryland

April 5, 1993

Affirmative Action in Baseball

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of Jesse Jackson's protest today?

The President. I think it's an informational protest. I think it's fine. The owners put out a statement a few days ago which they say was the first step in, you know, efforts to increase minority ownership and minority increases in management. I think we should. I'm encouraged by Don Baylor's appointment out in Colorado. And I think it's time to make a move on that front. So, I think it's a legitimate issue, and I think it's, like I said, it's an informational picket and not an attempt to get people not to go to the game. So, I think it's good.

Q. Do you think they're moving fast enough?

The President. Well, I think that it was a good first step. And I think you'll see some movement now. And I think it's an issue that deserves some attention, and they're obviously going to give it some. And I think that Reverend Jackson being out there will highlight the issue. So I think it's fine.

Stimulus Package

Q. Mr. President, how about the logjam in the Senate on the economic stimulus plan? Do you think they'll be able to break that and get cloture?

The President. I don't know. We're working at it. I mean, it's a classic—there was an article in the paper today, one of the papers I saw, which pretty well summed it up. They said, you know, it's just a political power play. In the Senate the majority does not rule. It's not like the country. It's not like the House. If the minority chooses, they can stop majority rule. And that's what they're doing. There are a lot of Republican Senators who have told people that they might vote for the stimulus program but there's enormous partisan political pressure not to do it.

And of course, what it means is that in this time when no new jobs are being created even though there seems to be an economic recovery, it means that for political purposes they're willing to deny jobs to places like Baltimore and Dallas and Houston and Pittsburgh and Philadelphia and Portland and Seattle. It's very sad. I mean, the block grant program was designed to create jobs in a hurry based on local priorities, and it's one that the Republicans had always championed. Just about the only Democrat champions of the program were people like me who were out there at the grassroots level, Governors and Senators. I just think it's real sad that they have chosen to exert the minority muscle in a way that will keep Americans out of work. I think it's a mistake.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:45 a.m. aboard the MARC train en route to Oriole Park at Camden Yards. In his remarks, he referred to civil rights leader Rev. Jesse Jackson. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt

April 6, 1993

World Trade Center Bombing

Q. President Mubarak, did you give the United States a specific warning about the World Trade Center bombing?

President Mubarak. Let me tackle this problem in the press conference, if you don't mind.

Stimulus Package

Q. Mr. President, do you think you'll get your stimulus package intact after the recess?

President Clinton. Well, let me say this: We're going to give the Senate a chance to prove that the stated objections to some of the programs were their real objections. I mean, the American people, I'm sure, are disappointed to find that a program that would put a half-million people to work and that has the support of a majority of the United States Senate cannot be brought to a vote in the Senate, because democracy and the majority rule is being undermined.

The whole purpose of the Senate's debating rules is to allow all amendments to be offered. We've had amendment after amendment after amendment after amendment, and the Republican minority is just trying to keep it from being voted on. So we're going to give them a chance to see if they were serious about their specific concerns and if they really want to put the American people back to work or not. This is a big issue, and we'll just see what happens.

Q. You are going to have to compromise, though, aren't you?

Q. —frustrated about the delay?

President Clinton. Of course. I think that we ought to be—I can't imagine how they could be satisfied with the condition of this economy. I can't imagine how they could be satisfied with it. They were here, many of them, while we increased the national debt by 4 times, while we exploded the deficit, we drove down employment and drove up unemployment. And I've given them a plan to bring down the deficit and increase employment, put people back to work, and I

think they ought to be for it. And we'll see if they will be.

Q. How much are you willing to cut—

President Clinton. As soon as the thing is over—when they come back, we'll see whether they really care about putting people to work or whether this is all just political posturing to prove that a minority can paralyze the Federal Government. It's just more gridlock, and I think the people will rebel against it.

You can count how many people they're going to keep out of work. You will know job by job how many they'll be responsible for not putting to work. We'll see.

Q. You sound pretty passionate on the subject.

Serbia

President Clinton. What did you say about Milosevic?

Q. How do you feel—by his message?

President Clinton. Oh, that was like the Iraqi charm offensive. He's just trying to head off tougher sanctions if the Vance-Owen plan is not embraced.

Q. Is it going to work?

President Clinton. No, it won't. Of course not.

Q. Do you think he's getting the wrong message, though, sir? I mean—

President Clinton. It's pure politics. He's trying to head off tougher sanctions in the U.N. if the Serbs don't sign off on Vance-Owen. That's all that's going on there. And it won't work.

Q. Don't you think he's sending a message saying it's actually—this is great, you're not going to hound us?

President Clinton. Well, we are going to press for tougher sanctions. We'll see.

Q. You don't want any compliments from him, huh?

Q. —are you rethinking the arms embargo?

President Clinton. I'm always rethinking that. There's never been a day when I haven't rethought that. But I can't do that by myself.

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

Meeting With President Mubarak

Q. How about your first impression, Mr. President?

President Clinton. Very good. I'm glad to see President Mubarak. He and I have talked on the phone and worked on some things together, but this is our first personal meeting. And we'll have a press conference in a few minutes—in a couple of hours, I guess. We'll answer your questions.

NOTE: The exchange began at 9:45 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, President Clinton referred to President Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt

April 6, 1993

President Clinton. Good morning. Today I have the great pleasure of welcoming President Mubarak to Washington and to the White House. We have had an excellent meeting, and I look forward to more in the coming years, as well as to a successful conclusion of our first meeting here at lunch after this press conference.

For nearly 2 decades, Egypt and the United States have worked together in a special relationship to bring peace and stability to the Middle East. American and Egyptian soldiers have served side by side in defeating aggression in the Gulf and in bringing humanitarian relief in Somalia. American and Egyptian diplomats have worked side by side to pioneer peace with Israel and lately to bring others to the negotiating table. And after our discussions today, I am convinced that we share a common vision of a more peaceful Middle East, and we are determined to see that vision realized.

