


Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, June 7, 1993  
Volume 29—Number 22  
Pages 991–1033

## Contents

### Addresses and Remarks

*See also* Interviews With the News Media  
Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights  
nomination withdrawal—1027  
Business leaders—1020  
Central State University NAIA Champion  
athletic teams—1026  
Fredericktown Village in Frederick, MD—  
1021  
Memorial Day ceremonies  
Arlington National Cemetery—1001  
Vietnam Veterans Memorial—1003  
Milwaukee, WI—1004, 1016  
Radio address—994  
U.S. Military Academy, West Point, NY—995  
White House staff changes—991  
World War II 50th anniversary—999

### Appointments and Nominations

*See also* Addresses and Remarks  
State Department, Ambassador to Mexico—  
1020

### Communications to Congress

Budget rescissions, letter reporting—1031  
Trade with Bulgaria, letter—1025  
Trade with Albania, Romania, and certain  
states of the former Soviet Union, letter—  
1021

### Communications to Federal Agencies

Trade agreements, memorandum—1004  
Trade with Bulgaria, memorandum—1025  
Trade with Albania, Romania, and certain  
states of the former Soviet Union,  
memorandum—1021

### Communications to Federal Agencies— Continued

Withdrawal of Russian forces from Lithuania,  
Latvia, and Estonia, memorandum—1004

### Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters  
Briefing Room—1027  
Frederick, MD—1021, 1024  
Milwaukee, WI—1014  
Old Family Dining Room—1020  
Oval Office—1017  
Rose Garden—991

### Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Canada, Prime Minister Mulroney—1017

### Proclamations

Emergency Medical Services Week—991  
National Safe Boating Week—1030  
Suspension of U.S. entry of persons impeding  
return to constitutional rule in Haiti—1025  
Time for the National Observance of the  
Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II—1001

### Statements by the President

Sanctions against Haiti—1029

### Statements Other Than Presidential

President's Task Force on National Health  
Care Reform—1031

### Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1033  
Checklist of White House press releases—  
1032  
Digest of other White House  
announcements—1032  
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1032

## 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, June 4, 1993

**Proclamation 6567—Emergency Medical Services Week, 1993 and 1994**

*May 28, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

**A Proclamation**

Emergency medical services personnel provide a vital public service 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Traumatic injury is the leading cause of death and disability for men, women, and children between the ages of 1 and 44 years. Each year, injuries account for more than 140,000 deaths, over 2 million hospitalizations, and more than 80,000 permanent disabilities.

Inclusive emergency medical systems play a significant role in reducing mortality and disability due to injuries. Quality emergency medical care saves lives and reduces disability by linking pre-hospital, hospital, and rehabilitation services that provide optimal care for all Americans.

Americans benefit daily from the dedication and immediate care provided by physicians, emergency nurses, emergency medical technicians, paramedics, fire fighters, educators, administrators, and others who serve in coordinated systems of emergency care. Emergency medical care providers dedicate thousands of hours to specialized training and continuing education to enhance and maintain their lifesaving skills. Two-thirds of these individuals are volunteers, many of whom serve in rural areas of the country.

Since the initial efforts to establish emergency medicine as a medical specialty 25 years ago, emergency medical care providers have continually advanced standards of practice in the emergency management of traumatically injured persons. Their efforts have resulted in the development of systems to improve trauma care planning, regionalized

systems of trauma care, and an increased public awareness of the effects of injury and their prevention.

We salute our Nation's emergency medical services providers. Their daily efforts affect millions of men, women, and children who suffer from acute illness or injury by returning them to productive lives.

The Congress, by House Joint Resolution 78, has designated the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as "Emergency Medical Services Week" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of the event.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton**, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the weeks of May 23 through 29, 1993, and May 15 through 21, 1994, as Emergency Medical Services Week. I call upon all Americans to observe this period with appropriate programs and activities.

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

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:43 p.m., June 3, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on June 7. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Remarks Announcing Changes in the White House Staff and an Exchange With Reporters**

*May 29, 1993*

**The President.** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The objective of this White House and everyone who works in it is to improve the lives of the American people and

to change their lives for the better. We have been working on that from the beginning. It takes the right people and the right organization to achieve those objectives. For the last several weeks the Chief of Staff Mack McLarty has been working to make appropriate changes in the White House to strengthen our ability to do our job for the American people.

I am pleased today to welcome to the White House staff one of the Nation's most respected journalists and commentators, David Gergen. I have known David for many years. He is a trusted friend and a dedicated public servant. By agreeing to accept Mack McLarty's invitation to join the White House team he is demonstrating one of the qualities for which he is well known, a sense of patriotism that transcends partisanship.

David Gergen is a Republican, as well as a longtime friend of mine. He is a moderate, prochange, patriotic American. We have shared many ideas over the years and found much agreement in the work I have done as Governor and with the Democratic Leadership Council and in many of the ideas I espoused in the campaign of 1992. I want him to help me make those ideas a reality in the lives of the American people.

The message here is that we are rising above politics. We are going beyond the partisanship that damaged this country so badly in the last several years to search for new ideas, a new common ground, a new national unity.

I am also announcing that my longtime and trusted aide, George Stephanopoulos will be working with me more closely, as he did in the campaign, on important matters of policy and strategy and day-to-day decisionmaking, helping me to integrate all the complicated debates that confront my Office. One of the reasons for this move is that I have missed very badly and I have needed the kind of contact and support that I received from George in the campaign, that I think was absolutely essential to the victory that was secured.

I'd now like to introduce the Chief of Staff and thank Mack McLarty for all the hard work that he has been doing, especially in the last few weeks to try to strengthen the White House and make it able to do the

things that we pledged to do for the American people.

Mr. McLarty.

[At this point, Thomas McLarty, David Gergen, and George Stephanopoulos made statements in support of the changes in the White House staff.]

### **White House Staff**

**Q.** Mr. President, the decision to bring in a Republican for this key position, does this mean you're going back to your centrist or New Democrat roots that you articulated during the campaign? And what does it mean about some of the more controversial decisions recently that suggested you were moving towards the more liberal wing of the Democratic Party, specifically your civil rights Assistant Attorney General nominee Lani Guinier? Do you still want her to become the Assistant Attorney General for civil rights?

**The President.** Today I want to talk about David Gergen, George Stephanopoulos, and the White House staff. The announcement that I have made today with Mr. McLarty—it was really his idea; I want to give him the credit for it; I wish it had been mine, but it wasn't—signals to the American people where I am, what I believe, and what I'm going to do.

I did not get into this race for President to divide the American people. I got into the race to unite the American people and to move this country forward. I have always, throughout my public life, had supporters who were independents, who were Republicans, who were interested in ideas and movement and not in partisan gridlock and moving the American people apart. That's what I'm trying to do. That's what I've always wanted to do. And that's what this announcement today means.

### **President's Priorities**

**Q.** Mr. President, Mr. Gergen talked about scorching partisanship on Capitol Hill and elsewhere in this town. He said that four of the five last Presidents have been broken by the weight of the office that you now hold. Do you feel that you're at that point? Do you feel the weight? And do you feel there's

a chance that you, too, could be broken by it?

**The President.** I don't know about the weight. I feel the responsibility. I have made a deliberate decision to move rapidly to do things which I think need to be done which have been neglected, and to push the agenda forward, especially on the budget. And as you know, we're moving forward in a record pace now with a very tough and difficult set of choices for the American people that I think will allow us to reclaim our destiny.

I believe that, when the history of this administration is written, we will look back and see that taking on the tough decisions early was the right decision for the people of this country. But I have been very concerned that the cumulative effect of some of the things which are now very much in the news has given to the administration a tinge that is too partisan and not connected to the mainstream, prochange, future-oriented politics and policies that I ran for President to implement. And that's what I want to do.

I think that this will help me to be a successful President. But the issue is not whether I'll be a successful President, it's whether we'll have a successful country. And I believe we will. And I think this is one big step toward that today.

### **Improving Communication**

**Q.** Mr. President, with your public opinion polls fairly low right now, does this change suggest an inability to get your message out so far, or change it?

**The President.** I don't think that anybody would be surprised to admit that the major work of this administration and the passionate concerns of this administration are not always the things which come to mind in what's being communicated to the American people. So do we want to improve our ability to communicate what we believe and what we're doing? Yes, we do.

When I had the nationally televised town hall meeting here last week and all those people came up to me and said afterward how much better they felt about their country having been here and having had a personal conversation, knowing exactly where I and where my administration is coming from,

what our values and objectives are, it made it utterly clear to me that if the American people knew exactly what we were doing, just like they did on the night of February 17th, they would support these tough decisions and these difficult changes.

On the other hand, I think it unrealistic ever to assume you can take on the kind of challenges that we are trying to take on without having some momentary bumps and runs in the public opinion polls. We can't be governed by that. But what I want to know is that the American people at least know me, know who I am, where I'm coming from, and more importantly, know what our administration is about. Then whatever their opinions in the polls will be will actively reflect the reality of who we are and their judgment about it. That's all I want. And I think that's what the communications can do.

### **President's Priorities**

**Q.** Mr. President, you've made much of cutting the White House staff in an effort to reduce Government spending. With the addition of Mr. Gergen and the rumored addition of others, doesn't that seem out of keeping with a leaner White House staff?

**The President.** The White House staff is going to be much leaner than it was before, but the number-one task that I have is to serve the American people. Let me just give you an example. One of the things we never could have anticipated is that we'd get more mail here in 3½ months than the White House did in all of 1992.

I am cutting the Federal Government. I am cutting the White House staff. We are doing that. But I think our number-one objective is to serve the American people well. And that's what we're trying to do.

I have got to go to West Point. I am going to be late, and that would be a terrible mistake. I owe it to the graduating seniors at West Point to get them off on their military careers on time. I'm sorry.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:30 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

## **The President's Radio Address**

*May 29, 1993*

Good morning. This weekend, in solemn ceremonies and joyful gatherings, families will honor the military personnel who have kept us free. In honoring these patriots we honor what is best in the American spirit.

I'll be joining those families at West Point to pay tribute to the officers graduating from the military academy, at Arlington National Cemetery to lay a wreath and pray for the fallen, and at the remarkable memorial to the men and women who died in Vietnam whose names are engraved in its polished walls and whose memories are etched in the hearts of the American people. These are the heroes who have protected our borders, defended our interests, and preserved our values.

Our military strength makes our freedom possible. But our military might depends on our economic strength. Just as our liberty cannot rest upon a hollow army, our strong military cannot rest upon a hollow economy. Our ability to remain strong abroad is founded on our ability to remain strong here at home. For too many years the people in Washington in both parties have permitted our strength to ebb. Government of gridlock and favoritism for the few has caused our economy to lose its historic promise in a time of intense global competition when we have to change and when the status quo isn't enough.

Look at the results of the last several years: middle class families working longer hours for lower wages; economic growth in this recovery slowing to historically low levels; 9 million Americans out of work in the 25th month of what is supposed to be a recovery. Thirty-five million Americans go to bed every night facing a serious illness or injury which could bankrupt their families because they have no health insurance, and many, many millions more fear losing their health insurance if they have to change jobs and they have a sick person in their family or if their company goes down.

In the midst of all of these challenges our National Government too long has given enormous tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and special interests and, at the same time, reduced investments in areas essential

to productivity and security of working families. And in our cities, small towns, and rural areas, look what's happened. In the last 12 years the Government's debt has grown from \$1 trillion to \$4 trillion, in just 12 years. And what a burden and shackle it has become.

The American economy is in the middle of the global marketplace, challenged by nations who have made wise investments in their people, their workers, and their technological edge, and who have disciplined their own spending on other things. If we don't start getting better, we can fall behind, and the American way of life will be denied to this generation and the next. This is the great struggle of our time. And it is a challenge I am determined our country will meet, a battle we will win.

At stake is whether Washington will stop doing business as usual and put our own house in order and put our people first, whether we will be satisfied with the status quo and let the special interests continue to dictate our country's future, or whether we will expand American prosperity and preserve the American dream.

Just this week, the House of Representatives stepped up to the plate and voted for change, for growth, for renewal. The House voted for an economic program that really reduces the deficit through specific spending cuts that will lead to economic growth. They voted for 200 cuts in old spending programs, \$250 billion in deficit reduction through spending cuts alone. We also asked the wealthy to pay their fair share because they are able to pay more and because in the last 12 years taxes have gone down on the wealthy as their incomes have gone up. Of the money we raise in taxes 75 percent of it comes from individuals with incomes above \$100,000.

The plan also asks the middle class to make a modest contribution through an energy tax. In 1994, a family making \$40,000 a year will pay a dollar a month; the next year, \$7 a month; the next year \$17 a month when the energy tax is fully phased in.

Our plan for economic growth is serious about deficit reduction, by asking all but the most meagerly supplied working families and the poor to make a contribution. We reduce our deficit by \$500 billion. That puts our fiscal house in order. It pays down the deficit,

and at the same time, it does something else we have to do: we make a down payment on future economic growth, investing in the work skills, the education standards, the technologies that our people need to be able to compete and win in global markets.

This plan rewards full-time work instead of lifetime welfare. For the first time, this plan will make it possible for us to say to every American family, if you work 40 hours a week and you have children in the home, you won't be in poverty. That means that people will no longer have an incentive to prefer welfare to work. In fact, it will be the other way around.

The House of Representatives deserves our special thanks for passing our plan. Now it's time for the Senators to do the right thing as well. But unfortunately, even well-intentioned and respected legislators are still clinging to the illusions of the past, that somehow there are easy ways out of this and no-pain decisions. Then other people in the Senate would actually pay for lower taxes on the very wealthy by cutting Social Security benefits for older Americans living barely above the poverty line. And for working Americans living barely above the poverty line, they'd be denied tax benefits so there could be more to upper-income people. If we were to protect interest groups from paying their fair share of taxes by cutting the earned-income tax credit for low-income working Americans, we'd just force millions of low-wage workers back into poverty and force many into welfare.

These ideas would return us to the failed policies of the past, policies that increased our deficit, short-changed our future, and put narrow interests over national interests. But those days are over. Gridlock is out. Growth is in. It's time for the Senate to join the House and get with this program.

This is not about politics. It's about America's future, about rebuilding the foundation of our prosperity, about restoring the confidence of our people in Washington's capacity to deal with our common problems. It's about being strong nationally and about our families being secure and strong in their homes and in their lives.

We're making progress. We're turning things around. We're doing it together like

a family. On Memorial Day, let's rededicate ourselves to our Armed Services who are fighting for our national security and to our common economic future which makes that national security possible.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 1:27 p.m. on May 28 in the Wyndham Franklin Plaza Hotel in Philadelphia, PA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on May 29.

### **Remarks at the United States Military Academy Commencement Ceremony in West Point, New York**

*May 29, 1993*

Thank you very much. Please be seated.

General Graves, thank you for that fine introduction and for your outstanding leadership here. General Sullivan and the distinguished platform guests, distinguished guests, all the families and guests of this graduating class, and most of all, to the young men and women of the Corps of Cadets, it is a great privilege for me today to join in this celebration of accomplishment.

To the class of 1993, I want to extend my heartfelt congratulations. You've worked hard, and you've well earned the honor bestowed upon you today.

To your parents and your relatives, let me assure you that however often you've wondered about it, you really aren't dreaming. Your sons and daughters, your brothers and sisters really made it. And you can take pride in their graduation and in the strong values that you must have helped to instill in them that made this day possible for them.

