

Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, August 23, 1993  
Volume 29—Number 33  
Pages 1619–1650

## Contents

### Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings  
Community in Alameda, CA—1622  
Heroes of the Midwest flooding, tribute in St. Louis, MO—1619  
NAFTA Task Force Chairman, announcement—1640  
National Governors' Association, Tulsa, OK—1629  
Radio address—1627

### Appointments and Nominations

NAFTA Task Force Chairman—1640, 1642

### Bill Signings

Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993, statement—1626  
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Relief From the Major, Widespread Flooding in the Midwest Act of 1993, remarks—1619  
Small Business Guaranteed Credit Enhancement Act of 1993, statement—1627

### Communications to Congress

Chemical and biological weapons proliferation report, letter—1648  
Cyprus conflict report, letter—1644

### Communications to Federal Agencies

Assistance to African refugees, memorandum—1643

### Communications to Federal Agencies—Continued

Assistance to Mozambican refugees, memorandum—1644  
Combined Federal Campaign, memorandum—1644

### Executive Orders

Establishment of the Domestic Policy Council—1638

### Interviews With the News Media

Exchange with reporters in the Oval Office—1640

### Proclamations

Women's Equality Day—1639

### Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings  
Democratic national health care campaign chair—1643  
NAFTA Task Force Chairman—1642  
National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry report—1643

### Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1650  
Checklist of White House press releases—1650  
Digest of other White House announcements—1649  
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1650

## 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, August 20, 1993

**Remarks on Signing Flood Relief  
Legislation at a Tribute to Flood  
Heroes in St. Louis, Missouri**

*August 12, 1993*

Thank you very much. Please be seated, and good morning, to our distinguished host, Governor Carnahan; and majority leader of the United States House, Dick Gephardt; Secretary Espy; Secretary Shalala; James Lee Witt; the distinguished other Members of Congress who are here, Congressmen Jim Talent, Alan Wheat, Jerry Costello, Ike Skelton, and Bill Emerson. To the distinguished Governor of Kansas, Joan Finney, my good friend, welcome, and to all of you from all the States who were affected by this terrible flood.

We're going to begin today by awarding 19 outstanding Americans Presidential Certificates of Commendation. These recipients are everyday people, but what they did was most extraordinary. Hillary and Chelsea and I just had the opportunity to meet them all and to talk with them a little bit about their experiences during the flood. Because of their efforts, lives were saved and larger disasters were averted. In some cases, they provided the support that kept all the other volunteers going, and that's what made the difference.

In their communities, they are mothers and fathers, business owners, police officers, and neighbors. But in this time of crisis, they risked their lives to save children and parents, to pull people from troubled waters or trapped vehicles, to feed the hungry, to provide water to people who literally could not have had safe living conditions otherwise. And most importantly, a lot of them are committed to staying involved in this for the long haul. It is so easy to forget that much of the work is still to be done.

Today we salute them and others like them. And to be sure, there are hundreds, indeed thousands of others that we might

have just as well recognized today who took on the raging rivers to stick up for their friends and neighbors and total strangers.

Now I'd like to ask the FEMA Director, James Lee Witt, to come here and present the commendations to the individuals as they are introduced and to thank him and all the State FEMA directors and all the local emergency management people for the wonderful work that they have done also in dealing with this flood.

Mr. Witt.

*[At this point, Director Witt presented the Presidential Certificates of Commendation. Gov. Mel Carnahan and Representative Richard Gephardt then made brief remarks.]*

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Please be seated. I want to thank my friend Congressman Gephardt for that generous introduction and Governor Carnahan for his fine remarks. I acknowledged Governor Finney here. I thank all the others from the other States who are here. We have the Lieutenant Governor of Nebraska, the heads of various States' National Guards and emergency management programs, representing all those who worked.

I have been now to the Midwest four times since this flood began. The Secretary of Agriculture, who was up here with me, Mike Espy, has been here probably twice that many times, if not more. And I have charged him with being responsible for the long-term cleanup efforts, so I wanted him standing up here. So when you get frustrated with the Federal Government 30 days from now, call him—*[laughter]*—and harass him. He'll be good at it.

I thank also the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Donna Shalala, who has come here with me today. Many members of my Cabinet have been here to the Midwest, and many of them have a role to play.

We are here for two reasons. The first was to honor these fine people who have received their just recognition. The second is to sign the relief package which will permit the rebuilding to begin with a significant dose of support from the Federal Government.

Throughout human history it has been the way of nature to visit us on occasion with disaster, without apparent cause, without explanation, often without mercy, always reminding us that we need to live our lives with a little more humility and always understanding that we are not in full control. How we face these misfortunes tells us a lot about ourselves and our friends. We know we cannot contain the fury of a river. But we can and we must allow our humanity to overflow as well, to help to reclaim the lives that are shattered. That is what I have seen happen here in the Midwest, from official responses and from individual responses.

The other day I had a young girl from Wisconsin in the Oval Office. You may have seen her story written up. She's 13 years old, but she's only 4 feet tall. She weighs about 60 pounds. She was born with a rare bone disease which resulted in over two dozen bone-breakings in her body before she was born. Years ago she would never have been able to live any kind of life, but because of the medical miracles of the National Institutes of Health, which she has visited once every 3 months since she was an infant, she is able to function as a student. She is able to have a semblance of a normal life. She is a delightful young person. But she still can easily break major bones in her body. And yet, she implored her parents to let her leave Wisconsin—she lives in Milwaukee—and come to Iowa to help to fight the floods, knowing that she had an imminent risk just by carrying a can of water around.

That is the sort of thing that I have seen happen. When people say to me, "Well, FEMA really did a great job this time. The Federal Government was here all the way," I say, what else could we have done in the face of that kind of contribution by ordinary Americans?

One of the reasons, frankly, that FEMA did such a good job, I think, is that the Director of FEMA has actually spent several years helping ordinary people fight disasters. He

is a friend of mine. He was a county judge in a county where all the Clintons came from. But he was not a political appointment to FEMA, he was somebody who knew what it was like to see people there risking their lives, their businesses, their livelihoods, putting sandbags against a swollen river. We need more people like that in our National Government, people who are related at the grassroots level to the real concerns of people. And we're going to try to give you that.

In this disaster, more than 45 lives were lost; 70,000 people had to be evacuated. But you all know it could have been a lot worse if it hadn't been for folks like you and the many tens of thousands who fought to make it as good as possible.

In just a minute I will sign this disaster relief bill, \$6.3 billion in Federal assistance to the victims of the flood here in the Midwest and other disasters. This is an extraordinary measure taken under extraordinary circumstances with real speed, moving through Congress with the help of suffering citizens from the Midwest and eloquent advocates for the Midwest. I would be remiss if I did not commend the legislators of both parties who put aside partisan differences and put the people of this area first in passing this bill: people who are not here, like Senator Tom Harkin from Iowa and Senator Paul Wellstone of Minnesota; people who never seek the headlines, like Senator Jim Exon of Nebraska; people who are here represented, who quietly work for you day in and day out, again, without regard to party. We finally even found something that Senator Dole and I could agree on, in this bill. [*Laughter*]

These funds will be used across a wide spectrum and delivered quickly. They'll help farmers who lost their crops. Secretary Espy will see to it that payments are made at the rate of 100 percent of approved 1993 crop losses as defined by the 1990 farm bill. The funds will also be used to repair public facilities, bridges, highways, levees, and flood control networks; to provide for the health and social service needs of flood victims, and they will be significant. I hope we will have heroes who will be attending to those who will inevitably suffer from depression, from an undefinable and almost uncontainable sense of loss as they go back and see their life savings

gone, the work of their lifetime washed away, even their family albums no longer available to them in times of sorrow. They'll be used to provide housing for the displaced; to help homeowners and businesses to clean up and rebuild; to help our dislocated workers to find new work, hopefully with even better skills.

Two billion dollars will go to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, for relief of the floods and other disasters and to provide for emergency cash relief for those who qualify for that. I'm proud to say that FEMA has enjoyed a new respect as a result of their efforts in this flood. I was especially heartened by the praise given FEMA by the Mayor of Quincy, Illinois, Chuck Scholz. His city's brave stand against the rising waters made all Americans proud. And they didn't win all their battles.

All of the help in this relief package will come free of the bonds of redtape. Disasters provide enough grief without more coming from Washington, so we've worked as hard as we could to streamline the paperwork, to cut out unnecessary delays, to work on flexibility and fairness, to help in every way that we can.

A good example of this flexibility and willingness to cut redtape is contained in another bill that I will also sign this morning, called Depository Institutions Relief Act. It doesn't mean a thing, does it? Washington language. But what the act will do is important. It will allow Federal regulators to waive certain legal requirements for financial institutions serving areas hard hit by flooding, by relaxing a few regulations in response to this emergency. We'll allow local banks to make local decisions on how best to speed up aid and credit to those who really need it.

Just this week I signed into law the largest deficit reduction package in the history of America, almost \$500 billion. There were a lot of things in that bill, which will become apparent over time, which really help ordinary Americans, including tax relief for people who work 40 hours a week and have children in their homes and still are living below the poverty line. One part of that bill is especially important today. Under it, flood victims will have more time and flexibility in replacing their homes and personal property. At

the same time, the IRS will ease tax collection requirements on those who now have to live on their insurance proceeds.

You can be sure that we will continue to review the help needed by people in this region. We are in it for the long run. As I said, Secretary Espy is our designated leader on long-term Federal involvement in the rebuilding. And if there are further problems, we'll depend upon you, directly or through your elected representatives, to let us know.

Will Rogers once said, "We can't all be heroes because somebody has to sit on the curb and clap as everybody else goes by." [Laughter] Well, that may be true. And today we have applauded 19 heroes. But we have acknowledged also that they simply represent the best of what thousands of people demonstrated. I think that we can all be heroes if we learn something from this that we carry over into the rest of our lives.

Think about Reverend Donna Harris and the people of Niota, Illinois—the spiritual nourishment and the groceries, meals, and fresh water that she provided in the tiny town of 200 for flood victims. Or Al Vogt in Glen Haven, Wisconsin, who risked his life to save a teenager, a boy being dragged by flood waters through the street, when Al saw him and pulled him to safety. The town I grew up in had a flash flood once where waters 10 feet high rushed at 30 miles an hour down the main street of town. I saw people pull babies flying in that kind of water. It is a terrifying experience. He braved it. He could have been drowned; he could have been pulled away. Sheriff Ken White helped to rescue two people, in two separate operations, from drowning. Once he had to tie himself to a truck so he could save a woman hanging on to a telephone pole.

Hearing these people, I'm reminded of what President Kennedy said of his own heroism in World War II. He said, "It was involuntary; they sank my boat." [Laughter] To be sure, for all these people heroism was involuntary. Maybe that's why the courage of daily life, in a way, is all the more to be admired, when there is no life-threatening danger, when we just are required to get up every day and to go about our business and to try to face our challenges and seize our

opportunities. That, in a way, is the enduring heroism of the American people.

It's the heroism that I believe will be embodied when the Congress comes back to town next month and passes the national service corps bill to give young people a chance to serve their communities and earn some credit toward a college education, the heroism embodied in people like the local VISTA volunteers here in St. Louis. I want to single out Delores Despiwa. She's here somewhere. Please stand, Delores. Stand up there. Her home's under water, and she's still working for other people. I want to recognize the Iowa Conservation Corps. There are some members here from the Iowa Conservation Corps. Would they stand? I think they're here. Yes. Thank you.

That is the sort of sustained service that all of us need to think about providing to our country, and the attitude of cooperation, the determination to bridge the gaps that divide us, gaps of party and religion and philosophy, to struggle for common values. In the face of a 500-year flood, that's what millions of you did here in the Middle West. And you gave us an enduring vision of your courage.

The best way for the United States to reward that courage is not only for me to sign this flood relief bill and to work with you for the long haul but for all of us to try to learn something that we can take into our daily lives from the example you set in this emergency.