Egypt has long experience in peacemaking and knows that only negotiations can resolve longstanding grievances. The Egyptian-Israeli treaty stands as a cornerstone of our common efforts to attain a just and lasting and comprehensive settlement based upon U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and

338. Our challenge is now to broaden the circle of peace, recognizing the principles that underlie the peace process: territory for peace, realization of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, security for all parties, and full and real peace.

As I have made clear, the United States is prepared to assume the role of full partner when the parties themselves return to the negotiating table for serious discussions. We both feel deeply that there is an historic opportunity to achieve real progress in the Arab-Israeli peace process in 1993. This opportunity must not be missed. And all parties must live up to their responsibilities for making peace.

We discussed the need to ensure stability in the Gulf. We're determined that the hard-won achievements of Desert Storm will be protected and that Iraq will comply fully with all relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. We're also determined to counter Iran's involvement in terrorism and its active opposition to the Middle East peace process.

Both our nations have suffered from the tragic consequences of terrorism. Both are absolutely determined to oppose the cowardly cruelty of terrorists wherever we can. We reviewed the common danger presented by religious extremism which promotes an intolerant agenda through violent means. We discussed ways of strengthening our cooperation in countering this and other forms of terrorism. We know that all Americans, including Americans of all races and all faiths, join us in strongly condemning such terrorism.

Mr. President, I know that you have undertaken the difficult task of reforming and restructuring your nation's economy to provide for the needs of tomorrow. We have a similar challenge here in the United States. We appreciate the gains that have been made in Egypt, as well as the bridges that remain to be crossed. We are impressed by your courage and your efforts.

We will continue to work together to stimulate trade, investment, and cooperation. Our economic assistance will continue to support Egypt's economic reform program, including privatization and Egypt's cooperation with international financial institutions.

We are fast approaching a new century. This is perhaps less of a milestone for Egypt, which has, after all, 7,000 years of recorded history, than it is for our relatively young country. I told the President on the way up that every President of the United States since 1800 had lived in the White House, and he looked at me as if it were a drop in the bucket of time. *[Laughter]*

But even taking the longest view, this is a critical period for the Middle East, the crucible of much of our common spiritual heritage. For the Middle East, the year 1993 can determine whether the new century is consumed by old enmities or used to unlock the human and material potential of the people. Our historic mission is to make this a year of peace. And I am delighted to have President Mubarak as a partner in pursuing this mission.

The microphone is yours.

President Mubarak. Thank you, Mr. President.

I was very pleased to meet with President Clinton today. Our meeting was very positive and productive. In a spirit of friendship and mutual confidence, we explored the problems and opportunities our two nations are facing. I emphasized to the President that it is of utmost importance to our region to reach a just and comprehensive settlement between Israel and all her Arab neighbors, including the Palestinian people.

Such a settlement should be raised on Security Council Resolution 242 and 338 and the principle of land for peace and realizing the national rights of the Palestinians. We believe that Egypt and the United States have a crucial role to play in order to allow the peace negotiations to reach a successful conclusion. Together we can make the ends meet and bridge the existing gaps.

Equally important is the task of removing the remaining obstacles, especially that of the deportees. I was pleased to hear from President Clinton that significant progress has been made on this issue and that he recognizes the importance of the Middle East peace talks. He is committed to the influence of the United States to achieve meaningful progress in these talks when they are resumed on April the 20th. We are confident

that the negotiations will proceed smoothly and successfully.

Beyond the peace process, we discussed a wide range of regional issues of common concern to our two countries. We stressed our concern for the stability of the Gulf region and the need for full compliance with the relevant Security Council resolutions. No country of that region should doubt our firm commitment to help preserve the security, stability, and territorial integrity of all friendly states. Similarly, we are doing all what we can to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. As you are certainly aware, Egypt has submitted a plan for making the area free of all weapons of mass destruction. We shall pursue this goal with vigor and determination.

On the global front, I offered to work closely with the President for the purpose of making the world more humane and equitable, a world where opportunity and hope exists for all and where people learn to accept divergences and employ diversity for the benefit of mankind.

I am making this appeal because I am alarmed by the refusal of some elements in the different societies to accept the diversity and the coexistence. This has resulted in unprecedented atrocities and suffering in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The world cannot tolerate the savage practices which are committed under the ugly slogan of ethnic cleansing and purification. It is against all human values to see such claims emerge at the threshold of the 21st century.

Unfortunately, violence is increasingly being used by certain misguided elements in many parts of the world, including the Middle East. Acute social and economic problems are being exploited in order to breed violence and anarchy. At the same time, foreign countries are interfering in the domestic affairs of other nations under false pretext. All civilized nations are called upon to fight the spirit of violence and terrorism everywhere, for this is a threat to the existence and future of humanity. No country is immune or distant from that danger.

In Egypt, we are coping with the phenomena through a comprehensive program which deals with the roots and the causes of the problem. We have embarked on an ambitious

economic reform program. Parallel with this, we are enforcing our democratic system, solidifying the protection of the human rights. Our goal is to improve the quality of life for every Egyptian with equal determination. We are confronting foreign plots and attempted intervention.

Having said this, I would like to assure you all that Egypt is not in danger. The image which has been projected by the media lately is rather exaggerated. As well as all know, violence makes instant news, but the real story is our confidence, our unity, and our growing success in facing this problem. The Egyptian people will not accept any challenge to their tradition of friendship with other nations and hospitality to our visitors. We will remain true to our culture of resolving problems peacefully and defeating the forces of violence and aggression. Let the whole world know that Egypt is as strong as ever and that its leadership is firm and confident.

Mr. President, as I told you, Egypt is a country which values its excellent relations with the United States. Let me take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation for the support and assistance we are receiving from the United States. This aid is crucial to the success of our reform program.