To the faculty and staff of this wonderful Academy, let me offer my gratitude for your dedication as this historic institution graduates its 50,000th cadet. It is said here at West Point that much of the history you teach was made by the people you taught. That's true and very much to your credit. The work you and your predecessors have carried forward since 1802 is truly that of nation-building, and today your Nation thanks you once again.

For the class of 1993, today marks the completion of an arduous process. I look out at you and think you endured Beast Barracks. You passed countless PT tests, none of which I could pass anymore. *[Laughter]* You have met high standards for discipline, for physical fitness, for academics, and I must say, I am impressed by your haircuts. *[Laughter]*

No one is perfect, of course, as even the President demonstrates from time to time. I'm reminded that one of your greatest graduates and one of my predecessors as Commander in Chief, General Dwight Eisenhower, was punished as a cadet for such terrible offenses as, I quote, "apparently making no reasonable effort to have his room properly cleaned at a.m. inspection," and—I wonder what a "reasonable effort" is—and second, "being late for breakfast." In the unlikely event that there have been any such breaches of discipline on your part, let me announce today that in keeping with customary practice, I exercise my prerogative as Commander in Chief to grant amnesty to the Corps of Cadets. *[Applause]* I hope the assembled crowd is not too troubled that so many seem to be celebrating. *[Laughter]*

Two centuries ago at this bend in the Hudson River, America's first defenders stretched a chain across the river to prevent British ships from dividing and conquering our new Nation. Today we add 1,003 new links to that unbroken chain of America's defenders, 1,003 new and solid segments in the Long Gray Line, a line that stretches back 191 years through your ranks and as far into the future as the Lord lets the United States of America exist. The Long Gray Line has never failed us, and I believe it never will.

Like the great chain itself, you have emerged from the forge, tested and tempered, composed of a stronger metal than you brought here. Forty-eight months ago, you came here as young adults. Today when you leave this stadium, you will be officers of the United States Army.

West Point has prepared you for a life of service. And as you well know, West Point's graduates have served America in many, many ways, not only by leading troops into combat but also by exploring frontiers, founding universities, laying out the railroads, building the Panama Canal, running

corporations, serving in the Congress and in the White House, and walking on the Moon.

Yet, no service is more important or admirable than your simple decision to put on the uniform of this great Nation and to serve wherever America calls you in defense of freedom. The willingness to serve and sacrifice for the greater good is the ultimate tribute to your character and your efforts. For those services and sacrifices, those that brought you here and those that will take you and our great Nation into the future, you have the appreciation of all the American people.

You have stepped forward not only to serve but to lead. For the hallmark of West Point has been its tradition of growing leaders of character. Whenever the Nation called, members of the Long Gray Line have led the way. Your predecessors led tight-lipped troops into the smoke and flame of battle at Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. They were first out of the muddy trenches into the attack at the Meuse-Argonne. They led the first wave of assaults from Normandy. They held the line at Pusan and were first off the helicopters in the Ia Drang Valley and the Iron Triangle. More recent graduates were among those who jumped into Panama and led the charge into Iraq. And the corps was there as well when the call came from the victims of hunger, when the call came from the victims of Hurricane Andrew. From Florida to Somalia, you have been there.

The 172 battle streamers on the Army flag commemorate the skill and courage of those who have gone before you. Marked and unmarked graves around the world testify to the corps' selfless devotion to country. Your steadfast commitment to duty, honor, country is our national strength.

My commitment and that of the Congress and the American people is to stand by you. That means before we ask you to put your life and the lives of those whom you command in harm's way, it is our solemn responsibility to take your advice, to give you the tools you need, and then to give you our complete support. That is our pledge to you as you enter this career.

You are pinning on your gold bars at a time of remarkable challenge and change for the United States. On this Memorial Day week-

end, we all pray that we have sent America's sons and daughters to war for the last time. Yet, history suggests that during your years of service, we will again need to call upon America's weapons and warriors to defend our national interests.

The changes of recent years allow us to be hopeful. But common sense reminds us to be prepared. One way we must be prepared is by ensuring that our forces have what they need to get the job done, the equipment and the quality people needed to ensure that we can achieve decisive victory should we be called to battle once again. As our forces must change to meet the challenges and dangers of a new world, one need will remain constant, the requirement for leaders of character.

You will be called upon in many ways in this era: to keep the peace, to relieve suffering, to help teach officers from new democracies in the ways of a democratic army, and still to fulfill the fundamental mission which General MacArthur reminded us of, which is always to be ready to win our wars.

But whatever the challenge, I know you will accomplish your mission, not only because of your training but because of your values and character. I will do my part by doing whatever is necessary to keep our forces ready—and to keep our microphones up. [Laughter] I will do my part—and I think the Congress will, too—to make sure that our forces are always ready to fight and win on a moment's notice. We ought, really, to meet the standard of one of your classmates, Pat Malcolm, who came in the clutch and delivered the goods for you. If we can do that, you will be able to serve.

If you have the character and will to win, we owe it to you to make you the best trained, the best prepared, the best equipped, and the best supported fighting force on the face of the Earth.

The budget cuts that have come at the end of the cold war were necessary, even welcome, appropriate in light of the collapse of the Soviet Union and other changes. But we must be mindful, even as we try so hard to reduce this terrible national deficit, that there is a limit beyond which we must not go. We have to ensure that the United States

is ready, ready to win and superior to all other military forces in the world.

In doing that, we can ensure that the values you learned here and the values you brought here from your families and your communities back home will be able to spread throughout this country and throughout the world and give other people the opportunity to live as you have lived, to fulfill your God-given capacities.

We must also stay prepared by understanding the threats of this new era. We can't predict the future. We cannot tell precisely when the next challenge will come or exactly what form it will take. Yet, we do know that the threats we face are fundamentally different from those of the recent past. The end of the bipolar superpower cold war leaves us with unfamiliar threats, not the absence of danger.

Consider what we witness today in the world you will move into: ethnic and religious conflict, the violent turmoil of dissolving or newly created states, the random violence of the assassin and the terrorist. These are forces that plagued the world in the early days of this century. As we scan today's bloodiest conflicts, from the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia to Armenia to Sudan, the dynamics of the cold war have been replaced by many of the dynamics of old war. A particularly troubling new element in the world you face, however, is the proliferation around the globe of weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery. Today, ambitious and violent regimes seek to acquire arsenals of nuclear, biological, and chemical warfare.

As we discovered in Iraq, surging stocks of ballistic missiles and other advanced arms have enabled outlaw nations to extend the threat of mass destruction a long way beyond their own borders. And meeting these new threats will require a new approach and a new determination shared by all peace-loving nations to oppose the spread of these dread weapons. In the coming months, our administration will address the dangers from growing stockpiles of nuclear materials that could be used in these weapons and the risk of nuclear smuggling and terrorism.

We will soon begin negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty which will increase

our political leverage to combat this proliferation. We will reform our export controls to keep weapons-related technologies out of the wrong hands, while cutting redtape for legitimate American export activities. And we must make further changes in how we organize the Government to reflect the priority that we place on nonproliferation. For, if we must contemplate the possibility of sending America's men and women once again into harm's way, then we owe it to you to do our best to prevent the proliferation of weapons that could vastly multiply the dangers and the casualties of any conflict.

Ultimately, preparedness lies in strength. And if our Nation is to be strong abroad, it must also be strong at home. It was President Eisenhower who once said, "A strong economy is the physical basis, the physical basis of all our military power."

One of the most potent weapons behind our victory in World War II was the industrial might of the United States. What ultimately enabled us to prevail in the cold war was the simple fact that our free political and economic institutions had produced more prosperity and more personal human happiness than did the confining institutions of communism. In the same way our global era leadership must, must depend on our ability to create jobs and growth and opportunity for Americans here at home who, in turn, will have the finances to make sure we can maintain the world's strongest military.

Unfortunately, for too many years in this new global economy, we have had difficulty maintaining opportunity at home. In the face of intense competition around the world and the now-familiar problems we have in the United States, our debt has grown from \$1 trillion to \$4 trillion, even as we have reduced military spending and investments in areas that are crucial to our future in new technologies, in education and training, and in converting defense cutbacks into domestic economic opportunities.

Today we face an especially troubling phenomenon that the United States has never faced before at home: slow economic growth which does not create new jobs. We must refuse to accept this as a pattern that will be repeated in the future. Just as our security

cannot rest upon a hollow army, neither can it rest upon a hollow economy.

If we are to sustain the American way of life that you have been trained so well to defend, we must do more and do better. We must cultivate the teacher who can hold her class' attention, encourage the entrepreneur who bets his savings on his own ideas. We must do right by the middle class families of this country who work hard and play by the rules. We must pay down the deficit and make downpayments on the future, both at the same time, honoring work, rewarding investment, and sharpening our competitive edge. If you can win on the battlefield, surely America can win in every field of competition we must face as we march toward the 21st century.

That is the great challenge facing our country. And the Congress today is facing that challenge in dealing with the economic plan I have presented. The House of Representatives, led by concerned Americans like Congressman Jack Reed, who is the only West Point graduate in the United States Congress, has sent a plan to the Senate which now must be produced from the Senate in the form of an economic plan to bring this country back.

In this new era, those of us in political life need a new strategy, need sound tactics, need the kind of discipline in implementing it that all of you have learned to provide for our Nation's defense here at West Point. In short, we must approach the job of rebuilding our Nation with the same kind of single-minded determination that you have brought your skills, your dedication, and leadership ability to in these 4 years and that you will bring to the defense of our Nation in the years ahead. We can do no less for you.

Finally, let me say this. Someday, some of you out here will be sitting in the Situation Room at the White House or with the President or with the Secretary of Defense in some other circumstance. At that moment you will be called to give your advice on an issue which may be small but also may be large and of incredible significance to the future of this country. I ask you in all the years ahead to keep preparing for that day throughout your careers by continuing study and continuous listening and continuous ab-

sorption of every experience you have. The world is changing rapidly, and if you do not work to make change our friend, then it can become our enemy. You represent the very best of the American people. It will be your understanding of our Nation's challenges and your embodiment of our Nation's values, enriched by what you have learned here, leavened by the experiences to come, bound by your commitment to "Duty, Honor, Country" which will permit you to make our greatest contribution to the Nation: continuing service. You have earned your turn to lead, to follow in the footsteps of those who have been on the Plain before you.

Over the past 4 years, your Nation has invested heavily in you. The skills and dedication you now bring to the defense of our Nation are more than ample repayment. I am proud of the work you do, honored to serve as your Commander in Chief, confident that all Americans join me in saluting your achievement, and very, very optimistic about the future of our Nation in your hands.

Good luck. God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. in Michie Stadium. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gen. Howard D. Graves, USA, Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy; Gen. Gordon R. Sullivan, USA, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; and Pat Malcolm, who kicked the winning field goal in the 1992 Army-Navy football game.

### **Remarks Honoring the Observance of the 50th Anniversary of World War II**

*May 31, 1993*

Good morning. Please be seated. It's a great honor for the First Lady and for me to have all of you here in the White House today. I want to welcome all of you, and a few by name, beginning with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown; the Deputy Secretary of Defense Dr. William Perry; Marvin Runyon, the Postmaster General; Lt. General Claude Kicklighter, the Executive Director of the World War II Commemoration Committee; Mr. Roger Durbin, a World War II veteran and the initiator of the World War II Commemorative Coin legislation.

Also here with me, representing all World War II veterans, is Admiral Eugene Fluckey. I'd like to welcome Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur from Ohio, an ardent supporter of veterans' cause who heeded the call of her constituent, Mr. Durbin, and took the lead on the legislation to issue the World War II 50th Anniversary Commemorative Coin, to fund a building of the World War II Memorial here in Washington with no net cost to the United States Treasury. I wonder if we might undertake some other programs with that device. [*Laughter*]

I'd like to thank our good friend, Senator Jay Rockefeller from West Virginia, another great advocate for veterans, for being here with us; Secretary Shannon from the Army; Admiral Kelso, wearing both his Chief of Naval Operations and Navy Secretary hats today; Secretary Donley from the Air Force; Admiral Jeremiah, the Vice Chair of the Joint Chiefs; General Sullivan, the Army Chief of Staff who took me to West Point on Saturday for one of the better days of my life, thank you, General; General McPeak, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force; General Mundy, the Commandant of the Marine Corps; and Admiral Kime, the Commandant of the Coast Guard. I'm delighted to welcome the many representatives of veteran service organizations who are here with us today.

I want to say a special word of thanks to the veterans organizations, and the VA particularly, for working with the health care task force that the First Lady is chairing so closely on health care. Hillary visited the Washington, DC, VA medical centers on May 29th, and she talked to me in our brief stay at Camp David for 30 or 40 minutes about how impressed she was about what she saw there. And we are very, very hopeful that we can work with the active military health operations and with the VA in working through this health care issue. I think you have a major role to play.

I'd also like to say a special word of thanks to the people who were involved in the May 28th kickoff of this weekend's Memorial Day remembrances. There I had the opportunity to speak with three VA medical centers, a telephone conversation that initiated a program replacing the old system of isolating

veterans in these hospitals from their families and friends by replacing it with a system where telephones are placed alongside their beds and are usable by veterans even with severe disabilities. We now are having five hospitals so equipped, but eventually will have 174 veterans hospitals where veterans will be able to call from their bedside to their families and friends.

This is an important issue. One of the men I talked with in Queens has three children; two of them are in the service and are overseas. And now, even though he is quite ill, he'll be able to talk on this day to both of his children who, like him, are serving in the armed services.

In just a few moments I'm going to sign a resolution and a proclamation designating this May 31st through June 7th as a period of national observance, as part of the 50th anniversary of World War II. But before I do that, and before Postmaster General Runyon and I unveil this year's additions of the World War II Commemorative Stamps, I'd like to say just a few things about the debt that all of us owe to our veterans.

Fifty years ago, the United States and its allies were engaged in a monumental struggle to defeat a totalitarian Axis bent on controlling the world, to preserve the dignity of mankind and to protect individual freedom. Americans from every walk of life were called upon to sacrifice their freedoms and their comforts, to undergo great danger to shore up our Nation's future, and to fight for democracy.

As we observe the 50th anniversary of World War II, our country must remember and honor the million who defended democracy and defeated aggression. We learned from those early defeats in World War II that we must remain vigilant and always prepared to resist future aggression and that all nations dedicated to freedom must stand together. The freedoms we enjoy today are results of our victory over aggression, and the efforts the United States makes today to work with all other nations who love and believe in freedom are a testimony to the wisdom of the lessons learned then.

We must be committed now to leave our children a world free of the horrors of war: hatred, violence, and inhumanity. Franklin

Roosevelt once said, "We must cultivate the science of human relationships, the ability of all people to live and work together in the same world at peace." I think Admiral Fluckey, a courageous man, would agree that while courage and deeds of warriors are indeed heroic, the ultimate goal of this courage is to make it unnecessary for future generations.

President Kennedy once said, "It is an unfortunate fact that we can secure the peace only by preparing for war." Our Nation stands committed to defend itself and our allies by remaining strong and vigilant and ready. And therefore, it is very fitting that this week-long period of national observance of the 50th anniversary of World War II begins on Memorial Day, a day when we remember and honor our Nation's war dead. As we work toward a more peaceful future, it is appropriate that we remember and thank the brave and selfless patriots who served our Nation 50 years ago.

During this commemoration, Americans of all ages must also remember those who gave their lives and dedicated themselves in other wars so that our Nation could remain free and strong, so that the deeds, the commitment, and the sacrifice of those who made this commitment will not have been in vain.