A couple of nights ago, Hillary and I had the incredible honor of hosting at the White House all the commanders in chief of all of our military commands all over the world, all the four-star generals and admirals that—someone said it was a 76-star dinner, but I don't think it was because I'm not sure you can divide 76 by 4 and get an even number. *[Laughter]*

But at the dinner, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral David Jeremiah, who's become quite a good friend of mine, came up to me and said, "You know, you can't roll up your sleeves if you're wringing your hands." An interesting statement, isn't it? When the floods were coming no one had time to wring their hands, so they just automatically rolled up their sleeves. When

the floods go away, we have time to wring our hands, so a lot of us don't roll up our sleeves. Let us honor the heroes here today by firm resolve to go back about the business of our daily lives as Americans, rolling up our sleeves and not wringing our hands.

Thank you very much.

I would like now to ask the Members of the United States Congress who are here to come up on the stage and join me as I sign this bill.

*[At this point, the President signed the bill.]*

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. at the Henry VIII Hotel. H.R. 2667, approved August 12, was assigned Public Law No. 103-75. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

## **Remarks to the Community in Alameda, California**

*August 13, 1993*

Thank you very much, Secretary Perry, Admiral Ruck, Admiral Briggs, Secretary of the Navy Dalton, Acting Secretary of the Army Shannon. The other people on this platform with me are essential to the partnership that I seek to establish and continue here today: Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown, who has been instructed by me to head the administration's efforts to develop a specific strategy to revitalize the California economy; the United States Senators from California, Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer; and your Congressman and the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Ron Dellums. I am glad to be here with all of them.

To the distinguished military officers to my right and most of all to those of you who are here from the United States Navy, from the Marine Corps, the United States Army, and from the Coast Guard, it is an honor to be here with you in the shadow of this magnificent aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Carl Vinson*, and just off to my left here, a ship that I helped to launch, the U.S.S. *Arkansas*, back in a former life of mine. It's wonderful to see the ship again and to see the flag of

my State and the flag of my country waving there.

I come here, first of all and foremost, to thank all of you, those of you in uniform and those of you who have worked to support those in uniform, for being genuine patriots, for helping to win the cold war, for making a difference in the lives of all Americans and billions of people around the world. You have done the right thing by your country.

As a result of that, it has become possible, indeed it has become necessary, to downsize the defense establishment of the United States and to, more importantly, reorganize so it can maintain its dominance in a world that is new and different but still quite dangerous and very much uncertain.

The one thing we must never do is to lose the ability to recruit and maintain the best trained, the best educated, most highly motivated men and women in the Armed Forces in the entire world. The other thing we must never do is to lose our capacity to train them and to give them the finest, most technologically advanced weaponry of offense and defense available in the world.

In order to accomplish those tasks, it is inevitable that as we downsize defense, we must not only reduce the numbers of people coming into the Armed Forces, not only reduce some of the money we have been spending on weapons systems, we have to reduce the base structure of our Armed Forces. If we do not do it at an appropriate level, we will wind up underspending on the education and training and support systems for the men and women in the service, underspending on the important research and development and weaponry we must have in order to maintain our own national security and our capacity to lead the world.

Nonetheless, when a base closing is announced, it means a difficult transition for the people in uniform and, very often, even more for the people in the community. I know that because I have been through a very traumatic one in my own State, when an Air Force base was closed in a community that had 15 percent unemployment when the closing was announced.

I come here today not only to say what I have said about why these things are happening but also to talk about what we can

do together to help all of you cope with this change and to help this place and all these people come out winners in the end.

The wave of change that has washed over our shores has caused this shifting military structure. It has also opened up dramatic new opportunities in a global economy, if we have the vision and courage to seize those opportunities.

One of the things that we have not done very well is to frankly face the future and to plan aggressively for change, to give every person in this country a chance to live up to his or her God-given potential even in the face of change. You heard Secretary Perry quoting President Kennedy, "Those who think only of the past and the present will miss the future." That has happened. In a world that is changing as rapidly as ours is, people lose the opportunities they now have not just because of defense cutbacks but because of other changes in the global economy. It is absolutely critical if we are going to secure a better future for these young boys and girls that the Navy and the Marine Corps have helped to get off to a better start in life, to stay off drugs, in school, to be learners. We have got to learn to adapt to change and plan for it.

Let us first say clearly what you already know. This base and others like it, announced in the last round of base closings, will not actually shut down for several years. But if we wait until then to plan what happens to the people in and out of uniform and to the resources here, we will absolutely ensure a period of economic dislocation that need not occur.

Those of you in the military face the uncertainty of relocation. Others are wondering whether they will find a new job or what the future will bring. As I said, as Governor I went through this when we lost several thousand jobs in the Arkansas delta, which was the poorest area in the United States with the highest unemployment rate. I can report to you that if there is a good, aggressive partnership, good things can happen. There are hundreds of new and different and higher paying jobs in that community today because of what the local folks did working with the State and making the most of what we were

given by the National Government. But I think we can do even better.

I make this pledge to you. The men and women who won the cold war will not be left out in the cold by a grateful Nation. If we are smart, imaginative, and creative, if the Federal Government listens to people at the grassroots level and moves this vast national bureaucracy in the interests of the people rather than the priorities and the prerogatives of those who govern the bureaucratic levers, we can move forward.

Nobody knows better what kind of future you can build than your own people. Just this morning, I found imaginative ideas in your local newspaper for urging the base to form closer ties to the growing economies of Asia. That's a good idea, the fastest growing region of the world.

Our plan for reusing military bases is community centers. The vision for the future is up to you. Our job is to give you the tools to build a future, whether you are individual service men and women who deserve a right to a good relocation or, if you leave the service, an adequate opportunity to increase your skills, your income, and your future, or whether you're staying behind here in this community and you want to grow the economy and find opportunity.

Last month, as Secretary Perry said, I announced a five-part, \$5 billion action plan to help to turn closing military bases into engines of economic opportunity. We will respond rapidly and spend money wisely. We will not just give speeches. We will act.

Indeed, before I came here today I met with your local community commission devoted to revitalizing the economy of the area, and I listened to them. Presidents would do better if they spent more time listening to people at the grassroots levels. And that's one of the lessons I'm trying to learn and teach to Washington.

When a base closes, henceforward our first priority will be to create jobs and promote economic development. Every one of the changes will be directed toward providing jobs for the people who live here and their neighbors. Believe it or not, putting jobs first is a change in Federal policy. Even though we have been downsizing the defense establishment since 1987, that has not been the

priority until this administration passed a new policy.

Right now, believe it or not, the law actually requires the Government to charge communities full price for a closed military base if it is used for job creation and economic development. But the Government can give away a military base if it's used for recreational purposes. Well, people who are out of work have too much time for recreation. Let's put people to work first and then provide for their recreation.

Earlier today I met with this community commission representing you so well and announced an example of our jobs-first policy. For years the port of Oakland has been trying to lease 200 acres of Navy property at the Oakland Naval Supply Center so that it could expand. For years there was a stalemate. Today I announced that that property will be rented out, much of it for \$1 a year. That will create hundreds of good jobs.

To make the port a magnet for shipping and commerce we must deepen the channel. For years environmental concerns have slowed this process. I have directed the Army Corps of Engineers, the EPA, and all other concerned agencies to get on with it and to act as quickly as possible to resolve the issues so that we can dredge the channel and bring more opportunity to the people who live here.

Under the leadership of your Congressman, Ron Dellums, the people who formed the East Bay Conversion and Reinvestment Commission, with whom I met this morning, are already planning for a better and a brighter and a much more different future. Our administration has already provided \$70,000 to hire staff and start the work of this commission. Now we can say that we will provide up to \$3.5 million to plan for the East Bay of tomorrow. And we will begin now. We will not wait until the dislocations occur.

We've got to avoid the problems that others have faced in the past, problems that I faced when I was a Governor. Environmental cleanup is often dragged on for years. But my EPA Administrator, Carol Browner, has already met with this commission and has set firm deadlines for the cleanup. We've appointed local coordinators here in the East

Bay to bust the bureaucracy, to slash through the redtape.

The East Bay has the potential to be a magnet for technology, for aviation, for manufacturing. Alameda County is the home of some of the world's finest research laboratories, Lawrence Livermore, Lawrence Berkeley and the University of California at Berkeley. We have a technology reinvestment project for defense conversion that is already drawing high-tech firms into partnerships with these institutions. If we succeed, this military axis could be transformed into a thriving, high-tech commercial hub, a high-tech gateway to Asia and beyond.

Here at the Naval Air Station you already have a wealth of facilities that can be converted into commercial use: an aircraft painting facility that meets Federal and State pollution rules. Now they paint fighter jets. Why not commercial planes? You have a state-of-the-art hush room used to test jet engines. Why not private jet engines? If we use our imagination, our energy, our creativity, this naval base and those around it now serving our freedom can and will thrive in the pursuit of commercial excellence.

In the technology reinvestment initiative, we have already received over 8,000 new proposals to put the American people to work in a peacetime economy, and almost 3,000 of them have come from the State of California alone. The future is out there waiting for us, if we have the courage and vision to seize it.

Within 60 days after the Congress finalizes the base closing list, the Departments of Labor and Commerce will have a SWAT team on the ground here in Alameda, specialists whose marching orders will be to work with people, train them, counsel them, and help them find a future. When the time comes, we will put into place a reemployment center here on the base to help with everything from job training to résumé writing, to create a new jobs data base so that for the first time people can actually call on a computer and find all the jobs available in the near area. And they will make sure that you have access to as much training in high-tech fields as you need.

I have directed the Navy to hold a special west coast conference here in the Bay area

on October 26th and 27th to help community leaders plan for base reuse in their future. At that meeting there will be leaders from communities throughout the country which have already gone through base closures and have actually come out creating more jobs than they have lost. And they did it without the kind of support that we are now providing.

None of these changes will be easy, but we only have one choice. We can make this work to help people, or let the future take its course. I think the choice is clear. The world of global competition which we now face requires us, in order to make our next century a great one, to put our economic house in order. That means we live in an economy where capital, money, is mobile—can fly all over the world in a second—where commerce is global. Our wealth depends more than anything else on the skills of our people and our ingenuity in working together and investing in areas of high return.

That's why I fought so hard to get control of our economy again by the record deficit reduction package that the Congress passed last week. That's why I will propose a health care plan next month to provide affordable health care and security to all American families, because it's bad for business for us to spend 35 percent more on health care than any other nation in the world, insure 40 million fewer of our people than we would if we had any other system in the world, and constantly risk the security of millions of families and at the same time put our business in bad shape. In the private sector most American workers have given up their wage increases for the last several years just to hold on to their health benefits, and it will happen for 10 more years unless we have the courage to change the system. It's good for bringing the deficit budget down. It's good for the American economy.

That's why I will fight for expanded trade opportunity, to secure by the end of the year a world trade agreement through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that every analyst says will add hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs to America by the end of the decade, and why I can say today, finally, that we have concluded what I believe is a very successful negotiation with

the Mexican Government on the North American Free Trade Agreement, one that will now guarantee that a port city like Oakland will be able to send ever-increasing quantities of American-made goods to sell in Mexico and beyond.

I am pleased that the United States, Mexico, and Canada have reached this agreement and have done it in a way that for the first time ever in a trade agreement requires another nation, in this case Mexico, not to use lower environmental standards, not to use lower labor standards just to get jobs here at America's expense but to actually have mutual trade based on increasing environmental standards, increasing wages and incomes in Mexico, and fair trade between the two nations so that both of us can win, create more jobs, and build a better future. That's the kind of future we all need.