We would like to assure a friendly welcome to all Americans who visit us. We encourage the American business community to invest in our economy. The climate for investment has become very favorable following the steps we took in the past few years on the road to economic reform. Our budget deficit has been reduced from 18 percent of the GDP in 1990 to 3.5 percent this year. The foreign exchange market has been deregulated, and our foreign currency reserves have reached record levels. Trade is being liberalized, and the balance in payment is showing steady improvement. After registering a deficit of \$2.6 billion in 1990, it now shows a surplus of about \$3 billion.

President Clinton, our discussion today affirmed a broad identity of interest over a wide range of issues. We have developed a full agenda of cooperation for the future. I want to thank you for your understanding and your enthusiastic response. I fully appreciate your warm welcome and extend to the

American people my best wishes for success and fulfillment. I look forward to working closely with you during the months ahead for our common goals. And I extend to you an invitation to visit Egypt at your earliest convenience.

Thank you.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. —human rights and violence in the Middle East and elsewhere, what is the cause of your optimism? And this question's for both of you: What can you both do to promote peace this year in the—

President Clinton. The cause of my optimism, in terms of peace in the Middle East, is the extraordinary efforts that Prime Minister Rabin is making and my belief that the peace talks will reconvene in April, as well as some encouraging comments that have been made by Mr. Assad, the leader of Syria, recently in Egypt and publicly. He said he wanted a full peace, peace in all of its aspects, I think on Egyptian television. I think there is reason to believe that we can make real headway.

President Mubarak might want to answer the question.

President Mubarak. Really, I could tell you very frankly, I have met so many leaders in the area, not only the President of Syria, the Palestinians and the other Arab leaders. All of them want to reach peace as quickly as possible. The Syrian leader, he said it publicly and clearly, "I'm very keen on peace." Peace will help every leader to raise the standard of the living of the people in the area. The Palestinians also are fed up from the present situation, being denied from everything. So I think this is very important, and I have great hopes that the negotiations will start on the 20th of April. And I may say much more, I hope and we are going to work closely on that to get an end to the problem by the end of this year, if it is possible.

Terrorism

Q. —what's now happening in Egypt is Muslim and Muslim which is not Islam. What is your policy in confronting this exported terrorism to Egypt and get Egypt back where it was and where it is: love, peace, happiness, pleasure with Egypt?

President Mubarak. Look, the majority of the Egyptian people are supporting me and any measures I am taking to put an end to this kind of terrorism. Copts, Muslims, any kind of religion in Egypt, they are all Egyptians. We expect that this small minority was trying to make use of the economic problems. You know we are going through economic reform in our country; the reform has its side-effects. It makes a burden on some groups of the people. Some foreign forces, like the Iranians, let me mention the name, making use of this to try to destabilize the country. But be sure we are very firm with that by law, and we are not going to violate the law. And the Copts and the Muslims are very good friends, and the best friends I had all my life were all Copts.

Stimulus Package

Q. Mr. President, on another subject, the Republicans have been delaying action on your \$1 billion jobs stimulus bill, and now the Senate has gone out. Are there areas where you would be willing to compromise, cut spending in order to win Republican votes?

President Clinton. Well, I'm going to work on a proposal that I think will address some of the legitimate expressed objections. And we will see when Congress comes back whether the Republicans are committed to putting the American people back to work or just playing politics.

You know, we have a system in this country where people, all of whom have jobs—a minority of the Senators, who all have jobs—can literally thwart majority rule; where a rule designed to guarantee that all possible amendments can be offered can be used to stop all decisions. Now, the American people now are learning that again, that—and if they want to stop the Government, they can do it.

But I don't think that it's going to be very defensible when they come back to say, "The economy is fine in America. There are enough jobs. We don't have to do this." And I'll give them a chance to show their real motives, and I trust that they'll do the right thing.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News]?

Palestinians

Q. Mr. President, President Mubarak has been quoted as saying he wants you to press Mr. Rabin on the issues of the deportees. When Mr. Rabin was here, you said that you didn't raise that issue with him. Are you now prepared to—

President Clinton. We had discussed that in great detail before he came here; that's what I said.

Q. Are you now prepared to take more steps to press Mr. Rabin? And Mr. Mubarak, I'd like to know whether you feel that the President is doing enough to resolve that issue.

President Clinton. I believe that Israel has been quite forthcoming in trying to give the reassurance that the Palestinians need to come to the talks. President Mubarak is going to have further discussions, I think, with all the parties and certainly with Israel about it. We will see what will be done. But President Rabin has taken a very forthright and open stand in trying to reach out to the Palestinians and to the other parties, and I believe that it's enough to get people back to the table. I hope it is.

President Mubarak. Really I didn't use the word "press" on Mr. Rabin. We have good contacts with Mr. Rabin. I'm used to exchange views with him, and where it was convenient to help the peace process to start and the negotiations to continue, I am doing it. I sent him a message when I was in London before I come here and am intending to meet with him. And I have discussed all these points with the President, and I am going to continue that with Mr. Rabin whenever I go back.

Q. Is there anything more that the United States should be doing regarding Israel?

President Mubarak. I think that the United States is a full partner and she's doing its maximum in that sense. She has good dialog with Prime Minister Rabin, and he was here. And I'm going to continue with Mr. Rabin so as to persuade the Palestinians to start negotiations on the fixed date.

President Clinton. There is someone from the Egyptian press—

Q. I would like to address to President Clinton, please, the human rights President: How far are you ready to go to help the

human rights of the Palestinians in the occupied territories? Would you like to comment on the ideas expressed by President Mubarak to remove the obstacles so that they can come to the table?

President Clinton. Well, the human rights issues obviously will be discussed as a part of the peace process. They are very important to me, and I think they will be at the forefront of the process. And President Mubarak and I have discussed that, and I think that there won't be peace in the Middle East unless those issues are addressed.

Tom [Tom Friedman, New York Times]?