I have asked the Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, who is in Brussels today, in conjunction with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown, to continue coordinating the commemorative events of the 50th anniversary of the Second World War. I want to urge all the veterans, the Government, the civic, the business, and the patriotic organizations to join together in expression so that a grateful Nation will remember. Our Nation will rededicate itself during this time to studying the lessons of the past.

I want to say in closing, again, how grateful I am to have all of you here in the White House today. This is your house. You have paid the price for it, and those whom you represent made the fact that it is still standing possible. We are all very, very grateful to you.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:15 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. Following his remarks, he signed Proclamation 6568—Time for

the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II.

**Proclamation 6568—Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II**

*May 31, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

**A Proclamation**

Americans live in an era when there are no major confrontations between world powers. This period of peace traces its roots back 50 years to the Second World War. Our Armed Forces stood strong against totalitarian regimes that sought to dominate and suppress freedom-loving peoples of the world. Although Americans felt ill-equipped to take on the vast international responsibilities, we rose to take on world leadership. In the process, we learned the price of aggression and the benefits of peace.

At the end of the Cold War, it is therefore fitting to remember the years of World War II and those brave and selfless American patriots who stood strong and true against tyranny so that we could enjoy a safer and more prosperous life. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's thoughts about the time still apply today:

We are faced with the pre-eminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationship—the ability of all people, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world, at peace. . . .

Our generation and future generations must heed these words. In a world warmed by the sunshine of freedom, but threatened still by ancient hatreds and new plagues, the United States of America must stand as a beacon of liberty and justice.

During this period of remembrance and reflection, it is appropriate that Memorial Day be included during the "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II." As we preserve the memory of the events of World War II and honor the memory of our loved ones lost during that tragic time, I call upon Americans

to study the history of that era so that the values our Nation defended and the lessons we learned will never be forgotten. I ask that we celebrate freedom and peace in our houses of worship and in our halls of government, in private thanksgiving and public ceremonies, and that we remember and honor our Nation's World War II veterans.

The Congress, by House Joint Resolution 80, has designated May 30, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II."

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby designate May 30, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as a Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II. I call upon all Americans to observe this period with appropriate programs and activities.

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

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:44 p.m., June 3, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on June 7.

**Remarks at a Memorial Day Ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia**

*May 31, 1993*

Thank you very much. General Gordon, distinguished leaders of the armed services, the Defense Department, the Cabinet, the Congress, the leaders of our veterans organizations here, to all the veterans and their families who are here and to all those here who are family members of veterans buried in this cemetery or in any other place around the globe, and to my fellow Americans: We come together this morning, along with our countrymen and women in cities across the

land, to honor those who died that we might live in freedom, the only way that Americans can ever truly live. Today we put aside our differences to better reflect on what unites us. The lines so often drawn between and among us, lines of region or race or partisanship, all those lines fall away today as we gaze upon the lines of markers that surround us on these hallowed hills. The lines of difference are freedom's privilege. The lines of these markers are freedom's cost.

Today Americans all across our land draw together in shared experience and shared remembrance. And whether it is an older veteran in Florida, or a teenager in New Mexico, or a mother in Wisconsin, all today will bow their heads and put hand to heart. And without knowing each other, still we will all be joined in spirit, because we are Americans and because we know we are equal shareholders in humanity's most uplifting dream.

Today, as we fly the American flag, some will recall the pledge we began to recite daily as youngsters in grade school, with solemn faith and awkward salute, some of us even before we learned the difference between our right and left hands. Others will remember the flag waving over public gatherings, large and very small. But on this day, in this serene and solemn setting, conscious of the past, conscious, too, of the perils all too present, what we see most vividly in that flag are the faces of American soldiers who gave their lives in battle and the faces of this generation of young service men and women, very, very much alive, still training and preparing for possible conflicts tomorrow. From the first militiaman downed at Lexington to today's rawest recruit, the flag unites them, soldiers living and dead, and reminds the rest of us that we are all the inheritors of a sacred trust.

It is with that flag and that trust in mind that we resolve this May morning to keep America free, strong, and proud. We resolve in this era of profound change and continuing peril to be ever vigilant against any foe that could endanger us and against any undercurrent that might erode our security, including the economic security that is the ultimate foundation of our Nation's strength. We resolve, as well, always to keep America's

Armed Forces the finest in the world. And we resolve that if we ask them to fight in our behalf, we will give them the clear mission, the means, and the support they need to win.

In honoring those who died in the defense of our country, we must never neglect to honor as well our living American veterans. The Nation owes a special debt to the millions of men and women who took up posts at home or abroad to secure our defenses or to fight for our freedom. Because of what they have done for us, their health and well-being must always be a cause for our special concern.

Here by the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, we renew our Nation's solemn pledge also to the POW and MIA families from all wars, a pledge to provide not just the prayers and memorials but also to the extent humanly possible to provide the answers you deserve. And we vow, with the new Korean War Memorial project finally underway, that no future conflict, if conflict there must be, must ever be regarded as a forgotten war. The inscription on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier says that he is, quote, "Known only to God." But that is only partly true. While the soldier's name is known only to God, we know a lot about him. We know he served his country, honored his community, and died for the cause of freedom. And we know that no higher praise can be assigned to any human being than those simple words.

Today we are at peace, but we live in a troubled world. From that flag and from these, our honored dead, we draw strength and inspiration to carry on in our time the tasks of defending and preserving freedom that were so nobly fulfilled by all those we come here to honor in this time. In that effort and in the presence of those buried all around us, we ask the support of all Americans in the aid and blessing of God Almighty. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. at the Memorial Amphitheater. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. F.A. Gordon, USA, commander of the Military District of Washington.

**Remarks at a Memorial Day  
Ceremony at the Vietnam Veterans  
Memorial**

*May 31, 1993*

Thank you very much. General Powell, General McCaffrey, and my good friend Lou Puller, whom I did not know was coming here today, I thank you so much.

To all of you who are shouting, I have heard you. I ask you now to hear me. I have heard you. Some have suggested that it is wrong for me to be here with you today because I did not agree a quarter of a century ago with the decision made to send the young men and women to battle in Vietnam. Well, so much the better. Here we are celebrating America today. Just as war is freedom's cost, disagreement is freedom's privilege, and we honor it here today. But I ask all of you to remember the words that have been said here today. And I ask you at this monument: Can any American be out of place? And can any Commander in Chief be in any other place but here on this day? I think not.

Many volumes have been written about this war and those complicated times. But the message of this memorial is quite simple: These men and women fought for freedom, brought honor to their communities, loved their country, and died for it. They were known to all of us. There's not a person in this crowd today who did not know someone on this wall. Four of my high school classmates are there. Four who shared with me the joys and trials of childhood and did not live to see the three score and ten years the Scripture says we are entitled to.

Let us continue to disagree, if we must, about the war. But let us not let it divide us as a people any longer. No one has come here today to disagree about the heroism of those whom we honor. But the only way we can really honor their memory is to resolve to live and serve today and tomorrow as best we can and to make America the best that she can be. Surely that is what we owe to all those whose names are etched in this beautiful memorial. As we all resolve to keep the finest military in the world, let us remember some of the lessons that all agree on. If the day should come when our service men and women must again go into combat, let

us all resolve they will go with the training, the equipment, the support necessary to win, and most important of all, with a clear mission to win.

Let us do what is necessary to regain control over our destiny as a people here at home, to strengthen our economy and develop the capacities of all of our people, to rebuild our communities and our families where children are raised and character is developed. Let us keep the American dream alive.

Today, let us also renew a pledge to the families whose names are not on this wall because their sons and daughters did not come home. We will do all we can to give you not only the attention you have asked for but the answers you deserve.

Today I have ordered that by Veterans Day we will have declassified all United States Government records related to POW's and MIA's from the Vietnam war, all those records, except for a tiny fraction which could still affect our national security or invade the privacy of their families. As we allow the American public to have access to what our Government knows, we will press harder to find out what other governments know. We are pressing the Vietnamese to provide this accounting not only because it is the central outstanding issue in our relationship with Vietnam but because it is a central commitment made by the American Government to our people, and I intend to keep it.

You heard General Powell quoting President Lincoln: "With malice toward none and charity for all let us bind up the Nation's wounds." Lincoln speaks to us today across the years. Let us resolve to take from this haunting and beautiful memorial a renewed sense of our national unity and purpose, a deepened gratitude for the sacrifice of those whose names we touched and whose memories we revere, and a finer dedication to making America a better place for their children and for our children, too.

Thank you all for coming here today. God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:07 p.m. at the memorial. In his remarks, he referred to Lewis B. Puller, Jr., Vietnam veteran and Pulitzer prize-winning author.

**Memorandum on Trade Agreements**  
*May 31, 1993*

*Memorandum for the United States Trade Representative*

*Subject:* Presidential Determination Under Section 1105(b)(1) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988

Section 1105(b)(1) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-48; 19 U.S.C. 2904(b)(1)) (“the Act”), provides that the President shall determine, before June 1, 1993, whether any major industrial country has failed to make concessions under trade agreements entered into under section 1102(a) and (b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 2902(a) and (b)) which provide opportunities for the commerce of the United States in such country substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities, provided by concessions made by the United States under trade agreements entered into under section 1102(a) and (b) of the Act, for the commerce of such country in the United States.

Since the United States has not entered into any agreements under section 1102(a) or (b) of the Act, I hereby determine that there has been no failure to make concessions thereunder.

**William J. Clinton**

**Memorandum on the Withdrawal of Russian Armed Forces from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia**  
*May 31, 1993*

Presidential Determination No. 93-24

*Memorandum for the Secretary of State*

*Subject:* Withdrawal of Russian Armed Forces from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

Pursuant to the Foreign Operation, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-391) (the “Act”), including subsection (e) under the heading “Assistance for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union” in Title II of the Act, I hereby certify that substantial withdrawal has occurred of the

armed forces of Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

You are authorized and directed to notify the Congress of this determination and to publish it in the *Federal Register*.

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: This item was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 1.

**Remarks to the Community in Milwaukee, Wisconsin**

*June 1, 1993*

*The President.* Thank you very much. Senator Kohl, Congressman Barrett, Mayor Norquist, ladies and gentlemen, it’s wonderful to be back in Wisconsin and back in Milwaukee again for the first time since I became President. I suppose I ought to begin by thanking the State of Wisconsin for your electoral votes. I’m very grateful for that. I’d also like to thank the Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce and the Public Policy Forum for hosting this opportunity for me to visit with you, and through you, all the people of Wisconsin, about the economic issues facing our country.

I’d like to introduce some other people who are here, up there somewhere. I asked Senator Kohl where they were, and he said, “Up there somewhere.” But it’s dark. I can’t see. I brought with me the former chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, now the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services, Donna Shalala, who is here; the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee in the House, your Congressman, David Obey, is here with me somewhere there; and we were met at the airport by Congressman Gerry Kleczka, who is here, Gerry; and Congressman-elect Peter Barca, who is also here somewhere. Thank you.

You know, a lot of times when I get out in the country now, people who worked for me—or who didn’t, who just feel like they can come up and talk—say, “Well, aren’t you worried about getting isolated up there in Washington? I mean, what’s the real difference in being President and just being out

here living?" And I had one thing happen to me a couple of weeks ago that illustrates the problem of being President or in the Congress or anything else.

I was in the White House and I was up on the residence floor. And I got on the elevator, and I was going down to the first floor where all big—if you've ever taken a tour of the White House, that's where all the big, fancy rooms are that the public tours. But we also use them when they're not open for tours, and I was going to a meeting there. And the young man who was taking me down in the elevator works for the Usher's Office, and of course, they were all hired under my predecessors. He didn't know me very well, and he was a little awkward, you know. So he took me downstairs, and he opened the doors of the elevator, and I found myself immediately in the presence of 30 total strangers who were standing there in front of the elevator. And it turned out that they had been walking out of a meeting with my wife on something entirely different. I didn't know them. They didn't—they knew who I was, but I'd never met any of them. [*Laughter*] And there I was. So I said hello to them, shook hands with them, and they walked by. And I turned around and looked at the young fellow running the elevator, and he was all red-faced. And he said, "Oh, Mr. President," he said, "I'm so sorry I let you out in the midst of all those people." And I looked at him, and I said, "John, that's okay. I used to be one myself." [*Laughter*]

I want to say a lot of things that I'll get into in a moment, but there are one or two things I want to say especially about Wisconsin. First, I was very moved by the drinking water crisis here. And one of the things that we tried to invest in that I don't think is a waste of your money in the next 5 years is more Federal investment in dealing with drinking water problems, waste water problems, and other environmentally related issues. I think that's a good investment of our tax dollars. And I did enjoy my conversation with your Mayor about that.

The other thing I'd like to do is to—[*ap- plause*]. Thank you. I want to say a little more about this in a moment, but since it was brought up, I want to compliment Congressman Barrett and Congressman Kleczka for

reintroducing the appropriations to fund the New Hope welfare reform project. It was vetoed last year. And I just want to tell you that, as I said, I want to say a little more about this in my speech, but the idea of giving people the tools they need to move off welfare and then calling a halt to it after 2 years, saying it has to come to an end and people who can should go to work, I think is a good thing. And I think we ought to fund that experiment in Wisconsin and see if it won't work. I think a lot of people will be for it, and I think it will work.

For any visitor who comes here to Milwaukee, as I have many times, the church steeples and the factory smokestacks are a vivid reminder of the faith and the work that made our country what it is today. People from every continent have come to our Nation and come to cities like Milwaukee and Chicago and Detroit without much money in their pockets, but filled with the faith that if they worked hard and played by the rules, they would find a better life for themselves and give their children a better chance.

In my part of the country, in the rural South, when the agricultural economy collapsed in the Depression and then didn't pick up after the Second World War, for 30 years people poured out of the places where my folks farmed in Arkansas and Mississippi and southern States and came up here to the northern cities seeking that same kind of opportunity.

Over the years in different ways our country has dealt with different economic challenges, but we have always tried to keep alive that American dream that if you worked hard and played by the rules you would be rewarded. If you were especially good you could get very, very wealthy, but everyone knew that the country would rise or fall based on the broad middle class, the small business people, the factory workers, the farmers, the people who really lifted the country and made it work.

We have, to a large extent, in the 20th century succeeded in doing that until just recently. Until recently, that is, in the last 20 years, we had succeeded in building the world's most diverse society and keeping it growing together, not coming apart.

Today, we're more diverse than ever before. One county in California, Los Angeles County, has 150 different racial and ethnic groups. Today, we still have the strongest, most vibrant free enterprise economy in the world. We have some of the most productive businesses in the world. But we have serious economic problems, as you all know.

Hard work rewarded by rising living standards is literally at the heart of what it means to be an American. It's at the heart of my family's heritage and probably at the heart of most of your families' heritage. And it's at the heart of the economic philosophy that compelled me to enter the race for President in 1991 and that brings me here again to Milwaukee today.

Once Americans looked forward to doubling their standard of living roughly every 25 years. As I said, that stopped about 20 years ago, as we began to be confronted with the highly competitive global economy and a slower rate of economic growth in our own country. Now, it will take us about 75 years to double our standard of living at the present pace. That means that not only do you have too many people who want to work who can't work, you have too many people working part-time, and you have too many people who are working like crazy and falling further and further behind.

Because I believe we can do better, I asked the people of this country to give me a chance to serve as President. As I said, it's very important to note what happened and when. Our real average hourly wages peaked about two decades ago. And since then, they've either been stagnant or declining as a whole. Indeed, the average working family is spending more hours a week on the job than they were in 1969 for lower real wages than they were making certainly 12 years ago, and in many cases, 20 years ago.