My fellow Americans, I am determined not to let the American dream founder. What a tragedy it would be if the aftermath of winning the cold war were a legacy that we left millions of Americans who won that war out in the cold. What a tragedy it would be if because we did not have the discipline and will to change, we hung on to outmoded ways of doing things under the guise of being good to our men and women in uniform, and we wound up weakening our national security because we didn't have the money to invest in continued technology and training in support of the men and women in uniform.

There is another and better way. And it is the way we are pursuing here. I do want this county, I do want these facilities, I do want this area to be a national model.

On the surface you have paid an enormous price here. The largest impact of the last round of base closings came in the Bay area and in northern California. Everybody knows that. But if you look around you at the people, if you look around you at the resources, if you imagine the future toward which we are tending, if we do the right thing, it means a better future for our people. It means a brighter future for this area, and it means a stronger, stronger America.

I thank you again for your service to your Nation. The best way we can demonstrate honoring your patriotism is to take steps now that are aggressive, tough, unrelenting, and

worthy of what you have done for your country. I will do my best to do just that.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:05 p.m. at Wharf #3 at the Alameda Naval Air Station. In his remarks, he referred to Rear Adm. Merrill W. Ruck, USN, Commander, Naval Base San Francisco; and Rear Adm. Steven R. Briggs, USN, Acting Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

### **Statement on Signing the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993**

*August 13, 1993*

I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 631, the "Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993." This Act designates 19 areas within the National Forests and public lands of Colorado, encompassing 612,000 acres, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System. This Act also protects five areas, totalling some 155,000 acres, under management plans that are slightly less restrictive than wilderness designation.

Enactment of this bill ends a long debate regarding wilderness designation in the National Forests of Colorado. Key to resolving this debate is the compromise language on the protection of wilderness water resources. Because all of the areas designated as wilderness lie at the headwaters of river watersheds, wilderness water resources can be protected by restricting new diversions of water from within these areas. Existing water rights and water diversions are also protected by this Act. In short, the Colorado delegation has found an innovative solution to a very complicated water resources issue, and for this they are to be commended. However, the circumstances in Colorado are unique and this compromise language may have to be refined if it is to be used to protect wilderness water resources in other States.

By signing this bill into law today, we further the protection of unique and sensitive lands within the National Forests of Colorado. The areas designated in this Act are outstanding additions to the National Wilderness Preservation System. These areas join

the 2.6 million acres of outstanding National Forest System (NFS) lands in the State that have already been designated as wilderness. At the same time, this Act releases about 115,000 acres of NFS lands in Colorado for other purposes, balancing the goal of environmental protection with the need to provide for a healthy economy.

Today, we complete the decade-long process of reviewing wilderness study areas in Colorado that were designated in earlier legislation. I commend the Colorado delegation for their diligence and bipartisan leadership in making this Act a reality. This balanced approach to wilderness designation preserves opportunities for economic development in Colorado, while maintaining the quality of life that makes Colorado such a wonderful place to live and work.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
August 13, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 631, approved August 13, was assigned Public Law No. 103-77. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 14.

### **Statement on Signing the Small Business Guaranteed Credit Enhancement Act of 1993**

*August 13, 1993*

Today I am signing S. 1274, the "Small Business Guaranteed Credit Enhancement Act of 1993." This legislation will inject new life into many small businesses by significantly increasing the availability of loans that can be guaranteed by the Small Business Administration (SBA).

My Administration and the Congress recognize that SBA is an increasingly critical component of our efforts to end the credit crunch by making sufficient capital available for small businesses to grow and prosper. The demand for SBA loan guarantees has increased over the past several years at a 35 to 40 percent annual rate, as banks have increasingly turned to SBA for assistance in small business lending.

S. 1274 increases the amount of loans that may be guaranteed per dollar of credit sub-

sidy. This will allow SBA to more than double its Section 7(a) General Business Loan Guarantee program from a range of \$3 billion to \$4 billion to a range of \$7 billion to \$8 billion in fiscal year 1994, based on anticipated appropriations. This higher program level will provide an uninterrupted source of credit for small businesses, something that has been lacking over the past few years. And it will do so while providing significant savings to the taxpayers. The savings will be about \$180 million in the first year and \$748 million over four years relative to appropriations that would be needed to meet expected demand for the 7(a) program absent the reforms.

Perhaps most importantly, the lending authority provided by S. 1274 will assist firms in maintaining and creating more than 600,000 jobs over the next four years.

S. 1274 also makes technical changes to other small business programs in order to improve SBA's administration of the Small Business Development Center Program and the Microloan Demonstration Program, and to facilitate planning and execution of the White House Conference on Small Business.

I am pleased to sign legislation that helps small businesses and their employees.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
August 13, 1993.

NOTE: S. 1274, approved August 13, was assigned Public Law No. 103-81. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 14.

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

*August 14, 1993*

Good morning. This week we took a big step toward restoring opportunity and prosperity to the people of our Nation when I signed into law our economic growth plan. It puts our house in order with the largest deficit reduction measure in our history, mandating more than \$250 billion in spending cuts, with substantial cuts in more than

200 specific spending programs. It makes over 90 percent of our small businesses eligible for tax cuts if they invest to spur job creation. And it provides new incentives to lift people who work full time and have children in their homes but still live in poverty above the poverty line. That's a real incentive for the working poor to stay at work and a down-payment on our plan to end the welfare system as we know it.

With this economic plan in place, private analysts believe more than 8 million jobs will be created over the next 4 years. Already the plan has brought interest rates to historic lows and the stock market to historic highs. People are refinancing home loans and business loans, saving a lot of money, money that can be invested to grow this economy. And we've had about a million new jobs come into the economy in the last 6½ months. This plan will help us to restore the economy and revive the American dream.

But there's another threat to our security, to our economic revival, and to our most basic values. It's the crime that's ravaging our neighborhoods and communities. There were 90,000 murders in America in the last 4 years and a startling upsurge in gang activity, drive-by shootings, and bloody carjackings. There's a virtual war on many of our streets, and crime has become a national security issue to millions of Americans. I've worked to fight crime as an attorney general and a Governor. I've worked with law enforcement officers, community leaders, victims groups. I know we can make our streets safer and our children's future more secure.

This week I announced my administration's anticrime plan, and law enforcement officers from all over America came to support it. People from Massachusetts to Mississippi spoke up. William O'Malley, a district attorney in Massachusetts, said the murder rate in Plymouth County had doubled, and the age of defendants in court is getting younger. One of the law enforcement officers said that in his area the average age of a killer was now under 16 years of age. Police commissioner Bill Bratton of Boston spoke of the fear that grips his city where homicides have gone up 60 percent this year because of gangs and domestic violence. The attorney general of Mississippi pointed out that the

crime wave has now reached small towns and rural areas, and we can't leave them out of our solution.

These facts could be repeated by any prosecutor, any police officer in the United States. We have to give these people the help they need to seize the control of our streets. And that's precisely what I'm determined to do.

Our new crime initiative goes back to basics: toughening criminal laws and disarming criminals, putting more police on patrol, protecting students, restoring order to our streets. It also emphasizes some good ideas that do work: community policing, working with citizens to prevent crime and catch criminals, and boot camps for youthful offenders to give them a second chance to develop self-discipline and other skills to live lawful, successful lives.

Society has the right to impose the most severe penalty on the hardened criminals who commit the most heinous crimes. I support capital punishment, especially against those who kill our police officers. This legislation expands the Federal death penalty and limits the time available to criminals to appeal their sentences. The plan cracks down on the easy availability of guns. I'm eager to sign the Brady bill, which requires a waiting period before the purchase of a handgun. And I've signed a directive ordering the Treasury Department to suspend the importation of foreign-made assault pistols, the weapons of choice for many gangs and drug dealers.

Our crime bill will fund the hiring of up to 50,000 new police officers to walk the beat. It will also create a police corps to allow young people to pay for college and then ask them to return to their communities as police officers in exchange for the educational benefit. The plan expands the cop on the beat program to help pay to put more police on the street, to hire more security guards to keep our schools safe, to beef up patrol in public housing and communities where small businesses are vulnerable to crime. We ask for new Federal boot camps to provide wayward young people the discipline, the education, the training they need for a chance to avoid a lifetime of crime.

And we put these new tools into the hands of the toughest and most talented trio of crimefighters ever assembled at the Federal level: the Attorney General, Janet Reno, a seasoned prosecutor from Miami; the FBI Director, Louis Freeh, a streetwise former prosecutor and tough Federal judge with a nationally acclaimed record of crimefighting; and Lee Brown, the former police chief of New York, Houston, and Atlanta, the father of community policing, who now serves as our Director of Drug Control Policy.

But these law enforcement leaders cannot and must not wage this war alone. We in Government can start by ensuring that the criminal justice system reflects our values and restores people's confidence in the Government's ability to prevent and punish crime. But the power of every individual to influence those around them is also very strong, and it's also a power we must turn to if we're going to turn the crime problem around. Too many of our fellow citizens simply reject values like decency, order, and the respect for the rule of law. Often we can yank people like that back to what is right and what is true.

Every one of us needs to speak up and provide better role models for our young people before we lose them to the meanness of the streets. We can take simple but effective actions like taking car keys away from teenagers and adults who are under the influence of alcohol or drugs before they get behind the wheels of their cars and risk great damage to themselves and to others. We can urge broadcasters and advertisers to tone down the violence we see on television and in theaters every day and persuade them that there is a market for programs and movies that reflect and reinforce our values. We can remind people of the opportunities they have for community service so that they can express their patriotism and caring by giving something back to the country which gives us so much and helps people in need at the same time.

In short, we can work together as partners. And when we do, when the Government works with us and not against us, there is nothing the American people can't do.

With the economic plan in hand and a very tough anticrime bill on the way, we can truly

say our country is headed in a new direction: more responsibility, more opportunity, a deeper sense of community, and restoring the American dream.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4:40 p.m. on August 13 at the Park Oakland Hotel in Oakland, CA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on August 14.

### **Remarks to the National Governors' Association in Tulsa, Oklahoma**

*August 16, 1993*

Thank you very much, Governor Romer, Governor Campbell, our host Governor, Governor Walters. I'm really glad to be here today. The last time the Governors met in Oklahoma was in 1981, right after I had just become the youngest former Governor in American history. I've never been to an NGA meeting in Oklahoma, so I would have showed up here even if you hadn't invited me to speak.

I want to say that Hillary and I are both very glad to be here, to be with you again. We're looking forward to our meeting after this where we can talk about the health care issue and other issues in greater detail. I treasure the partnership that I have had with so many of you and which we are trying to develop and literally imbed in Federal policy today. I know that you have already received an update on the progress that we have made together, working on more rapid processing of the Governors' waiver requests in many different areas and a number of other issues, which I hope we'll be able to talk more about later.

I know too, that the Vice President has already been here and taken all my easy lines away. Even told you the ashtray story, I know, yesterday, which I understand Governor Richards said was one of those issues that her mother in Waco could understand.

Today I come to talk to you about the issue of health care. I would like to put it into some context. When I became President it was obvious to me, based on just the announcements and evidence which had come into play since the November election, that the

Federal deficit was an even bigger problem than I had previously thought and that, unless we did something about it, we would not have the capacity to deal with the whole range of other issues; that forever, at least during the term of my service, we would be nibbled away at the edges in trying to deal with health care reform or defense conversion or welfare reform or any other issue by the fact that we simply were not in control of our own economic destiny.

And so we devoted the first several months of this administration to trying to pass an economic plan that would reduce the deficit by a record amount, that would have at least as many spending cuts as new tax increases—in fact, we wound up with more spending cuts—and that would give some incentives where they were needed, particularly in the small business, in the high-tech, in the new business area, to try to grow more jobs for the American economy. That has, I believe, laid a very good foundation for the future.

This morning I was reading in the morning newspapers that long-term interest rates are now at a 20-year low, the lowest they've been since 1973. And we have the basis now to proceed on a whole range of other issues. When the Congress comes back next month, I believe that the Senate will rapidly pass the national service legislation, which many of you are very familiar with and which many of you have supported. It will pass on a bipartisan basis and will enable tens of thousands of our young people to earn credit for their college education by serving their communities at home and solving problems that no Government can solve alone.