PLO

Q. When the United States broke off the dialog with the PLO 2 years ago, it did so leaving three conditions behind that if the PLO met, the dialog would be resumed: that they forswear terrorism, expel those involved, and condemn the act involved. Does your administration stand by those conditions? That is, if the PLO now fulfills those conditions, would you be willing to resume the U.S.-PLO dialog? And to President Mubarak: Do you think the resumption of the U.S.-PLO dialog would be helpful to the peace process at this time?

President Clinton. Let me say this: There has been no change in the policy of the United States, but the focus of my efforts has been toward getting the peace process started again. I still believe that that is the best way to proceed.

President Mubarak. The PLO we consider in the Arab world is the representative of the Palestinians. We have very good contacts with them, and we convey whatever we needed to President Clinton and even to the Israelis. I think at this present time we are going to concentrate on the negotiations to start. And you know, the PLO is everywhere. So many people of the delegation are from the PLO. So I don't think that there is any problem at the time being for that.

Serbia

Q. —the situation in Bosnia. I know that earlier today you dismissed the comments of President Milosevic about your policy there as a charm offensive. But I wonder, sir, if you don't think, nonetheless, that he wouldn't have said such things if he was find-

ing the actions you've taken so far very bothersome and perhaps whether you think now that they would ever be sufficient to deter?

President Clinton. I don't know. I've done everything that I know to do, consistent with the possibilities we have for further action in the United Nations with our European allies and the members of the Security Council. As you know, I think the sanctions should be strengthened if the Bosnians don't sign the Vance-Owen agreement. We obviously have made life more difficult for the people in Serbia, and I think there are other things that we can do. I wouldn't rule out or in anything. But it's plain that what Milosevic was trying to do was to essentially head off further efforts to toughen the sanctions or to take further actions. That will not be successful.

Q. —that he may not feel that, not ruling out anything, that he may indeed feel that the use, for example, of American military force has in effect been ruled out?

President Clinton. It's never been ruled in. The United States is not capable of solving that problem alone. I don't think anyone expects us to do that. We have been, in many cases, more aggressive in what we were willing to do than the European neighbors of the former Yugoslavia. I still believe there is some chance that we can make this peace process work, and I still think there are lots of other things we can do to make life more uncomfortable for the Serbs. And I wouldn't rule those out.

Libya

Q. This is a question President Clinton, please. Owing to the new—

President Clinton. Oh, I recognized you hoping you would ask President Mubarak a question. [*Laughter*]

Q. Egyptians want to ask you—

President Clinton. Please, go ahead.

Q. Owing to the new liberal view that you represent now in being the President of the United States, to what limits have you arrived to an agreement with Mr. Mubarak about the ties of Libya with the West?

President Clinton. The question was about our policies with regard to Libya.

Well, as you know, we have one huge barrier that overrides everything else right now,

and that is the determination of the United States to see that the people who have been charged with the Pan Am 103 disaster are released from Libya and subject to a legitimate trial. And that has to be resolved in a way that is legal and appropriate before any other issues with regard to Libya can be raised.

The President and I discussed this today. I think that it is inevitable that we will press for tougher sanctions if the Government of Libya does not release the people that have been charged. There's a lot of evidence against them. They should go on trial. They should be punished if they're found guilty. It should be a real and legitimate trial. It is an enormous issue in the United States, and nothing else really can be resolved with regard to Libya until that issue is resolved.

World Trade Center Bombing

Q. Could the United States have made better use of the information which was given to us by Egypt before the bombing of the World Trade Center? President Mubarak, why do you believe, as you said in an interview, that the bombing might have been prevented if the U.S. had used the information differently?

President Clinton. The short answer to your question is I don't know yet. I have ordered a complete review of what the United States was told last year and when we were told it. I think President Mubarak would support my contention that we have tried to step up our cooperation with the Egyptians in combating international terrorism since I've been President. In February we sent American officials to Egypt, and they stayed there about a week working on cooperative exchanges and information. And we talked today about what we could do to do more. Whether there was something given to us that we could have acted on that might have changed the shape of future events, I cannot answer that yet. But since the statements that President Mubarak has made, I have ordered a review of what we knew, when we knew it, what was done. And I don't know yet what the answer to that is.

I think the important thing is we do know that there was nothing specific related to the World Trade Center bombing that was given

to the United States. We know we have stepped up cooperation, and we know we intend to do more in the future. And the United States has to review a lot of its policies in view of what happened at the World Trade Center to try to make sure we are doing everything we can to minimize the impact of terrorism in this country.

President Mubarak. I would like, if the President would permit me, we had no definite information about what happened in the World Trade Center. We were making good cooperation with the United States in the direction of fighting terrorism. But nobody knows, or knew beforehand that something was going to happen to the World Trade Center.

We are exchanging information about any kind of terrorism which takes place here or there. But different information, of course, we haven't. Otherwise, we would have told very clearly to the Americans, there is something going to happen in this or that place.

Iran

Q. Mr. President, it was mentioned the question of the threat of regional security in the Gulf. Can you be more specific what these threats are at present, and are you putting the threats from Iran and Iraq on an equal footing?

President Mubarak. It's for me?

President Clinton. Both.

President Mubarak. Look, Iraq now is in a position not to have the ability to threaten any of the—accept some—things that Kuwait is ours, but there are so many measures being taken. But Iran, Iran now, because it's the only country on the—you know the Iranians and Kuwaitis were competing each other. Nowadays, the Iranians are stronger. They are trying to find a way to destabilize the security in some countries, mainly Egypt. And we are working hard for that. And this was the main cause of making some explosions, some instance in our country. I think Iran now is trying to create problems. And we are very firm with them. We are capable to do so many things, but we are not a country to interfere in any internal affair of any other.

Q. You mentioned that you and President Mubarak were agreed on the need to counter

Iran's support for terrorism and its opposition to the Middle East peace process. What specific steps are you considering and have you discussed with President Mubarak?

President Clinton. I don't think it would be appropriate for us to discuss that at this time.

Serbia

Q. I couldn't help but notice in your answer to Brit's [Brit Hume, ABC News] question that you sounded frustrated about the situation in Bosnia and that if there is no change in the position of European governments, that if they can withstand sanctions, the Serbians will essentially be able to get what they want.