This is because, as I said, of changes in the global economy, more competition from people who were either more productive than we are or who work for wages we can't live on, or lack of productivity growth, of efficiency growth in our own country, or other problems with our economy.

Twelve years ago, in 1981, after the Presidential election of 1980—another election conducted in very difficult economic cir-

cumstances—the American people decided to give another President the chance to try an approach to deal with this problem. The whole idea of Reaganomics was trickle-down economics, that we should lower taxes on the wealthiest Americans, depend upon them to invest in our economy to grow it; we should reduce domestic spending, but increase defense spending even more than we reduced domestic spending.

Now, in the last 12 years, that philosophy was modified around the edges some, but it maintained itself at the heart of our economic dealings. Because the taxes were cut so much in '81, they were added back a little bit over the last 12 years, mostly on the middle class. And after a while, defense spending could not be sustained because of the end of the cold war, so it began to be cut. But by the time it was cut, health care costs were exploding. So all the defense cuts were swallowed up by exploding health care costs and interest payments on the debt.

But the fundamental idea remains, that the most important thing was not to worry about investment or the deficit or anything else; the most important thing was to worry about keeping taxes low on upper income people and keeping the Government's hands off the economy, except when it was necessary to invest in defense, and then when it wasn't necessary, to even get out of that.

Now, that was the theory, and we now have had a chance to see how it works. I think it's fair to say that the only reason I was elected in 1992 is that the American people thought that it hadn't worked very well, that there were problems. I say this—as I will make clear in a minute, this is not a partisan criticism, because it took bipartisan agreement at least to go along with the framework of this. But what had happened was that we had a good deal of growth in the early eighties, where we had defense increases and tax cuts, but the deficit got big. Then when the defense business got cut, all we did was pay more for the same health care. No one reinvested in the economy to give those defense workers something else to do, and the deficit got bigger and bigger and bigger.

Now, the American people voted for change. They wanted me to try to rebuild

the middle class both in terms of jobs and incomes, to invest in our own people and our jobs, to cut the deficit, to open the doors of education to all, and to deal with the terrible health care crisis, and to make a real dent at welfare reform, removing people from dependence and moving them to independence.

I was sent to the White House, I think, to take on brain-dead politics in Washington from either party, or from both. Some, but not all, in the national Democratic Party have placed too much faith in the whole politics of entitlement, the idea that big bureaucracies and Government spending, demanding nothing in return, can produce the results we want. We know that is simply not true. There is a limit to how much Government can do in the absence of an appropriate response by the American people at the grass-roots level. And there is a limit to how many decisions can be made properly in Washington. And most of our growth has and always will come from the private sector.

On the other hand, some, but not all, in the national Republican Party have practiced the politics of abandonment, of walking away from common concerns like dropping test scores or rising crime rates or an insufficient infrastructure or taking care of the people who won the cold war for us and now don't have anything to do in the wake of defense cutbacks, and in simply insisting that as long as you don't raise taxes on upper income people and don't talk about it when you raise taxes on anybody else, everything's going to be fine. Well, that's not right either. We have to move beyond entitlement and abandonment.

I ran for President basically on the same things that I found had worked for me when I was a Governor, not entitlement, not abandonment but empowerment, the idea of creating a new American community by offering people more opportunity and demanding more responsibility.

I think we have made a real start at that. In the first few weeks of this administration we have passed an important political reform measure, the motor voter bill, and we have moving through the Congress a really tough lobby disclosure bill and a campaign finance

reform bill that are the kind of things Wisconsin has been famous for for years.

We have tried to support the middle class in this administration. Only 17 days into the administration, I signed the family leave bill to guarantee that people don't lose their jobs when they have to take a little time off to have a baby or when there's a sick parent. The Congress is now considering our national service legislation, which would open the doors of college education to all, and soon will have a health care program that will provide real security to working families.

For the first time in 17 years the Congress passed the budget resolution, the outline of our deficit reduction plan and our plans to invest in the country, on time, for the first time in 17 years. And that helped to produce the lowest home mortgage rates in 20 years and other low interest rates because people believe we're trying to bring this deficit down. So we have made a good beginning.

But to be fair, the hard work is still ahead. The House of Representatives passed my economic program last week with some minor modifications, many of which made them better, I thought. But the hard work lies ahead. All the difficulties in this world are in the details. We can always agree on generalities. The question is, what are the specifics?

I came here to ask you to join with me in trying to tackle the three deficits that are paralyzing this country today: the deficit of dollars in our Federal budget, the deficit of investment in the private and public sectors, and the deficit of responsibility in our National Government.

Now, let's talk about this deficit, the Government's budget deficit. Our country last ran a balanced budget in 1969. We haven't balanced our national books since then. But to be fair, the deficit was not a serious problem for our economic performance until 1981 when we built permanent deficits into our Federal Government system.

What happened? President Reagan, in the midst of a recession, made what has been a typical proposal by Presidents throughout American history. He said, "We're in a recession. We ought to have a tax cut." The problem was, by the time he and the Congress got through bidding each other up and play-

ing to the American people's hatred of taxes, the tax cut was twice the percentage of our annual income that he originally proposed. And it was adopted anyway. Nobody really thought about what it would do to the structure of the Federal budget.

And ever since then, we've been dealing with the consequences of that, plus increasing spending, as I said, first in defense, and then after defense was cut, an absolute explosion in health care costs, which I'll bet many of you have also experienced in your private health insurance premiums as well as your Government tax dollars.

Listen to this: Over the past dozen years alone, the annual deficit soared from \$79 billion to \$322 billion. The national debt in 12 years, after over 200 years as a nation, quadrupled from \$1 trillion to \$4 trillion. While Washington cut taxes on the wealthiest individuals, even after the deficit went up, we had exploding health care costs, exploding costs to pay interest on a bigger and bigger debt. And while the Government was used as a punching bag—everybody talked against big Government—no one ever really did anything fundamentally to reform the way it operates or rein in its unnecessary spending.

As this deficit soaked up more and more of our national savings which could otherwise have been invested in private plant and equipment and human skills, we created a second deficit, an investment deficit. From the 1960's to the 1980's public investment—that is, the expenditure of your Federal tax dollars in education and training, in new technologies for new jobs, and in infrastructure, things like better water systems and bridges and roads and airports—dwindled from 4½ percent to just 2.6 percent of our annual income.

Every time a company can't find qualified workers, every time trucks are rattled by highways riddled with potholes, every time a department store closes because a city is not safe after dark, we see the consequences of the investment deficit. Our income as a nation goes down, and we have fewer jobs as well.

Meanwhile, national policy rewarded companies for their financial strategies, not their investment strategies; for making deals, not products; for seeking new mergers, not new

markets. Business investment declined from 7.2 percent of our gross national product in the 1970's to only 5.4 percent in the eighties.

The investment deficit also slows the growth of our workers' productivity. And in a market economy, people get paid by what they can produce by global standards. Compensation per hour, what workers earn in wages and fringe benefits, grew more slowly in the last 20 years than in the previous 100. From 1954 to 1973, hourly compensation grew at over 3 percent per year. The more people produced, the more they earned. But in the last 20 years, as productivity slowed down, compensation increased by less than one percent per year.

This low productivity led to higher unemployment, stagnant wages, and—guess what—lower tax receipts. So the deficit got bigger, because people weren't earning enough money to pay into the Government to keep the deficit down. They relate one to the other.

This was aggravated when we cut the defense budget with no plan to put the defense workers back to work in the new civilian economy. And in some of our biggest unemployment areas, you see, from Connecticut to southern California, you see high-dollar scientific workers, people with advanced degrees and very skilled factory workers, with nothing else to do because there was no thought given to what these people would do once the defense work was shut down, even though we know there are tens of thousands of jobs waiting to be had in the global economy in new technologies, in aerospace, in electronics, in biotechnology, and environment cleanup, just to name four. We know those jobs are out there. But we know our competitors are working hard in partnership with the government and the private sector to develop them.

At the same time, the exploding costs of health care and education put a crimp not only on the growth of average families' incomes and small business incomes but on the overall health of our economy. Average health costs per family tripled in the last dozen years. Too many middle class people at the same time experienced "job block," that is, they couldn't move jobs because someone in their family had been sick. They

had what the insurers call a preexisting condition, meaning that if they wanted to have their health insurance, they had to stay in the job they were in.

Now, we're living in a country, folks, where the average 18-year-old will change work seven or eight times in a lifetime. If you can't change jobs in this kind of an economy, your future is dramatically constricted, all because we are the only nation with an advanced economy that hasn't figured out how to provide basic health care at affordable cost to all of our people.

And look what's happened to education. In the 1980's, the value of an education virtually doubled. By the end of the decade, the average college graduate was earning twice the average high school graduate; the difference between what a college graduate and a high school graduate earned at the end of the decade was twice what it was in 1980 at the beginning. And yet, look what happened to college costs. The cost of public colleges went up by 109 percent and private colleges by 145 percent; college drifting, drifting, drifting out of the reach of ordinary Americans. And the college dropout rate became more than twice as high as the high school dropout rate, either because people were sent unprepared, which was wrong, or they couldn't afford to stay, which happened all too often.

Virtually every economic decision that was made in Washington, or not made properly, sent signals to our people that the old rewards for hard work and playing by the rules and responsibility were declining. Most of the economic gains of the 1980's went to people in the top one percent of the income brackets, and most of them were not those that were producing new products and services but instead were those who were producing financial arrangements, which exploded the cost of paperwork and didn't do much to create more jobs in America.

Too many people who were at the bottom rung of the ladder and working hard to get out, which, after all, is where most of our families started somewhere along the way, found that their hard-earned wages left them below the poverty line and removed even more the incentive to work instead of to be on welfare. If work doesn't pay, why not go

on welfare? How many times have we heard that said in the last 10 or 12 years in the city streets and in the rural communities of America?

These are the things, my fellow Americans, that we have to change. This is a historic moment. Now that the House has passed this budget plan to reduce the deficit and to target investments in our future, and it's going to the Senate for further debate, we can make a decision to seize control of our economic destiny. That is why I have asked everyone in Washington to go beyond politics as usual, to forget about partisan divisions, to try to find bipartisan responsibility in place of bipartisan blame and irresponsibility.

Now, the plan that I have proposed cuts \$500 billion from the Federal deficit, the largest deficit reduction program in our history. It makes decisions long delayed and avoided. The plan is balanced and fair. About half of the deficit reduction comes from spending reductions and restraints on entitlements; about half comes from tax increases. Entitlements—that is, medical programs, Social Security benefits, agriculture benefits, welfare benefits, food stamp benefits, things you get because of who you are—those things, we rein in spending by \$100 billion over the next 5 years. We cut 200 other areas of the budget by more than \$150 billion in the next 5 years. We cut some very popular programs in this country, from highway demonstration projects to rural electrification. But that has to be done. We cut about \$47 billion directly out of the operations of the Federal Government: freezes in Federal pay, restrictions on Federal retirement, the reduction in the Federal work force by 149,000 people over the next 5 years.

All of that has been written into this budget. The plan imposes new discipline on Government spending: no increases in taxes unless there are cuts in spending, and all of it put into a trust fund that must remain there for the 5-year life of the deficit.

We also adopted a unique mechanism right at the end of the House of Representatives debate which requires every year, if we miss this deficit reduction target—and Congressman Obey got a bunch of charts, I wish he were up here showing them to you, about how the two previous administrations said

the deficit would go down to zero three different times, and they never did make a target—if we miss our target, every year now the President is legally bound to come in and offer a correction in the budget to meet that deficit reduction target, and the Congress has to vote on it.

Now, I lead with all this—I dare say that most of you, since all you've heard are about the fights on taxes, didn't know how much spending was cut and probably don't know what incentives are there for investment. I'll get to that in a minute. Some taxes are raised. No less authority than David Stockman, who was President Reagan's Budget Director, was quoted not long ago as saying, anybody, Republican or Democrat, who thinks you can get this deficit down without increasing taxes does not understand what we did to the tax system in 1981.

Now, those are the spending cuts we had. The spending cuts are real. There are more than 200 of them. There are more than I recommended in the campaign because I didn't know in the campaign what happened right after the election, which is that the deficit miraculously was increased by \$165 billion, announced by the Government before I took office but after the election. So we cut spending some more.

And there are some more tax increases, too. But look how they fall. Seventy-four percent of the money we raise comes from people with incomes above \$100,000. Over 60 percent of this money comes from people with incomes above \$200,000. Now, that is not an attack on the wealthy. It is an acknowledgement that people in that income group had their incomes go up and their taxes go down in the eighties. Middle class people had their taxes go up and their incomes go down in the eighties. So we're just trying to redress the fairness of the matter.

Now, let me tell you exactly what you will pay if you're a middle class American, if your family income is under \$100,000. I had wanted, and I advocated in the campaign, tax relief for middle class families, especially those with children. I still want that, and I still intend to propose that before I'm done. But I can't do it now because the deficit is so much bigger than it was when I was making these proposals. It would be irresponsible for

me to advocate a very substantial increase on upper incomes and not ask the middle class Americans to make any contribution at all.

But listen to what it costs. First of all, for working families with incomes under \$30,000, we have done everything we could to make sure that the energy tax, which is the middle class tax here, will cost nothing by giving an income tax credit to offset the income tax. One fellow out here has been heckling me and saying I'm not telling the truth. So I'll say, Arthur Anderson, which is a fairly reputable firm, hardly packed full of Democrats, has examined my program and says that a family of three with an income of \$25,000 a year or less will actually get a tax cut under the Clinton economic plan as it is now. For a family with an income of \$40,000 a year, if the energy tax passes just as it is, and if there are four people in the family, the bill will be a dollar a month next year, \$7 a month the year after that, and \$17 a month the year after that. All of the money, every last red cent of it, will go into a deficit reduction trust fund to bring down the deficit, every penny.

Now, the question is, is it worth it? Is it worth it? And here's my answer to you. You may say it's not worth it, but look what's happened since November. First, when we announced the energy tax and the deficit reduction plan, long-term interest rates started to go down. Second, after I actually presented it to Congress in February, they went down some more. Now, for most of the last 3 months, long-term interest rates have been at their lowest rate in decades: mortgage rates at the lowest rate in 20 years; consumer loans down; college loans down; car loans down; business loans down. Millions and millions of Americans are out there breaking their necks to refinance their home loans and their business loans, so much so that the business analysts say that if we can keep interest rates down at this level for a year, we will put \$100 billion back into this economy in lower interest rates because people think we're serious about bringing the deficit down.

What does that mean? What does that mean? Let's just say if someone had a \$100,000 home mortgage financed at 10 per-

cent and they refinanced it at 7½ percent, that would be a \$2,000 saving in one year, a \$2,000 saving in one year. In other words, there would be more than twice the savings in one year as this program would cost that same family in 4 years if it were passed exactly as it is today.

Now, I think that's pretty good for America. If we don't do something to get the interest rates down, clean the debt out, and get control of our economic destiny, we're going to be in big trouble.

Now, there are also a lot of incentives in this program for people to further save money. Let me just give you a few. Let's take a typical farm family in Wisconsin. The family's income net is under \$30,000. They will be eligible for tax credits. A single-family farm under this program for the first time will be able to get a tax deduction for their health insurance premiums, something they haven't been able to do before. The expensing provisions for small businesses and farmers will allow them to write off \$25,000, not \$10,000, of investment now. So much so that the average Wisconsin farm, even after they pay higher energy costs and have agricultural budget cuts, will wind up with a lower bill rather than a higher bill if this whole program passes.