We are working on defense conversion initiatives from northern California to South Carolina and at all points in between. I hope we can do more on that. We will have a major welfare reform initiative coming up at the first of the year, which I hope all of you will not only strongly support but will be active participants in. And meanwhile, keep doing what you're doing and asking for the waivers you think you need.

There is now before the Congress a crime bill which can have a big impact in every State here, that will add 50,000 more police officers on the street, support innovations like boot camps for first offenders, help us

to pass the Brady bill, and deal with a number of other issues facing us there.

There will be initiatives to expand the economic range of Americans. As I know that you all know now—and I wish he could be here with us today—our Trade Ambassador, Mickey Kantor, successfully concluded the NAFTA negotiations just a few days ago with some historic, some historic provisions never before found in a trade agreement anywhere, including the agreement by the Government of Mexico to tie their minimum wages to productivity and economic growth and then to make their compliance with that the subject of a trade agreement, which means that it can be reviewed, that if there are violations they can be subject to fine, and ultimately the trade sanctions can be imposed. Nothing like this has ever been found in a trade agreement before. It ensures that workers on both sides of our border can benefit. And I appreciate the support of the Governors for the whole issue of expanding trade. We are now in Europe trying to get the GATT negotiations back on track, and I hope we can do that.

Finally, let me say there will be a whole push toward the end of the year on a whole range of political reform issues. One or the other House of Congress have already passed a campaign finance reform bill, a lobby limitation bill, and the modified line-item veto, which I think that 100 percent of you think that the President ought to have.

In addition to that, the Vice President will issue a report to me very shortly on the reinventing Government project, which he discussed with you in great detail yesterday. The only thing I can tell you is that everything I ever suspicioned about the way the Federal Government operates turned out to be true, plus some. The ashtray story is only illustrative. The fundamental problem is not that there are bad people in the Federal Government or that the payrolls have been swollen by people who just want to pad them. That is not true. In fact, many of the Federal agencies didn't grow at all in the 1980's. What has happened is that for the last 60 years one thing has been added on to another and people with the best of intentions have just piled one more requirement on to the Federal Government, and the fundamental

systems that operate this Government have gone unexamined for too long, whether it's personnel or budgeting or procurement. And we are trying to do that in ways that I think would free up a lot of money and improve the efficiency and service that the American people are entitled to expect from all of us.

Now having said all that, I want to make two comments. I don't think that any of it will take America where we need to go unless we also reform the health care system, which is the biggest outstanding culprit in the Federal deficit and is promoting economic dislocations in this economy. And secondly, I don't think we can do it unless we do it on a bipartisan basis.

I never want to go through another 6 months where we have to get all of our votes within one party and where the other party has people that want to vote with us and they feel like they've got to stay—and the whole issue revolves around process instead of product, political rhetoric instead of personal concern for what's going to happen to this country. There's plenty of blame to go around. As far as I'm concerned there will be plenty of credit to go around. I don't much care who gets the credit for this health care reform as long as we do it.

But I am convinced that what this Nation really needs is a vital center, one committed to fundamental and profound and relentless and continuing change in ways that are consistent with the basic values of most Americans and that move all of us along a path. And I don't think you can do it unless we can sit down together and talk and work.

Many of the skills which are highly prized among you—both in your own States, where you serve and work with people who think differently than you do on some issues, who belong to different parties than you do, and the way you work around this table—those skills are not only not very much prized, sometimes they're absolutely demeaned in the Nation's Capital.

When we come here and we try to work on something like we worked on the welfare reform bill in 1988, we talked about: How does this really work? How are people really going to be affected by this? How can we deal with our differences of opinion and reach real consensus that represents prin-

cipled compromise? And how can we be judged not just on what we say but on what we do?

Back east where I work, consensus is often turned into cave-in; people who try to work together and listen to one another, instead of beat each other up, are accused of being weak, not strong. And the process is a hundred times more important than the product. Beats anything I ever saw. And the people that really score are the people that lay one good lick on you in the newspaper every day instead of the people that get up and go to work, never care if they're on the evening news, never care if they're in the paper, and just want to make a difference.

And so I say to you, anything that you can do to help me and the Congress to try to recreate the mechanisms by which you have to function in order to do anything at the State level and by which we have worked together here to move forward on a whole range of issues, I will be grateful for. This country has too many words and too few deeds on too many issues, and we can do better than that.

Now, let's talk about the health care issue. We all know what's right with our health care system. For those who have access to it, it is the finest in the world, not only in terms of the incredible technological advances but in terms of having choice of our physicians, ready access to health care, and overall high quality that lasts throughout a lifetime. We can all be grateful for that.

My Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros, and I were talking the other day. His son just had a profoundly important and difficult operation. Just a few years ago he was told that about all he could hope for for his boy was a comfortable life, and eventually his time would run out, probably sooner rather than later. And because of the relentless progress of medical technology, his son now has a whole new lease on life.

Nobody wants to mess up what is good with American health care. We must preserve it and preserve it with a vengeance. But we also know what is not so good. We know that in a world in which we must compete for every job and all the incomes we can, we are spending over 14 percent of our

income on health care. And only one other nation in the world, Canada, is over 9. They're at about 9.4. Our major competitors in the high-wage chase for the future, Japan and Germany, are down around 8 percent. So they're at 8, and we're at 14. More troubling, if we don't do anything to reverse the basic trends that are now rifling through our system, by the end of this decade we'll be at 19 percent of GDP on health care. No one else will be over 10, and we'll be basically spotting our competitors 9 cents on the dollar in every avenue of economic endeavor. I don't think that is something that's right.

We know that this places enormous pressure on businesses. I'll come back to some of the comments made by Mr. Motley along toward the end of my remarks, but the truth is that about 100,000 Americans a month are losing their health insurance because their employers can no longer afford to carry it under the present system we have, and others, holding on for dear life, are never giving their employees pay raises. And it is estimated, unless we do something about this system, that the increased cost of health care between now and the end of the decade will literally absorb all of the money that might otherwise be available in this economy to raise the salaries of our working people.

We see employers unequally treated by the cruel hand of the system that we have. We know now we are spending far more money, about a dime on the dollar probably, administratively just on paperwork, pushing paper around, than any of our competitors are. A decade ago, the average doctor took home about 75 cents on the dollar that came into the clinic. Today that's down to 52 cents on the dollar, in only 10 years, because we are awash in paperwork imposed (a) by the Government and (b) for the fact that only the United States has 1,500 separate health insurance companies writing thousands and thousands of different policies.

I have a doctor friend in Washington who recently hired somebody not even to do paperwork but just to stay on the phone to call insurance companies every day to beat them up to pay what has already been covered—money right out of the pockets of the nurses that work in his clinic. And there's a story

like that in every health care establishment in America today.

We know we still have almost 40 million people uninsured, and more every month, not fewer. We know that State governments are literally being bankrupt by the rising costs of Medicaid—money that used to go to education, money that used to go to economic development, money that could have gone to law enforcement going every year, just shoveling out the door, not for new health care, more money for the same health care. And even when we control the price of certain things, that extra utilization, or more people coming into the system because the rest of it is broken down, are driving the costs up. We know that there are still serious access problems.

And we know, as I said, that the Federal deficit is in terrible shape because of health care. If you look at this budget the Congress just adopted, defense goes down, discretionary spending is flat. That means we spend more money on defense conversion, on Head Start, on pregnant women, on a few other things—every dollar that we spend more on, that something else was cut. The only thing that's going up are the retirement programs—and Social Security taxes produced a \$60 billion surplus for us even with the cost-of-living allowances—and health care. Everything else is either flat or down. And under all scenarios proposed by all people who presented any budgets last year, the deficit went down for 4 years and then started going up again because of health care. So the only way we can keep our commitments, you and I, to the American people to restore real control over this budget is to do something about health care.

Now, I would argue that if you know you've got a list of what's right and you know you've got a list of what's wrong and what's wrong is going to eventually consume what's right, you cannot continue to do nothing. And I don't think most people want to continue to do nothing.

I want to thank the NGA and especially the Governors who have worked with us throughout this process. Many of you have met with the First Lady and Ira Magaziner and the people, literally hundreds and hundreds of people, who have worked with them

on a bipartisan basis to try to craft a health care reform package that will ensure that the States are real partners in our efforts to preserve quality, cover everyone, control costs, and enable the States and the Federal Government to regain some control over their financial futures.

No one embodied that spirit of bipartisanship on this issue more than our late friend, George Mickelson. And I just want to take a word here to say how very much I appreciated him as a friend, as a Governor, and as someone who had the sort of spirit that if it could embrace this country on this issue, we could solve this problem in good faith.

The National Government has a lot to learn from the States in the tough decisions that some of you have made already. I can honestly say that along toward the end of my tenure as Governor, the most frustrating part of the job was simply writing bigger checks every year for the same Medicaid program when I didn't have the money that all of us wanted to spend on education and economic development and the other important issues before us.

There have been phenomenally important contributions made to this debate already by the Governors of many States in both parties. I won't mention 1, 5, or 10 for fear I'll leave out someone I should have mentioned, but let me say that I am very grateful to all of you for the work that you have already done. I also want to say a special word of regret about the absence here of the Governor from my home State, Jim Guy Tucker, who himself has been getting some world-class medical care. And I talked to him last night. He's feeling quite well, and he promises to be at the next meeting.

But all of you have a role to play in what we're about to do. Over the last 8 months, I've met with many of you personally in Washington. Many of you have lent your staffs to the efforts that we're making on health care reform. And we've learned clearly that what works in North Dakota may not work in New York. Just yesterday your executive committee pledged to support health care reform within a comprehensive Federal framework that guarantees universal coverage and controls costs. We will work with the States to phase in reform, and we will

help you to work out problems as they arise. And we have to have an honest discussion about what that framework ought to look like.

I want today to tell you what I think we should do. Next month I will outline a plan to Congress that will offer real hope for all Americans who want to work and take responsibility and create opportunities for themselves and their children. I think the elements of that plan ought to be as follows:

One, we've got to provide health care security to people who don't have it. That means not just those who don't have health insurance coverage now but those who are at risk of losing it. I don't know how many people I met last year all over this country, all kinds of people, who knew they would never be able to change jobs again because someone in their family had been sick. I don't know how many other people I met who couldn't afford their health insurance package because there was someone in their job unit that they needed to get rid of in order to be able to afford it. We have got to have a system of universal coverage that provides security to Americans.

Second, I think we have to have a system of managed care that maintains the private sector, organizes Americans in health alliances operated within each State, contains significant new incentives for prevention and for wellness and against overutilization, and that has a budget so that the competition forces should keep things within the budget. But ultimately, especially in the early years, there must be some limit. I will say again, if we don't change this, we're going to go from 14 to 19 percent of our income going to health care by the end of the decade. It is going to be very difficult for us to compete and win in the global economy with that sort of differential.

Second—third, excuse me, there must be insurance reform. There has to be a basic package of benefits. There needs to be community rating. There has to be some opportunity—I heard Governor Wilson talking about this before I came out—for pooling for small employers. We cannot permit price differentials that exist today to get worse instead of better simply because of the size of the work units.

Finally, in this connection, if we do these things, there will be massive cuts in paperwork because you won't have to have every health unit in this country trying to keep up with thousands of different options and all the myriad complexities that flow from that. We won't have another decade when clerical employment in the health care area goes 4 times faster than health care providers. No one believes that that is a very sound investment in our Nation's future.

Next, we have to have significant, significant increases, not decreases, in investment and research and technology.

Next, in my judgment, we should attempt to take the health care costs of the workers' comp system and the auto insurance system into this reform. That might be the biggest thing we could do for small businesses. It would also perhaps be the biggest thing we could do to reduce some of the inequalities—some of you might not like this, and others would love it—but the inequalities in economic incentives that various States can offer because of dramatic differences in workers' comp costs from State to State, occasioned more than anything else by the health care burden of workers' comp.

Next, I think that we should have 100 percent tax deductibility, not 25 percent tax deductibility, for self-employed people. And that will be a part of the plan we will offer to Congress, something that will increase the capacity of people who are self-employed to maintain health insurance, whether they're farmers or independent business people.

Finally, I think the States must have a strong role and essentially be charged with the responsibility and given the opportunity to organize and establish the health groups of people who will be able to purchase health care under the managed care system. I think we should expand options for people of low incomes on Medicare but not poor enough to be on Medicaid to get a prescription drug benefit phased in over a period of years. Similarly, I think we must do the same thing with long-term care. But as we provide more long-term care opportunities for the elderly and for persons with disabilities, we must also expand the option so that they can get the least cost, most appropriate care. We must remove the institutionalized biases that are

in the system now, which keep a lot of people from having access to home care, for example.

And finally, I think there has to be some responsibility in this system for everyone. There are a lot of people today that get a free ride out of the present system who can afford to pay something. I think there should be individual responsibility. I think every American should know that health care is not something paid for by the tooth fairy, that there is no free ride, that people should understand that this system costs a lot of money. It should cost a lot of money; it ought to be the world's best. But we should all be acutely aware of the costs each of us impose on it.

But I also believe that in order to make individual responsibility meaningful and in order to control the cost of this system, there has to be some means of achieving universal coverage. If you don't achieve universal coverage, in my judgment, you will not be able to control the costs adequately. Why? Well, for one thing, you will continue to have cost shifting. If you have uncompensated care, the people who give it will shift the cost to the private sector or to the Government. And that will create significant economic dislocations.

Now, it seems to me we have four options. If you believe—you have to decide—if you believe everybody should be covered, you have only four options. And I would argue that three of them are not, at least based on what I have seen and heard, very good options in practice as opposed to in theory.

Option number one is to go to a single-payer system, like the Canadians do, because it has the least administrative cost. That would require us to replace over \$500 billion in private insurance premiums with nearly that much in new taxes. I don't think that's a practical option. I don't think that is going to happen. That would be significantly dislocating in the sense that overnight, in a nation this size, you'd have all the people who are in the insurance business out of it unless they were in the business of managing the health care plans themselves, as more and more are doing.

Option number two would be to have an individual mandate rather than a mandate

that applies to employers and to employees, saying that every individual's got to buy health insurance, and here are some insurance reforms to make sure you can get it. This approach has found some favor in the United States Congress, primarily among Republicans but not exclusively, because it has the appeal of not imposing a business mandate, which has a bad sound to it.

Here's the problem with that, it seems to me. If you have an individual mandate, on whom is it imposed? And don't you have to give some subsidy to low-income workers, just the way you'll have to give some subsidy to low-income businesses if there's an employer mandate? Who gets it and who doesn't? And if you impose an individual mandate, what is to stop every other employer in America from just dumping his employees or her employees, to have a sweeping and extremely dislocating set of—a chain of events start? So it seems to me that there are a lot of questions that have to be asked and answered before we could embrace the concept of an individual mandate.

The third thing you could do is not worry about it. You could just say, well, we'll have all these other reforms, and just hope that if you could lower the cost of insurance and simplify the premiums and have big pools, that sooner or later somehow everybody will be covered.

The problem is that there is a lot of evidence that some people will still seek a free ride. And make no mistake about it, people that never see themselves as free riders still ride the system, because everybody in this country who needs health care eventually gets it. It may be too late. It may be too expensive. But if someone who works in a workplace where there is no insurance has a child that gets hit in a car wreck or just gets sick or has an acute appendix or something happens, they'll get health care. And that will be paid for by someone else.

And indeed, even for the employers and employees that may go a whole year and never use the health care system, it's there waiting for them. It's an infrastructure just as much as the Interstate Highway System is. Every medical clinic, every hospital, every nursing home, all these things are the health care infrastructure of the country, all being

paid for by someone else but still available to be used for those folks. So I don't think we can rationally expect to stop cost shifting or to have a fair system if we say we're going to organize all this and just hope everybody will get into it.

That leaves the fourth alternative, which is to build on the system we now have. The system we now have works for most Americans. Most Americans are insured under a system in which employers pay for part of the health insurance and employees pay for part of the health insurance, and it's worked pretty well for them except for the laundry list of problems that we talked about. But most Americans are covered under it.

What are the problems with doing this? Well, first of all, if you just passed an employer mandate and did nothing else, there would be a ton of problems in doing it, because the most vulnerable businesses would have the highest premiums and a bunch of them would really be in deep trouble. No one proposes to do that. In other words, an employer mandate itself would not be responsible unless you also had significant insurance reforms, a long period of phase-in, and a limitation on how much the premium could be for very small businesses or businesses with very low-wage workers that obviously are operating on narrow profit margins.

But I would argue to you that based on my analysis of this—and I've been thinking about this seriously now for more than 3 years, ever since the Governors' Association asked me and the then-Governor of Delaware, now a Congressman from Delaware, to look at the health issue. And I have thought about it and thought about it. There may be some other issue, but I see only those four options for dealing with this. And it seems to me the shared responsibility, in a fair way, of employer and employee, building on the system we have now which works, taking proper account of the need to phase it in and to maintain limits on lower income and lower wage employment units, is the fairest way to go.

Now, it seems to me that all this will be discussed and debated in the Congress; the Governors will be a part of it. The first decision we have to make is whether we can fool around with this for another 10 or 20 years

or whether the time has come to act. Just consider this one fact: If health care costs had been held in check—that is, to inflation plus growth—since 1980, State and local governments would have, on average, 75 percent more funding for public school budgets. In 1993, fiscal year 1993, States spent more on Medicaid than on higher education for the first time. And State spending on Medicaid is expected to jump from \$31 billion in 1990 to \$81 billion in 1995 if we don't change this system.

I believe that health care reform will boost job creation in the private sector if it is done right. I believe it will offer a level playing field to all those small employers who are covering their employees right now and paying too much for it. I believe it will be a critical first step in rewarding work over welfare.

When we did the Family Support Act in 1988, those of you who were here then will all remember what all of us concluded—and the Governor of South Carolina, since he had once been the ranking member of the appropriate subcommittee on the House Ways and Means Committee, played as big a role in understanding this as anybody else—that a lot of people stayed on welfare not because of the benefits, because the benefits had not kept up with inflation; they did it because they couldn't afford child care for their kids and because they were going to lose health insurance for their children.

We have gone a long way, I think, toward reducing incentives to stay on welfare with this new economic plan, because the earned-income tax credit has increased so much that now people that work 40 hours a week and have children in the home will be lifted above the poverty level. That was the most major piece of economic social reform in the last 20 years. But we still have to deal with the health care issue.

I recently had a very sad conversation with a woman who became a friend of mine in the campaign who was a divorced mother of seven children, and her youngest child had a horrible, horrible and very expensive health care condition. The only way she could get any health care for this kid was to quit a job where she was making \$50,000 a year, proudly supporting these children, to go on public

assistance so she could get Medicaid to take care of her child. And the young child just recently passed away. And so I called and talked to the woman, and I was thinking about the incredible travail that she had gone through and wondering if now she would ever be able to get another job making that kind of money to support her remaining children and to restore her sense of dignity and empowerment.

Let me say one last thing about this. I think if we do this right, it will restore our sense of individual and common responsibility. I will say again, I do not believe anybody should get a free ride in this deal. I think we have all—at least I've been part of it—have made a mistake in trying to say that people should pay absolutely nothing for their health care if they could afford to pay something. People ought to pay in proportion to what they can afford to. But I think that the system we have is so riddled with those who don't have any responsibility at all that it is chock full of loopholes.

And let me say again, everybody who says, "Well, this is just too complicated, and it's too much trouble, and it's too hard to think about," ought to consider the consequences of doing nothing. Doing nothing means more people lose their coverage, and those who don't will pay too much for their coverage. Doing nothing means that all those uninsured and underinsured Americans will be covered by vast outlays by State, local, and Federal governments. The rest of us will pay more at the doctor's office, the hospital, and our own businesses. Doing nothing means insurers will continue to be able to charge prices that are too high to those who don't have the good fortune of being in very large buying cooperatives, and that the paperwork burden of this system, I will say again, will continue to be a dime on the dollar more than any other country in the world. We cannot sustain that sort of waste and inefficiency. More than 60 cents of every new dollar going to the Federal Treasury over the next 5 years under our reduced budget will go to health care, after we had a \$54 billion reduction in Medicare and Medicaid expenses over the estimated cost of the previous budget; 12 to 15 percent added costs every year for large businesses; 20 to 30 percent for small busi-

nesses; no wage increases for millions, indeed tens of millions of workers; and continued fear and insecurity. Policing the system against incompetence will be left to a flawed system of bureaucrats, of insurance oversight and malpractice that rewards things that don't deserve to be rewarded and ignores legitimate problems.

Now, let me talk about this jobs issue one more time. If you just imposed a mandate and did nothing else, would it cost jobs? Yes, it would. Any study can show that. That is not what we propose. If you reform the insurance system and all these big employers that are paying way too much now and all these small employers that are paying way too much now, wind up with reductions or no increases in the years ahead, that is more money they're going to have to invest in creating new jobs in the private sector. If you reform the insurance system, you phase in the requirements, and you limit the amount of payroll that someone can be required to put out in an insurance premium, you're going to limit the job loss on the downside while you're increasing it dramatically on the upside. If you reduce the paperwork burdens, yes, you won't have this huge growth in people doing clerical works in doctors offices and hospitals and in insurance offices. But you will have more people going into old folks' homes and giving them good personal health care, trying to keep them alive in ways that are more labor intensive but less expensive. So there will be shifts here.

But who can say, if you trust, if you trust the private sector to allocate capital in ways that will make America most competitive and to take advantage of lower health care costs by reinvesting it in this economy, who could possibly say that if we move closer to the international average in the percentage of our income going to health care, it wouldn't lead to more productive investment and more jobs in America? I think that is clearly what would happen.

We have focused this debate only on the minority of people who don't have health insurance and don't cover their employers and assume that we would lay some mandate on them and make no other structural changes. I wouldn't be for that. You couldn't be for that, although at least that would stop the

cost shifting. It would not be enough. That is not what we propose. But if you do this right and we phase it in so that as we deal with problems, we find them, we can correct them; if the States are dealing with the management side of this through these health alliances, we can make this work.

It just defies common sense to say that we can't maintain the world's finest health care system, stop all this cost shifting, bring our costs back at some competitive level, cover everybody, and create jobs. No matter what happens we'll be spending a lot more than any other country on health care at the end of the decade. But we'll be protecting people, and we'll be working with them.

I'm convinced that the biggest problem we've got right now is the fear of the unknown and the exaggeration into the unknown of what, in fact, is already known. To say that we're talking about some untried, untested thing ignores the experience of Hawaii, ignores the experience of every other country that we're competing with, ignores what we know about how our private sector could actually manage the problem better in some ways than Germany and Japan have managed it, and basically, is rooted in somehow our lack of belief that we can overcome all the ideological divides and the rhetorical barbs and the fears that are gripping us.

So I will say again, I don't pretend to have all the answers, but I am absolutely sure this is the problem that America cannot let go, that we cannot walk away from. And I am absolutely convinced that we can solve it if we can meet around a table without regard to party and listen to the facts and work through it. I am convinced of that.

I want to close by telling you a story. When the Pope came to Denver and I was given the opportunity to go out there and meet him and have a private audience that I will remember and cherish for the rest of my life, we arranged for a young girl to come there and just stand in the audience. And all she did was have the Pope put his hand on her head and say a word of blessing. This child is 13 years old. She's from Wisconsin. Her father we met in the course of the campaign. She was born with a rare bone disease which caused the bones in her body to break continuously so that by the time she actually

came out of her mother's womb she had already had about more than a dozen bones break in her body.

Just a few years ago, anybody like that could never have grown up and had anything like a normal life. They just would have been helpless, just continually crumbling. Now, this girl has gone to the National Institutes of Health every 3 months for her entire life. And even though she's just 13 years old, if she were here talking to you, she would speak with the presence, the maturity, the command of someone more than twice her age. And she looks a little different because the bones in her skull have broken, the bones in her legs have broken, the bones in her back have broken. But she can walk and she can function and she can go to school. And even though she's only 4 feet tall and weighs only 60 pounds, she can function.

And she asked her father to take her to Iowa so she could help people in Iowa to fight the flood. And she went to Iowa and loaded sand in the sandbags, knowing that any one of those bags could have broken her leg above the knee, could have put her away for a year. She said, "I cannot live in a closet. This is something that's there. I want to live. I want to do my life. I want to do what other people do."

And I was so overcome by it, I brought the girl to see me, and then we just quietly arranged for her to be there when the Pope was there. I say that to make this point. I asked her why in the world she would have done that, why she would have risked literally breaking her body apart to be there with all these big, husky college kids fighting this flood. And she said, "Because I want to live. And it's there, and I have to go on. I have to do things."

If a child like that can do something like that, surely to goodness, we can stop wringing our hands and roll up our sleeves and solve this problem. And surely we can do it without the kind of rhetoric and air-filling bull that we hear so often in the Nation's Capital. We can do it.

I miss you. I miss this. I miss the way we make decisions. I miss the sort of heart and soul and fabric of life that was a part of every day when I got up and went to work in a State capital. Somehow we've got to bring

that back to Washington. Think about that little girl, and help us solve this health care problem.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. at the Tulsa Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to John Motley, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, and Gov. George S. Mickelson of South Dakota, who died April 20 in an airplane crash.

### **Executive Order 12859— Establishment of the Domestic Policy Council**

*August 16, 1993*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including sections 105, 107, and 301 of title 3, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

**Section 1. Establishment.** There is established the Domestic Policy Council ("the Council").

**Sec. 2. Membership.** The Council shall comprise the:

- (a) President, who shall serve as a Chairman of the Council;
- (b) Vice President;
- (c) Secretary of Health and Human Services;
- (d) Attorney General;
- (e) Secretary of Labor;
- (f) Secretary of Veterans Affairs;
- (g) Secretary of the Interior;
- (h) Secretary of Education;
- (i) Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;
- (j) Secretary of Agriculture;
- (k) Secretary of Transportation;
- (l) Secretary of Commerce;
- (m) Secretary of Energy;
- (n) Secretary of the Treasury;
- (o) Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (p) Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers;
- (q) Director of the Office of Management and Budget;
- (r) Assistant to the President for Economic Policy;

- (s) Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy;
- (t) Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of National Service;
- (u) Senior Advisor to the President for Policy Development;
- (v) Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy;
- (w) AIDS Policy Coordinator; and
- (x) Such other officials of Executive departments and agencies as the President may, from time to time, designate.

**Sec. 3. Meeting of the Council.** The President, or upon his direction, the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy (“the Assistant”), may convene meetings of the Council. The President shall preside over the meetings of the Council, provided that in his absence the Vice President, and in his absence the Assistant, will preside.

**Sec. 4. Functions.** (a) The principal functions of the Council are: (1) to coordinate the domestic policy-making process; (2) to coordinate domestic policy advice to the President; (3) to ensure that domestic policy decisions and programs are consistent with the President’s stated goals, and to ensure that those goals are being effectively pursued; and (4) to monitor implementation of the President’s domestic policy agenda. The Assistant may take such actions, including drafting a Charter, as may be necessary or appropriate to implement such functions.

(b) All executive departments and agencies, whether or not represented on the Council, shall coordinate domestic policy through the Council.

(c) In performing the foregoing functions, the Assistant will, when appropriate, work with the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy.

**Sec. 5. Administration.** (a) The Council may function through established or ad hoc committees, task forces or interagency groups.

(b) The Council shall have a staff to be headed by the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy. The Council shall have such staff and other assistance as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this order.

(c) All executive departments and agencies shall cooperate with the Council and provide such assistance, information, and advice to the Council as the Council may request, to the extent permitted by law.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
August 16, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:48 p.m., August 17, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 17, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on August 19.

### **Proclamation 6586—Women’s Equality Day, 1993**

*August 18, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

#### **A Proclamation**

On August 26, 1993, we celebrate the 73rd anniversary of the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution. In declaring that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex, the Nineteenth Amendment guaranteed for women the most cherished prerogative of American citizenship.

Since America was founded, women have demonstrated an active interest in shaping the practice of democratic government. But it was not until the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment that women’s myriad contributions to the social, cultural, and economic life of our Nation began to receive the full acknowledgment they deserved. As women’s voices continue to gain strength in the political arena, female elected officials at every level of government bring crucial insight to the decision-making process.

The struggle for true equality among the sexes has not been limited to the public sphere. Broadening the franchise fundamentally changed our understanding of equal opportunity, helping to encourage shared responsibility in the home and personal growth in the work place. Today, more and more

women are leading the way through advancements in law, science, business, and the arts. As we approach the 21st century, women's unfailing strength and wisdom remain integral to ensuring the lasting prosperity of our Nation.

Each year, we observe August 26 as "Women's Equality Day," to honor the infinite sacrifices and contributions that women have made to the United States. On this occasion we reaffirm our national commitment to the distinctly American promise of guaranteed equality for all our people.

**In Witness Whereof**, I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of August, 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 eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:37 a.m., August 19, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 20.

**Remarks on Naming William M. Daley as NAFTA Task Force Chairman and an Exchange With Reporters**

*August 19, 1993*

**The President.** Good afternoon, everyone.

**Audience member.** Happy birthday!

**The President.** Well, thank you very much. Thank you, Helen. [Helen Thomas, United Press International]

Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to announce that my good friend, Bill Daley of Chicago, has agreed to be the Chair of the administration's Task Force on the North American Free Trade Agreement. This agreement means more trade, more exports, and more jobs for the United States. I think it is very much in our national interest.

I also think it means the opportunity to go not only to Mexico but beyond Mexico into other nations in Latin America to develop stronger trading relationships that will boost our economy, the jobs, and the in-

comes of the American people well into the 21st century.

Thanks to the hard work done by Ambassador Mickey Kantor and the other members of the U.S. Trade Representative's staff, we have now seen in the last several days the conclusion of a remarkable set of side agreements to guarantee real investments in environmental cleanup and a dramatic and unprecedented commitment by the Government of Mexico to tie their minimum wage structure to increases in productivity and growth in the Mexican economy and to make that a part of the trade agreement, so that failure to do that could result in fines and ultimately trade sanctions, meaning that Mexico is serious about making this a trade agreement that benefits Mexican workers, raises wage levels, increases their ability to buy American products, and decreases the impetus for continued illegal immigration across the Mexican border. I am very, very encouraged by this.

I also want to say that as we move into this campaign vigorously now—and it's something that we've not been able to do because we didn't have an agreement until just a few days ago—Mr. Daley will be working with Ambassador Kantor, with the Secretary of Treasury, with the Director of EPA, with the Labor Secretary, and with other members of the Cabinet, including the Commerce Secretary, to present a strongly united front. Furthermore, we will be reaching out to involve in the national leadership of this task force prominent Republicans, Democrats, and independents who have a common interest in promoting the NAFTA and what it can do for our economy.

I believe, as I said repeatedly, that if we could get these side agreements which have now been concluded, this trade agreement means a better future for America's workers, for American industry, for the American economy. I think it is very much in our interest to adopt it. I believe the fact that Bill Daley has agreed to take a leadership role enhances the chances of its adoption, and I know that the Vice President, Mr. McLarty, and others in our administration join me in expressing our thanks to Bill Daley. And he'll be here soon, and we'll be going to work.

Would you like to say a few words?

**Mr. Daley.** I appreciate, Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, this opportunity. Obviously it's quite a challenge. And through your leadership we will be successful. Thank you.

**Q.** [Inaudible]

**Mr. Daley.** Yes, ma'am.

#### **NAFTA and Job Creation**

**Q.** Mr. President, how can you convince American workers that NAFTA is good for them when major corporations are laying off thousands of people? Where are the jobs going to come from?

**The President.** Well, major corporations are laying off thousands of people in part because they don't have enough work for them. Part of this downsizing is an inevitable part of the reorganization of some of those big employers. But what has happened is that for the last 12 years—for a long time—we had more jobs created in small business, in medium-sized businesses than were being lost in large businesses. The Fortune 500 laid off more than 100,000 people a year every year of the 1980's.

So, this trend is something that has been going on for some time. Whether we gain jobs or not, and gain good jobs, depends on whether there is more demand for American products and services. And there is ample evidence that the only way a wealthy country grows wealthier in a global economy is to increase the volume of trade. And it is a clear, elemental principle of economics that if you want more people to go to work in a competitive economy, you have to have more people to sell to. So that's what we're trying to do. I feel very strongly about it.

I also believe that by raising the incomes of Mexicans, which this will do, they will be able to buy more of our products, and there will be much less pressure on them to come to this country in the form of illegal immigration. So I think this will be a very stabilizing, economically healthy agreement.

I believe, to be fair, that a lot of the people who are against this agreement were against the original agreement and may not have had the chance to evaluate the side agreements that we've worked so hard since January to conclude with the Mexican Government. And I think that that will make a difference.

I also think that it's important that this Government, our Government, make a good-

faith effort to make sure that we provide adequate retraining and other opportunities for people who fear they will be subject to dislocation under this agreement. In my mind, there is no question that this agreement is a significant net plus for the American economy.

#### **Efforts To Combat Drugs**

**Q.** Mr. President, what do you think about this proposal to merge the DEA with the FBI? And what kind of signal would that send about U.S. commitment to drug interdiction?

**The President.** Well, first of all, I've not had a chance to view the proposal. The Vice President's task force has under review a number of proposals. I'm not sure they've even finalized their own decisions. You might want to ask him about that. But he'll be making a presentation to me early in September. And when and if that recommendation comes to me, I'll evaluate it. I'll talk to him, and I'll talk to the Attorney General about it. But I will say this: Anything we do will be designed to enhance our efforts to combat drugs, not to weaken it. And any decision I make will be made with that in mind.

#### **NAFTA**

**Q.** Do you and Mr. Daley have any idea how you are going to overcome or circumvent the leadership of the House, the majority leader and the chief whip, both of whom are opposed to NAFTA?

**The President.** Well, the chief whip is clearly opposed to it, and I think he and I—I admire him immensely, but we just have an honest disagreement about this. And I might say, since he's from Michigan, I would just point out to you not very long ago General Motors announced that they were moving 1,000 jobs back from Mexico to the United States to be closer to the market and because of the higher productivity of the American worker.

I'd like to make one point about that, and then I'll say something about the majority leader. I have governed a State where people shut their plants down and went to Mexico for low wages. I have been there. And my belief is that if we defeat NAFTA, nothing

will stop. NAFTA won't stop people. If you beat NAFTA, it will not stop people who want to go to Mexico for lower wages from going there. But more and more, smart manufacturers are deciding that they should locate where they're going to have a highly productive work force and where they'll be reasonably close to the market and where they'll be very flexible to change product lines on a rapid basis. I think that this will help the American economy.

I also think that the kinds of investments you'll see in Mexico, if NAFTA passes, are not those investments along the American border that produce more products to come back into America but investments further down into Mexico to put Mexican people to work to produce products for their own market, which, again, will stabilize their incomes, stabilize their population movement, increase their ability to buy American products. So that's the argument I'm going to make to others. I don't think I can change Mr. Bonior's mind, but I think perhaps I can change others.

Mr. Gephardt has a different set of concerns. He wants to make sure that we're going to adequately fund the training programs, that we're going to adequately fund the environmental programs, and that the Mexican commitment to raise minimum wages means that manufacturing wages will in fact go up as their incomes go up. And I still have high hopes that things that will happen between now and the time the implementing legislation is presented to Congress in several weeks will persuade him to support this. I do believe it will be difficult for us to prevail if both of them are opposed. But Mr. Gephardt has some high standards for this agreement, but I'm not sure they can't be met.

And I also say, I want the Members of Congress who have not announced their positions to review these agreements. There has never been a trade agreement with this kind of environmental protection in it. There has certainly never been a trade agreement where one country committed to raise its wages when its productivity increases and to make that wage increase a subject of the trade agreement so that they can be subject to fines for trade sanctions that they don't

keep. This has never happened before. Mexico was serious about trying to raise the living standards of its own people in ways that help stabilize American wages and American jobs.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:57 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

### **Statement on Naming William M. Daley as NAFTA Task Force Chairman**

*August 19, 1993*

I am pleased to announce that William Daley has agreed to serve as Chairman of the administration's Task Force on the North American Free Trade Agreement. His willingness to serve—on behalf of expanded exports, expanded jobs, and expanded trade—is a further measure of his commitment to public service.

For the next several months, the Congress of the United States will debate and determine the fate of NAFTA. With the leadership of the United States Trade Representative, Mickey Kantor, and the help of others in our administration, new supplemental agreements have been completed that will transform NAFTA into a force for job creation, environmental cleanup, greater American competitiveness, and higher labor standards.

The case for NAFTA is strong, and in Bill Daley, I have found the strongest possible advocate to make that case. Bill will work effectively and closely with Ambassador Kantor, Treasury Secretary Bentsen, Commerce Secretary Brown, Labor Secretary Reich, EPA Administrator Carol Browner, and other members of the Cabinet to conduct a positive, bipartisan campaign to explain the benefits of the NAFTA to the country and to the Congress.

NAFTA is a pathbreaking trade agreement because its implementation will bring a better deal for American workers, companies, and consumers, while acting as a spur for a cleaner environment and a better climate for workers on all sides of the border. Passage of the NAFTA is a high priority of our admin-

istration, and the appointment of Bill Daley to coordinate our efforts for its adoption should be viewed as a signal of my personal commitment. I am grateful to him for accepting this appointment and this challenge.

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

**Statement on the Report of the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry**  
*August 19, 1993*

Today I received with great interest and enthusiasm the report of the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry. For the past 3 months, Governor Baliles and his colleagues have worked tirelessly to identify ways to revive this critical industry. The Commission has done its work well.

Now my administration and the Congress must take the next steps to ensure that Government policy encourages a prosperous airline industry. Aviation provides high-wage jobs and is a leading exporter of American products and services. In the past, this industry has provided good jobs for millions of Americans, while meeting and beating our competition abroad. In recent years, however, both airlines and aerospace manufacturers have suffered financial losses and have laid off some of our most skilled and productive workers.

We have already taken the first and most important steps toward strengthening the aviation industry. This sector's problems are intertwined with our Nation's broader economic challenges. By reducing the deficit and providing incentives for economic expansion, the recently enacted budget creates the climate for economic growth that is a precondition for the revival of aviation.

The Commission's report recommends several additional steps to achieve an air transport system that is efficient, technologically superior, and financially strong. Under the leadership of Transportation Secretary Federico Peña and Council of Economic Advisers Chair Laura Tyson, my administration will consider these proposals and develop an administration plan. We will work with Congress to respond to the indus-

try's problems in a manner consistent with our deficit reduction and economic goals.

I look forward to meeting with Governor Baliles and the Commission members upon my return to Washington.

**Statement on Democratic National Health Care Campaign Chair Richard Celeste**

*August 19, 1993*

In selecting Governor Celeste to chair the national health care campaign, David Wilhelm has made a superb choice. I had the pleasure of working side-by-side with Governor Celeste for 8 years as a fellow member of the National Governors' Association. I learned then what the people of Ohio know well: Governor Celeste is a strong, effective, charismatic leader, and a remarkable motivator of people.

Governor Celeste's proven ability to forge bipartisan consensus will be a great help as Democrats and Republicans work together to reform our health care system. I am heartened to know that Governor Celeste will help in our fight to bring health security to every American. Health care reform is a complex issue, and it is critically important to our lives.

I know that Governor Celeste accepted this new challenge because he wants to serve all the people, and I compliment David Wilhelm on his leadership in making this appointment.

**Memorandum on Assistance to African Refugees**

*August 19, 1993*

Presidential Determination No. 93-33

*Memorandum for the Secretary of State*

*Subject:* Determination Pursuant to Section 2(b)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as Amended

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2601(b)(2), I hereby designate African refugees who have returned to their countries of origin as qualify-

ing for reintegration assistance, and determine that such assistance will contribute to the foreign policy interests of the United States.

You are authorized and directed to inform the appropriate committees of the Congress of this determination and the obligation of funds under this authority, and to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

**William J. Clinton**

### **Memorandum on Assistance to Mozambican Refugees**

*August 19, 1993*

Presidential Determination No. 93-34

*Memorandum for the Secretary of State*

*Subject:* Determination Pursuant to Section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as Amended, and Amendment to Presidential Determination 92-39 of August 17, 1992

Pursuant to section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(1), I hereby determine that it is important to the national interest that up to \$6,300,000 of the \$14,000,000 of the funds previously authorized for use in support of Angolan repatriation be available to meet the urgent and unexpected needs of Mozambican refugees and returnees. This determination amends Presidential Determination 92-39 of August 17, 1992, to permit the use of up to \$6,300,000 of the funds authorized by that determination from the U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund to meet the needs of Mozambican refugees and returnees through contributions to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

You are authorized and directed to inform the appropriate committees of the Congress of this determination and the obligation of funds under this authority, and to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

**William J. Clinton**

### **Memorandum on the Combined Federal Campaign**

*August 19, 1993*

*Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies*

The Combined Federal Campaign is an avenue through which thousands of Federal employees voluntarily express their concern for others each year. Public servants working in nearly every corner of the globe not only contribute to the campaign but assume leadership roles to assure that the campaign is a huge success.

I am delighted to inform you that Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown has agreed to serve as the chair of the 1993 Combined Federal Campaign of the National Capital Area. I ask you to support Secretary Brown by personally chairing the campaign in your agency and appointing a top official as your vice chairman.

Your commitment and visible support will help to guarantee another successful campaign this year. Together, we must do everything we can to encourage Federal employees everywhere to do their part by participating in the 1993 Combined Federal Campaign.

**William J. Clinton**

### **Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Cyprus Conflict**

*August 19, 1993*

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

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (22 U.S.C. 2373 (c)), I am submitting to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered the period from November 13, 1992, through February 14, 1993, the date of the election of Glafcos Clerides to succeed George Vassiliou as President of the Republic of Cyprus. The current report covers the remainder of February through July 15, 1993.

On February 22, Secretary of State Warren Christopher, while enroute between Beirut, Lebanon, and Cairo, Egypt, met with President-elect Clerides and then-President

Vassiliou at the airport in Larnaca, Cyprus. During this short meeting, the Secretary of State assured them of the continued high level of U.S. interest in U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali's efforts to find a fair and permanent solution to the Cyprus problem.

President Clerides was sworn in on February 28.

On March 2, the U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator, Ambassador John Maresca, met in Rome with his counterpart from the Government of Turkey, Mr. Tugay Ulucevic. Ambassador Maresca also met with the U.N. Secretary General's Deputy Special Representative, Mr. Gustave Feissel in Rome. At both meetings, Ambassador Maresca stressed the necessity of an early resumption of the Cyprus negotiations.

Also on March 2, in Nicosia, Mr. Oscar Camilion, the Secretary General's Special Representative, informed the parties that he was resigning the position to return to the service of the Argentine Government as Minister of Defense. Mr. Camilion left Cyprus in mid-March after participating in another round of preparatory talks on the island. During Minister Camilion's tenure as the Secretary General's Special Representative, substantial progress was made toward resolution of the Cyprus dispute, and I would like to take this opportunity to add my appreciation for his long and distinguished service.

U.N. Under-Secretary General Marrack Goulding and Mr. Feissel arrived in Nicosia for a round of preparatory talks on March 7 and, during the course of the talks, obtained commitments from President Clerides and Mr. Denktash to come to New York for a short face-to-face meeting on March 30. On March 10, the two Cypriot leaders met for dinner at the invitation of Mr. Camilion, the first face-to-face meeting on the island of the leaders of the two communities in several years.

At the end of the preparatory meetings in Cyprus, Goulding and Feissel returned to New York where they met on March 15 with Ambassador Maresca to discuss their plans for the March 30 meeting.

On March 25, on the occasion of the National Day of the Hellenic Republic of Greece, I publicly restated the strong U.S. interest in the U.N. Secretary General's ef-

forts to reach a fair and permanent solution of the Cyprus problem.

In preparation for the face-to-face meeting between the two Cypriot leaders scheduled for March 30, the members of the U.N. Security Council authorized the President of the Security Council to issue a statement that called on the parties to cooperate fully with the U.N. Secretary General and reaffirmed the determination of the Security Council members to remain seized of the Cyprus question and to lend their support to the Secretary General's efforts. (The full text of the Security Council President's statement is enclosed.)

On March 29, the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Madeleine Albright, met with President Clerides and Mr. Denktash to reiterate the U.S. position that both sides should work with the U.N. Secretary General to reach an equitable and lasting solution for the benefit of all Cypriots. She presented letters to the two leaders from Secretary of State Christopher and me.

At the March 30 face-to-face meeting, the leaders of the two communities agreed to return to New York for substantive discussions on May 24. The Under-Secretary General's summation of the meeting stated that the sides had agreed to resume their discussions "using the set of ideas for the purpose of reaching freely a mutually acceptable overall framework agreement" after a preparatory process on the island (full text enclosed). The summation also welcomed the parallel process of private meetings (that is, not under U.N. auspices) between the two leaders. There was another such meeting between the two leaders in New York on the margins of the U.N. talks.

Also on March 30, U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali issued a report on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus in which he requested a major restructuring and reorganization of the U.N. Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) due to reductions, withdrawals, and announcements of plans for further withdrawals of troops by troop contributors. (The full text of that report is enclosed.) Informal consultations among members of the Security Council on this subject continued throughout the remainder of this report-

ing period, ultimately resulting in changes in the way UNFICYP is financed. Information on the U.N. Security Council resolutions through which this was done will be found later in this report.

On March 31, the five Permanent Members of the U.N. Security Council held separate meetings with the leaders of the two communities to urge them to cooperate with the representatives of the Secretary General and to prepare for the substantive talks, which were to resume on May 24.

In mid-April, Mr. Feissel, who had been named as the new resident representative of the Secretary General on Cyprus, began the preparatory talks in Nicosia working on both the U.N. "set of ideas" and on confidence-building measures developed by the U.N. Secretariat, in accordance with the suggestions of the Secretary General at the end of the October-November session of the New York talks.

On April 24, I again publicly stated the strong U.S. commitment to a fair and permanent solution of the Cyprus problem. On the same day, President Turgut Özal of Turkey, who had strongly supported the efforts of the Secretary General to find such a solution, died after a strenuous effort to resolve serious disputes in south-west Asia.

Mr. Feissel concluded the first phase of his preparatory work in Nicosia on May 6, and, on the same day, the State Department's Director of Southern European Affairs, Mr. David Ransom, arrived in Nicosia. He was joined there on May 10 by Special Cyprus Coordinator Maresca, and both met with the leaders of the two communities to urge them to cooperate with the U.N. effort. Ambassador Maresca departed Cyprus on May 12 and Director Ransom departed on May 13 after meeting with Mr. Feissel, who had returned to Nicosia for additional intensive preparation for the May 24 meetings in New York.

A U.N. Security Council resolution sponsored by the United Kingdom on the structure and financing of the U.N. Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus was vetoed by Russia on May 11 because it appeared to eliminate voluntary contributions as a preferred way of financing U.N. peace-keeping operations. (Another resolution was successfully nego-

tiated during the two weeks that followed, and it was passed on May 27, after the end of this reporting period.)

Mr. Feissel's intensive preparations for the May 24 New York negotiating round focused on a package of confidence-building measures, which included a plan to reopen the fenced area of the city of Varosha and the Nicosia International Airport under U.N. auspices.

In my view, the package of confidence-building measures is fair and balanced, offers significant benefits to both sides, and should be accepted by both sides as a means of improving the atmosphere for negotiation of a fair and permanent resolution of the Cyprus problem. More specifically, I urge Mr. Denktash, the leader of the Turkish-Cypriot community, to accept this package in order to establish a better climate for negotiations based on the U.N. "set of ideas." I believe that the Government of Turkey also should exercise its special responsibility to urge him to accept this package. This is an historic opportunity for the Turkish-Cypriot community and for all Cypriots. It would be tragic if this opportunity to move forward were missed.

Following these developments, the U.N. Secretary General's resident representative in Cyprus was engaged in intensive talks in Nicosia with the leaders of the two Cypriot communities, which focused on a package of confidence-building measures, including the reopening, under U.N. auspices, of both the Nicosia International Airport and the city of Varosha, on the eastern coast of Cyprus. These consultations ended, and Mr. Feissel returned to U.N. Headquarters on May 20 to begin final preparations for the May 24 New York negotiating session.

That session opened, as scheduled, with a meeting chaired by the U.N. Secretary General and attended by the leaders of the two Cypriot communities, Mr. Joseph Clark, the Secretary General's newly appointed Special Representative; Cyprus Coordinator John Maresca; and U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus Robert Lamb.

During the next five days it became apparent that Mr. Denktash, the leader of the Turkish-Cypriot community, was not prepared to accept the package of confidence-building measures. He asked for additional

time to consider the package and consult with his community. The Secretary General initially granted Mr. Denktash four additional days. At a meeting on June 1, chaired, in the absence of the Secretary General by Mr. Clark, Mr. Denktash was granted an additional postponement until June 14, with the approval of the representatives of the permanent members of the Security Council, also present, on condition that Mr. Denktash would seek a positive response from his community on the proposed package of confidence-building measures, including the proposals for Varosha and the Nicosia International Airport.

On June 8, the State Department released a statement (copy attached) that supported the U.N. Secretary General's package of confidence-building measures, including his proposals for Varosha and the Nicosia International Airport, stated that we believe the package is fair and balanced and that it offers real economic and practical benefits to both sides and that the package should be accepted quickly and in its entirety, and stated our belief that Turkey should be helpful in ensuring an agreement on this package.

Also on June 8, in an airport statement on his arrival in Turkey, Mr. Denktash made it clear that he was not seeking a positive response from his community to the Secretary General's package. On the same day, Secretary Christopher spoke with Turkish Foreign Minister Cetin, who, like Secretary Christopher, was in Athens for the meetings of the North Atlantic Council and the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, about the developing situation.

On June 9, a letter on the Cyprus situation and the U.N. Secretary General's confidence-building package from Secretary Christopher was delivered to Foreign Minister Cetin. In a speech to the Turkish Grand National Parliament, in Ankara, on the following day, and in follow-up statements to the media, Mr. Denktash said that he could not accept the confidence-building package and would not return to New York as scheduled on June 14.

Secretary Christopher discussed the Cyprus situation with President Demirel and Foreign Minister Cetin in meetings in Ankara on June 12. In New York, a spokesman

for the U.N. Secretary General issued a statement (copy attached) the same day that stated that the Secretary General had been informed by Mr. Denktash that he would not be able to return to New York as planned on June 14 and that a representative of Mr. Denktash would come in his stead "to explain the situation that has arisen." The statement said that the Secretary General regretted that Mr. Denktash had unilaterally departed from the agreement of June 1, and that, as a consequence, the joint meetings would not resume at U.N. Headquarters as planned on June 14. The Secretary General undertook to submit a report to the Security Council.

On June 14, Mr. Kenan Atakol, representing Mr. Denktash, arrived in New York and started a series of meetings with Mr. Feissel and members of the diplomatic missions to the U.N. of the five Permanent Members of the Security Council. Mr. Atakol was not prepared to discuss "practical problems" concerning the Secretary General's confidence-building package, to which Mr. Denktash had referred in Nicosia and Ankara. On June 25, before returning to Cyprus, Mr. Atakol met with Ambassador Edward Walker, the U.S. Deputy Representative to the U.N.

On July 1, the Secretary General issued the report (copy attached) that he had promised on June 12. In the report he reviewed his efforts since November 1992, explained in detail the confidence-building package that he had proposed, including his proposals for Varosha and the Nicosia International Airport, and provided observations on the current state of the negotiations. The gist of those paragraphs is that: (paragraph 45) all concerned have a special responsibility to bring to a positive conclusion an effort that has already produced "significant progress"; (paragraph 46) the Secretary General was particularly gratified that the preparations in Nicosia for the May 24 New York negotiating session had brought his confidence-building proposals to an advanced stage; (paragraph 47) the Varosha/Nicosia International Airport proposals would bring considerable and proportionate benefits to both Cypriot communities; (paragraph 48) beyond the economic gains to both sides, the package would open avenues of contact between the communities and engender the kind of goodwill that

should exist in a federation; (paragraph 49) the Secretary General is disappointed that, despite his assurances of June 1, Mr. Denktash neither promoted the acceptance of the package during his consultations in Nicosia and Ankara, nor did he honor his agreement to return to New York on June 14; (paragraph 50) the Secretary General hopes that the merits of the package will commend themselves to all concerned once they have been fully presented; and (paragraph 51) the Secretary General intends to continue his efforts and, to that end, has asked his Special Representative (Mr. Clark) to visit Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey in the following few weeks. The Secretary General also attached, as an annex to his report, a list of the confidence-building measures that his representatives had proposed to the two sides (including the Varosha/Nicosia International Airport proposals, which were detailed in the body of the report).

The Security Council, on July 7, approved a letter (text attached) from its President to Secretary General Boutros-Ghali that endorsed the conclusions of the Secretary General's report and underlined the obligation of both parties to cooperate fully with the Secretary General in promptly reaching an overall framework agreement and, in the first instance, in reaching an agreement on the Secretary General's confidence-building package.

The letter welcomed the Secretary General's decision to send Mr. Clark to Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey, and requested a report from the Secretary General in September 1993, and, if necessary, his recommendations for action by the Security Council.

Mr. Clark and Mr. Feissel arrived in Nicosia on July 13 on the mission outlined in the Secretary General's report. On the same day, the U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator, Ambassador Maresca, arrived in Ankara for discussions with the Government of Turkey on the Cyprus question.

On June 11, the Security Council extended the mandate of the U.N. Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for an additional six-month period until December 15, 1993. As noted in the last report, the Council had reached agreement on the future mission and funding of UNFICYP on May 27, during

the New York negotiating session outlined above. The U.N. Secretariat continues to seek forces to replace the Canadian contingent that began its previously planned withdrawal in the week following June 15. (The Secretary General's report of June 9 on U.N. operations is attached.)

As I noted in the conclusions of my last letter to you on this subject, I believe that the Secretary General's package of confidence-building measures is fair and balanced. I believe that its acceptance by both sides, promptly and in its entirety, would certainly improve the atmosphere and could speed the acceptance of an overall framework agreement based on the Secretary General's "set of ideas." I want to reiterate the strong support of the U.S. for the efforts of the Secretary General to carry out his good-offices mandate and to reach a conclusion acceptable to both Cypriot communities and which is for their mutual benefit. It is time for all concerned to build on the substantial progress noted by the U.N. Secretary General in his July 1 report and to resolve this long-standing problem.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders  
Reporting on Proliferation of  
Chemical and Biological Weapons**

*August 19, 1993*

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

On November 16, 1990, in light of the dangers of the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12735, and declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*). Under section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), the national emergency terminates on the anniversary date of its declaration unless the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice of its continuation. On November 11,

1992, the previous Administration extended the emergency, noting that the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act contain periodic reporting requirements regarding activities taken and money spent pursuant to an emergency declaration. This report is made pursuant to those provisions. Additional information on chemical and biological weapons proliferation is contained in the report to the Congress provided pursuant to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991.

The United States has continued to control the export of items with potential use in chemical or biological weapons or in unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction through the 3 export control regulations issued under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative. The United States has also continued to address the problem of the proliferation and use of chemical and biological weapons in its international diplomatic efforts.

In January 1993 the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) was opened for signature in Paris. In addition to banning chemical weapons among its parties, the Convention will also require parties to restrict, and ultimately cut off, trade in certain chemical weapons-related chemicals with nonparties. The United States was an original signatory of the Convention and has sought to encourage other countries to sign as well. To date, over 145 nations have signed the CWC, which is expected to enter into force in early 1995.

The United States is playing a leading role in the work of the CWC Preparatory Commission, which is meeting in The Hague to work out the procedural and administrative details for implementing the Convention.

The membership of the Australia Group (AG) of countries cooperating against chemical and biological weapons proliferation has grown from 22 to 25, with the group admitting Argentina, Hungary, and Iceland to membership at its December 1992 meeting.

At the same meeting, all AG-member countries agreed to impose export controls on a common list of biological organisms, toxins, and equipment.

In December 1992, Hungary hosted a seminar on Australia Group practices for non-Australia Group countries from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. The AG plans further outreach programs to non-members. Progress also was made in the steps taken by countries outside the Australia Group to expand chemical weapons export controls. India announced that it would control all chemicals on the Chemical Weapons Convention schedules even before the CWC enters into force, and China indicated that it would do the same.

Pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, there were no additional expenses directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency.

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.

---

## 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.

---

### **August 16**

In the early morning, the President, Hillary Clinton, and Chelsea Clinton traveled from Vail, CO, to Tulsa, OK. Later in the afternoon, they traveled to Springdale, AR.

### **August 17**

The President announced his intention to nominate the following persons to the positions indicated:

- Luis Sequeira, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Science and Education;
- Anthony A. Williams, Chief Financial Officer, Department of Agriculture;

- Michael DiMario, Public Printer of the United States;
- Margaret A. Browning, member, National Labor Relations Board;
- Magdalena Jacobsen, member, National Mediation Board; and
- Anthony P. Carnevale, Chairman, National Commission for Employment Policy.

The White House announced the President has invited the following Caribbean leaders to the White House for a working luncheon on August 30:

- Prime Minister Hubert Ingraham of the Bahamas;
- President Cheddi Jagan of Guyana;
- Prime Minister Patrick Manning of Trinidad and Tobago;
- Prime Minister P.J. Patterson of Jamaica; and
- Prime Minister Erskine Sandiford of Barbados.

### **August 18**

In the late afternoon, the President, Hillary Clinton, and Chelsea Clinton returned to Washington, DC.

In the evening, the President had a telephone conversation with Japanese Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa to congratulate him on recently assuming the position of Prime Minister.

### **August 19**

In the afternoon, the President, Hillary Clinton, and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Martha's Vineyard, MA, for vacation.

---

## **Nominations Submitted to the Senate**

---

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

---

## **Checklist of White House Press Releases**

---

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

---

### **Released August 17**

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's invitation to five Caribbean leaders on August 30

### **Released August 19**

Announcement of appointment of Kevin Anderson to the White House Office of Communications

### **Released August 20**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's telephone conversation with Japanese Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa

---

## **Acts Approved by the President**

---

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