President Clinton. That is what I am concerned about. You got it. That's about as good a statement as I could have made myself. [Laughter]

Q. Are you putting, then, the onus on the European governments to take this a further step, or is there some other step the U.S. can—

President Clinton. No. No, my point is, though, that the United States—if you believe that we should engage these problems in a multilateral way, if you believe, for example, in what happened in a good way in Operation Desert Storm, then the reverse has to be true, too. The United States has got to work through the United Nations, and all of our views may not always prevail. Look how long it took us to just secure the approval of enforcement of the no-fly zone.

Also it is, frankly, a very difficult situation. The Europeans remember how many German troops were once in what became Yugoslavia and then came apart. It is a difficult situation. It is the most difficult, the most frustrating problem in the world today.

The only point I was trying to make is I have proceeded all along on the assumption that whatever we did and whatever we could do, we would and should act through the United Nations in a multilateral way. I have done my best to continue to stiffen the sanctions, to continue to push for more action, to push for the enforcement of the no-fly zone, to push all the countries involved to do what we could to try to bring this to a successful conclusion so that the principle of

ethnic cleansing is not rewarded in Bosnia and, therefore, encouraged in other countries.

I have not thought that the United States should or could successfully take unilateral action. And I know that a lot of things that we could do to inflict some pain might also entail a great deal of cost and might not change the ultimate outcome of how the Bosnian people have to live.

So it is a very frustrating and difficult circumstance. And I can't really add to the way you captured the question; you said it very well.

Thank you.

President Mubarak. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 10th news conference began at 11:35 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In the news conference, he referred to Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel.

Announcement of Nomination for Three Sub-Cabinet Posts

April 6, 1993

The President today named three deputies to the Departments of Energy, Interior and the Office of Personnel Management. The President announced his intention to nominate William H. White as Deputy Secretary at the Department of Energy and Lorraine A. Green as Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management. In addition, the President approved Allen P. Stayman as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Territorial and International Affairs at the Department of the Interior.

"The field experience, technical know-how, and commitment to excellence these three individuals have demonstrated in the past will serve them well as they join our teams already in place at Energy, OPM, and Interior," the President said. "I have full confidence they will work hard to reinvent the way Government works."

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

Remarks on Signing Enabling Legislation for the National Commission To Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry and an Exchange With Reporters

April 7, 1993

The President. Good morning, everybody. As you know, the bill I have just signed is the aviation commission legislation. It enables us to start planning the revitalization of one of our country's most important industries, one of our most important exporters, one of our most important employers: the aircraft manufacturers and carriers that have been the pride of the United States and the world's leaders since the beginning of aviation.

But we're also here because our National Government has failed to create the economic climate necessary for this leading edge industry to thrive at home and in an increasingly competitive global economy. The condition of the domestic aviation industry has been spiraling downward for some time. Unemployment in the industry has reached record levels over the past few years. Recent layoffs have been severe. New orders for aircraft have shrunk, along with the demand for airline service, leading to unemployment in the aircraft manufacturing industry as well.

When I visited with managers and employees at the Boeing Corporation in Everett, Washington, they described for me in very personal terms the devastating impact of these developments in their lives and the lives of their coworkers. The legislation I sign today, providing for the creation of a National Commission To Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry, commits us, on behalf of the industry and the workers whose livelihoods depend on its health, to search for real answers.

Some of the answers may lie in a more aggressive trade policy. Others may come from keeping the global marketplace freer from unfair competition. More may stem from the supporting role of aviation in preserving our national security. In any case, I want to commend the strong bipartisan effort that was shown in passing this legislation on such a fast track. This bill creates the Commission that will enable me and the House

and the Senate leadership to appoint a knowledgeable and diverse group of people to review these complex issues and make recommendations back to the President and the Congress within 90 days of the appointment of the Commission. This is a fast-track operation.

I've been working closely with both parties in the House and the Senate, and I anticipate that the Commission will be appointed very soon after Congress returns from its recess. As I think all of you know, the minority leader, Bob Michel, is in Russia now on a mission. He has two voting and two ex officio members who he must appoint. We are, for our part, ready to go here in the White House, and I think the Commission will be appointed very soon.

I also want to make it clear that I will detail whatever staff is necessary from the National Economic Council, from the Council of Economic Advisers, from Commerce, from the Trade Representative's Office, wherever we need it.

The problems facing this industry are quite complex, and it's important that we build a consensus as quickly as possible. I assure you that when that is done, I will move rapidly with Congress to take whatever action is appropriate based on the recommendations of the Commission.

But ultimately, no industry in our country flourishes in isolation. The health of each sector depends at least in some measure on the overall health of the American economy. And no one can look at this economy and say that we are satisfied with things just the way they are. We are in the midst of the weakest recovery since World War II. The March unemployment report failed to show any improvement in the labor market. Unemployment is stuck at 7 percent of the labor force. While the economy supposedly has been in recovery for a year now, manufacturing employment has continued to decline. This recovery is like a fire starving for oxygen. Jobs, and the incomes, profits, and consumer spending jobs produce, are the oxygen this recovery needs.

Investment and deficit reduction are long-term ingredients for making the recovery durable, and we've gone a long way toward doing that over the long run. Our economic

plan addresses these objectives and addresses them very well. Long-term help is on the way. The Congress has agreed to provide the broad outlines of our budget package, paving the way for real deficit reduction and a high-investment, high-productivity, high-wage economy. The plan also increases investment by the Federal Government in our physical infrastructure and the human capital of our citizens. This shift in the spending priorities of the Government will help make us competitive again in the global economy.