And I think it's very important to look at the incentives here. We have more incentives for small businesses, an historic incentive for people to invest in new business, real incentives for people to put money into plant and equipment and hire people in America, instead of just put money into financial transactions or invest money overseas. These are incentives that will give the American people the way to lower their taxes by creating jobs here in America, which is what I talked about in the campaign. That's how you ought to be able to lower your tax bill.

Now, let me also tell you that this plan invests some new money. You have to ask yourself whether you think it's worth it. Is it worth it for us to invest enough money at the national level to do the following things: to try to provide some incentives for companies who won't have defense contracts anymore to develop domestic technologies to put those high wage workers back to work. Is it worth it to try to provide jobs in America

in areas where America needs work with new water systems and new environmental clean-up systems? Is it worth it to provide a small amount of money to try to see that America joins Germany, Japan, and every other advanced country in saying if you don't go to a 4-year college, at least you ought to have access to 2 years of further education and training so you can get a good and decent job? Is it worth it or not? You have to decide.

Now, if you believe all Government spending is evil and bad, you would say no, it's not worth it. But if you look at our competitors and if you look at what works and what produces growth and the fact that it is clearly the skill levels of our people which will determine as much as anything else the economic future of America, I think you'd have to say yes, it is worth it. We've got too many people who are not competitive in a global economy today.

One final thing: This State has always been a pioneer. People in both parties have always been interested, at least in my experience as Governor, in welfare reform, in moving people from welfare to work. One of the biggest problems with welfare reform is this: If you take somebody off welfare and you put them in a low-wage job because they don't have much education, they have to take that wage and pay for child care out of it, because they're not home taking care of the kids anymore, and they may not have medical insurance. And the earnings are so low there is a big incentive not to do it.

This bill, this economic program, makes a major downpayment on welfare reform, doing what I want to do, which is to change the whole system and say after you get education and training, if after 2 years you don't have a job, you have to go to work in the public or private sector. This bill starts that by saying this: If you work 40 hours a week and you've got a kid in your house, the tax system will lift you out of poverty. We'll give you a tax break so that you will not be living in poverty if you work full-time with children in your home. What else could be more American, and what else would do more to end the welfare dependency we have in this country?

Now, let's talk about where we are with this. This bill's going to the Senate now. Sen-

ator Kohl and Senator Feingold are going to get a chance to work on it. And everybody in America—if I said, wouldn't you like it if we did everything I just said but we did it with more budget cuts and even less tax, and you would say, yes; I would say yes. Who could disagree? Who could disagree? The question is, what are the details?

Let me try to describe to you what's going on. When you hear all this stuff, that this is a tax program, this is not just a tax program. This is a budget cutting program. This is an investment program in your future. This is incentives for the private sector to create new jobs in ways that have never been provided before.

You know, in this bill, if you invest in a new business and it makes money, and you hold that investment 5 years, you cut your tax rate in half under this program. That's a real incentive. Under this bill, if you invest money in a poor neighborhood in Milwaukee, if it gets designated an empowerment zone, you can get all kinds of incentives for private sector investment that have never been available before, ever; never proposed by Republicans or Democrats before to get private sector investment to rebuild. So there's a lot of things in this bill.

But let's just take the rhetoric. Everybody would like to do all this with less tax and more budget cuts. But look behind the rhetoric. For example, when the House voted on my program last week, there was a Republican substitute. The Republican substitute purported to have the same amount of deficit reduction I did with no taxes and all budget cuts. Guess what. More Republicans voted against a Republican bill than Democrats voted against my bill. Why? Why? Because the Republicans who voted against it thought it cut too much out of Social Security, too much out of medical care, too much out of farm programs, too much out of things that are part of the fabric of this Nation's economy or part of our built-in obligation to one another. So they disagreed. They couldn't agree on that.

Let me give you another example. Some define less tax and more cuts as lower taxes on the very wealthy, replaced by reducing the cost of living increase to Social Security recipients barely above the poverty line, or

to people barely above the poverty line who are working, they want to reduce the tax credits they get.

Let me give you another example. Others say, "Well, just cut more Medicare costs. Don't give those doctors and hospitals any more money." Now, that's got a lot of appeal to a lot of people. But let me tell you what happens. If you cut Medicare costs without reforming the health care system, you can do it to some extent, but if you do it too much, you know what will happen? Every one of you who works in the private sector who has a private health insurance policy, will have your premiums go up as a result. Because if the Government doesn't pay for the care that the Government mandates that people get, what do the doctors and hospitals do? They put the cost onto private business, onto private employers and private employees. And your health insurance premiums soar.

One of the reasons a lot of you are paying too much for health care today is that America has 35 million people with no health insurance and other people who are being undercompensated. And as a result of that, you're paying more. Because everybody in this country gets health care, don't they? They just get it when it's too late, too expensive, and at the emergency room. And you get sent the bill if you have health insurance. So it sounds good, but it may not be so good.

I could give you a lot of other examples. The way words are used, for example, the way our adversaries calculate this, if we ask upper income Social Security recipients, who are getting more out of the system than they put in, plus interest, to pay a little more of their income to taxation, then that's a tax. But if we cut the cost of living allowance to the poorest Social Security recipients, that's a budget cut. Right? That's the way they define it.

Now, but most people in this room say, "Well, if you have to do one or the other, better to ask people who can pay and who are getting more back out than they put in plus interest to give a little more than to take it out of the poorest ones who are just above the poverty line." But if you get into these word games, it sounds terrible if it's tax and

cut. It doesn't sound so bad when you talk about what it really is.

Here are the principles that I hope the Senate will honor next week:

Number one, we've got to cut the deficit at least \$500 billion, and we ought to put it in a trust fund so the money can't be fooled with for the next 5 years.

Number two, because of what happened in the last 12 years, any taxes we raise must, in the end, be progressive. Those who can pay more should pay more, and we should minimize the burden on the middle class.

Number three, don't do anything to the incentive to move people from welfare to work. Let's go ahead and say that if you work 40 hours a week and you have a child in your home, you don't deserve to be in poverty. You've played by the rules, and we'll let you out of poverty.

Number four, keep the incentives for small businesses, for new businesses, for investment in our cities, for housing incentives, for research and development, keep all those tax incentives in there to grow this economy. Don't take them out.

And number five, when we cut spending, and we'll cut some more and raise some, we'll cut the taxes and have more spending cuts next week. But when we do it, let's leave the money in there that will shape these children's economic future. Let's have the money for education and training, for investment in technology, for help for the defense industries that are building down. Let's rebuild the American economy. Because, after all, you can cut all the spending you want, and if people don't have jobs and they aren't earning money, we're still not going to be able to balance the budget. So let's keep the economic future of the country uppermost in our minds.

The last thing I'd like to say to you, my fellow Americans, is that none of this is going to be easy, but you should not be discouraged. After all, these trends, as I said, have gone through administrations of Democrats and Republicans for 20 years now. We are moving away from a set of policies that have been the rule for 12 years. I'm trying to move beyond a bipartisan gridlock which has existed for about a decade.

We are trying to do it in a global economy where other rich nations have unemployment rates as high or higher than ours, and there's a recession all over the world. This is not easy, but it can be done. It can be done if we have the courage to change direction. And if we will listen and look beneath the labels to the facts, I believe we can do it. It is simply a question of asking what we have to do to regain control of our destiny, what we have to do to invest in our people, what we have to do to get jobs and incomes and health security back into this country again.

And let me just say one last thing in closing. When I was a Governor for 12 years, my State in every one of those 12 years had a tax burden—the State and local tax burden was in the bottom five in America. We had one of the toughest balanced budget laws in the country. And when I asked the people of my State for more taxes it was always to pay for something specific, better schools, better roads, more jobs, in a trust fund. I never ever dreamed I would be in a position in my life asking people to pay \$1 just to bring the deficit down. But we got ourselves in this fix, folks, over a long period of time. And until we get our interest rates down and regain control of our economic future and show that we have the discipline to handle our affairs, it is going to be very difficult for us to do a lot of these other things that all of us want to do.

These decisions are not easy, but we must make them. So I ask you again, encourage Senator Kohl and all the other people in the United States Senate, encourage Senator Feingold, encourage them all to give me a good budget with less taxes and more spending cuts. But remember the principles: make sure the money goes to deficit reduction; invest some in our economic future, because that's important; make sure the people who can pay do; don't take the welfare reform initiatives out of it; and remember that in the end, the private sector creates the jobs, so leave the incentives in there.

And let me say this: 50 of the 100 biggest companies in this country have endorsed this program. I have been very moved that so many people in upper income groups, who are going to pay the overwhelming majority of these taxes, have endorsed this program,

because they know that it is imperative to get control of our future. And I ask you, the people of Wisconsin, to endorse the program for the future of your children and our Nation.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:10 p.m. in the Milwaukee Exposition Convention Center and Arena. In his remarks, he referred to Milwaukee Mayor John O. Norquist.

### Exchange With Reporters in Milwaukee

June 1, 1993

#### President's Priorities

**Q.** [*Inaudible*]*—*view the whole treatment where you basically—first with having to deal day after day with the news accounts that kind of talk about the haircuts and the Travel Office and things? No, no, I'm asking you how important—

**Q.** That's a cheap shot. That's a cheap shot. You are the President of the United States. You should—

**Q.** Can I do my job, please?

**Q.** Get out of here. We don't need those cheap shots. That's a cheap shot. Get out of here.

**The President.** The answer is, I have to work in Washington, but you have to work outside, too. The real issue is not so much what you said, but the real issue is, I secured agreement early on for about \$250 billion in tax cuts, spending cuts, I mean, a little under, about \$245 billion. And as a result of that, because they weren't the focus of controversy, no one knows we did it.

And then we got agreement early on for the new incentives, for small businesses and for starting new businesses and for investing in our depressed areas, reviving the housing market. Because there was no controversy, people don't know we did it. So the only controversy has been over the taxes. It's important that people know that there are budget cuts in here. It's important that people know there are real incentives to the private sector in here. It's important that people know what we still spend money on. And it's important

for people to know that over 70 percent of the money is being paid by the top 6 percent of income earners. If I don't get out here and do all that work, they won't know it. So that's what I'm doing.

#### Health Care Reform

**Q.** Let me follow, sir. Are you going to recommend a tax on hospitals to pay for the health care program on the theory that they're going to have a windfall profit from your reform program?

**The President.** Well, let me say this, if we do it right, they will have significantly lower administrative costs. That is, if we do health care right, they will have lower administrative costs. Let me just give you one example: The average American doctor in 1980 took home 75 percent of the income that he or she generated into the clinic. By 1992, that figure had dropped to 52 percent, all the rest of it going to administrative costs caused by insurance companies and the Government just piling on regulations and rules and paperwork and thousands of different insurance costs. If we simplify that, their costs will drop dramatically.

So one of the options that has been recommended is that we leave some of that money with them but have some of that money flow back in to cover the uninsured, which will also help them because that will come right back to the doctors and the hospitals in the form of insurance for the uninsured. So it would be almost like returning the money to them in a different form for services rendered. We'll just have to see whether that works out. No final decision has been made on that.

**Q.** But you like that idea?

**The President.** I have made no decision on it. I don't want to flame the story anymore. That is one of the options that has been presented, and one of ones that, frankly, some hospital people have talked to us about.

**Q.** Are you going to hold off the health plan until the fall, Mr. President?

**Q.** That's all. You talk—

**The President.** Hold it off until what?

**Q.** Are you going to hold off the plan until the fall to let the Congress concentrate—

**Q.** That's enough.

**The President.** Oh, no, no, no. I hope we move this budget through in a hurry.

### **Budget**

**Q.** [*Inaudible*]

**The President.** [*Inaudible*]—I think he's got some really good ideas. But once he committed himself to cutting as much as he did, he actually lost more Republicans than I lost Democrats.

**Q.** It's just the issue of party politics that you talked about. The Democrats, I feel, are doing the same thing. So I just think you should address that part of it. The Democrats are doing the same thing.

**The President.** Well, I didn't let them off the hook.

**Q.** I'm just bringing up the point because the people need to know that.

**The President.** I have nothing to add over and above what's been in the paper already. I mean, the Senators on the Senate Finance Committee have discussed with me and also with the House Members who voted for this program the options that are there within the principles that I established. I always said—on February 17th I said if we can meet these principles, \$500 billion in deficit reduction, aggressive taxation, incentives to invest in America, move from welfare to work, lift the working poor out of poverty, and these targeted investments in technology, jobs, and education which will meet those principles, with some less tax and some more spending cuts, I'm for it. And I think that's what we're working toward.

**Q.** What would you be willing to accept in less taxes—

**The President.** I'm not going to get into that.

**Q.** How about—

**The President.** No, I'm not going to get into it because Congress is on recess and our commitment is twofold, of our administration. One is to work with the Senators of any party who will work with us and, secondly, to make sure the Senate Finance Committee works with all the House Members who voted for this budget with our solemn commitment that we would all work together in the Senate to keep these principles intact and see if these principles can be achieved with

less tax and more spending cuts. So that's what we're trying to do.

**Q.** Good way to sell your plan here?

**The President.** Oh, I think so. This was terrific. I loved it.

### **Russia**

**Q.** What's your position on Russia's not paying back your \$80 billion in debt, loans that are still outstanding?

**The President.** They're broke. They can't right now.

**Q.** What is your feeling on that? Are you looking for them to repay those loans in the next 2 years, or is that part of their plan to balance the budget?

**The President.** They can't do it right now. They have no money. They're absolutely flat broke. What we ought to do—I think the Russians have now undertaken—their recent credits, in other words, the things that they've gotten since they adopted a free market approach, since they got rid of communism, I think they will honor those debts once they start making money again. But the history is that countries need a few years to basically move from a Communist economy to a free market economy. As they do that and they begin to acquire some success, then I think they'll be able to pay down their debt. But the dilemma now is if we tried to make them pay it off now, we'd just drive them further in the economic hole and run the risk of having them revert to a dictatorship of some kind. And we don't want to do that.

So I wouldn't let anybody off the hook that could pay it back, but the point is for them, they never really—unlike the Chinese, for example, who were traders for centuries and had a whole market history, the Russians essentially went from a feudal agricultural economy under the Czars to a Communist economy that then became dominated by heavy industry. And moving into a modern free market economy is very difficult for them.

**Q.** So we're going to work with them?

**The President.** Yes, I think we should.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 1 p.m. outside of the Milwaukee Exposition Convention Center and Arena. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

## Remarks to the Bay View Community in Milwaukee

June 1, 1993

**The President.** Thank you very much. I want to thank Gerry Kleczka and everybody else. But I especially want to thank the Langer family for bringing me to Bay View. I'm glad to be here. When I was on the way out here today the mayor said that he was the mayor of Milwaukee and Bay View and that I needed to know that if I was going to come here. So I'm glad to be here. I also want to introduce to you Wisconsin's newest Member of Congress, Mr. Peter Barca, who just showed up.

I'm sorry you all are in there behind that fence, and I look forward to getting out and shaking hands with you. I just wanted to say one or two things before I do. I was just in downtown Milwaukee, speaking with several thousand people about the economic plan that I have presented to Congress. And there are two or three things that I want to say to you about it so you'll all know, because there are a lot of things that have not been brought out that I think you're entitled to hear.

First of all, this plan has over 200 spending cuts. I see all these signs saying, "Cut spending." Where were you when we cut them? It has a lot of spending cuts in it, over \$240 billion.