While the budget plan will provide long-term benefits for the economy, the jobs plan now is needed to ensure a sustained recovery. As it is written, the job stimulus package will provide about 500,000 full-time jobs this year and next year: real jobs, repairing and rebuilding highways and bridges, creating new mass transit and clean water projects, rebuilding our communities. Passage of the bill will mean youths in our cities and rural communities can make their passage from idleness to a meaningful work experience, boosting their incomes and educational achievements, learning as they earn. The jobs plan is carefully targeted and will be followed by real and enforceable budget cuts, now more than 200 specific budget cuts contained in the investment and deficit reduction package Congress has approved.

In my view, the message of the last election was to break the gridlock and grow the economy, because Americans are tired of a system that doesn't work and a recovery that doesn't produce new jobs. We know what works. We'll only be able to reduce the deficit and increase investment in the long term if we guarantee the strength of the recovery by building jobs in the short run. Passing the jobs plan following the adoption of deficit reduction and increased investment by Congress is the best way to accomplish those objectives. This will strengthen not only the aviation industry but every industry at a time when workers, firms, and average citizens are looking to us here in Washington for leadership.

I want to commend Secretary Peña, the House and Senate leadership, and all the others who have supported this legislation. I look forward to announcing the Commission membership. I also hope very much that we

can break this deadlock and create some jobs for this economy beginning immediately.

Stimulus Package

Q. Mr. President, the Republicans have legitimate concerns about your stimulus package, and what would they be?

The President. Well, the only legitimate concerns I cited were the ones that were cited by the Democrats, too. What they did, and you can see this in the amendment that the House decided not to adopt and the amendment Mr. Brown offered in the Senate, was to take hypotheticals from what could be funded through the community development block grant program and in the Economic Development Administration, and come up in a multi-billion dollar jobs package with a couple of hundred million dollars of things that they thought were wrong. I had assured them that I would take executive steps to stop that. That is not what is going on here. The kinds of cuts the Republican Senators are talking about are cuts designed to keep people out of the work force. And so that was a tempest in a teapot. That's the only point I was making.

And I will say again, a lot of the things that were cited amaze me. It was the Republicans and the Democrats at the State and local level all these years who came out for greater flexibility for the States and the localities. Now the Republican Senators are saying they don't trust Republican Governors to spend the money in a way that will create jobs in their own States. I find that an amazing argument and a 20-year departure from their stated position.

Economic Initiatives

Q. Mr. President, you just named an Airline Commission. You've asked for a timber report. You've got the health care commission. You've got the budget coming out tomorrow. Have you too much on your plate? Some critics are saying that you're spreading yourself too thin and missing what happened to Jimmy Carter.

The President. Well, if you look at what we're doing, though, it all relates to the economy. It all comes back to the economy. The health care issue is an issue of personal security to Americans and American families

who've been badly battered by the economic developments of the last decade or more. But it also is critical to the long-term deficit reduction, to balancing the Federal budget, and to strengthening the health of the American economy. The timber issue is not just an environmental issue; it's an economic issue. We have to resolve the deadlock out there so people can get on with their lives. Every other issue you've mentioned is an economic issue.

We may not get 100 percent of everything we're trying to do in every area. But I do think the American people will see that the focus of all of this is to guarantee a healthy economy and a growing jobs market to try to turn this around. There are many things which need attention in the economic area, I think we have to be active in all of them. I don't want to spread myself personally too thin, but we have, after all, a large number of people working in this Government and a lot of work to do. And I think I have to keep pushing on the economic front.

Potential Supreme Court Nominee

Q. —Cuomo decided not—not to being a justice?

The President. Excuse me?

Q. Has Governor Cuomo decided not to be a Supreme Court Justice?

Q. And are you disappointed about it?

The President. Well, you know, I think he's terrific. I think you need to talk to him for anything on that.

Q. Did he pull out?

The President. I'm not going to discuss the appointments until I make them. Justice White was kind enough to give me a considerable amount of time. And given the economic issues before the Congress and the summit I had with President Yeltsin, I appreciated that because I couldn't devote immediate time to it. But I don't think I should comment on any individuals. You know about my regard for Governor Cuomo. He would have to say anything that would be said on this.

Q. But you want someone like Governor Cuomo, now that he has withdrawn.

The President. I didn't say he had. You'll have to ask him about that.

Stimulus Package

Q. Mr. President, during your administration the American people seem to be really engaged. There were telephone calls flooding Washington on various issues, yet they seem to be largely silent on the deadlock over the jobs program. To what do you attribute the gridlock in that case?

The President. Well, I think first of all, I don't think they've tuned out but, to go back to Andrea's [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News] question, there's a lot going on here. And I think that one of the things that I hope will happen during the break here is that we can somehow bring all these disparate activities back into sharp focus. I also, to be fair, have not been out in the country much in the last few weeks discussing this. I've been here working at the job. And one of the toughest decisions, when you talk about spreading myself too thin, one of the toughest decisions I have to make every week is to balance between staying here and meeting with the Congress and doing the job that I have to do here, and going out into the country and continuing to engage the people.

I think they know that the broad outlines of the economic program have passed, and I think there was an enormous amount of support for that. I think a lot of people thought that the whole thing passed when the economic program passed, and I have to just try to bring this jobs program into sharp focus and explain to everybody why I think we need to create some jobs now and bring the unemployment rate down now.

And as I have pointed out again and again, this is not a uniquely American problem. Every major economic power is facing this. The Japanese are about to adopt a much bigger stimulus package than we have to drive their unemployment rate down and generate domestic economic development. And I think we ought to do the same thing. It is going to be critical, in my view, to try and keep faith with the American people, especially during the upcoming summer.

Q. How much are you willing to cut on the stimulus?

The President. All I can tell you is I'm going to try to get action here. I think it is a shame to rob anybody of the right to have a job. And a lot of the objections which have

been raised, I think, are somewhat spurious. I mean, the attack on building swimming pools, let's just take that one, for example. You know, if you put people to work in a city or a suburb or a small town building a city park which gives people, kids a chance to have recreational opportunities in the summertime, and you create jobs doing it, is that a waste of money? I don't really think it is. I mean, the Senate's got a swimming pool, doesn't it? [Laughter] Doesn't it? And, it was built with taxpayers' money, and somebody worked; somebody had a job building it. And so, you know—

Q. How much are you going to cut?

The President. No more than I have to, to get the thing passed. I just—I want some action. I want those kids in this country to have jobs this summer. I want them to have the first summer jobs program that includes a strong educational component. I want these places where they have not seen any jobs in years to have a chance to have them. And I'm going to create as many as I can, but I want to get some action. I want to do something, and I'll do the very best I can.

Q. Are you going to go to the country?

The President. Excuse me?

Q. Are you going to the country during the recession on this issue?

The President. I haven't made a decision what to do yet, about how to do it. I'm going to reassess all that today. As you pointed out, I've been dealing with a lot of different issues, and this morning I've got to try to put it into focus. Again, let me say, I think some of this is politics. It's, you know, just pure gridlock politics. Some of it is the continuing debate over what is the best economic policy. But in terms of the minor objections that have been raised to things in this bill, those can be taken care of rather easily.

The real thing we've got to decide is whether the United States Government has a responsibility to try to help start the jobs machine again, and I believe we do. There is obviously a difference in the United States and every other wealthy country in the world between what looks like an economic recovery and creating jobs. That is the big idea we've got to come to grips with. It goes way beyond sort of traditional politics. There is a difference now. This is a problem that all

these countries are having. I do not want to see the United States go the way of the European countries that are now living with 10 percent unemployment. And by the way, we can't afford to do it, because we don't provide health care. We don't provide the supports they do. It's tougher for people in this country when they're unemployed than it is in Europe or Japan. So we don't provide that kind of support services. And the Japanese unemployment rate, I might say, is still about half what ours is, actually slightly less than half.

We have got to do something to create the jobs. And I'm just going to do the very best job I can. And in terms of how to spend my time and how to do it, I'm going to have to assess that over the next couple of days.

Thank you.

Q. Speaking of cuts, what kind of razor are you using?

The President. I got this playing with my daughter, I'm ashamed to say, rolling around acting like a child again. I reaffirm that I'm not a kid anymore.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. H.R. 904, approved April 7, was assigned Public Law No. 103-13. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Signing Enabling Legislation for the National Commission To Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry

April 7, 1993

Today I am signing into law H.R. 904, a bill providing for appointments to the "National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry." I am pleased to have the opportunity to join with the Congress so quickly in the new session in this effort to gain a fuller understanding of the difficulties facing the Nation's aviation industry—both airlines and aircraft manufacturing.

The recent experience of the aviation industry has not been good. Unemployment in the airline industry has reached record levels over the past few years. The backlog of new

orders for aircraft has shrunk, leading to unemployment in the aircraft manufacturing industry as well. When I visited the Boeing Corporation in Everett, Washington, managers and employees alike described the personal impact of these developments.

The issues facing the industry have an international dimension. In recent remarks at the American University here in Washington, I stressed that our Nation is ready to compete in the world economy fairly and squarely. In our bilateral and multilateral aviation negotiations, my Administration will promote fair competition in international trade and airline routes.

I asked Secretary of Transportation Peña to join with the Congress to develop a process for addressing the industry's problems, and I am pleased by this strong bipartisan result. The aviation industry is important not only to our economy, but (as Operation Desert Storm demonstrated just 2 years ago) to our national defense as well. The information and recommendations developed by the Commission will assist us in building a consensus from the many competing views on how government and industry can best work together to address the aviation industry's current difficulties.

I am pleased that this legislation accelerates the deadline for the Commission's report. I have asked Secretary Peña, working with the rest of the Cabinet, to do everything possible to get the Commission up and running quickly. I look forward to receiving the Commission's report within 90 days after appointments to the Commission are completed.

I note that the House Subcommittee on Aviation has already begun to assemble a record of the relevant issues during its hearings in February. With concerted effort by all parties, this Commission can provide valuable, timely answers.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 7, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 904, approved April 7, was assigned Public Law No. 103-13.

Announcement of Nomination for Two Ambassadorial Posts

April 7, 1993

The President announced today his nomination of Marshall McCallie to be Ambassador to Namibia, and his intention to nominate John Schmidt to the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as the Uruguay Round Coordinator. In that position, Mr. Schmidt will be the chief U.S. negotiator for the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

"These are two key appointments," said the President. "The Uruguay round of the GATT talks is vital to our hopes for freer and fairer trade in the world. Likewise, our relationship with Namibia is key as we seek to promote democracy in southern Africa. I am very happy with the choices of John Schmidt and Marshall McCallie to fill those roles."

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

Announcement of Nomination for Sub-Cabinet Posts at the Department of the Treasury

April 8, 1993

The President intends to nominate George Munoz to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Management and Chief Financial Officer, the White House announced today. The President also expressed his approval of Secretary Bentsen's choices for three positions. Joyce Carrier, Joan Logue-Kinder, and Marina Weiss will serve as Deputy Assistant Secretaries with responsibility for Public Liaison, Public Affairs, and Health, respectively.

"George Munoz has excelled in a variety of ways in both the private and public sectors," said the President. "I am confident that he and the rest of Lloyd Bentsen's team at Treasury will keep that key Department running smoothly."

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

Proclamation 6541—National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day, 1993

April 9, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As Americans enter a new era that holds prospects for greater international cooperation and the expansion of democracy's reach, we are deeply indebted to the Armed Forces of the United States. We recognize that their service helped our Nation preserve liberty through two World Wars and the testing regional conflicts of the Cold War era and since. We remember how their sacrifices helped to maintain our way of life and safeguard freedom's cause.

The sacrifices made by our military personnel take many forms, from their willingness to serve, to their countless acts of selfless courage, to the expenditure by hundreds of thousands in this century of that last, full measure of devotion in behalf of their country. Today, we honor the particular sacrifice of the thousands of Americans who have been captured and held as prisoners of war—in Europe and the Pacific, in Korea and Vietnam, in the Persian Gulf during Operation Desert Storm, and elsewhere.