Secondly, the tax increases in this plan all go to reduce the deficit, and over 74 percent of the money comes from people with incomes above \$100,000. Families with incomes below \$30,000 pay nothing. The other thing I want to tell you is, if your income is above \$30,000 and below \$100,000, depending on the size of your family, the energy tax that the House approved costs you a dollar a month next year, \$7 a month the year after that, and for a family of four, \$17 a month the year after that. All of it goes to reduce the debt.

I think it's worth doing. It's brought interest rates down to a 20-year low. We have interest rates at a 20-year low. That means Americans are going to refinance their homes, get lower car loans, refinance their business loans, get lower consumer loans, lower college loans. It will save \$100 billion

for American businesses and individuals this year if we can keep those interest rates down. So I want you to support that.

The second thing I want to say about it is this: We have put forward a program which will open the doors of college education to all Americans, just like I promised in the campaign, lower interest loans, better repayment terms, and giving tens of thousands of Americans a chance to pay their college loans by serving their communities here at home, by working to make their communities a better place.

The next point I want to make is that as soon as this budget is over, just like I said in the campaign, we're coming forward with a plan to provide health care security, affordable health care, to the working families of this country, who have been savaged by high costs, insufficient coverage, and the inability to change jobs because somebody in their family has been sick. This administration is about jobs, incomes, health care, education, and training, and bringing this deficit down.

Now, I want to say one last thing. I heard all this talk in the country about how this is a tax program. I just want to make this point. It is not just a tax program. It's an economic program. It is over \$240 billion in budget cuts. We're going to reduce the size of the Federal Government by 150,000. We are—

**Audience member.** Make the cuts first!

**The President.** We are cutting first. That's what the budget resolution is all about. You can't raise taxes without the budget cuts. It's illegal now. That's the whole point. We won't have the tax increases without the budget cuts. It's all going to be put in a trust fund. And unlike all previous years, if we don't make our reduction targets and reduce that debt, the President by law is now required to come in and fix it, something previous Presidents did not have to do. We have changed the law.

And what you've got to decide is whether you want more hot air, more rhetoric, more politicians up there telling you what you want to hear, or somebody who will tell you the truth, turn the country around, and get the economy going again. I think that's what you want, and I hope you'll support your Mem-

bers of Congress and me as we try to do that.

Let me say one final thing. I think that a lot of you before I came here today had no earthly idea that we'd cut all that spending because the Congress didn't fight it; they just did it. I think you did not know also that families with incomes under \$30,000 were being held harmless because we had support for that. And you may not know that small businesses like Langer's Pharmacy are going to have tax incentives to reinvest in their businesses that were not there before if this plan passes.

This is a good plan for the economy. It's a fair plan for the middle class. It asks the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share. And unlike previous plans, it's not a lot of hot air. It will do what it's supposed to do. I think we've had enough hot air for the last 12 years. Let's do something real and strong and move this country forward.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:45 p.m. at Jack Langer's Pharmacy. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Gerald D. Kleczka.

### Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Brian Mulroney of Canada

June 2, 1993

#### Prime Minister's Visit

**Q.** Is this a hail and farewell visit?

**Prime Minister Mulroney.** I came down to see the President about NAFTA and some trade matters and Bosnia, where we have troops on the ground, and to work with him. We agree with the prudent and thoughtful course he's been pursuing there. And I'd like to talk to him about further engagement at the United Nations and also to say good-bye and to you, Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]. After a decade I thought I owed you a trip.

**Q.** Are you going to miss it?

**Prime Minister Mulroney.** Pardon?

**Q.** Going to miss it, aren't you?

**Prime Minister Mulroney.** Yes. All politicians suffer from decompression when they leave office.

#### Bosnia

**Q.** Do you agree with the Bosnia policy?

**Prime Minister Mulroney.** Yes, I do. I agree that—

**Q.** You don't think it should have been more aggressive on the allied part?

**Prime Minister Mulroney.** Well, I've been astonished by some American commentators and observers asking for an American solution in Bosnia. There's no such thing. There is only a common solution, for all of us have to get into this together and accept our responsibilities. It's unfair to say that, oh, why don't we have an American solution to this intractable problem that's gone on for hundreds of years. It's not available. But there is, perhaps, a better, as the President's pointed out, a better common approach that we can develop at the United Nations Security Council with everybody pulling his weight or her weight. And that's what we're going to talk about today.

#### Btu Tax

**Q.** Mr. President, Senator Boren says now that there can be no Btu tax—no longer a compromise, it's now none.

**The President.** I don't have any comment on that. I had a good visit with him. He called me the other day, said he was encouraged by where we were going, and he thought we would reach agreement. I'm not going to get into a verbal war of words. The Congress is out this week, and we're going to meet next week and try to work it out.

#### Health Care Reform

**Q.** Have you decided to push a health care plan?

**Q.** Are you going to pull the nomination of Guinier?

**The President.** No, we're working ahead. As a matter of fact, I've got another meeting, a big meeting on the health care issue this week. We are, you know, trying to—we're trying to do two things. We're trying to, first of all, to get as many of the kinks worked out as we can before we go forward. It's an enormously complicated issue. And then we want to make sure that we have, you know,

discussed it with as many people as possible, many groups and everything, after we've reached some final conclusions, and that when we present it to the Congress, it's presented at a time and in a way that both the Congress and the American people can focus on it. But there's been no decision for a sustained delay here. I'm focusing right now on passing the budget when the Senate comes back next week.

**Q.** Will it be released this month?

**The President.** I don't want to get—I'm not in a time—I don't want to get—

**Q.** How about Guinier? Are you pulling out the nomination of Guinier?

**Prime Minister Mulroney.** Bye, Helen. [Laughter] On behalf of all Canadians, Helen, good-bye.

**Q.** Nothing ventured—[laughter].

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

### **Public Perception**

**Q.** Mr. President, are you as certain as the Prime Minister that NAFTA will pass? And do you plan on calling on his considerable experience in dealing with the perils of unpopularity?

**The President.** Well, these things go up and down. I mean, you know, the American people want something done about the deficit but very often don't want to—you know, when the coverage gets negative, because of the pain of it, it's something no one wants to face. I think what I have to do here is do more of what I did yesterday, force, force full coverage of—what's happened in our country is that there has only been discussion about the tax increases in the budget plan. So no Americans really know very much about all the budget cuts that are in there and all the tax incentives that are in there for investment for new jobs. When they know the whole thing and also when the middle class knows how small the burden is on them, then the support for the program and for the administration goes way up. So I'm laboring out there under a general perception that the administration has a tax plan that falls almost entirely on the middle class when, in fact,

the administration has a plan for spending cuts, investment incentives to create jobs, and some taxes, which fall almost entirely on upper income people. And that's my problem. It's very difficult in the midst of a legislative debate to keep the public focus on that since the focus is always on controversy. But that's my problem, and I'll fix it.

### **NAFTA**

**Q.** Why have you not gone out and fought—

**The President.** On NAFTA I think we can pass it with a very concerted effort if the Congress has some assurances on the environmental and labor issues. Keep in mind, the United States—as far as I know, no country has ever signed a trade agreement which—also an investment agreement, which—at least millions of Americans feel is an investment agreement that would encourage people to invest in another country for production in our market, not in theirs. And so that is the tension here that—I keep arguing to the American people that that could happen anyway, that under our present law, people, if they choose, can go and produce in Mexico for the American market. But that causes great tension here when we've had 20 years of virtually flat wages for middle class working people.

I believe NAFTA will create jobs and raise incomes in both the United States and Mexico, and I think it will help Canada. I have always believed that over the long run, the integration of our three economies and the potential that gave us to continue to move south into other market economies in Chile and Argentina and Venezuela and others was enormous. And I think eventually we'll get there. But it is going to be a very tough fight.

### **Ross Perot**

**Q.** Why have you allowed Ross Perot to shape the debate on that—

**The President.** I haven't. I haven't allowed it at all. I don't agree with his position. I don't agree with his assertions, and I don't agree with the evidence that he offers. But you know, in this country we have a free press. I can't control who gets what kind of

press coverage. That's what the first amendment is all about.

**Prime Minister Mulroney.** I saw Ross Perot's appearance on television the other night, and I've heard every single one of those arguments from the Socialists and the protectionists in the Canadian House of Commons. There's not a single word that was new. The fact of the matter is that it's all contradicted by the facts. Canada and the United States entered into a free trade agreement in 1988. We've since been mired in a recession. Even in those 4 difficult years for both countries, American exports to Canada have increased by approximately 25 percent, thereby creating 1.4 million new jobs in the United States. And Canadian exports to the United States have increased by a like amount. Well, this is clear indication that prosperity comes through these lowering of trade barriers and the creating of new pools of common wealth.

What Mr. Perot's argument is—I saw anyway, and I don't know him and he seems to be a fine fellow—is that wage rates alone are a determinant of competitiveness. Wage rates are one of many considerations of competitiveness, cost of capital, infrastructure, education, technology. And if wage rates alone determine the location of industry, Haiti would be the manufacturing capital of the world. Our productivity is so far and ahead above that of Mexico that to make the argument simply on the basis of wages is misleading in the extreme.

I think the President's point of view is a very valid one. It's one that we support. And the evidence appears to be there that when you lower barriers to trade between and among friendly countries, you create new pools of wealth, and you raise the living standards of everybody affected by it. You don't lower standards. And so these arguments, I have to tell you—Mr. Perot may have some better days. But I want to tell you that his arguments, he might be surprised to find that he's been poaching those arguments from the Socialists in the Canadian House of Commons, and they might sue him for copyright infringement. [*Laughter*]

**Q.** Mr. President, you that Mr. Mulroney is leaving office—

**The President.** On NAFTA, let me say one other thing about NAFTA. President Salinas, when he took over in Mexico, unilaterally reduced a lot of very high Mexican tariffs with the consequence that the United States went from a \$5 billion trade deficit with Mexico to a \$6 billion trade surplus. And last month, Mexico replaced Japan as the second largest purchaser of our manufacturing products. So we are, in effect, opening our trade relationships anyway. It's been, on balance, beneficial to the United States. And I just—if you look at where the world is going, where Europe is going, where Asia is going, there's no question that both Canada and the United States need more trading partners in our own backyard, and we need for them to be richer, to grow, to do more, so they can buy more from us. And I feel very strongly that it's the right thing to do, and I'm going to keep plugging away and hope we can pass it. I think we can.

### **Haiti**

**Q.** On Haiti, Mr. President. Is it time to show some muscle on Haiti if diplomacy doesn't work?

**The President.** Well, we thought we had an agreement on Haiti and, of course, it didn't work out, and I'm very disappointed. We worked very, very hard. And I talked to the Prime Minister about this on several occasions. It is time to reexamine our options and consider some others, and I expect the United States will do that.

### **Prime Minister Mulroney**

**Q.** Mr. Clinton, any parting words for Mr. Mulroney now that he's going to be leaving office?

**The President.** I wish him well. He served well and for a long time, and I wish him well. And he's given me a lot of very good advice. He's been very helpful.

NOTE: The exchange began at 8:49 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

## Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters During a Luncheon With Business Leaders

June 2, 1993

### Interest Rates

**The President.** Let me just make one remark. You know, once a week if at all possible I attempt to have lunch here in the White House with business leaders from around America and solicit their views and their opinions, their suggestions. These lunches have been enormously valuable to me and, I think, are helping us develop the kind of partnership with the private sector we need.

I'd just like to mention two things that I think support the economic position that I have taken and the work we're doing in the Senate. First of all, there were news stories today and yesterday pointing out that long-term interest rates are down again, the stock market is strong again in anticipation of the passage of a real deficit reduction package after the vote in the House. And that means we're taking the right course. And I'm looking forward to working with the Senate when they get back next week.

Secondly, just today we've learned that we had the largest monthly increase in new housing sales in 7 years, which is clearly the result of lower interest rates and proves the point that we've been trying to make that if we can get the deficit down, get the interest rates down, that will be the biggest job stimulus to the economy. It will put another \$100 billion back in this economy.

So there are lots of things that we have to discuss and lots of things that perhaps we can all change for the better. But at least the general direction, I think, is clearly right. And I thank these kind business leaders for coming here today, and I look forward to continuing to do this every week as long as I'm President. I think it will be very helpful to the country.

Thank you very much.

### Lani Guinier

**Q.** [*Inaudible*—nomination, Mr. President?

**The President.** Well, let me say this, I think that I have to talk to some of the Senators about it because of the reservations that have been raised both publicly and privately. I want to reaffirm two positive things about her. One is everyone concedes she is a first rate civil rights lawyer, and no real civil rights lawyer has ever held that position before, someone who made a career of it.

Secondly, I think any reasonable reading of her writings would lead someone to conclude that a lot of the attacks cannot be supported by a fair reading of the writings. And that's not to say that I agree with everything in the writings. I don't. But I think that a lot of what has been said is not accurate. On the other hand, I have to take into account where the Senate is, and I will be doing that and talking to them. And I think until I do that, I should have nothing else to say.

**NOTE:** The President spoke at 12:29 p.m. in the Old Family Dining Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

## Nomination of Ambassador to Mexico

June 2, 1993

The President declared his intention today to nominate Jim Jones, the CEO of the American Stock Exchange and former House Budget Committee chairman, to the position of Ambassador to Mexico.

"A great deal of our economic future," said the President, "is bound up in our relationships in this hemisphere, particularly our relationship with Mexico. That is why I have chosen an Ambassador who is seasoned by years of economic leadership in both the private and public sectors. Jim Jones brings a unique perspective and uncommon talents to the continuing dialog with our Mexican neighbors."

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

**Memorandum on Trade With  
Albania, Romania, and Certain States  
of the Former Soviet Union**

June 2, 1993

Presidential Determination No. 93-25

*Memorandum for the Secretary of State*

*Subject:* Determination Under Section 402  
(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as  
Amended—Continuation of Waiver  
Authority

Pursuant to section 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1)) (hereinafter “the Act”), I determine that the further extension of the waiver authority granted by section 402(c) of the Act will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act. I further determine that the continuation of the waivers applicable to Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 3.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders on  
Trade With Albania, Romania, and  
Certain States of the Former Soviet  
Union**

June 3, 1993

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

I hereby transmit the documents referred to in section 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1)) (“the Act”), with respect to a further 12-month extension of the authority to waive sections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act. These documents constitute my recommendation to continue in effect the waiver authority for a further 12-month period, and include my reasons for determining that continuation of the waiver authority and

waivers currently in effect for Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

Sincerely,

**Bill Clinton**

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

**Exchange With Reporters in  
Frederick, Maryland**

June 3, 1993

***The Economic Plan***

**Q.** Mr. President, speaking of construction, should Lani Guinier withdraw?

**The President.** I’ll have more to say about that later. But this is the most important thing I’m working on. This is the illustration of why the economic program is important. Housing sales at a 7-month high last month, creating jobs for people like this because of low mortgage rates. If we can keep the interest rates down by passing the economic program, getting the deficit down, you’re going to see a lot more jobs, a lot more homes, a lot of money putting into this economy. That’s the real important thing that this administration was elected to do and that’s what I’m working on.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:11 a.m. while the President was touring a house under construction in Fredericktown Village.

**Remarks at Fredericktown Village in  
Frederick**

June 3, 1993

Thank you very much. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and good morning, boys and girls. It’s great to be here in Frederick today. I want to thank Roger Glunt, the

President of the National Association of Home Builders, for being here and for his support of our economic program, as well as the support of homebuilders and realtors all across America who understand what we can do for the American economy if we can get interest rates down and keep them there.

I want to thank the Murrays for giving me a tour of their home before it was finished. One of the things I did in my former life, back when I had one—[laughter]—when I was a young man, was engage in a little bit of homebuilding. That's hard work. And I'm glad to see somebody else doing it back there. But they did a great job. I want to say thanks to the Dragers and the Fishmans and the Taylors, the other families here on this circle who showed me their home and talked to me a little bit about their lives. I want to thank Jim Johnson for being here and for the wonderful job that he does at Fanny Mae to help finance homes and make the American dream come real for Americans. And I want to say thanks to Don Meade, the construction site supervisor, who hasn't spoken today. That will make him the most popular person here. I thank him for showing me around.

Ladies and gentlemen, last year when I was out campaigning for the job I now hold, I think all of us realized that our country was in a period of short-term recession, which it lasted for about 3 years, but of long-term economic problems brought on by some economic competition from other countries around the world and from some problems that we had created for ourselves and that it was impossible to point the blame at one person, that both parties in Washington were to blame, but that it was absolutely clear that we couldn't keep going the way we were going, where the deficit was going up and up and up every year, so our debts were piling higher.

In 12 years, 12 years, we went from a \$1 trillion to a \$4 trillion national debt. And the deficit was over \$300 billion a year. And at the same time, we were reducing our investment in the things that make us a rich country: in incentives for people to build houses, in new technologies to compete with other countries, in the education, and training of our work force.

So what I tried to do was to turn that around. It seemed to me that the faith—we had to begin was to bring down the deficit with a combination of tough spending cuts and tax increases that would be mostly on those who had been more successful, whose taxes had gone down and were in higher income groups.

This plan that I have presented to Congress does that. But I want to emphasize to you—I'll talk a little more about the details in a moment—but why would the homebuilders be here supporting it if it were bad for business and bad for America. They wouldn't be. They're here because all these people building these houses need jobs, and we need more people like them working. And if people can work, we wouldn't have half the problems we've got in this country.

Six million Americans are employed in the housing and related industry. Homebuilding is critical to our future and critical to the dreams of millions of American families. A year ago, less than half of the American people under the age of 35 thought they had a good chance to buy a home. Today, over 70 percent of them do. And there's one clear reason: lower long-term interest rates, which make mortgage rates as low as they've been in 20 years.

If you think about it, mortgage rates currently are at about 7.5 percent. Now, if someone had a home mortgage at 10 percent and they refinance that at 7.5 percent, in the very first year of the refinancing, they'd save \$2,100. That is way over twice as much in one year as the same family, let's say, a family with an income of \$40,000 to \$60,000 would pay in new taxes under the energy tax in 4 years under our program.

That is the key to this whole thing. A balanced approach, cut spending, raise money from people who can afford it, minimize the burden on the middle class, but ask people to pay something, but give them back low interest rates, more jobs, and a growing economy. That is the idea, and the critical thing is the interest rates.

Every time mortgage rates go down a point, an additional 350,000 people are able to buy homes. In November, shortly after the election, our administration announced a serious attempt to reduce the deficit based on

spending cuts, targeted revenue increases. Long-term interest rates started to drop. They've dropped almost one full point since the election. Last week, after the House of Representatives adopted the economic program, they dropped again, and the stock market went up again because people who control these decisions began to believe again that we could take control of our destiny and really move America forward.

You've already heard some of these specific ideas, but let me just reiterate. In this bill there aren't just tax increases; there are spending cuts, \$100 billion in the entitlement areas, and another \$150 billion in 200 specific cuts in other areas, including a reduction in the size of the Federal Government by 150,000 employees over the next 4 years, an across-the-board cut of 14 percent in the administrative costs of Government, and hundreds of other specific cuts in spending.

But there are also some incentives in this program which are important. The small business community, some of you would be in that, have been asking for years to increase the expensing provisions in the tax code so they could write off \$25,000 a year, not \$10,000 a year, if they invested in their business to make it more productive. That's in this provision.

Larger businesses who invest a lot of money in new plant and new equipment, which put people to work, have been asking for years for us to change the minimum tax provisions so they won't have to pay taxes on investments they make to put people to work. And we did that in this tax bill, and that will put people to work.

People in real estate have been asking for years that they simply be treated on what are called their passive losses, like people in every other business in the United States of America. And that is in this tax bill, and that will put people to work. These things will create jobs.

Maybe most important of all, for something I care a lot about, I'll bet you that more than half the people in this audience from time to time in the last 10 or 15 years, have complained about the welfare system and have said sometimes there seems like there are more incentives to stay on welfare than off. Well, let me tell you something else this

bill does. Some people stay on welfare rather than work 40 hours a week, because if they take a minimum wage job and go to work, they've got to pay somebody for child care; they don't have any health insurance, so they go back on welfare; you pay it through Medicaid, and they can stay home with the kids. It's not because the welfare check is big, it's because of the child care and the medical benefits. This tax bill says that, look, we're going to favor work over welfare forever. If you go to work, you work 40 hours a week, you have a child in your house, the tax system will lift you out of poverty. We're going to favor work over welfare. That's a very important thing that this tax bill does.

Now, next week the United States Senate is coming back into session, and we have to pass this bill in the Senate. Many Senators and many House Members and the President would like to pass the bill with even fewer taxes and more spending cuts, and we're going to look for that. But let me remind you, look at the results already. The most important thing is to pass a bill that has real deficit reduction, real spending cuts, put it all in a trust fund so the money can't go to anything else, and no tax increases without the spending cuts, and keep the interest rates down. That is what is important here.

I have been overwhelmed—yesterday I had lunch again, as I do about every week with a lot of business executives who themselves will have to pay the lion's share of the tax bill. Over 60 percent of this money will come from people with annual incomes in excess of \$200,000, over 75 percent of it from people in the top 7 percent of the income bracket. And most of them are willing to pay as long as they know the interest rates will go down because the deficit is going down. So I think it's important to say, yes, let's shoot for more spending cuts and less taxes, but let's pass the bill and get the deficit down.

I want to just leave you with this. New home sales last month reached a 7-year high in April, 7-year high. That's worth doing. Mortgage rates are at a 20-year low. That's worth keeping. Well, I ask you, let's don't take our eye off the ball. It is estimated that in this year alone, if we can keep these interest rates down at this level, it will put \$100 billion back into the American economy, in

people refinancing their mortgages, refinancing business loans, lower consumer loans, lower college loans, lower car rates. That's what we've got to do.

I ask for your support. I ask for your support not on a partisan basis but to rebuild the American economy. There is no party label; there's just jobs and incomes behind this. We've got to grow this economy.

I thank the people on this stage and all of you for being here today to make that point. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:12 a.m. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

### Exchange With Reporters in Frederick

June 3, 1993

**The President.** [*Inaudible*]—deficit down to keep these interest rates low. Here at this place, people understand low deficits means lower interest rates, more jobs and more money in middle class people's pockets. That's what's going to happen.

**Q.** You seemed more adamant and forceful in your speech today.

**Q.** Mr. President, why did you come to Republican territory?

**The President.** This is an illustration of what really counts. Coming here today and being able to put the charts and the words and the numbers with real jobs, real homes, and real people's lives is what really makes this go for me. And this is what I got elected to do. This is why I ran for President. And I'm doing my best to give real opportunity and hope back to the American people.

**Q.** But Mr. President, why did you come to someplace where you didn't—

**Q.** —back off with the Btu tax?

**Q.** It's Republican territory.

**Q.** Why did you come to someplace where you didn't succeed in November? You only got 32 percent of the vote here.

**The President.** Doesn't matter, because even here I wanted to make the point that it's not a partisan issue. I mean, I don't know that a majority of the homebuilders in America or a majority of the realtors in America voted for me in November. Most of them

were probably Republicans. But the homebuilders and the realtors, as a group, nationwide, are supporting this program because it's good for the economy; it means jobs; it means lower interest payments for middle class people, for businesses; and it means economic opportunities. And I wanted to illustrate that this is not a partisan issue. It's a bipartisan effort to move this economy forward.

**Q.** Is it still an uphill battle in the Senate, sir?

**The President.** I'm encouraged. I feel good about it.

**Q.** Is Lani Guinier a partisan issue, sir?

[*At this point, the President continued greeting people and then the exchange continued.*]

**The President.** [*Inaudible*]—and some—if there can be—if there are more cuts, and we're all trying to agree with that.

**Q.** What's the status—

**Q.** Do you think that Lani Guinier deserves a public Senate hearing?

**The President.** I'm here to talk about jobs and the economy today.

**Q.** Hi. I'm State Senator Jack Derr. We're happy to have you here in Frederick today.

**The President.** Good to see you.

**Q.** Are you reconsidering keeping her, sir?

**Q.** Are you afraid it's going to look like you're cutting and running in the face of Senate opposition?

**The President.** You can't have it both ways, folks. You can't say that I'm brave to the point of being crazy for offering an economic plan that raises taxes, cuts spending, and changes things, and for taking on issues like gays in the military and then say we're cutting and running. This administration has taken more tough positions on more tough issues earlier than any one I can remember. So I don't think you can have that both ways. This is an idea issue, and I will have more to say about it later.

**Q.** Are you going to have a speech, Mr. President, this afternoon?

**The President.** Lower interest rates and real growth. That's what people who don't have jobs are worried about.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 11:30 a.m. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

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

### **Memorandum on Trade With Bulgaria**

*June 3, 1993*

Presidential Determination No. 93-26

*Memorandum for the Secretary of State*

*Subject:* Presidential Determination Under Subsections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as Amended—Emigration Policies of the Republic of Bulgaria

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by subsections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2432(a) and 2439(a) (“the Act”), I determine that the Republic of Bulgaria is not in violation of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection 402(a) of the Act, or paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection 409(a) of the Act.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

**William J. Clinton**

### **Letter to Congressional Leaders on Trade With Bulgaria**

*June 3, 1993*

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

I hereby transmit a report concerning emigration laws and policies of the Republic of Bulgaria as required by subsections 402(b) and 409(b) of Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (“the Act”) (19 U.S.C. 2432(b) and 2439(b)). I have determined that Bulgaria is in full compliance with the criteria in subsections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Act. As required by Title IV, I will provide the Congress with periodic reports regarding Bulgaria’s compliance with these emigration standards.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

### **Proclamation 6569—Suspension of Entry as Immigrants and Nonimmigrants of Persons Who Formulate or Implement Policies That Are Impeding the Negotiations Seeking the Return to Constitutional Rule in Haiti**

*June 3, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

#### **A Proclamation**

In light of the political crisis in Haiti resulting from the expulsion from Haiti of President Aristide and the constitutional government, I have determined that it is in the interests of the United States to restrict the entry to the United States of certain Haitian nationals who formulate, implement, or benefit from policies that impede the progress of the negotiations designed to restore constitutional government to Haiti, and the immediate families of such persons.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** by the power vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, hereby find that the unrestricted immigrant and nonimmigrant entry into the United States of persons described in section 1 of this proclamation would, except as provided for in sections 2 or 3 of this proclamation, be detrimental to the interests of the United States. I do therefore proclaim that:

**Section 1.** The entry into the United States as immigrants and nonimmigrants of persons who formulate, implement, or benefit from policies that impede the progress of the negotiations designed to restore constitutional government to Haiti, and the immediate family members of such persons, is hereby suspended.

**Sec. 2.** Section 1 shall not apply with respect to any person otherwise covered by section 1 where the entry of such person would not be contrary to the interests of the United States.

**Sec. 3.** Persons covered by sections 1 and 2 shall be identified pursuant to procedures established by the Secretary of State, as authorized in section 6 below.

**Sec. 4.** Nothing in this proclamation shall be construed to derogate from United States Government obligations under applicable international agreements.

**Sec. 5.** This proclamation is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until such time as the Secretary of State determines that it is no longer necessary and should be terminated.

**Sec. 6.** The Secretary of State shall have responsibility to implement this proclamation pursuant to procedures the Secretary may establish.

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

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:30 p.m., June 3, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on June 7.

### **Remarks Honoring Central State University NAIA Champion Athletic Teams**

*June 3, 1993*

Thank you. Please sit down, ladies and gentlemen. I want to welcome all of you here and especially say a word of welcome and thanks to Senator Glenn and Mrs. Glenn and their daughter. Senator Glenn made this occasion possible today.

I want to welcome a group of extraordinary student athletes, the Marauders and Lady Marauders of Central State University, winners of the NAIA championships in football as well as men and women's indoor and out-

door track and field. I want to welcome the Central State president Dr. Arthur Thomas.

These teams have been remarkably successful. First of all, Central State's football team captured the 1992 NAIA Division One national championship with a come-from-behind victory over—what school? [*Laughter*] This was no fluke. For Coach Billy Joe, named Division One Coach of the Year, it was the second time that he's won a national title in 3 years. Coach Joe has guided Central State to the playoffs for the past six seasons and to the finals for the past three. His winning formula: the three D's he preaches to his players, drive, desire, and determination. These are good words to live by not only on the playing field but here in Washington as well. That is surely what drove the senior quarterback, Henderson Moseley, to lead his team to two touchdowns in the second half of the championship, after being carried off in the first half with a severe ankle injury. I've been through that sort of campaign myself. [*Laughter*]

Coach Joe, you've earned a fourth D for the Marauders, dynasty. That's what you've put together. And I must say, I've carried a special interest in this team because you had to run over the University of Central Arkansas a couple of times in playing for these championships. So we followed it very interestingly.

Now, let me move on to track. The Marauders and the Lady Marauders this year swept the Division One national indoor and outdoor track and field championships, making history. I'm told that this is the first time any college in any league has won four outright team championships in track and field in one year. What a sweet victory, especially for Coach Josh Culbreath, a former Olympian who was also named Coach of the Year. Where is he? You come on down here.

Now, I'm told that Coach Culbreath is known as Pop, although he doesn't look old enough to be my pop. [*Laughter*] He came out of retirement 4 years ago to revitalize track and field at Central State. It's amazing what somebody can accomplish in just 4 years.

This was the first national title in both indoor and outdoor track. At the indoor championship, they captured the title by winning

the mile relay in the final event. They also swept the 600-yard run behind the winning pace of team member Neil DeSilva. This young man went on to clock winning times in both the 200- and 400-meter dash, to help them win the outdoor championship.

The Lady Marauders took their indoor title and also their first, winning 6 out of 16 events with record-setting performance and double wins by both Carolyn Sterling and Sherdon Smith. Outdoors, the Lady Marauders claimed their third consecutive NAIA championship, a "threepeat." Dionne Hemming set a world record for the 400-meter hurdles on her way to earning the title of Most Outstanding Female Performer. Jumping hurdles can also be a useful skill in this city. But I understand Dionne could not be with us here today because she's in Spain.

On behalf of our Nation, let me salute all of you for your fine performances. You are teams with truly a proven track record. As student athletes at an historically African-American institution, you can be proud of your many achievements. Your drive and your desire and your determination are an example for all Americans.

I want to congratulate both the coaches, give them a chance to say something. And thank you again, Senator Glenn, for bringing them here today to the Rose Garden.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

### **Remarks Announcing Withdrawal of the Nomination of Lani Guinier and an Exchange With Reporters**

*June 3, 1993*

**The President.** Good evening. It is with deep regret that I am announcing tonight the withdrawal of the nomination of Lani Guinier to be Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

Earlier this evening I met with Ms. Guinier to talk through the issues that prompted my decision. I told her that had I known all along the intense controversy this nomination would inspire I would not have asked her to undergo the ordeal, and I am sorry that she has suffered as much as she has.

At the time of the nomination I had not read her writings. In retrospect, I wish I had. Today, as a matter of fairness to her, I read some of them again in good detail. They clearly lend themselves to interpretations that do not represent the views that I expressed on civil rights during my campaign and views that I hold very dearly, even though there is much in them with which I agree. I have to tell you that had I read them before I nominated her, I would not have done so.

Now, I want to make it clear that that is not to say that I agree with all the attacks on her. She has been subject to a vicious series of willful distortions on many issues, including the quota issue. And that has made this decision all the more difficult.

The Lani Guinier I know is a person of high integrity, great intellect, strong character, and a superb civil rights record. That's why I nominated her. I agree with civil rights leaders and members of the Congressional Black Caucus that she is a wonderful lawyer. And I want all of you to know that if this nomination could be fought out on her character or her record as a civil rights lawyer, I would stay with it to the end, if we didn't get but one or two votes in the Senate.

It is not the fear of defeat that has prompted this decision. It is the certainty that the battle would be carried on a ground that I could not defend. The dilemma with which I have struggled basically comes down to this: Should we have proceeded with a confirmation battle that would give her more ample opportunity to clarify her views but would guarantee a bloody and divisive conflict over civil rights based on ideas that I, as President, could not defend.

Because the controversy over her academic writings includes mischaracterizations, this battle, unfortunately, has already polarized our country. My campaign for the Presidency was based on trying to unite Americans on the basis of race, opportunity, and responsibility, the idea that we could all work together to reach common solutions. And I regret very much the bitterness and the divisiveness which has occurred already.

I am well aware that this withdrawal will upset many people in this country who believe in Lani and had hoped that she might be confirmed. I can only pledge to them that I will continue to work, as I have for nearly 20 years, for the cause of civil rights and that I want an administration second to none in its dedication to civil rights.

I will be consulting promptly with the Attorney General and with other Members of the Senate and House committees and with civil rights leaders about a replacement for Lani. I hope to have an announcement in the next few days. In the meantime, I want to again say I take full responsibility for what has happened here. I want to express my sorrow about what has happened to Lani Guinier and to say again I think that she is one of the ablest civil rights lawyers I have ever known, and I wish this battle could be fought over that rather than ideas that I myself cannot embrace.

**Q.** Mr. President, Attorney General Reno has been a staunch defender of Ms. Guinier. Did she urge you to keep her on, or is she fully on board with your decision to abandon this nomination?

**The President.** I believe she is. I would urge you to talk to her about that.

**Q.** Mr. President, could you just give us an idea of what part of her writings you really had trouble with?

**The President.** Yes, I can give you an idea. In the Michigan Law Review there was an article. Lani analyzed the weaknesses of the present remedies available under the Voting Rights Act—and many of her analyses I agree with—but seemed to be arguing for principles of proportional representation in minority veto as general remedies that I think are inappropriate as general remedies and antidemocratic, very difficult to defend.

Now, the Supreme Court has obviously changed the law on that, but the whole thrust of that kind of argument, it seems to me, is inconsistent with the arguments that I tried to make to members of all races all during my campaign.

**Q.** Mr. President, what part did your friendship, yours and Mrs. Clinton's, with Guinier play in your decision to nominate her and perhaps in your decision—or your ne-

glect of her record at the time that you did nominate her?

**The President.** Well, Hillary played no role in this nomination or this decision and so deserves no blame or credit for it. But the fact that I have known her since law school and had actually seen her in action as a civil rights practitioner played a very large role in my desire to nominate her. That is, I thought it would be not only interesting, but positive to have, for the first time, someone who had been a career civil rights lawyer head that division.

And frankly, I think the fact that I had known her and cared about her and admired her probably contributed to the way this thing has been handled in a kind of a drawn-out fashion. And it may be the adequacy or inadequacy of the briefings I received about this issue is partly based on the assumption that I must have known everything she'd written about since I knew her as a lawyer. I think that's probably true.

**Q.** Mr. President, there's a perception among some of your critics among the Black Caucus that your move to the center and your desire to have conservative Democratic votes in the Senate for your economic plan, and your health plan to come, played a large role in this. And they are saying—Craig Washington said, for instance, today, that he was with you in the House vote on the economic plan but won't be with you because of your decision to, in his view, cut and run on Lani Guinier. What do you say to those people and how—

**The President.** I would say two things. Number one, this is about my center, not about the political center. I will say again, I would gladly fight this nomination to the last moment, if nobody wanted to vote her, nobody, if it were on the grounds that I could defend. If somebody said, "You know, she sued the State of Arkansas, and she sued all these other people, and she came out for remedies in her law practice that weren't right, and she ran over this group and that group," I would say, "Fine, let's fight this thing out. You know, I know that. I have personal knowledge of that. You are wrong." And if everybody in the Senate disagreed with me, I would stay with it to the bitter end.

The problem is that this battle will be waged based on her academic writings. And I cannot fight a battle that I know is divisive, that is an uphill battle, that is distracting to the country, if I do not believe in the ground of the battle. That is the only problem. This has nothing to do with a political center. This has to do with my center.

Now, let me say about Craig Washington, whatever he does for the rest of his life, I'll be grateful to him for what he did and what he said in fighting that economic problem through. I know how strongly he feels about it. I can tell you, I received—if any—there's pressure over the issue. I got more pressure to stay with this than to drop it. But in the end, I had to do what I thought was right. Whether I am right or wrong, I tell you tonight, I have done what I think is right.

*Q.* Mr. President, did she agree with you?

*Q.* Did she agree with you?

*Q.* Has she withdrawn or are you withdrawing her?

**The President.** I am—I think you'd better ask her what she said.

*Q.* Well, if she comes—have you withdrawn her name?

**The President.** Well, she's in town and we've—I think she'll probably have a statement later tonight. I have no idea what she will say.

*Q.* Did she ask you not to withdraw her name, sir?

**The President.** Well, you know what she wanted. She wanted her hearing. But she was surprised that I felt the way I did. You know, this is the first long, detailed conversation we've had about it. It was a very painful thing between two people who have liked and admired each other a long time. This was one of the most difficult meetings I've ever had in my life. But I did what I thought was right.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:05 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

### **Statement on Sanctions Against Haiti** *June 4, 1993*

One of the cornerstones of our foreign policy is to support the global march toward democracy and to stand by the world's new democracies. The promotion of democracy,

which not only reflects our values but also increases our security, is especially important in our own hemisphere. As part of that goal, I consider it a high priority to return democracy to Haiti and to return its democratically elected President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, to his office.

We should recall Haiti's strides toward democracy just a few years back. Seven years ago, tired of the exploitative rule that had left them the poorest nation in our hemisphere, the Haitian people rose up and forced the dictator Jean-Claude Duvalier to flee. In December 1990, in a remarkable exercise of democracy, the Haitian people held a free and fair election, and two-thirds of them voted for President Aristide.

Nineteen months ago, however, that progress toward democracy was thwarted when the Haitian military illegally and violently ousted President Aristide from office. Since taking office in January, the United States Government has worked steadily with the international community in an effort to restore President Aristide and democracy to Haiti. The OAS and United Nations Special Envoy, Dante Caputo, has demonstrated great dedication and tenacity. To support Mr. Caputo's effort, Secretary of State Christopher in March named U.S. Ambassador Lawrence Pezzullo as our Special Adviser for Haiti.

We and the international community have made progress. The presence of the International Civilian Mission has made a concrete contribution to human rights in Haiti. Mr. Caputo's consultations with all the parties indicated that a negotiated solution is possible.

Unfortunately, the parties in Haiti have not been willing to make the decisions or take the steps necessary to begin democracy's restoration. And while they seek to shift responsibility, Haiti's people continue to suffer.

In light of their own failure to act constructively, I have determined that the time has come to increase the pressure on the Haitian military, the de facto regime in Haiti and their supporters.

The United States has been at the forefront of the international community's efforts

to back up the U.N./OAS negotiations with sanctions and other measures. Beginning in October 1991, we froze all Haitian Government assets in the United States and prohibited unlicensed financial transactions with Haitian persons. Today, I am acting to strengthen those existing provisions in several ways.

First, I have signed a proclamation pursuant to Section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act prohibiting the entry into the U.S. of Haitian nationals who impede the progress of negotiations designed to restore constitutional government to Haiti and of the immediate relatives of such persons. The Secretary of State will determine the persons whose actions are impeding a solution to the Haitian crisis. These people will be barred from entering the United States.

Second, pursuant to the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and the Executive orders on the Haiti emergency, I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to designate as "specially designated nationals" those Haitians who act for or on behalf of the junta, or who make material, financial, or commercial contributions to the de facto regime or the Haitian armed forces. In effect, this measure will freeze the personal assets of such persons subject to U.S. jurisdiction and bar them from conducting any transactions whatsoever with the individuals and entities named.

Third, I have directed Secretary Christopher to consult with the OAS and its member states on ways to enhance enforcement of the existing OAS sanctions program. And I have directed Secretary Christopher and Ambassador Albright to consult with the U.N. and member states on the possibility of creating a worldwide sanctions program against Haiti.

Sanctions alone do not constitute a solution. The surest path toward the restoration of democracy in Haiti is a negotiated solution that assures the safety of all parties. We will therefore strongly support a continuation and intensification of the negotiating effort. We will impress on all parties the need to take seriously their own responsibilities for a successful resolution to this impasse.

Our policy on Haiti is not a policy for Haiti alone. It is a policy in favor of democracy

everywhere. Those who seek to derail a return to constitutional government, whether in Haiti or Guatemala, must recognize that we will not be swayed from our purpose.

At the same time, individuals should not have to fear that supporting democracy's restoration will ultimately put their own safety at risk. Those who have opposed President Aristide in the past should recognize that, once President Aristide has returned, we and the rest of the international community will defend assiduously their legitimate political rights.

It is my hope that the measures we have announced today will encourage greater effort and flexibility in the negotiations to restore democracy and President Aristide to Haiti.

### **Proclamation 6570—National Safe Boating Week, 1993**

*June 4, 1993*

*By the President of the United States  
of America*

#### **A Proclamation**

Nearly 70 million Americans enjoy recreational boating as a favorite pastime. America's scenic lakes, beautiful rivers, and vast waterways provide a wonderful place for boaters to enjoy family outings, waterskiing, fishing, and other activities. It is appropriate that we recognize the many joys recreational boating affords. At the same time, because recreational boating can involve risks to persons, property, and natural resources, it is also important that we reflect upon ways to ensure safe boating.

The U.S. Coast Guard, the National Safe Boating Council, and the many State and local recreational boating organizations allied in the cause of safe boating have chosen "Boat Smart" as the theme of National Safe Boating Week. This theme serves as a reminder to the millions of Americans who engage in recreational boating that this activity should be enjoyed in a thoughtful, responsible manner. Many Americans can benefit from preparation and caution: taking boating safety courses; wearing personal flotation de-

vices; following the “Rules of the Road”; and not using alcohol or drugs when operating boats. Young boaters learn safe boating practices by example, and today’s boating practices may affect the well-being of American families for years to come.

Boating is an activity that directly affects our precious national water resources and associated wildlife. Boaters must carefully preserve and protect our rivers, lakes, seashores, and wildlife by avoiding practices that give rise to accidents, injuries, and pollution. Today’s boaters must take care to preserve our precious waterways for future generations.

For all of these reasons, I call upon boating Americans, during National Safe Boating Week, 1993, to reflect on the importance of safe boating to the health of our people and the preservation of our natural resources. We must commit ourselves to safe and environmentally sensitive boating—for now and for the future.

To promote boating as a safe sport, the Congress, by joint resolution approved June 4, 1958 (36 U.S.C. 161), as amended, has authorized and requested that the President annually proclaim the week beginning on the first Sunday in June as “National Safe Boating Week.”

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning June 6, 1993, as National Safe Boating Week. I encourage the Governors of the 50 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and officials of other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to provide for the observance of this week with appropriate activities. I urge all Americans to become informed boaters and to enjoy safe, thoughtful recreational boating.

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

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:21 p.m., June 4, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on June 8.

## **Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Budget Rescissions**

*June 4, 1993*

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

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report six proposed rescissions, totaling \$176.0 million in budgetary resources.

These proposed rescissions affect the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Transportation. The details of the proposed rescissions are contained in the attached reports.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

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

## **Statement by the Press Secretary on the President’s Task Force on National Health Care Reform**

*June 4, 1993*

On January 25, 1993, the President announced the creation of a Task Force on National Health Care Reform. The President asked the task force to provide him with proposals for comprehensive health care reform. The President also announced on January 25 the creation of an interdepartmental working group that would gather and analyze information and options for the task force.

In over 20 meetings held during April and May, the task force reviewed materials it received from the interdepartmental working group, formulated proposals and options for health care reform, and presented those proposals and options to the President. Each of those task force meetings was noticed in the *Federal Register*.

Having completed its mission, the task force terminated on May 30, as provided in its charter.

The President is now in the process of reviewing the proposals he has received from the task force and choosing from among the

policy options that have been presented to him.

---

### **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.

---

#### **May 29**

In the morning, the President traveled to West Point, NY, and returned to Andrews Air Force Base, MD, later that afternoon. The President and Hillary Clinton then traveled to Camp David, MD, where they remained overnight.

#### **May 31**

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton returned to the White House. Later in the morning, the President visited Arlington National Cemetery, VA, where he placed a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. In the afternoon, the President participated in a wreath laying ceremony at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

#### **June 1**

In the morning, the President traveled to Milwaukee, WI, and returned to Washington, DC, in the evening.

The White House announced that the President signed H.R. 1378, Making Technical Corrections in Defense-Related Laws.

The White House announced the public access to the White House electronic mail system.

#### **June 2**

In the morning, the President went to Watts Branch Park where he and former Georgetown University classmates participated in a clean-up project sponsored by the Marshall Heights Community Development Organization.

#### **June 3**

In the morning, the President traveled to Frederick, MD, and returned to the White House in the afternoon.

#### **June 4**

In the afternoon, the President met with the Vice President, Justice Department officials, and civil rights leaders.

The White House announced that the President sent to the Congress requests for FY 1993 supplemental appropriations.

---

### **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 June 1**

Jean Kennedy Smith, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

---

### **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 May 29**

Transcript of a press briefing by Chief of Staff Thomas F. (Mack) McLarty and Counselor to the President David Gergen

#### **Released June 1**

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's signing of H.R. 1378, Making Technical Corrections in Defense-Related Laws

Announcement by the Office of Presidential Correspondence on public access to the White House electronic mail system

**Released June 2**

Transcript of a press briefing by Senior Adviser for Policy and Strategy George Stephanopoulos

List of business leaders attending the President's weekly CEO luncheon

**Released June 3**

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's planned meeting with Lani Guinier

**Released June 4**

Transcript of a press briefing by Senior Adviser for Policy and Strategy George Stephanopoulos

Announcement of transmittal of supplemental appropriations requests

List of officials and civil rights leaders meeting with the President

---

**Acts Approved  
by the President**

---

**Approved May 31**

H.J. Res. 80 / Public Law 103-34

Designating May 30, through June 7, as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II"

H.R. 1378 / Public Law 103-35

To amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the applicability of qualification requirements for certain acquisition workforce positions in the Department of Defense, to make necessary technical corrections in that title and certain other defense-related laws, and to facilitate real property repairs at military installations and minor military construction during fiscal year 1993