We know that many of our men and women in uniform have been subject to brutal torture and inhumane deprivation. The treatment they endured too often violated fundamental standards of morality and stood in stark contravention of international treaties and customs governing the treatment of prisoners of war. Many of these brave Americans were disabled or died as a result of such treatment. Their experiences underscore our debt to those who place their lives in harm's way and stand willing to trade their liberty for ours. As a Nation, we must always remember the sacrifices made by our men and women in uniform and their families.

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 April 9, 1993, as National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day.

I urge all Americans to join in honoring all members of the Armed Forces of the United States who have been held prisoners of war. I also encourage all Americans to join in saluting these individuals for their great sacrifices. Finally, I call on State and local officials, as well as private organizations, to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of April, 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, 11:47 a.m., April 12, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on April 13.
**Proclamation 6342—National
Preschool Immunization Week, 1993**
April 9, 1993

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

I believe that each child in this country must have the opportunity to live a healthy and full life. Therefore, I am taking dramatic steps to ensure that all children are fully immunized at the earliest appropriate age against preventable, infectious diseases.

Immunizations save lives, prevent suffering, and allow significant savings in health care costs. Ironically, in this country, which develops and produces the majority of the world's vaccines, current immunization levels among two-year-olds fall between just 37 and 56 percent. In the recent measles epidemic, for example, an estimated one-half of the reported cases occurred among unvaccinated preschool children. Today, measles vaccine coverage is reported to be as low as 50 percent among two-year-olds in some inner-city populations.

My Administration has launched a comprehensive initiative on immunization, including new funding for immunization programs in cities throughout the United States.

In addition, I have submitted legislation that, if passed, would provide for free vaccinations to all children, a new tracking system to help inform parents when immunization is needed, new avenues of outreach to parents, and other necessary measures designed to create a comprehensive immunization program.

We must expand our efforts to every community and demand the full attention and cooperation of everyone in our society in order to find solutions to our problems. Much is being done. Federal, State, and local governments are devising innovative ways to deliver vaccines at more reasonable costs. We are attempting to make providers more sensitive to the need to eliminate barriers and problems that cause children to miss immunizations. New partnerships and coalitions are being formed between the public and private sectors.

Parents and adults responsible for safeguarding our youngest children must be made aware of the seriousness of the problem and act appropriately. More than 80 percent of all recommended vaccinations should be given before children are two years old—well before they start school.

We must acknowledge this problem, accept our individual and collective responsibilities, and get the job done.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the last full week of April as National Preschool Immunization Week, beginning with April 1993. I call upon all Americans, especially parents and health care providers, to do their part to help in this fight and to observe this week annually with appropriate activities and recognition ceremonies.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of April, 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, 11:40 a.m., April 12, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on April 13.

Nomination of Harold Palmer Smith To Be Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy

April 9, 1993

The President will nominate Harold Palmer Smith to be Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy. Mr. Smith, a trained nuclear engineer, has advised the Defense Department in a variety of capacities since the late 1960's.

"Through his long career of public and private sector service, Harold Palmer Smith has distinguished himself with sound scientific advice," said the President. "I am glad to have him joining Secretary Aspin at the Pentagon."

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was 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.

April 3

In the morning, the President traveled to Vancouver, Canada, where he met with Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. Later in the morning, President Clinton and President Boris Yeltsin of Russia attended a luncheon hosted by Prime Minister Mulroney.

In the afternoon, President Clinton and President Yeltsin toured the Museum of Anthropology.

In the evening, President Clinton hosted a working dinner for President Yeltsin.

April 4

In the morning, the President attended Palm Sunday services at the First Baptist Church in Vancouver.

April 5

In the early morning, the President returned to Washington, DC, from Vancouver, Canada.

April 6

The President announced his approval of the appointments by Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown of Kent Hughes to be Associate Deputy Secretary and Wilbur Hawkins to be Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Development.

April 8

In the morning, the President met with Secretary of Defense Les Aspin and the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon.

Later in the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Little Rock, AR, where they stayed overnight.

April 9

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton attended a memorial service for Hillary Clinton's father, Hugh Rodham, at the Court Street United Methodist Church in Little Rock.

The White House announced the President will send to Congress proposed legislation to extend congressional fast track procedures to conclude the Uruguay round of the multilateral trade negotiations.

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 April 5

J. Brian Atwood,
of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

Jerry D. Klepner,
of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, vice Steven B. Kelmar.

Elizabeth Ann Reike,
of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice John M. Sayre, resigned.

Submitted April 7

Webster L. Hubbell,
of Arkansas, to be Associate Attorney General, vice Wayne A. Budd, resigned.

Drew S. Days III,
of Connecticut, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice Kenneth Winston Starr.

Marshall Fletcher McCallie,
of Tennessee, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Namibia.

Harriet S. Rabb,
of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services, vice Michael J. Astrue, resigned.

Robert Armstrong,
of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice David Courtland O'Neal, resigned.

Bonnie R. Cohen,
of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice John Schrote, resigned.

**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 April 3

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released April 4

Fact sheet on the food for progress credit sales to Russia

Fact sheet on Russia and the GATT

Fact sheet on the Generalized System of Preferences

Fact sheet on the Safe, Secure Dismantlement (SSD) Initiative With Russia

Fact sheet on the Safe, Secure Dismantlement (SSD) Initiative With Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine

Fact sheet on the START I/NPT (Lisbon Protocol)

Released April 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released April 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Released April 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released April 8

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Transcript of a press briefing on the budget by Vice President Albert Gore, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury Lloyd Bentsen, Director of the Office of Management and Budget Leon Panetta, and Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers Laura D'Andrea Tyson

Released April 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved April 6

H.R. 1430 / Public Law 103-12

To provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

Approved April 7

H.R. 904 / Public Law 103-13
To amend the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal

Transportation Act of 1992 with respect to the establishment of the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry.