

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, September 6, 1993
Volume 29—Number 35
Pages 1655–1694

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Meetings With Foreign Leaders
Departure from Martha's Vineyard, MA—
1657
FBI Director, swearing-in ceremony—1680
1992 Nobel Prize recipients—1684
Opportunity Skyway school-to-work program
in Georgetown, DE—1685
Radio address—1655
Special Adviser to the President for NAFTA,
announcement—1689
Summer of Service forum in College Park,
MD—1665
White House interfaith breakfast—1657

Appointments and Nominations

Agriculture Department, Farmers Home
Administration, Administrator—1678
Defense Department, Assistant Secretary—
1678
Energy Department, Assistant Secretary—
1682
Health and Human Services Department,
Indian Health Service, Director—1678
Labor Department, Assistant Secretaries—
1678
Senior Executive Service positions—1679,
1692
U.S. International Development Cooperation
Agency, Agency for International
Development, Assistant Administrator—
1678
Veterans Affairs Department, Assistant
Secretary—1678
White House Office, Special Adviser to the
President for NAFTA—1689

Executive Orders

Adding Members to the Committee on
Foreign Investment in the United States—
1691

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Blue Room—1664, 1684
Cabinet Room—1665
East Room—1661
Oval Office—1689
Roosevelt Room—1660
Rose Garden—1682

Letters and Messages

Labor Day, message—1692

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Caribbean leaders—1661
Russia, Prime Minister Chernomyrdin—1682

Proclamations

National POW/MIA Recognition Day—1691

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations
30th Anniversary of the March on Washington
for Jobs and Freedom—1656

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1694
Checklist of White House press releases—
1693
Digest of other White House
announcements—1693
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1693

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, September 3, 1993

The President's Radio Address

August 28, 1993

Good morning. Thirty years ago today a great American spoke about his dream for equality, brotherhood, and the need to make real the promises of democracy. His voice thundered from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, across the great Mall in Washington, and into our homes, our heart, and our history. That man, of course, was the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

He lived and died in a great struggle to close the gap between our words and our deeds, to make good on good intentions, to see that none of us can be fully free until all of us are fully free, to make us all agents of change.

In the 30 years since Martin Luther King gave what I believe is the greatest speech by an American in my lifetime, we've come a long way. But clearly, we've got a long way to go before realizing his dreams. We owe it to him, to his work, to his memory to re-dedicate ourselves today to the causes of civil rights, civic responsibility, and economic opportunity for every American. In the last 7 months, we've made some great strides on that road.

To begin to turn good words into better deeds we first had to get our economic house in order. That's what we did by breaking gridlock and passing a tough economic program to cut our deficit by nearly \$500 billion over 5 years, to give new incentives to businesses to expand, to individuals to invest, and to create millions of new high-wage jobs here at home.

Already we've felt some of the good side effects of getting serious about our economy. Unemployment has dipped to its lowest level in 22 months, and interest rates are at their lowest rates in 20 years. We've also won some important battles for working families. The Family Leave Act now permits people to take some time off from work to care for a sick

family member or a newborn child without losing their job. And changes in the tax laws now provide that no one who works 40 hours a week with children in the home will live in poverty. That's a big first step in welfare reform and in ending welfare as we know it. It's prowork and profamily.

We're moving to open the doors of college education to all Americans at a time when education is more important than ever to getting good jobs. We've reorganized the student loan program so that there will be lower interest rates, and repayments will be tied to income and, therefore, easier to make. We're on the verge of passing the national service program to give our young people the chance to use their energies and talents to rebuild our communities and, at the same time, to help pay for their college educations.

We've been moving on a massive program of defense conversion to help defense workers, military personnel, and communities who won the cold war build a brighter future even in the face of defense reductions. And because we want America to be a safer place, I've sent to Congress a crime bill that, among other things, will put tens of thousands more police officers on the streets and will pass the Brady bill to provide for a waiting period before handguns can be bought.

We're moving to change politics as usual. The Senate has passed a campaign finance reform bill that gives less influence to political action committees and opens the doors of communication to all candidates. And they've passed a lobby reform bill to reduce the influence of lobbyists. Now we have to get the House to pass these bills, too.

So in the quiet of this August day, as we reflect on what's happened over the last several months, we can say that together we've made a good beginning, but the job has just begun. There are still great challenges out there for Americans. There aren't enough jobs, incomes are too stagnant, and there is too much insecurity for too many families.

Our biggest challenge is to reform health care. It's the main reason millions of people can't get pay raises. It's the chief cause of insecurity for millions of families. It's the biggest culprit in the Federal deficit. And it's a threat to America's business growth because we're spending over 14 percent of our income on health care. Our competitors, the Germans and the Japanese, are spending just over 8 percent of their income on health care, and they have every bit as good a health care system, in most ways, as we do.

Soon the First Lady's task force will make its recommendations on what we need to do to ensure that every American has access to good, affordable health care, a plan that keeps what's good about our health care system—our doctors, our nurses, our health care providers, our medical research, our great technology—but a plan that changes what's wrong: an increasingly expensive and unjustifiable system of finance, one that's too bureaucratic, one that has runaway costs.

Another urgent task for our country is to pass the North American Free Trade Agreement. Last year I told the American people this agreement with Mexico and Canada could mean more jobs for Americans if it could be strengthened to ensure that our jobs would not be lost because of low environmental standards or depressed wages in Mexico. Today I can tell you we've won unprecedented provisions in this agreement that will help to guarantee that it will benefit all Americans. When it's in place, we'll open up a whole new world of job opportunity for Americans here at home by trading more with Mexico and ultimately with the rest of Latin America, the second fastest growing area in the world.

We're also dedicated to fixing our own Government, to reducing unnecessary bureaucracy, eliminating waste, increasing the quality of service, in giving you more value for your dollar. We haven't reexamined the way our Government works or doesn't work, for a very long time. But for the last several months, Vice President Gore has been studying the problem with the best experts in the country, and early next month we'll have his recommendations on how our Government can serve you better and save you money. Quite simply, we've still got a lot to do in

a town where change is hard and words too often substitute for real action. Congress, however, has already spent about 40 percent more time on the job than it did last year.

Many people say I'm pushing too hard for change. Well, 30 years ago today Martin Luther King said, "This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy." As our children go back to school and, after a great family vacation, I go back to work, I have faith that together we can do just that, make real the promises of democracy for all Americans.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 9:45 a.m. on August 27 at a private residence on Martha's Vineyard, MA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on August 28.

Statement on the 30th Anniversary of the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom

August 28, 1993

On this day 30 years ago, almost a quarter million Americans gathered in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial to ask our Nation to uphold its founding ideals of equal justice and equal opportunity for all.

As he looked at the crowd, Martin Luther King, Jr., must have been inspired by what he saw: people of every color, united in mutual respect and common purpose, representing America as it was meant to be and as it must be. In the words of A. Philip Randolph, whose vision of a multiracial movement for social justice inspired this historic demonstration, those who marched on August 28, 1963, were "the advance guard of a massive moral revolution for jobs and freedom."

Three decades later, we remember how far we have come on freedom's trail, and we rededicate ourselves to completing the journey. As a son of the South, I have seen in my own lifetime how racism held all of us down and how the civil rights movement set all of us free. We must never forget the hard-

earned lesson that America can only move forward when we move forward together.

That is why we rededicate ourselves to vigorous enforcement of the civil rights laws, to eradicating discrimination of every kind, and to opposing intolerance in all its forms. And we firmly believe that, as such visionary leaders as Martin Luther King, A. Philip Randolph, and Bayard Rustin understood three decades ago, jobs and freedom are inextricably linked. Human dignity demands that each of us have the opportunity to use our God-given abilities, to support ourselves and our families, and to produce something of value for our fellow men and women.

In everything we do, we are guided by that vision of economic empowerment. That is why we have struggled to lift the working poor out of poverty. That is why we have struggled to expand the opportunities for education, training, and national service. That is why we have struggled to bring new jobs, new opportunities, and new hope to communities all across this country, from our smallest towns to our oldest cities. That is why we will spare no effort to provide every family in America with health care they can count on, health care that's always there. And as we pursue the timeless goals of opportunity for all and responsibility for all, let us follow the example of those who marched 30 years ago and work together, regardless of race or region or religion or party.

As we honor the past and build the future, let us listen again to the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., "Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy . . . now is the time to make justice a reality for all God's children." Together, we can make that dream a reality. Together, we can make the country we love everything it was meant to be.

Remarks Prior to Departure From Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts *August 29, 1993*

The President. Can you hear me? Good. Well, first of all, let me thank you all for coming. I'm astonished by this crowd, but it is what we have seen all week. I can't thank you enough on behalf of all of us for the wonderful hospitality we've had here. My

family never needed a vacation more, and it's hard to imagine how this one could have been better. We are going home immensely grateful to all the people who have been here, for your hospitality, your warmth, your understanding of the problems we caused on occasion and very much refreshed, renewed, and ready to go back to work for the American people.

We have a lot of work to do. We're going to take up the health care issue, which I think is the most important thing out there facing our country right now and any number of other things that you will read about in the days ahead.

I don't want to give a political talk tonight. I just want to tell you that, at a very personal level, this was a wonderful 10 days for us, and we are grateful to all of you. This has been a great time. This is a great family place. I wish everyone in America could see it, but at times I thought everyone in America was here already. *[Laughter]*

I'd like to ask Hillary to come up and say a word on behalf of our family, and I want to thank you again. And we want to get out here and shake a few hands before we leave, but I want Hillary to say a word or two.

[At this point, Hillary Clinton thanked everyone for helping to make their family vacation enjoyable.]

The President. Thank you very much. Bless you. I hope we'll see you again. Thank you so much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:36 p.m. at the Martha's Vineyard Airport.

Remarks at a White House Interfaith Breakfast *August 30, 1993*

Thank you. Thank you very much. I want to, once again, as the First Lady did, welcome all of you to the White House on behalf of Vice President and Mrs. Gore and Hillary and myself. We're delighted to have you all here.

We wanted to make this new beginning by beginning with a group of religious leaders from all faiths and parts of our country to come here today as we rededicate ourselves to the purposes for which we're called here.

I wanted to make just a couple of brief remarks. We've had an immensely interesting conversation at our table about some of the things which are dividing Americans of faith as well as those which are uniting them. I would say to you that I am often troubled as I try hard here to create a new sense of common purpose. All during the election I would go across the country and say that we're all in this together. Unless we can find strength in our diversity, our diversity of race, our diversity of income, our diversity of region, our diversity of religious conviction, we cannot possibly meet the challenges before us. That does not mean, in my view, that we have to minimize our diversity, pretend that we don't have deep convictions, or run away from our honest disagreements. It means that we must find a way to talk with respect with one another about those things with which we disagree and to find that emotional as well as the intellectual freedom to work together when we can.

A couple of days ago, when I was on vacation—let me say, the most important religious comment made to me this morning was that several of you gave me dispensation for my vacation. You said I did not need to feel any guilt for taking a little time off, so I appreciate that. *[Laughter]* But I bought a book on vacation called "The Cultural Disbelief" by Steven Carter, a professor at our old alma mater, Hillary's and mine, at the law school. He is himself a committed Christian, very dedicated to the religious freedoms of all people of faith, of any faith, in the United States. And the subtitle of the book is "How American Law and Politics Trivialize Religious Devotion." And I would urge you all to read it from whatever political as well as religious spectrum you have because at least it lays a lot of these issues out that I am trying to grapple with.

Sometimes I think the environment in which we operate is entirely too secular. The fact that we have freedom of religion doesn't mean we need to have freedom from religion. It doesn't mean that those of us who

have faith shouldn't frankly admit that we are animated by the faith, that we try to live by it, and that it does affect what we feel, what we think, and what we do.

On the other hand, it is very important that, as Americans, we approach this whole area with a certain amount of humility, that we be careful when we say that because we seek to know and do God's will, God is on our side and, therefore, against our opponent. That is important for two reasons. One is, we might be wrong. *[Laughter]* After all, we're only human. The other is that the thing that has kept us together over time is that our Constitution and Bill of Rights gives us all the elbow room to seek to do God's will in our own life and that of our families and our communities. And that means that there will be inevitable conflicts, so that there will never be a time when everything that we think is wrong can also be illegal. There will always be some space there because there will have to be some room for Americans of good faith to disagree.

I think we need to find areas where we can agree and work together on. The restoration of religious freedoms acts is a very important issue to me personally. And this administration is committed to seeing it through successfully. And I think virtually every person of faith in this country, without regard to their party or philosophy or convictions on other issues, agrees with that. So we are hopeful that that will happen. But there must be other areas in which we can meet together and talk together and work together and frankly acknowledge our agreements and our disagreements.

If people of faith treat issues about which they disagree as nothing more than a cause for a screaming match, then we also trivialize religion in our country. And we undermine the ability to approach one another with respect and trust and faith. And I say that not just to those who disagree with me on some of the particularly contentious issues but also to those who agree with me. Every person in this country who seeks to know and do the will of his or her Creator is entitled to respect for that effort. That is a difficult job, difficult to know, even harder to do. That is hard work.

But people that have that level of depth, that aren't totally carried away by the secular concerns of the moment must, it seems to me, find a way to talk and work with one another if we're ever going to push the common good. We can't pass a health care program without a conviction that this is in the common interest, that over the long run we will all win. If this becomes some battle where I'm trying to slay some dragon of special interest and that's all it is, we'll never get where we want to go. The American people have to open their hearts as well as their minds and figure out—this is this horrible problem. We have to solve it. But we have to solve it in a way that enables us to be united together.

We can't work our way through a lot of these economic problems unless we frankly admit that we're moving into a new age where no one has all the answers. We may have to modify, all of us, our specific policy positions. But our goal should be to enable every person who lives in this country to live up to his or her God-given potential. And if we look at it that way and frankly admit we're in a new and different era, then we can go forward.

We can't possibly do anything for anybody in this country unless they're willing to also do something for themselves. There has to be a new ethic of personal and family and community responsibility in this country that should unite people across the lines of different faiths and even different political philosophies. And the people of faith in this country ought to be able to say that, so that if you say that you've got to have that sort of revitalization at the grassroots, person by person, that the Democrats can feel comfortable with saying that. No one says, "Oh, you're just being a rightwinger." It's just simply true. It is self-evidently true; you cannot change somebody's life from the outside in unless there is also some change from the inside out.

So these are the kinds of things that I've had a lot of time to think about over the last few days. And I have felt in the last several months during my Presidency that we oftentimes get so caught up in the battle of the moment, the heat of the moment—how are you going to answer this charge and make

that change or deal with this difficulty—that sometimes we forget that we are all in this because we are seeking a good that helps all Americans. There must be some sense of common purpose and common strength and, ultimately, an end which helps us all, that revels in the fact that there are people who honestly disagree about the most fundamental issues but can still approach one another with real respect, without assuming that if you disagree on issue X or Y, you've jumped off the moral and political cliff and deserve to be banished to some faraway place.

So I wanted to have you here today because I wanted you to hear this direct from your President. I wanted to ask you to continue to pray for me and for our administration, and I wanted to invite you to be part of an ongoing dialog, which we will come back to all of you later on, talk about how we can continue to involve people who care about their citizenship as well as about their relationship to their God and how we can work through these things.

There are no easy answers to this. The Founding Fathers understood that; that's why they wanted us to have the first amendment. There are no simple solutions. But I am convinced that we are in a period of historic significance, profound change here in this country and throughout the world and that no one is wise enough to see to the end of all of it, that we have to be guided by a few basic principles and an absolute conviction that we can recreate a common good in America.

But it's hard for me to take a totally secular approach to the fact that there are cities in this country where the average murderer is now under the age of 16. Now, there may not be a religious answer to the policy question of whether it's a good thing that all these kids can get their hands on semi-automatic weapons. But there certainly is something that is far more than secular about what is happening to a country where we are losing millions of our young people and where they shoot each other with abandon and now often shoot total strangers for kicks, shoot at them when they are swimming in the swimming pool in the summertime.

So I believe that we have enormous possibilities. I think we have enormous problems.

There will always be some areas of profound disagreement. What I would ask you today to do is to, as I said, to pray for us as we go forward, to be willing to engage in this dialog, to reach out to others who may disagree with us on particular issues and bring them into the family of America, and to give us a chance to find common ground so that we can build a common good and do what all of us in our own way are required to do. For I believe that each of us has a ministry in some way that we must play out in life and with a certain humility but also with deep determination.

So I thank you for being here. This has been a wonderful morning for me and for all of us. And I ask you to think about these things and to be willing to continue to engage in this dialog. We have a lot of work to do to lift this country up and to pull this country together and to push this country into the 21st century. And we have serious responsibilities beyond our borders. Every day there is some good news in the press about that. Some of you have been talking about the Middle East. How many times have we thought we had good news and been disappointed?, but better than the bad. And every day there is some frustration. So we have to go forward with a much deeper sense of shared values and togetherness toward the common good than we've had so far. That is what I seek to do and what I ask for your prayers and guidance and support and involvement, active involvement, to achieve.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:03 a.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting on Flood Relief and Hurricane Emily *August 30, 1993*

The President. Let me say, I asked that James Lee Witt to come in this morning to provide to me and to the Vice President and to our senior staff a briefing on Hurricane Emily and what provisions we're making to be ready for that and as well as to give me an update the—how we're handling the aftermath of the flood damage in the Mid-

west. And as you know, there was more flooding in Iowa yesterday.

So those are the two things we're going to be talking about, and I thought I would maybe just let Mr. Witt say a word or two and then you may have a couple of questions.

[*At this point, Director Witt gave a briefing on Hurricane Emily and stated that FEMA was prepared for the storm.*]

Middle East Peace Talks

Q. Mr. President, changing the subject for a second. The Palestinians and the Israelis appear to have some historic breakthrough involving perhaps mutual Israeli-PLO recognition. If the Israelis and the PLO recognize each other, will that result in the U.S. resuming its dialog with the PLO?

The President. Well, first, let me say I am very much encouraged by what is happening there and very hopeful. The administration has worked hard to facilitate it. But ultimately, whatever happens will have to be done by the parties themselves. If there is a new and different landscape in the Middle East, then I might be willing to entertain some questions. But I can't say now. I can't answer your question now. It's hypothetical, and it would only interfere with the discussions now going on. I don't think it's appropriate for the United States even to consider its own position here until the parties have a chance to work out a resolution of this.

Q. But the U.S. did have intervention in this, didn't it? I mean—

The President. Oh, absolutely. I don't know if I would call it an intervention, but we've certainly worked hard to be a handmaiden or whatever the appropriate term is—

Q. So you are involved?

The President. We are involved, but our position has not been at issue here and should not be discussed until the parties themselves worked out their differences.

NAFTA

Q. Mr. President, Senator Dole suggested the prospects for NAFTA would be better were you to take it up to the Senate first. Do you agree?

The President. Yes, I think I do. At least my preliminary—I haven't talked to Mr. Daley about this or to the congressional leadership. But if you mean by that there's a far greater likelihood that today that NAFTA would pass in the Senate than the House, that's clearly correct.

Q. What's going to be your strategy for winning over the House Democrats? David Bonior says that 75 percent of them right now are against NAFTA.

The President. Well, not all of them have reached a position on it. And I want to do two or three things. First of all, as I told the Governors when I met with them in Tulsa, I'd like for all the Governors who support this to ask their Members of Congress to take no position until they actually read the agreement and see the implementing legislation itself.

Remember, my position, going back to 1992, was that I was not for the NAFTA agreement as originally concluded but that I would support it if certain conditions were met. Those conditions have been met as far as our agreements with the Mexicans. We still have to have a training program, but we're going to have the first trade agreement in history that's got strong environmental requirements and that has Mexico committing to raise its minimum wage as its economy grows.

So these are very encouraging and very different things. So my strategy for Democrats and Republicans who have not declared for but have not adamantly planted their feet in cement against, would be to ask them to read the agreement and wait until they see the implementing legislation, because that will tell them where we're going with the job training, and then make a judgment. And I think if that happens, we can prevail because, again I will say, Latin America is the second fastest growing part of the world. Mexico is just the beginning of this process. And I think it means more jobs for Americans. And I think I'll be able to persuade——

Q. Should Bonior remove his hat as your whip, and——

The President. No. I think that's a decision that the leadership in the House has to make. You know, Presidents and their Members of Congress are going to differ on some

things. I heard the other day—I don't know that this is true—but I heard that so far, the Democrats in the Congress have voted for me more consistently than the last two or three Democratic Presidents. I have not checked that. That's just what I heard.

Q. You don't believe that, do you?

The President. I think yes, I think they have with remarkable consistency and very high percentages. But I think that we have an honest disagreement here. He has worked his heart out for me. This is the first issue on which we have disagreed. I think he's wrong; he thinks I'm wrong. I think in the end that my position will prevail.

Hurricane Emily

Q. I want to get this question—the people in the Carolinas are remembering still in their mind not only the devastation, of course, but the response of the Federal Government after—that they consider that largely a nightmare as well. What do you say to them to let them know that you're prepared, well prepared, in case it does, of course, hit them?

The President. I would say two things. First of all, we're here looking at this map today trying to get ready. That's what we're doing here. And secondly, if you look at the way FEMA and the Agriculture Department and the other Departments handled the flooding in the Middle West, it's obvious that while we don't control what Mother Nature does, we're going to be on top of it with all the resources and effort that we can possibly marshal as quickly as possible.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:13 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to William M. Daley, Chairman, NAFTA Task Force. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Following Discussions With Caribbean Leaders

August 30, 1993

President Clinton. Good afternoon. Today I had the great honor of welcoming five outstanding leaders from the English-

speaking Caribbean to the White House: President Cheddi Jagan of Guyana, Prime Minister Erskine Sandiford of Barbados, Prime Minister Patrick Manning of Trinidad and Tobago—Tobago, excuse me; I'm still hoarse from our luncheon—Prime Minister P.J. Patterson of Jamaica, and Prime Minister Hubert Ingraham of the Bahamas. I'm impressed by the intelligence, the dynamism, and the dedication of the Caribbean leadership.

The end of the cold war has altered the nature but not the depth of our interest in the Caribbean. Our concern for the region is firmly rooted in geographic proximity, the resultant flows of people, of commodities and culture, and in our shared interest in fighting drug trafficking and projecting our economic interests and in protecting fragile ecosystems.

As with U.S.-Mexican relations, U.S.-Caribbean relations dramatically demonstrate the absolute inseparability of foreign and domestic issues. More than ever before, our Nation is a Caribbean nation. In our discussions, we recognize the concerns that NAFTA may adversely affect the Caribbean and Central American nations by diverting trade and investment flows to Mexico. Therefore, I want to announce today that I have asked Ambassador Mickey Kantor to study the impact of NAFTA on these small economies and to consult with them on new measures to increase regional trade.

American workers have a direct interest in the prosperity of the English-speaking Caribbean. The \$2 billion in United States exports to those countries creates at least 40,000 American jobs. Our warm and productive luncheon meeting covered many other areas as well. These nations are all vibrant democracies striving to adapt their economies to new global realities while maintaining a full respect for individual freedoms and human rights.

In the Organization of American States and in the United Nations, they consistently take strong stands in favor of the collective defense of democracy. They have all been firm supporters of multilateral efforts to restore President Aristide in Haiti. And we discussed cooperative security and economic measures to assist Haitian democracies. I thank them for their support of the restoration of President Aristide and, of course, we

all enjoyed a recounting of President Aristide's swearing-in of his new Prime Minister today.

The Caribbean community will be an important building block of a hemispheric community of democracies linked by growing economic ties and common political beliefs. That will happen, I believe, in no small measure because of the leadership of the five people who are here with us today. And I'd like now to ask them each in turn to come to the microphone and say a few remarks. And I think President Jagan is going first. He was here first in 1961. Is that right?

The microphone is yours, sir.

[At this point, President Jagan, Prime Minister Sandiford, Prime Minister Patterson, and Prime Minister Ingraham made brief remarks.]

President Clinton. Thank you. Let me also say, before you ask the question, if there are people here representing your nations, I want to make sure that I give them a chance to ask their questions also, but we'll start with Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

NAFTA

Q. Mr. President, since you have a better chance of passing NAFTA in the Senate, will you push for the Senate consideration first? And did it come as a surprise to you that the Caribbean would feel adversely affected by NAFTA? I mean, was it news?

President Clinton. No. Well, let me answer the first question first. I haven't made a decision on that yet, and I don't think I should until I consult with the supporters of the agreement. It can't pass in either House until the legislation is developed, which is now going on to embody the agreement. But I'm certainly open to that. I just simply haven't had the opportunity to sit down and visit with the supporters and see what they want to do. I have no objection to going that way.

With regard to the Caribbean, it didn't come as a surprise to me. I think in general what these leaders said was that they thought it was a good idea but that it shouldn't adversely affect existing relationships. Our administration has worked hard to have a posi-

tive mutually beneficial relationship with the CARICOM nations to faithfully carry out the laws of Congress, including one that was passed late last year designed to stop a previous problem with our efforts there. And I said, as I said today, I asked the Ambassador for Trade, Mickey Kantor, to look into this and see whether we can provide some assurances that there will not be a disadvantage to the Caribbean nations.

Cuba

Q. Mr. President, can you be more specific about what the dialog was on Cuba and bringing it into a more democratic society?

President Clinton. Actually, we had a general conversation about it. As you know, the position of CARICOM and the position of the United States with regard to trade with Cuba is different. I just simply reiterated that the Cuban democracy act does not sanction any trade with Cuba unless it is somehow subsidized by governments. That is not contemplated, so the difficulty issue we just got off the table, and then we talked a little bit about what the prospects were for economic and political reform in Cuba, something that is devoutly to be hoped for by the peoples of all the nations here represented. But there was nothing more specific than that.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, if the Bosnian peace agreement is reached in Geneva, how many American forces would you be willing to offer to help enforce that agreement? How long would they be required to serve? And what would be the risk to those forces?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, whether I would be prepared to do that or not depends on whether I'm convinced that the agreement is both—is fair, fully embraced by the Bosnian government, and is enforceable. That has been a source of concern for our military planners all along—about, you know, whether we could have something that would be enforceable.

But I made clear last February, and I will reiterate again, the United States is prepared to participate in a multinational effort to keep the peace in Bosnia. But I want to see what the details are. I want to get the briefing on it. I want to know that it will be enforceable.

But I'm certainly open to that, but I also want to know whose responsibility it is to stay, for how long.

It's a little bit different than the situation in Somalia, for example, where you really have two problems that relate to one another. There needs to be a lot of nation-building in Somalia from the ground up, a lot of institution-building. We did go there to stop the starvation and the violence and the bloodshed. But it's also true that the absence of order gave rise to all those problems.

And so we're still trying to fulfill our original mission in Somalia. This is a very different sort of thing, but I certainly think it can work. A multinational effort to keep the peace, if it is enforceable and the understandings are there, can clearly work. You can see that in the longstanding success we've had in our participation in the aftermath of the Camp David agreement.

Cuba

Q. Mr. President, my question is for Prime Minister Patterson, if you could step to the microphone. Going back to Cuba, what is the position of CARICOM in regards to Cuba? And do you think you can do anything to bring Cuba back into the democratic fold?

Prime Minister Patterson. First of all, what we are seeking to establish with Cuba is a joint commission that discusses the range of matters no different from those presently covered by a joint commission with Mexico, with Venezuela, with Colombia. It is not an agreement that provides for subsidized trade with Cuba and therefore does not offend any existing legislation in the United States or elsewhere.

We feel that the time has come for all countries in the hemisphere to work towards a normalization of relationships among them. There are differences between the political systems in Cuba and those in the CARICOM countries. We remain firmly committed to the democratic tradition. But Cuba unquestionably is a Caribbean country. That is a reality which we must face, and we believe that the joint commission should assist in the process of inducing Cuba towards the sorts of policies and programs that are compatible with those of other independent nations in the hemisphere.

Q. Would you like to see the U.S. do the same thing?

Prime Minister Patterson. What the U.S. does is a matter for the U.S. to determine. If we can assist anywhere in the process of contact or mediation, we are always prepared to do so.

Somalia

Q. Mr. President, in Mogadishu some of the humanitarian relief workers say that the U.S. raid early this morning was a blunder, and in fact, the U.S. military is making their job more difficult. What do you say to those who are there to help? And will the U.S. forces remain there long enough to capture Aideed? Is that a target for you?

President Clinton. Well, the United Nations operation set that as their objective, and they asked us for our help in that regard.

I would remind you that I understand the problems with this, but the United Nations believes, and has ample evidence to support the fact, that the supporters of Aideed murdered a substantial number of Pakistani peacekeepers and are behind the deaths of four Americans. So we have to deal with that. And I am open to other suggestions. I think the United Nations should be open to other suggestions.

To date, we have tried to be cooperative with the policies that have been jointly developed. We have not been just simply driving this. We have really tried to work within the framework of the U.N. to prove that this thing could work over the long run. We've also tried to make sure that everyone understood that this is not all of Somalia we're talking about. We're talking about one part of Mogadishu. In much of the rest of the country, the U.N. mission has continued unimpeded and successfully. I don't think anyone wants to change the fundamental character of it.

And so, would I be willing to discuss that with our people and with anyone else? Of course, I would. But I think it is very important to point out that what provoked this was people involved with Aideed killing the Pakistanis first and then the four Americans.

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*—talked about the need for—[*inaudible*]. Is there a need to ensure the dialog continues through

the establishment perhaps of U.S.-CARICOM policy machinery? What are you prepared to do?

President Clinton. Well, I think there is a need for a continuing dialog. One of the things that I pledged today to these leaders is that next year when the conference on the sustainable development in smaller nations is held in the Caribbean, that the United States would send a high level delegation there. And we didn't discuss any specific mechanism. But I think it is very important. You know, all these nations, and others not here present, in the Caribbean, are at different points in their history with different challenges. And I think that what we need to do is to make it clear that the United States is committed to democracy, to market economics, and to economic growth of this region over the long run. Here even at home we find great difficulty in predicting with precision what's going to happen economically, because we're in a period of real profound economic change. And I think it's important that we make these commitments over the long run and that we keep the doors of communication open, and that's exactly what we intend to do.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:09 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Exchange With Reporters Following Discussions With Caribbean Leaders

August 30, 1993

Cuba

Q. Mr. President, are there any conditions that would be met that you would be able to end the U.S. embargo on Cuba?

The President. We've had the press conference. [*Laughter*]

I support the Torricelli bill, as you know. I did when it was passed, and I still do. But I said before, I could just reiterate what I said again: We all hope that there will come a time when democracy and an open-economy will come to Cuba. And it will be a cause

of enormous celebration in this country when it happens.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:36 p.m. in the Blue Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With the Joint Chiefs of Staff

August 30, 1993

Defense Review

Q. Is this a crisis meeting, Mr. President?

The President. I hope not. [Laughter] The Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs say it's a meeting to discuss their review of the defense needs of the country and how we're going—

Somalia

Q. Was the Somalia raid bungled?

The President. I don't think I would characterize it in that way.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:16 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at the Summer of Service Forum in College Park, Maryland

August 31, 1993

The President. You know, I really love Senator Mikulski, if she just weren't so laid back and passive and soft-spoken, you might figure out what's on her mind. [Laughter] She was terrific.

I'd like to begin by introducing some other people who are here, and I hate to do this always because I know I'm going to miss someone that I should introduce. But I want to begin anyway by introducing the distinguished Governor of Maryland, Governor Don Schaefer, one of my former colleagues when I was a Governor; one of the most important leaders in the House of Representatives, Congressman Steny Hoyer from Maryland. I want to introduce a man who came all the way from his State of Connecticut to

be here with us today, the first Republican sponsor we had for the national service legislation, Representative Chris Shays from Connecticut. Thank you very much.

I see my good friend Senator Mike Miller there, the head of the democratic majority in the Senate of Maryland. A former Congressman from Maryland and now the Co-chair of the President's Council on Physical Fitness—when he stands up you'll see why—distinguished former professional basketball player, Mr. Tom McMillen, my friend in the back. I was really—Tom and I ran 4 miles together the other day, and he's almost 7 feet tall, and he ran at a pace I had difficulty maintaining. So I was very impressed. He convinced me he was qualified for the job I gave him.

And finally, I'd like to acknowledge the President of the University of Maryland, President William Kirwan, who is here. And in some ways, most important of all, the person who I put in charge of creating and carrying out the national service program, my friend of nearly 25 years, Mr. Eli Segal. I'd like to ask him to stand.

I'll tell you, I just saw—there's one other person way in the back I've got to introduce because he and I started working on this concept of national service a few years ago through an organization I was involved in called the Democratic Leadership Council. And he's a professor here at the University of Maryland, but he's on leave. He's working in the White House for me now, Professor Bill Galston. Thank you, Bill, for your help.

I came here mostly to listen to you today and to thank you, but I wanted to just say a few words. This campus has a special meaning in my life. The first time I ever came to the University of Maryland was 30 years ago this summer when I was a delegate from my home State of Arkansas to the American Legion Boys Nation program. We stayed here and then went to Washington frequently to learn about the Government. I met President Kennedy then. I saw Members of Congress, members of the Cabinet, and really had my eyes opened to a whole world of possibility. But the thing that I remember

I think most clearly after all these years is that President Kennedy said in his Inaugural that we should not ask what our country could do for us, but what we could do for our country. And he also said that we must always remember that here on Earth, God's work must truly be our own. That's what all of you have done.

I just finished a 2-week vacation, which I needed very badly because I've worked pretty hard the last several years. But you just finished 2 months of very important work. The summer of service ends today, and I hope you feel refreshed by the time you gave to other people and the service you rendered. And we are about to begin, as Senator Mikulski said, when the Senate passes the national service bill next week, we'll start the first full year of national service at the community level. I always believe that you and tens of thousands, eventually hundreds of thousands of young people like you could change the future of America, and in the process, could change your lives.

I ran for President for two big reasons: One is I thought our country was not going in the right direction; and the second, I thought our country was coming apart when it ought to be coming together. I wanted to get the country moving again, and I wanted to bring the country together again. I wanted people to have a sense of the common good. I wanted us to draw strength from our diversity and to face our problems honestly and to seize our opportunities. I wanted people to recognize again that we don't have a person to waste and that too many of our young people are being lost.

And I believed that we could do it. I never thought the Government could do all these things alone. I just don't believe that. And for too long our country has been in the middle of this great debate where some people say, well, the Government ought to solve these problems, and other people say the Government ought to walk away. And I don't believe either is right. The Government basically has to be a partner. In order for Government to work, it has to be a partner.

And I have now, for the last several years, long before I started running for President, tried to capture this idea in three simple words. It's those of us in Government, it's

our responsibility to try to help create opportunity. So our watchword should be opportunity. That's what the economic program's all about. That's what trying to reform the health care system's all about. That's what creating a national service bill is all about, trying to create opportunity. Then, citizens have to recognize that all the opportunity in the world doesn't amount to a hill of beans unless there is someone there to seize responsibility, personal responsibility, for themselves, their families, their communities, and for their neighbors. And finally, out of that we can build a new American community.

There are so many people lost today because they don't think anybody really cares about them, because they can't imagine the future, because they have never been the most important person in the world to anybody else. We have got to create a sense of community in this country where we're prepared to take responsibility for each other, not just to point the finger at each other and tell each other what we ought to do but to offer a helping hand.

So I say all these things to you because I think you represent that. You represent the best of the opportunity you were given to be in the summer of service, of the personal responsibility you displayed by doing your work, and of the sense of the community that you helped to create by what you have done.

If every American did what you did for the last 2 months, if we all could do that for several years, we could revolutionize our country. There are no problems we could not solve. There is no future we cannot have. And I hope with all my heart that what you have done here will set the standard for the national service projects in community after community that young people will engage in when this bill becomes law.

I told Eli on the way up here today I'm convinced now there are tens of thousands of young people who could do this every summer who may not need to, want to, or be able to do it during the year. And I'm not sure we shouldn't go back to the Congress, Senator Mikulski and Representative Hoyer and Representative Shays, and at least file a report on this summer of service and consider having a special summer program

over and above the year-long program we do because so many young people could do it just during the summer.

I just want you to remember that you are this country. You are America. You are this country. And so now I want to hear from you, but I want you to know that not just your President but your country is grateful to you for showing what America can be at its best. And I hope that we'll see it repeated hundreds of thousands of times over the course of my Presidency. And I hope it will become a permanent part of American life. If it does, the whole country will be stronger. Greg, shall we begin?

[At this point, Greg Ricks, facilitator of the event, explained the Summer of Service project and the format for the event and discussed the overall accomplishments of the group. A participant then discussed her experience working in an immunization program.]

The President. Thank you so much. That was a terrific presentation. Let me just make one comment about the immunization issue because your presentation pointed it up more clearly than my words could, but you all should know that in spite of the fact that America is a very wealthy country we have the third worst record in the Western Hemisphere of immunizing our children. One problem is the cost of vaccines. We make vaccines in this country which cost more money here than they do in many foreign countries. That's a long story, and we don't have to go through it, but one of the things that Congress did, and I want to thank those here who supported it, was to pass the economic program which included several hundred million dollars for the Federal Government to buy vaccines in bulk to make them available to clinics like the ones with which you were working. Even if you have the vaccines there it won't increase the immunization rate if people don't know about the service, don't feel comfortable about it, don't want their kids to be immunized. And one of the things that we clearly need is more people going out doing door-to-door work, doing community work, and it's obvious that there's not enough money in any local government, particularly an area with a lot of

poor people and a lot of diversity, to hire people to do that unless you have a service project like this. So the national service whole idea really carries within it the seeds of lifting the immunization rates of America to those of other advanced nations in the world and changing the whole health care future of thousands and thousands of young children. Thank you.

[At this point, a participant from ICARE-Philadelphia asked if the health care reform plan would subsidize immunization programs.]

The President. Yes, the health care plan that will be announced in the next few weeks will have a big component of preventive care in it and will also provide the resources necessary to support the community-based clinics.

I think it's very important that—we have spent too little on preventive and primary care, causing us to have to spend too much on emergency care and care in later stages. So we're going to try to invest more in preventive and primary care and in those neighborhood clinics both in urban and rural areas. I think it will make a huge difference. The Philadelphia program is very, very impressive.

Yes. Nice hat. [Laughter]

[A participant asked about the role of medical students and other health care professionals in the health care reform plan.]

The President. Yes, actually, of course, all the students in all the health care professions will be eligible to actually participate in some of these programs through the national service initiative, so there will be a continuing opportunity there both during the school year and during the summer to do that.

Secondly, we have tried over the last several months, through the task force that the First Lady has headed, to engage in dialog medical students, nursing students, other people studying in the health care professions to try to make sure that the incentives we have in this program produce the kind of health care system we want and give young people who really want to serve in the problem areas a chance to do it. For example, as compared with all other advanced countries, the United States has far more special-

ists and far fewer family practitioners—dramatic difference, huge difference from any other country. That means it's much harder to get people out in the basic clinics doing the basic services. So what we tried to do was to construct a program which would provide more incentives for medical schools and for students themselves, financial incentives and others, to go out and practice family medicine but at the same time would not frighten the American people into thinking we're backing off of medical technology. So there's going to be more invested in medical research under this program. So I think that it will be good, and I hope you will be able to take advantage of that and continue to participate.

[At this point, several participants described their experiences working on environmental service projects.]

The President. Thank you very much. I thought they both did a terrific job. I'd just like to make one comment again to try to reinforce the importance of the whole service concept in the environmental area.

When you talk to most people, maybe even a lot of you, and certainly in my mind when you mention environmental issues, often you think of policies that ought to be changed. So, for example, after I became President, I had promised to take some different policies. So we committed ourselves to signing the Biodiversity Treaty that other nations signed after the world conference in Rio de Janeiro last year, or we committed ourselves to reducing the amount of greenhouse gases in the environment to the 1990 levels by the year 2000, or last week we committed ourselves to no net loss of wetlands.

But as you can see, when you pass a law it's one thing to say these things and another to do it, just like you did the wetlands restoration project. An enormous number of the environmental things that need to be done in this country require the same amount of labor intensity that it does to go door-to-door and try to immunize children. The lead paint example in New York is just one, but it is a very good one. That's a serious problem in many of the major cities in America, exposing some of the most vulnerable children.

That's another irony that you brought out here in your environmental presentation. A lot of people think of the environment as preserving distant areas that most people never see. But the truth is that the people in this country who need a better environment than most may be those who live in inner cities, who are most subject to pollution from dumps that are there, from lead in the paint, from any number of other threats.

So I really appreciate this because I hope that we can come to see the environment not only in terms of the sweeping national policies that the Vice President and I have committed ourselves to but also in terms of things that preserve the culture of Native Americans and that literally may preserve the lives of people not only in rural areas but in the cities as well. So I thank you for that.

Anybody got any questions on that subject?

[A participant asked about increased funding for energy conservation programs.]

The President. Yes. You know, having been a Governor—and the States operate those programs, Congress provides the funds, but the States specifically operate them—I have seen firsthand how many jobs they create and also how much good they can do. I mean, a lot of this—I didn't make that point before, but a lot of this weatherization work for poor people, especially for a lot of elderly people who are stuck in these old houses that have holes in the walls, literally, a lot of them, or in the floor—not only make them warmer in the winter and cooler in the summer. They also save money on their utility bills. They literally do. They conserve energy, and they put more money in the pockets of people who have just barely enough to get by. So I strongly support them.

I also think that, in general, we should move to more energy resources that are within our own control. We have vast amounts of natural gas, for example, in this country that are environmentally cleaner than a lot of the fuels we burn, and we ought to move to develop them.

So the short answer to your question is, yes. It's interesting, it's kind of a hard sell in the Congress now because the price of oil is so low and energy is so cheap. It's much

cheaper in America than it is in any other major country. But if you just have enough to get by on, you're living on a Social Security check or you're living on a minimum wage, it's still very, very expensive and a big part of your budget.

Thank you. Yes?

[A participant commented on lead paint and other housing conditions and asked about extending the national service program to community members who are not in college.]

The President. Good question. That's a good question not only on the housing issue but on a number of other issues. And I wish I had a very good, complete answer for you today. I can tell you that that question is one that we have seriously discussed, and I have asked Henry Cisneros, who is the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to try to come up with a proposal for me that would help to do that, where the Federal Government could basically help local communities trying to engage the energies of people who are prepared to volunteer, work part-time, do whatever it takes to solve some of these problems. They are also very labor-intensive.

I'm hoping, beyond that, that some of the things that were in this economic program we passed—for example, extending the low-income housing tax credit and some other things that we put in there—will help State governments and local communities to work with developers to try to rehabilitate a lot of these houses and try to put people to work in doing it.

If you look at the building structure of the United States, we still have a lot of commercial overbuilding. We haven't worked through that. And a lot of people are in a position now to finance or refinance their home mortgages or buy new homes because interest rates are low. But the population growth in America of people who can buy homes has kind of slowed down. So the real economic opportunity may be in rehabilitating existing housing structures. And we are looking at what can be done to try to deal with that terrible problem.

We went for 12 years without any kind of serious housing program in America, and it led to a lot of these difficulties. And now

I hope that, through Henry's work, working in partnership with people at the local level, we can come up with a better idea. So I don't have an answer for you today, but I can tell you we're working on the problem. And I see it as a real area of economic opportunity for people, the rehabilitation of existing housing structures. It's a better opportunity than building new commercial real estate buildings in many places and a better opportunity than building even new houses in some places where there's no population growth and no demand for it. So I hope we can come up with an answer to the problem you've posed.

[A participant asked about homeownership programs.]

The President. The most important thing we can do is get the mortgages down, which we've done. I mean, we have now the lowest mortgage rates in 25 years, so that people can buy housing at lower costs. The other thing that we did in this last economic program was to extend something called the low-income housing tax credit which basically gives people real incentives to build low-cost housing that is affordable. The final thing that we're doing is having Mr. Cisneros, the Secretary of the Housing and Urban Development Department, work with developers and people in local community groups all across the country to try to figure out how we can either build or rehabilitate more low-income housing so that those three things together I think should permit more people—particularly low-income working people who have virtually given up on the idea of owning their own home over the last 15 years as the price of housing outstripped inflation dramatically—I think you're going to see that kind of turn around now. And I believe that in the next 5 years the percentage of people owning their own homes, including lower income working people, will go up rather dramatically, but only if we work on all three of those areas.

[At this point, a participant discussed his experience as a teacher's assistant.]

The President. Thank you very much. I think you could see we were all very moved by the presentation.

Before I ran for President, I was Governor for 12 years, and I spent during that time more time in schools and with children and with teachers and watching people learn and watching people struggle, not just in my State but around the country, I guess than anything else I did. What I saw there emphasizes some very basic things that, again, I would say, the whole country could learn from and mobilize young people.

Number one, the one-room schoolhouses in New York proved that children can help other children learn dramatically. There's a lot of evidence of that, by the way. If we had time I could give you lots of other examples. But at phenomenal levels, phenomenal levels, there's evidence of—there's a school in Boston where, in order to get in the school, the seniors and juniors had to agree to tutor the seventh and eighth graders. And these kids were all basically from average or low-income families and most of them had average IQ's, and they all did very well, and there was almost no dropout—nearly everybody went to college, nearly everybody finished. And one of the key things was—and they had a very, very hard curriculum, very hard. But the older kids all did the tutoring for the younger kids—made a big difference.

Second point that your slide show pointed out and your presentation, was that learning should be fun for children, especially if they come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Instead of making it a pain, it should be fun, and they should be taught to believe that they can learn things. That New Orleans project I'm familiar with—it is astonishing that kids that once would be given up as—you know, you'd be lucky if they could read at the 7th-grade level when they got out of high school—are now being exposed to physics and computer technology and all that.

The third point I want to make—and this is something that all of you should remember, too—and that is, there's a lot of research in America which shows that kids that grow up in educationally disadvantaged homes or poor homes may work like crazy in school, but they're always afraid that they're not going to do as well as other kids, so they're always afraid to say what they don't know. But most of the best learning occurs in groups.

There was a huge study done a couple of years ago—and a lot of you going to college, you'll remember this—a huge study done in California a couple of years ago which showed that different groups of kids going into the University of California at Berkeley were studied based on how well they did academically and the connection to how hard they studied. The kids that actually spent the most time studying did the least well because they were afraid to study with each other because they were ashamed to say what they didn't know. The kids that studied in groups and talked with each other about what they didn't know and didn't understand, who worked together in a family, learned like crazy.

All of these things could be affected nationwide, these learning patterns could be affected nationwide by programs like this. You could literally revolutionize the educational system of the country if there were enough service volunteers like you to reach these kids.

The last thing I want to say is a lot of this stuff was done one on one. Every serious study of kids that grew up in difficult circumstances and succeeded against all the odds show that every one of them has got a different story, and there's only one constant that's almost always there: Nearly every child had some sort of a relationship with a caring adult, which you qualify for, for these little bitty kids. Keep in mind if you're 18 years old and you're helping some kid that's 5, you are the caring adult. Right?

So those are the points I want to make. Again, I would say, I hope this work will somehow register on people throughout the country that may not be within our program, because these four simple things that you have shown here could change the face of American education.

Yes, sir? I've been wanting you to talk because I wanted to get a good look at that hat. *[Laughter]*

[A participant from Harlem Freedom Schools asked about plans to focus on diversity in schools.]

The President. Under our system of government, basically, public education from kindergarten through 12th grade is the prov-

ince of the State government and the local school districts. The Federal Government provides extra help, by and large to help poor kids through nutritional programs, or extra educational resources. So the New York City School Board would have to decide to change that.

It's an issue, by the way, that you might want to see what you could do to get it made an issue in the coming mayor's race. There's going to be a mayor's race in New York. That's what politics is for, to debate these things. That's what elections are for, to discuss these.

But I want to try to support what you're saying in this way: When cultures lived separately from one another, you didn't have to worry about any of this being done at school because it was always communicated at home, and besides, everybody was just like everybody else. Now that we're crashing in on each other—Los Angeles County, for example, has 150 different racial and ethnic groups living in one county—this has become a very important thing. And I was very moved by what you said about the kids that wouldn't get on the bus with other kids, that wouldn't go in the classroom with other kids. You know, it seems when you think about it, it's perfectly logical that people coming to another country would be terribly frightened by people very different from them and maybe the only image they had of them was something they saw in some cheap thrills gangster movie or one of those. So I think it's important.

But I think the only thing that we can do at the national level besides talk about it—the President can talk about it—is to try to make sure that we run the national service program all year round like you said, not just in the summertime, all year round to make sure that we have volunteers available for programs like this and that if a program, for example, in your community, is set up to do this year round that we would give that a priority through national service so we could direct our people and say, you can earn your college grade, you can do it if you'll become a part of this program. We can support that, and we will.

So you can say, look, to New York, you won't have to pay for all of it, the national

service people will get you the volunteers if you will let the program go forward. And that's what I think we should do.

[A participant asked about the long-range future of the national service program.]

The President. Ten years from now I believe this will be a major fixture of our national life. I don't believe it will be 10,000 kids a year or 50,000 or 100,000; I think that the program will become so popular and will so capture the imagination of the country that, in effect, anybody who wants to be a part of it, to help defray their college costs or just because they want to serve, will be able to do it. I think it will become a very, very big part of American life.

Just look at what we've seen already, and look at what your experience is. This country simply has—first of all, we've got all these young people full of energy and passion and belief and without any cynicism and all this talent out there dying to serve, at a point in your life when you don't have to support a lot of other people so you can work for a fairly modest wage, particularly if you get some educational credit out of it. And secondly, we've just got an unbelievable number of problems out there that have to be solved in a personal, highly labor-intensive way that neither the Government nor the private sector could otherwise afford. So I believe 10 years from now, you will look back 10 years from now and say, I was a pioneer in something that changed America for the better.

[A participant asked about the role of the national service program in reforming and innovating the educational system.]

The President. First, let me tell you what I think the innovation should be in general. We have a bill now that we're trying to pass through the Congress which would write into law the national education goals that the Governors and President Bush's administration agreed on back in 1989. And I care a lot about them, because at that time I was the Democratic Governor representing the Governors to write the goals, so I believe in them.

One of the things that we learned, after years and years in studying schools, is that all the magic of education and the learning occurs not in the White House, not in the

Statehouse, but in the schoolhouse and in the school room between the teacher and the students and then among the students and then at home, if the student is lucky. We have to find more individual ways of reaching kids, and we've got to make our education system far less bureaucratic, and we've got to give school by school much more flexibility to principals and teachers and students to design their learning programs and to be flexible and to be creative.

So I believe that the role that the national service program will have in the revolution of American education will be very large if, but only if, we can persuade the schools of our country, in effect, to restructure themselves to give more flexibility and authority to the principals, the teachers, and the students on a school-by-school basis.

[A participant asked about holding the school system rather than community service accountable for educating children.]

The President. Well, I think community service should help, but I think the school system should be held accountable for it. The answer to your question is, we will start doing that when we start evaluating our schools based on the results they get rather than the input.

For example, let me just give you one simple example. We evaluate teachers for whether they can get hired in most school districts in this country based on whether they've got an education degree from a certified college of education, right? So there are all kinds of Americans who are retired from the military. Right now, we will take, from 1987 to 1998, the United States military will go from having 3.5 million people to 1.5 million people, 2 million folks out there walking around among the best educated, best trained, most highly motivated people in the world, with the best values, that know how to get things done, right? You can have one of these people, a graduate of the United States Military Academy and a massive amount of knowledge in chemistry, and they can't teach in most of the schools of the country. Most States now have some sort of exception, but it's a real problem. Why? Because we evaluate people not on whether they're good teachers but on whether they've got

good—the qualifications. We evaluate schools based on how many kids are in the classroom, what the schoolbook certifications are, or what does the building look like. All these things may be important, but we don't have any way of evaluating our teachers, our schools, and our school systems in most States based on the results they get. What do the kids know when they started; what do they know when they finished? What happened to them? What kind of problems did they have, and did they get services—that goes back to your question—did the school actually serve the problems they had instead of the problems that some kids had a generation ago? And we're still doing it the way we used to do.

So that's what I'm trying—I'm trying to be a part of a movement, at least, that will decentralize authority, let the principals, the teachers, the kids, and the parents, in effect, design more and have more flexibility over their own school year and then measure them by the results they achieve. So that if you don't get results, you stop doing what you're doing and you do something else. But we don't measure—anything funded by tax dollars is normally measured by rules and regulations on the front end, instead of results on the back end. We need less rules and regulations and more results, and we need it in schools.

[A participant spoke about her work to increase literacy.]

The President. Greg said you had been a VISTA volunteer for 20 years, is that right? 20 years ago you did it?

Q. Twenty years ago this summer.

The President. Good for you. That's another answer I'll give you. Ten years from now I hope you'll be wanting to do this just like she did after 20 years. That's great.

[At this point, a participant spoke about her work to improve housing and encourage safe neighborhoods.]

The President. I just would make one point about that. When we had a commission to study the needs of the Lower Mississippi River area, starting in southern Illinois and going all the way to New Orleans—that is still the poorest part of America. And one of the things that you forget—we always

think of public safety as an urban issue, but one of the things that's easy to forget is it becomes a big rural issue. And at periodic times in this country you will see crime waves will sweep across rural America. And one of the reasons is that a lot of people are just out there, and nobody can even find them.

The story she told you about the county in our State where people are literally unidentified, where they don't have an address, where they called for help—you know, it would take you 5 minutes to explain where they were—this is a serious problem in all of rural America. And I appreciate the work you did on it.

[A participant asked if the President could give him concrete examples of welfare system reform.]

The President. Yes, I can. That's a good question. I will give you three concrete examples, but let's talk about what's wrong with the system now, very briefly. Again, it goes back to the question the young man from Harlem asked me about education, where a lot of the schools are being run for a time that no longer exists instead of a time that does exist. The original welfare system was set up to deal with an American society that existed about 50 years ago, where nearly everybody who wanted to work could find some kind of job at some low level, but they could find some kind of job. There were very few women in the work force, if they were in the home and they had children. And the typical welfare recipient in the beginning was, let's say, a West Virginia miner's widow, 60 years ago. The husband gets killed in the mines. They live up in the hills and hollows of West Virginia. The woman has a fourth-grade education. She's got three or four kids, no way to go to work, no job to find, and the welfare supports the kids.

Then there was another typical welfare recipient that represents about half the people on welfare today, for whom welfare should exist, the people who hit on hard times. Suddenly a spouse dies, and there's two little children in the home, and you can't work. Or you lose a job, and you can't get another one, and you run out of unemployment benefits. In other words, about half the people on welfare only stay for 4, 5, 6 months, and

then they get off. Those are the people we would all want a welfare system for, because they fall through the unemployment system cracks or they need support or they have little children. They can't be working because they have a whole slew of them or whatever.

Increasingly, however, there are people on welfare whose parents were on welfare, whose grandparents were on welfare, who never have worked, and who basically can stay on forever as long as they have children under a certain age, because welfare's proper name is Aid to Families with Dependent Children, AFDC, that's what it means.

So, why do people stay on welfare? To know how to fix it, you have to know why they stay. The benefits aren't all that great in most States. In fact, over the last 20 years, benefits have not kept up with inflation. Why do people stay? They stay for one reason: because they, by and large, have very little education, may not know how to get into the system; if they did get a job, their job would pay low wages and they would lose two things they have on welfare, medical coverage for their kids under the Medicaid program and they would then have to pay for child care that they themselves are providing.

Now, I see the Governor paying close attention. Maryland's done a lot of work on this whole issue in this State. He can maybe give a better answer than I can. But if you look at the system—and by the way, I have spent hours and hours in my life talking to people who are on welfare, and nearly all of them want to get off quick as they can. So what would you do to fix it?

First thing you've got to do is make sure work pays. Eighteen percent of the American work force, almost one in five, work for a wage that will not lift a family of four out of poverty. In the last economic program that we passed just before the Congress went on recess, one of the most important parts of it was to increase something called the earned-income tax credit, which is a refund you can get from the Government on your tax system to say to the working people of this country, if you work 40 hours a week and you have a child in your house, you will be lifted above poverty by the tax system. We will not tax you into poverty. If you're willing to work hard, play by the rules, and

raise your kids, we'll lift you out of poverty. That's the first thing. That's one specific thing, very important to do.

The second thing you have to do is to provide medical coverage for all Americans without regard to whether they're working or not. Seventy percent of all the people in this country who don't have health insurance are working for a living. So if you're on welfare, let me just give you an example. This is something that actually happens now. I helped work on a welfare reform program which Congress passed and President Reagan signed in late 1988 right before he left office. And to try to deal with this medical coverage program, we said, if you get a job that doesn't have health insurance we will provide you health insurance for 6 or 9 months, to get you off welfare. That's great, but guess what happens? You've got two people working side by side, one of them that used to be on welfare has got health insurance for her kids for 9 months, working next to somebody who has never been on welfare that doesn't have any health insurance. So the second thing you have to do if you want to end welfare as we know it is to provide a system, like every other advanced country has, that has affordable health care for all Americans. If you don't do it, you're going to continue to have these problems.

The third thing you have to do is to make sure that all the States that run the welfare programs have the resources they need and the incentives they need to actually train people for jobs that it will exist.

And then there's one final thing, there's a fourth thing you have to do. If you want to end the welfare system as you know it, you have to say, if you have health care for your kids and yourself, and you have the education and training, after a certain amount of time, if you don't go to work there will be some sort of community service job provided for you by the local government, and that's what you have to do if you want to get an income. In other words, there has to be an end of it. Finally, you have to move people to independence and away from dependence.

If we did those four things, we could end the welfare system as we know it, and we could leave welfare for the people that really

need it. And all of you would feel good about the program instead of bad about it.

[A participant from Habitat for Humanity asked about easing restrictions in Federal housing programs in favor of homeownership.]

The President. Yes, I do support that. I don't know if I can prevail, but I do support that. There's a reason why there's been a longstanding debate in the Congress about this. And a lot of the Members of Congress who really believe in providing affordable housing to people are afraid if you move away from—if you have a really strong bias in favor of homeownership, that the good things that would be done by Habitat for Humanity, for example, would be offset by people being, in effect, cut loose in these public housing units that then they won't have the resources to maintain. So we have to do it in a delicate way, but I think you're absolutely right. And I think it has to be done.

By the way, for those of you who don't know about—we talked about it a couple of times, but Habitat for Humanity is arguably the most successful continuous community service project in the history of the United States, started by two wonderful people, Millard and Linda Fuller, who I was lucky enough to meet in another life before I ever thought about doing this job. It is organized on a community service basis, community by community. They never take any Government money. And it has revolutionized the lives of—how many houses has Habitat built now?

Q. —are we building now?

The President. No, I mean where are they now in the cumulative total? Does anybody know? How many?

Q. Twenty-one thousand around the world.

The President. Yes, that's how many they're building right now. They've built more, though. But anyway, it's an amazing thing. And I think—I wish I knew. I did know a couple of months ago, but I've forgotten.

You're absolutely right. What we need to do—that's one way we can have a partnership with Habitat, if we use the HOME program to favor more homeownership. And I think we can do it in a way that will satisfy the

legitimate concern of Members of Congress that we not be in a position of handing over big housing units to people who don't have the capacity, the resources to maintain them. That's the real problem there.

[A participant asked if former participants in the national service program would be able to serve in advisory roles in the development of new projects.]

The President. I'll let Mr. Segal answer that. Eli.

Mr. Segal. We've learned so much in the course of the last 8 weeks, I think. Had we not thought of it we would have said yes to you right now. It's a great idea, and we certainly need to make certain we're enjoying all the benefit of all the wisdom you've learned, and it certainly should be part of the program going forward.

The President. Let me make a suggestion. If you have a specific idea about how we can do that and how we should do that, if you would write it up and send it to Mr. Segal I'd really appreciate it. I hadn't thought of it before, and it is self-evidently the right thing to do. So why don't you think about it a little bit and write him a proposal on it.

[At this point, a participant presented the President with a T-shirt.]

The President. I'll get it. He'll bring it to me. Go ahead. Thanks, Chris. Nice color.

[A participant asked if national service would be mandatory and part of the school curriculum.]

The President. A different question—those are two different questions. I don't believe that participation in this program, the national service program, which we are proposing is, by definition, voluntary, but you get something for it. You get credit toward college.

I believe that it is a very good thing for States or local school districts to mandate community service for kids at certain levels in the public schools. A few years ago I had the opportunity to serve on a commission on middle schools, and we recommended two things that didn't get done, but I thought should be. One is that there ought to be a set of basic civic values that are taught in

the schools, and the second was that community service ought to be a part of the curriculum. So yes, I think that every State should include community service as a part of the curriculum at some appropriate point, where students, young people, as a part of their education, get the experience of doing what you've done, the thrill of it and learn from it and see—don't you find that you see the world in a different way once you do this? I mean, you know what the problems are, but you also have a sense that you can solve them and make a difference? Yes, that's what I think should be done.

Yes, over in the corner.

[A participant asked what can be done about the high number of young people in jail.]

The President. Yes, there are a huge number of young people in jail. We have now the unfortunate distinction of having the highest percentage of our people in prison of any country in the world. Did you know that? America has the highest percentage of its population behind bars of any country in the world, and most of them are young. Most of them are under 25 years of age.

I think, in a way, all of you are doing something about it. I think that if you go to the prisons and talk to these people and get the story of their lives and figure out how they got there. And most of them never met anybody like you on a consistent basis, that is, had a chance to be part of what you are doing. And so, I think there are a lot of things we can do about it, but in the end, what we have to do about it is to continue to touch more of them at the earliest possible point in their lives so they don't wind up doing what they're doing later, and keep something in their mind about tomorrow. Let them always believe there is a tomorrow, that there is a future, that there is something they can do that makes them feel good, that makes them important, they makes their lives meaningful, that doesn't require them to do what they do to get in prison.

I also think that a lot of kids who wind up getting in trouble because they're in gangs do it because—it goes back to what I said about studying—everybody wants to be in a gang. You just hope it's a good gang and not a bad gang, right? You're in a gang. That's

what all these T-shirts mean. Right? See what I mean?

So I think the whole point of what you do is to try to gather them up before it happens. Also, there's a whole lot of law enforcement strategies that work and antidrug strategies, and we could talk about that. But from your point of view, giving people something to say yes to, as well as something to say no to, and to be part of a group that matters, I think that would do more over the long run. If you gave every kid in America that chance, every one of them that chance, you would see the prison population go down dramatically over 10 or 15 years. Not overnight, but over a 10- or 15-year period.

[A participant asked about initiatives to help African-American and Latino males.]

The President. What I think I can do—again, I will say—I gave this answer to another question, but one of the things that I like about this national service concept is that we can go out and recruit African-American and Latino males, and then we can give priority to projects, community-by-community, that we know have a good chance of succeeding, and put people in there and help to pay for it. That's what we can do. And that will be a major, major thing. That's what you did, I mean, without maybe thinking about it in that way. But that's what we can do.

But what you've also got to do is to make sure that those things which are in the control of the State or those things which are in the control of the local government or those things which the private sector ought to be doing in your community, that they're doing that, too. For example, I still think you could rescue a bunch of kids that are in trouble if you have the right kind of court programs, if you have alternatives to incarceration for first offenders.

We've got another program that is separate from this now. I'm really proud of it. I signed a bill in June, another one of my passions, where we're using empty military bases and National Guard volunteers to work with high school dropouts to give them a chance to do what they once might have done in the military but can't now because we've phased the

military down so much, to recover their future and get a GED.

So we're going to continue to do programs like that that are highly targeted toward people that otherwise might get in trouble. But I will say what we want to do at the national level is to provide a vehicle for people like you to serve. But you still got to get people at the local level to say, hey, this is a problem in our community; will you give us the folks to do it? And then we can say, yes.

[At this point, the facilitator asked a participant from south central Los Angeles to talk about his experience working with children in the neighborhood he grew up in.]

Q. How are you doing?

The President. I'm doing better since I spent the last couple of hours with you.

[The participant discussed the need to educate young children about gang awareness, self-esteem, and the importance of education.]

The President. If I might just respond to you. You know, I've spend a lot of time in your community over the last—and I started going there before I ran for President and before the riots. I first went to south central L.A., over 3 years ago now, just to sit and talk with people. My wife and I went and talked with a bunch of sixth graders, and we met with the people from Uno and SCOC, the community organizations out there, and others. And one of the things I think Americans who don't live in these really troubled communities often forget is that most people who live in places like that do not break the law, get up and go to work every day, want their children to do well, are doing the best they can. And a lot of the kids who wind up in gangs do it almost out of self-defense because they don't think they have any alternatives.

I was out there the other day—you probably don't remember this, but I visited that sporting goods store in south central L.A. run by the two guys who used to be in gangs. We played basketball in the backyard there—the parking lot of the sporting goods store. But I think that is so important.

Now again, we have a job to do. We, the government and the private sector, have got to put more opportunity into places like that.

One of the things that the Congress did in this economic program I really hope will work—at least we've got a chance to see now—is to pass a bill which will enable us to identify six really troubled, big, urban areas and say to people in the private sector, "Look, we'll give you a whole lot of extra incentives if you'll put your money there, create jobs there, and put people to work." I mean, it is nuts if you go into some of these areas and you think about all these people just walking around without jobs. That's an enormous resource going to waste. If those people were working, they'd have money to buy things from other people. They would create jobs. We've allowed this economy to shrink.

But over and above that, we have to put in a lot of volunteers, people like you who can do that. I mean, I'm convinced that the economy is one thing we have to address, but all these social problems have to be addressed one-on-one.

And let me just close with this sentence. I was talking to somebody I've known since I was 6 years old the other day. And we were talking about all the kids in trouble. And she said, "You know, a guy asked me the other day what are we going to do about all these kids? How are we going to save all these kids?" And she said, "We've got to save them the same way we lost them, one at a time." And so you can have an enormous impact on the future of your community. And it's up to me to try to make sure that we can keep programs like this going so that you and people like you will have a chance to do that.

It's also important that you be an advocate for all those people and not let us forget about them. I mean, it's crazy just to pay attention to a city when all the buildings burn down. Then it's often too late. We need to pay attention to them when the kids are growing up and they're trying to do the right thing. And I hope that in south central L.A. and in a lot of the other places that are represented here today, we're going to be able to do that. Not that we'll solve the problems overnight, but if everybody knows we're trying, everybody knows we're working together, everybody knows we're going in the right direction, that is the feeling I think people want. That's what gets people going.

What breaks people is not the problems they face; what breaks people is that they think tomorrow is not going to be any better than today. And what this national service is about is making people believe that it will be different. And you have proved that. Thank you.

Q. And finally, Mr. President, nowhere have we seen service so urgently needed—

Q. Excuse me, Mr. President. I've got a really important question to ask and a really important observation. I'm from Ohio Wesleyan University, and I'm under the direction of John Powers. And I'd like to take time to ask you to recognize the program directors and the community leaders who are here and who have come so far to—[*applause*]—

The President. Would they stand up? Will you have them stand up?

Q. —to make sure that your vision has gone through.

The President. Stand up. Stand up. Good for you. Good for you. Thank you.

[A participant asked how the national service program would address rural problems.]

The President. It is true that this summer, because we were basically doing a test program this summer and we wanted to plug into programs that were established and that had a real chance of working—the program you mentioned in Philadelphia, the City Year Program that Greg's involved with—that we knew were working. So we did that, and we did it deliberately, and I still think it was the right thing to do.

On the other hand, there were some non-urban projects, the Red Lake project, the one in south Texas that was done. And as I said earlier, I come from a rural background, a State full of small towns and rural areas, and I know that all the problems that are in the big cities are also there. So we are going to appoint this board to run the national service program that is fully representative of the rest of the country, and one of their missions will be to allocate the resources in a way that are fair to the whole country so that we don't forget about the small towns and the rural areas. They're not much different, except in size, in the scope of the problems that they

face today. And I thank you for saying that. Give them a hand. *[Applause]*

[At this point, the facilitator mentioned Hurricane Emily and other natural disasters and introduced three participants who spoke about their experiences working to restore disaster areas.]

The President. First, let me just say a simple thank you to all of you.

I was in the Midwest during the floods on four occasions, and I saw a lot of young people there working hard and really giving it all they had. But one of the things I think being a Governor is a good preparation for President is dealing with natural disasters, because when you see them occur—first of all, it's just breathtaking to see a flood take away a town or a tornado or a hurricane blow away a place. But the other thing, you know, is just what you got through saying, that everybody pours out their heart when it's happening, and they come and help. But a year from now there are still people who don't have their lives together. And the stresses on the families and the communities are staggering.

One interesting thing we have done is to— as soon as I got in office, I named Henry Cisneros as the administration's coordinator for dealing with the long-term relief of Hurricane Andrew. Then I named Mike Espy, the Agriculture Secretary, as the administration's coordinator for dealing with the long-term relief of the flood in the Midwest. These are the kinds of things that we have to do. We've got to stay with it for the long run. And I hope that the national service project can provide volunteers next year in the Midwest if they are needed, and next year in south Florida if they are needed, so that we don't forget about those people. It takes a long time to recover from a disaster of the magnitude of Andrew or a 500-year flood, which is what we just had in the Midwest. And I really thank you for it. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in the Adele H. Stamp Student Union at the University of Maryland.

Nomination for Director of the Indian Health Service

August 31, 1993

The President today announced his intention to nominate Dr. Michael Trujillo, a physician who has spent his career working to better health care delivery to Native Americans across the country, as Director of the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services.

"Many Americans are without adequate health care, but access to care for our country's Native Americans has been particularly poor," the President said. "Dr. Trujillo has a well-earned reputation for working to change that situation, and I am confident he will work hard to improve the delivery of health care to Native Americans in our cities and reservations."

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

Nomination for Posts at the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Labor, Veterans Affairs, and the Agency for International Development

August 31, 1993

The President today announced his intention to nominate the following individuals to posts in his administration:

Department of Agriculture

Michael Dunn, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration

Department of Defense

H. Allen Holmes, Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict

Department of Labor

J. Davitt McAteer, Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health

Preston Taylor, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Veterans Employment and Training

Department of Veterans Affairs

Kathy Jurado, Assistant Secretary for Public and Intergovernmental Affairs

Agency for International Development

Mark Schneider, Assistant Administrator for Latin America and the Caribbean

The President applauded his new nominees. "These individuals, experienced in each of their fields, are important additions to our administration," the President said.

"Michael Dunn's work at the National Farmers Union will serve him well as he takes the helm on issues important to rural Americans. H. Allen Holmes brings an extensive knowledge of foreign affairs and previous State Department experience to his new role. Mr. McAteer's important work in mine safety will assist him as he works to ensure the safety of our country's mine workers.

"I am confident General Taylor will be an effective advocate for veterans in the Labor Department as will Kathy Jurado in the Department of Veterans Affairs. Mark Schneider's experience in pan-American issues will also bode him well as he takes his post at AID," the President said.

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

Announcement of Thirty-eight Senior Executive Service Appointments

August 31, 1993

The President today announced his appointment of 38 men and women to Senior Executive Service posts in his administration.

"I am proud today to name these hard-working men and women to posts in my administration," the President said.

Asian Development Bank

N. Cinnamon Dornsife, Alternate Executive Director

Department of Commerce

Gary Bachula, Deputy Under Secretary for Technology Administration

Keith Calhoun-Senghor, Director of the Office of Space Commerce

Michele C. Farquhar, Director of the Office of Policy Coordination and Management, National Telecommunications and Information Administration

Katherine W. Kimball, Deputy Assistant Secretary for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Paul L. Rosenberg, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning for the International Trade Administration

Jonathan M. Silver, Assistant Deputy Secretary

Department of Defense

Cheryl P. Bowen, Executive Director of the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve

Joan Kelly Horn, Chair of the Reinvestment Assistance Task Force

Josephine S. Huang, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Environmental Security

Clark A. Murdock, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Plans

David Ochmanek, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Resources and Plans

Department of Education

Eugene E. Garcia, Director of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs

Thomas Hehir, Director for Special Education Programs

Jana Sawyer Prewitt, Special Assistant to the Director for Communications, Office of Public Affairs

European Bank of Reconstruction and Development

Lee Jackson, Alternate Executive Director

General Services Administration

Cynthia A. Metzler, Associate Administrator

Department of Health and Human Services

Faye Baggiano, Associate Administrator for Communications, Health Care Financing Administration
 Lavinia Limon, Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement
 Donald Sykes, Director of the Office of Community Services, Administration for Children and Families
 Sally R. Richardson, Director of the Medicaid Bureau, Health Care Financing Administration
 Michael S. Wald, Deputy General Counsel
 Robert Williams, Director of the Administration for Developmental Disabilities

Department of the Interior

Robert P. Davison, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks
 Cynthia L. Quarterman, Deputy Director of the Minerals Management Service
 Michael J. Anderson, Associate Solicitor for Indian Affairs

Peace Corps

Patricia Wilkerson Garamendi, Administrative Director of Volunteer Recruitment

Small Business Administration

Richard Hernandez, Counselor to the Administrator
 John T. Spotila, General Counsel

Department of State

Bennett Freeman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs
 Cathy Elizabeth Dalpino, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs
 Mark R. Steinberg, Counselor on International Law Office of the Legal Advisor

Department of the Treasury

Jose R. Padilla, Associate Customs Commissioner for Congressional and Public Affairs
 Floyd L. Williams, III, Senior Tax Advisor for Public and Legislative Affairs

Thrift Depositor Protection Board

Dietra L. Ford, Executive Director

Agency for International Development

Michael Mahdesian, Senior Advisor for the Bureau of Food and Humanitarian Assistance
 Alejandro J. Palacios, Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Bureau of Legislative Affairs

U.S. Information Agency

Robert L. Schiffer, Director of the Office of Special Projects

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

Remarks on the Swearing-In of Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Louis Freeh

September 1, 1993

Thank you very much, General Reno, for that fine introduction and for your exemplary work. I want to thank, as the Attorney General did, Floyd Clarke for his distinguished work over a lifetime for the FBI and his work as the Acting Director. Also, I think bound to thank Judge Freeh's family, his wife, his children, his parents, who are here, for their willingness to support him and for the work they did to make him what he is today.

Finally, let me say by way of introduction, I am profoundly honored to be here in the presence today of the person Judge Freeh picked to swear him in, Judge Frank Johnson. To those of us who grew up in the South, Frank Johnson was a symbol of respect for law, the determination to live by it, and the belief that all of us who live in this country, without regard to the color of our skin, are entitled to a fair shot at life's brass ring. And I thank you for being here today, Judge.

I am also honored to be here today among the thousands of brave men and women who make up our FBI, people who continue to be our elite force in the fight against crime. You should know that I have special respect for FBI agents. When I was Governor of my State, a former agent served as my chief of staff, and other former agents served in my administration.

Today we come to celebrate the elevation of a genuine law enforcement legend, Judge Louis Freeh, to take the reins of this great Agency. It is a new day for the FBI. Judge Freeh has agreed to take on a difficult task, but no job is more important. And I want to thank the leaders of the Congress on a bipartisan basis, beginning with Senators Biden and Hatch and Mitchell and Dole, for their historic and rapid move to confirm Judge Freeh virtually as soon as I nominated him.

The FBI's mandate is broad. Its reach is sweeping. Its 24,000 employees track down violators of civil rights, people who defraud the health care system, those who run drugs ultimately into the veins of our children. The FBI scientists and technicians perform feats of investigative wizardry that can find wrongdoers through a fragment of a fingerprint or a shard of a bomb. Its agents show commonly that bravery is uncommon everywhere but the FBI, the Armed Forces, and a few other places in our country.

There are many heroes that do their work in the ordinary course of business: people like Special Agent Daniel Miller of Minneapolis, who subdued an armed bank robber by hand to ensure that no one else got hurt; Special Agent Neil Moran of New York, who was severely injured when he used his car to block a suspect's getaway vehicle rather than risk wounding his colleagues with gunfire; people like the 45 others who received Agency medals over the past 3 years. All of you have served well, and America is justly proud of you.

Today's FBI operates in a new and challenging world, without that part of the Agency's mission that was driven by the cold war, but with new and even more immediate threats. Terrorism once seemed far from our shores, an atrocity visited on people in other lands. Now, after the attack on the World Trade Center, we know that we, too, are vulnerable. Violent crime has been frightful but limited. But now armed drug gangs stalk the streets of our cities, equipped like mercenary armies, randomly cutting down innocent bystanders in a primitive struggle for territory.

The FBI has already begun to meet these challenges head on. Through the safe streets program, the Agency has begun working with

State and local police forces to combat drug gangs and to reclaim our neighborhoods. But we must do more, and we will. Today, I was given a pin which I am wearing that commemorates the FBI's drug prevention program. In churches, in schools and Scout troops all across this country, agents work with young people to stop drug use before it starts.

The FBI has always worked at the cutting edge of law enforcement technology. Today, the scientists and technicians are exploring new frontiers, pioneering the use of DNA analysis to ferret out the guilty and to protect the innocent. And in the interest of justice and effectiveness, the Agency has begun to open its doors to full equality for minorities and for women. We must do more, and we will.

Now, amid this swirl of change, a new era at the FBI is about to begin. The FBI has passed through some troubled times, but I believe those times are over. The men and women who work day and night to protect the public never let us down. And now, a vigorous new Director is going to lead the FBI into the next century so that the men and women who work for the FBI will be led and not let down.

In a few moments, Judge Freeh will take the oath of office. He is, as has been widely chronicled and now is as widely known by his fellow Americans, a brilliant investigator, a tough prosecutor, a born leader. He has the unique combination of experience, courage, and prudent judgment that I believe the directorship of the FBI demands. A career as the scourge of drugrunners and terrorists, tempered by his service as a Federal judge, in my judgment makes him the ideal Director of the FBI. He does have, as the Attorney General said, both humanity and humility to go with experience and brilliance and toughness and judgment. Even those who serve with him respect him and also notice all these qualities. I must say, I have been overwhelmed by the outpouring of support for Judge Freeh, and I have to tell you one example which may surprise even the biggest supporters of the judge. One fellow wrote in and told us that he'd had a lot of experience with the criminal justice system. I'd like to paraphrase the letter we received—the judge re-

ceived. He said, "Earlier this year you sentenced me to 20 years in prison. But I want you to know that of the five judges who have sentenced me to prison, you have been by far the fairest"—[laughter]—"and I endorse your nomination to be the Director of the FBI." With all the problems we've got in this country, I hope he'll be getting a lot more of those letters in the next few years.

I believe that under the leadership of this dynamic, young Director, the FBI will capture the imagination of the American people once again and will enlist once again the millions of ordinary Americans in the work of keeping our streets safe and fighting our crimes for us in partnership with the FBI and with State and local law enforcement officials. I want the men and women of the FBI to look back on the 1990's as a decade in which the FBI became well-known and well-loved for its successes in cracking down on terrorists and drug lords, just as much as the G-men of the thirties were successful in cracking down on racketeers and mobsters.

And to Judge Freeh I say, keep showing the vision and integrity that brought you here, that earned you the esteem of all your colleagues, your countrymen and -women, and even those you sent to jail. To the men and women of the FBI I say, you are the finest we have. Just keep on doing your best, and we will stand behind you. And to the American people I say, we know that our people value law and order and safety. We are working to pass a crime bill that will put more police officers on the street. We are working to get guns out of the hands of criminals. We are working to expand the toughness of our law enforcement. Our frontline crime fighters, Attorney General Reno, Drug Policy Coordinator Lee Brown, and now the FBI Director, Louis Freeh, are putting decades of grassroots experience to work for you.

You, the American people, have a right to freedom from fear. Your families have a right to security and to safety. We won't rest until you have those rights. We ask only for your support and your cooperation as this fine Director launches what I believe will be a legendary career in the legendary Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:16 a.m. at FBI headquarters. Following the President's remarks, Judge Frank Johnson administered the oath of office, and Director Freeh made remarks.

Nomination for an Assistant Secretary of Energy

September 1, 1993

The President today announced his intention to nominate Wyoming energy commissioner Dr. Bil Tucker as Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy at the Department of Energy.

"Through his years of work in the energy field in both the public and private sectors, Bil Tucker has demonstrated he has the technical understanding and commitment to hard work that will make him an asset at the Department of Energy," the President said. "I am pleased he has agreed to join our team."

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

Remarks Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin of Russia and an Exchange With Reporters

September 2, 1993

The President. I would like to make just a brief comment, if I might, and then I'll take a couple of questions.

I want to welcome Prime Minister Chernomyrdin here to the United States. We clearly recognize that his support for President Yeltsin's reform program has been essential to its success and will continue to be essential to its success. And we're very grateful that he's here.

I also want to express my appreciation to the Prime Minister and to Vice President Gore for successfully concluding the first round of talks and agreements under the Commission on Economic and Technological Cooperation that grew out of my meeting with President Yeltsin in Vancouver. They have signed just now, as all of you know,

some very exciting agreements which will permit us to cooperate with Russia in space. Russia has agreed to observe the principles of the Missile Technology Control Regime, which is something the United States very much appreciates. We are going to work together on matters of energy and environmental protection, which I think will be very helpful to Russia's long-term development and also help with American business. And in general, I think this is the beginning of a lot more opportunities for mutual trade and investment between our two countries.

So I'm personally very happy about this. And because of the efforts of the Prime Minister and the Vice President, this first step has exceeded my expectations considerably, and I'm very, very appreciative.

Health Care Reform

Q. Sir, on health care, are short-term price controls now dead?

The President. Well, they never were alive. I never embraced them. They have been discussed. What I think you have to acknowledge is that the pharmaceutical companies and the industry as a whole and other segments of the health care providers have voluntarily offered, during the course of this debate, to keep their prices within inflation for a year or two as we get up and get going the health care reform package. And I think they should be given the opportunity to adhere to the commitment that they've made.

And so, my own view is—I've never been particularly hot on price controls. I believe in budgets, and I believe we have to limit the amount of growth and the revenues we're spending on health care, both public and private. So I want to point out that, as all of you know, in the last budget, you've got a decline in defense, flat domestic spending. Medicare and Medicaid is going up. It's someplace between 11 and 15 percent in the first year, down to 9 to 11 percent in the 5th year of the budget, and still going up way too much. So we're going to bring it down. But I don't think we have to have a bureaucratic system of price controls to do it.

Q. Sir, what about the senior citizens groups that are afraid that Medicare is going

to be squeezed under the plan that will be announced?

The President. Under our plan, as you know because we've talked about it for a long time, we want to phase in a more comprehensive plan of long-term care for the elderly as well as access to medicine for people on Medicare who aren't quite poor enough to be on Medicaid and can't afford their drug bills. We're having a lot of extra costs in our health care system because senior citizens can't get the drugs that they need. So senior citizens will come out way ahead.

It is not logical, with inflation at 3 percent and the population growth of Medicare and Medicaid between 1 and 1½ percent, to have those programs going up between 12 and 16 percent a year. That's not right and it's not necessary, and we can do much, much better. And from those savings in the rate of increase—we're not talking about cutting the programs, we're talking about slowing the rate of increase—we can fund the drug and long-term care programs, which is what I propose to do.

Bosnia

Q. With the collapse of the Bosnian peace talks, are you going to repropose lifting the arms embargo on the Bosnian Muslims and the air strikes?

The President. Let me answer the question in two parts, if I might. First of all, they are stalled. I don't believe they are collapsed. The United States will do everything we can in the next few days to get the parties to resume the talks in good faith.

Secondly, if while the talks are in abeyance there is abuse by those who would seek to interfere with the humanitarian aid, attack the protected areas, and resume the sustained shelling of Sarajevo, for example, then first I would remind you that the NATO military option is very much alive. And secondly, I would say, as you know, I have always favored lifting the arms embargo. I think the policy of the United Nations as it applies to that government is wrong. But I am in the minority; I don't know that I can prevail. But our allies have said repeatedly that they don't want to totally eliminate the arms embargo if the present state of play is sufficiently abused by other parties. So yes, it's still on

the table, but I think that the sequence should be let's try to get the peace talks started again. Let's remember that there is a NATO option that is very much alive if there is an interruption of the present state of play that is sufficiently severe.

[At this point, a question was asked and answered in Russian.]

Q. Mr. President, a Russian journalist.

The President. A Russian journalist?

Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. Yes. When can be expected the lifting of these old restrictions and barriers to the trade and cooperation between Russia and the United States back from the cold war period?

The President. When the Congress comes back into town next Tuesday, we have a list of approximately 60 pieces of legislation that we would like to see repealed. And we believe there will be broad bipartisan support from both Republicans and Democrats in the Congress for moving this legislation through. So I think you will see quick legislative action on a whole broad range of issues to recognize the fact that Russia is a democracy, is working with us, and that we are moving forward together. And I look forward to pushing that package very aggressively.

Vietnam

Q. You mentioned the Bosnia arms embargo. Within the next couple of weeks people expect you to lift the embargo against Vietnam. Have you made a decision, sir, and have you discussed with the Prime Minister—what have you discussed about the possibility of American POW's in the Soviet Union?

The President. We're going to go visit. We haven't discussed anything about anything yet. We're just about to start our meeting. And I've reached no further decisions about Vietnam.

Middle East Peace Talks

Q. On the Middle East, you will be discussing, I'm sure, that with Russia, that played a major role. What is the latest development that you know of? Are you very optimistic on the Middle East?

The President. I'm still hopeful. The parties, I think, have been quite candid with the

public and the press about some continuing difficulties. But they're really working hard and with great candor, I think, with one another. I'm hopeful. We've been up the hill and down the hill before with the Middle East, but these people are really working at it, and I think their hearts as well as their minds are in it. I think we should keep our fingers crossed. The United States will continue to do what we have done. We're just a sponsor of this process. They will have to make the agreement. And I think there's reason for hope.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:15 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the 1992 Nobel Prize Recipients and an Exchange With Reporters

September 2, 1993

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I am here this afternoon to honor these winners of the 1992 Nobel Prize. I take great pride in their being recognized in their lifelong efforts to contribute to science and technology and to better the human condition.

Dr. Gary Becker received the Nobel Prize in Economic Science for his expansion of economic analysis to aspects of human behavior that had not before been analyzed with economic principles of our other social science disciplines. For example, in the 1950's, Dr. Becker made a groundbreaking proposal by concluding that racial and ethnic bias could exist only where markets were not fully competitive. Dr. Becker currently is a professor at the University of Chicago. He is to my immediate left.

To my right are Dr. Edmond Fisher and Dr. Edwin Krebs. They are joint winners of the Nobel Prize in Physiology of Medicine. In the 1950's they discovered a cellular regulatory mechanism that controls a variety of metabolic processes. The Nobel selection committee stated that this discovery, and I quote, "concerns almost all processes impor-

tant to life and opened up one of the most active areas of scientific research." Dr. Fisher and Dr. Krebs are professors at the University of Washington in Seattle.

To my left, Dr. Rudolph Marcus received a Nobel Prize in Chemistry for his mathematical analysis of the cause and effect of electronic changes among molecules. The Nobel committee said that this work helped to explain many complicated chemical reactions, including photosynthesis, that are fundamental to life's processes. Dr. Marcus currently is a professor at the California Institute of Technology. He told me that it took 20 years to actually prove the theories that he developed. And I told him that I was beginning to think that being President was more and more like being a scientist. [Laughter]

We are very proud of these Nobel laureates. I salute their successes and their contributions, not only as President but clearly on behalf of all the American people. And I thank them and their spouses for coming to the White House today.

Thank you very much.

Do you, any of you, want to give a speech?

Q. What does it feel like to win a Nobel Prize?

Dr. Krebs. A big surprise.

Q. ———better if it could be your economic policies, Mr. President.

The President. You got me, but at least it's more people-centered.

Health Care Reform

Q. Might you ask Dr. Becker whether your health care plans are economically feasible?

The President. He probably wants to read it first.

Dr. Becker. I haven't seen them yet. I'm looking forward to it. But clearly we need a great deal of reform in the health care area. So I'm looking forward with anticipation to see what they're like.

Q. Will a sin tax be part of that, sir——

Q. ———my segue.

The President. I'm against sin, aren't you? [Laughter]

Let me say one thing, since you asked Dr. Becker the question. There has been an assumption in many of the business articles about the health care plan that it was necessary because too many people don't have

health insurance and in any given 2- or 3-year period about one in five or one in four Americans will be without it. But the assumption is that it will be a job drain. That assumes that we will pile costs on top of what is already the most expensive system in the world by a good long ways.

I believe that this will be a job generator if we implement it sensibly and gradually and over time we slow the rate of growth of health care costs. Right now we have to compete with other countries that are spending under 9 percent of their income on health care and covering everyone with outcomes and life expectancy and health that are as good or better than ours, and we're over 14 percent. If we don't change, we'll be up to 19 percent by the end of the decade without covering everybody and with no improvements in the present problem.

So my judgment is that if we do this right, it will be a job creator. So I think you have two things here, we have better health care and more security for American families and a better economic environment over the long run.

I've already talked more than I meant to. Maybe I'll win a Nobel Prize for that theory. [Laughter]

Q. Is the assumption about costs on top incorrect, Mr. President?

The President. I don't know what the assumption is.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:11 p.m. in the Blue Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at the Opportunity Skyway School-to-Work Program in Georgetown, Delaware

September 3, 1993

Thank you. I want to say how delighted I am to be back in Delaware. You know, when I saw Governor Carper here I was reminded of the time back during the election when Senator Biden and I had a big rally in Wilmington. And I was pleased to say that I was delighted to be in a place where it was

not a disadvantage to be the Governor of a small chicken-growing State.

I am delighted to be here today. I can tell all of you are happy, too. How could you not be when you see students like Chrissy and Francis making those presentations? Weren't you proud of them? They were great. Let's give them another hand. *[Applause]*

I also want to thank Governor Carper and my former colleague and longtime friend, now your Congressman, Mike Castle, and Senator Biden—without whom I don't think I could function as President—all of them for being here today. He is not responsible for the mistakes I make, only for the things that go right. *[Laughter]*

I want to thank all your State officials for coming here today and many of the local officials, and all of you from the various groups. I want to say a special word of thanks to the two persons who also spoke on the program, Dorothy Shields from the AFL-CIO and my longtime friend Larry Perlman who came from a long way away. He lives in Minnesota, and he thought enough of this project to come here to represent the American business community. This is the sort of partnership that I want us to have in America. I'd like to say, too, how much I appreciate the work that has been done by this education program, and to Diane and to all the others who are here, Carlton Spitzer and others, I thank you for the work you have done.

I came here today not just to showcase these fine students but to make the point that every student in America needs the opportunity to be in a program like this. I got into the race for President because I was very concerned about the direction of my country, a direction that had been underway for 20 years under the leadership of people in both parties in Washington with forces that are beyond the reach of ordinary political solutions. In 1973, real hourly wages for most working people peaked in this country, if you adjust them for inflation. For 20 years, most Americans had been working a longer work week for the same or lower wages, once you adjust them for inflation, while they've paid more for health care, housing, and education.

We have tried a number of things to deal with this issue, to deal with the whole question of how do you keep alive the American

dream; how do you offer each generation of young people a better future than their parents had. It is clear to me that we have to revive our economy, all right, and we also have to pull our people back together. And the two things are inseparable. We need to offer our people more opportunity, insist that they assume more responsibility. We need to all be reminded that we are in this together. We have to recreate the American community. That's why when you see here business and labor and government, when you see young people of different racial and ethnic groups, when you see people reaching across their party lines, you really see the future of America—if it's going to be a good future.

I picked the two Cabinet members who are here with me today because I thought they could help us to create that future. The Secretary of Labor, Bob Reich, has been a friend of mine for 25 years and I think has written more thoughtfully than any other person I know about the future of the American work force and what's happening to us in this global economy. The Secretary of Education, Dick Riley, has been my friend for about 15 years now, was my colleague and one of the best Governors I ever served with on the issues of education and economic development. In other words, one of them is at the Labor Department, the other is at the Education Department, but they both understand that if you want a good economic future, there can be no simple division between work and learning. We must do both.

In the last several months and in the months ahead, you will see a lot of publicity about other initiatives of our administration: the economic plan that reduced the deficit, increased incentives to invest, offered 90 percent of our small businesses a chance to reduce their tax burden but only if they reinvest in their businesses and gave tax relief to 20 percent of the working poor families in the State of Delaware; the reinventing Government program that the Vice President will announce next week that will help us to virtually revolutionize a lot of the things about the Federal Government, to eliminate waste and inefficiency and give all of you better value for your tax dollar; the health program that the First Lady has worked on so

hard for several months now, which will finally give every American family the security of knowing they won't lose their health care if they lose their jobs or someone in their family is born with a serious medical condition and will give the American business community the assurance that we're not going to bankrupt the country and wreck the economy by continuing to spend more and more and more for the same health care.

I will ask the Congress to approve, with the amendments that we secured, the trade agreement between the United States and Canada and Mexico because I believe it will create more jobs. And we'll have a vigorous debate about that, but I will tell you this: The real problem we've got right now in America in creating more jobs is rooted at least in part in the fact that our exports are not selling abroad because we have too many trade barriers in the world and slow economic growth everywhere. Latin America is the second fastest growing part of the world. They can buy more of our things, and they should.

And finally, Senator Biden and I are going to work on a new crime bill that will put more police officers on the street and take more guns out of the hands of our children.

All of these are critical to restoring opportunity, insisting on more responsibility from our people, and giving America the sense that we are one community again. But none of them will work unless we maintain a steadfast determination to educate and train our people at world-class standards. We are living in a world where what you earn is a function of what you can learn; where the average 18-year-old will change jobs seven times in a lifetime; where there can no longer be a division between what is practical and what is academic. Indeed, one of the young students back there said, "I'm learning a lot more than I used to because this is fun." Now, that sounds funny, and a lot of you clapped when Chrissy talked before, but the truth is there's a lot of very serious academic research which indicates that significant numbers of our people actually learn better in practical circumstances than they do in classroom settings. It's different for different people.

For two centuries our education system has always been adequate to the task and has

helped us to keep alive the American dream—an awful lot of people here today who wouldn't be doing what you're doing if you hadn't had the opportunity to get a good education. But on the eve of this new century, when we are struggling so hard to get and keep good jobs; when we are struggling hard to reestablish the premise that people that work harder and are more productive should earn more money year in and year out; a world of instant communication, supersonic transportation, worldwide technologies in global markets and a veritable explosion of knowledge and invention, we have to face the fact that we, while we still have the best system of higher education in the world, are the only advanced country without a system to guarantee that every student that doesn't go on to a 4-year college institution has the opportunity to be in this program or one like it that we're celebrating here today. We don't do that.

So what happens? We see these young people talk and we see these young people demonstrate their skills, and our hearts are filled with joy, and we're proud, and we know they're going to have a decent future. What we don't see here today is that 50 percent of the high school graduates in this country do not go on to college, 75 percent of the high school graduates in this country don't finish college, and nowhere near all of them are in programs like this which should start when they are in high school. That is what this is all about today.

During the 15-year period from 1975 to 1989, the wages of young high school graduates, that is, young people who are under 25 who had only a high school diploma, dropped about 40 percent in real terms. The wages of young high school dropouts, that is, people who are working full-time, dropped even more. Why? Because of the downward pressure on those wages caused by global competition, caused by mechanization, caused by all the pressures that you all know. But young people who got at least 2 years of post-high school training related to a workplace skill for which there is a demand in this global economy were overwhelmingly more likely to get good jobs with rising incomes.

And when you look at the American economy, when you see the unemployment rate or you see the income statistics, you know that they're grossly oversimplified. If the unemployment rate is 6.8 percent, what it really means is that the unemployment rate among people over 40 with college educations is about 3.5 percent, which is almost zero. You've got almost that many people walking around at any given time. But the unemployment rate among young people who drop out of high school may be 20 percent. And if they happen to live in a place where there's already high unemployment, it may be 40 or 50 percent.

This issue that we're meeting here about today may never acquire a great deal of public attention because we're not fighting about it. The bill that I introduced shortly before the Congress left has Republican as well as Democratic cosponsors. There are labor as well as business people up here. We are not having the old fights, but the old fights have not provided the new solutions that America desperately needs. And that is what we are here today to seek.

Change is going to happen in this country. No President can promise to shield the American people from the changes going on. And anybody that tries to is simply not being candid. The real question is whether change is going to be the friend of these young people and the rest of us or our enemy. And that depends on whether we can adapt to change.

This program today is an example of what America has to do to adapt to change. We can no longer afford to be the only advanced nation in the world without a system for providing this kind of training and education to everybody who doesn't go on and get a 4-year college degree. We can do better. We can have programs like this everywhere. And that's what our legislation is designed to do.

This legislation basically will support learning in the workplace, learning in the schoolroom, and connections between the workplace and the schoolroom. It will involve all kinds of programs that are working. It is not a big Federal top-down program, but we will have some common standards: a certificate that means something when you finish a program, meaningful learning in the workplace

and in the schoolroom, a real connection between work and school, and a real chance to get a job. And when combined with the other major piece of education legislation that we have in the Congress, the Goals 2000 program, which seeks to enshrine in the law the national education goals that the Governors adopted along with the previous administration of President Bush back in 1989, that legislation will establish for the first time a national system of skill standards so that you will actually know whether you're learning what you're supposed to learn by national standards and whether they stack up with the global competition. That is what we seek to achieve, not with a new Federal bureaucracy but by building on successes like this.

This bill involves a historic partnership, too, between the Departments of Education and Labor. They will sort of operate like venture capitalists. They will provide seed money to States, set the goals and the standards, give waivers to communities to give them more flexibility as they set up new programs, and require that the graduates attain real skill certificates that verify the quality of their training. But the design and planning of the programs will be left to States and communities and educational institutions who know best how to address the local possibilities. Finally, the school-to-work legislation will enable our Nation for the first time to create the kind of partnership that we so desperately need between schools, businesses, labor, and communities, so that we can connect our people to the real world. That's why the Business Roundtable, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Alliance of Business, the AFL-CIO, and leading Republican and Democratic legislators all support this legislation.

If we are going to prosper in the world toward which we are heading, we have to reach out to every one of our young people who want a job and don't have the training to get it. We don't have a person to waste. And believe you me, when we waste them, the rest of us pay. We pay in unemployment. We pay in welfare. We pay in jail costs. We pay in drug costs.

And when we make education come alive, as it has for these young people who showed

me their plane, when we enable students to apply English, history, and science to the practical problems of the workplace, we are building a future that all of us will be a part of. We must—I will say it again—we must learn to integrate serious academic study into the workplace, starting in high school and continuing for at least 2 years thereafter, for everyone who needs it. If we do it, if we do it, we are going to do as much as anything else we could do to guarantee most Americans a real shot at a good future. And if we don't, all of our other, all of our other economic initiatives will be consigned to less than full success.

I got into this issue when I was a Governor of a State not unlike Delaware and I saw too many people working their fingers to the bone for less and less and less, too many people who were dying to go to work who could never find a job, too many people who didn't have impressive academic accomplishments but were plenty smart enough to learn anything they needed to know to compete and win in this global economy. I determined then as a Governor that if I ever had a chance to do something about this in this country, I would. And that's what we're here doing today.

I want you to support this legislation just like you support Opportunity Skyway. I want you to support the idea that the public and private sectors all over America can do for all of our young people who need it what this program has done for the young people we've heard from today: provide a smooth transition from school to work. So far, 900 high school students have participated in Opportunity Skyway. Many of them are en route to careers in aircraft maintenance, avionics, and airline piloting. Now they'll find out how much algebra and geography they've learned. And I'll say this, I'm on my way back to Washington now using a flight plan that the students prepared. Three or four hours from now, if I'm wandering out over the Atlantic somewhere—[laughter]—I'll know I wasn't very persuasive today.

There are programs like this one all over the country; we're going to build onto them. But we need your help. Next week when the Congress comes back, I hope each one of you will do what you can to encourage the

United States Congress, without regard to party, to embrace this new approach to a new economy to give these young people a better future and give America a better future. We can make a real difference, folks, a real difference if we'll pass this legislation and get about providing every young people the opportunity to be as self-assured, as knowledgeable, as skilled as the two young people you heard from today. That's an important legacy we ought to leave to them.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:47 a.m. in the Delmarva Aircraft Hangar at Sussex County Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Opportunity Skyway participants Chrissy Thomas and Francis Orphe; Larry Perlman, chairman and CEO of Ceridian Corp. and chairman of the Business Roundtable working group on workforce training and development; and Carlton Spitzer, director, Opportunity Skyway.

Remarks on Naming Bill Frenzel as Special Adviser to the President for NAFTA and an Exchange With Reporters

September 3, 1993

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. A few days ago, as all of you know, I announced that Bill Daley in Chicago would be Special Counselor to the President to coordinate our effort to pass the North American Free Trade Agreement in the Congress. It is my great pleasure today to announce that Bill will be joined in our team by the gentleman to my left—probably an uncomfortable position for him—[laughter]—the distinguished former ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, Bill Frenzel from Minnesota, who, for 20 years in Congress, established a well-deserved record and is a genuine expert on this use of trade. He is now a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution, and he has agreed to come aboard as Special Adviser to the President for NAFTA while we work through this effort in Congress.

I also want to point out that we have just received a letter signed by 283 economists, among them liberals and conservatives and

12 Nobel laureates, reinforcing the position that I have taken strongly for over a year now, which is that this agreement, especially coupled with the side agreements, means more jobs, not fewer jobs, for the American people. This is a jobs issue.

Since the late 1980's, over half of our net new jobs have come from expanding exports. And one of the biggest deterrents to our expanding the job base in America today is declines in exports because of the flat economy in Europe, the flat economy in Japan. Latin America, as a whole, is the second fastest growing area of the world. Mexico is leading that growth. I believe this is a very good move for the United States. It means more jobs. And I want to thank Bill Frenzel for his willingness to come aboard to make clear to all of America that this is a truly bipartisan effort and also to make it clear that we are serious about getting as many votes from Members of both parties as we can in the United States Congress. I thank you.

Congressman, I invite you to make a few remarks.

[At this point, Representative Frenzel thanked the President and reaffirmed his commitment to NAFTA.]

Q. Mr. President, do you think it will pass? And also, is there some intramural fight on whether health care should go first, or you should focus on NAFTA first?

The President. Yes, I think it will pass, and no, there isn't one. We believe that it is the challenge, obviously, to present any kind of a major initiative to the Congress. But there is quite a difference between the two issues. Once the bill is ready for introduction under the laws governing NAFTA, it must be voted on in a certain amount of time. So there is a legislative timetable that will control that. The health care issue—the timetable for that will be largely determined by how quickly a consensus can be reached and by how much time the individual Members of the Congress are willing to put into mastering what is clearly the most complex public policy issue facing the United States today.

Nevertheless, I continue to believe strongly that the two issues complement each other; I do not think they conflict. I think that there is an enormous amount of biparti-

san interest in doing something to control health care costs as a way of stimulating the economy as well as providing health security to all Americans. And it gives people something to be for, and it puts in the larger context that all these things are being done to try to provide the American economy and bring the American people into a stronger position as we face the 21st century. So I just don't buy the conflict argument. I feel good about this.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, do you think that the fact the Congress won't let you go forward with any additional broad-based taxes to pay for health care reform, that that's going to force you to so scale back the universal health care that you once envisaged that it won't have the kind of effect that you thought it would originally?

The President. No, not at all. If you go back to my February address, I have never wanted to have any big, broad-based taxes to pay for health care. I have never thought that was right, and I've never understood why you can justify taxing the American people as a whole to pay to cover those who aren't covered, when more than half of the American people are paying more for their health care than they'll be paying today. And when we are paying now almost 40 percent more of our income for our health care than any other advanced nation, I just don't think you can justify that. So I'm quite comfortable with that, and I think when we put out our ideas and others put theirs out, that the American people will see pretty quickly we can do comprehensive coverage and without a big, new tax.

Q. Do you think Mr. Kantor is big enough to take on Mr. Perot?

The President. Yes, he's wanted to—show them your—he's already wounded, but even wounded, Mr. Kantor is a formidable fighter. Now he's got a lot of good help, too.

Oval Office Redecoration

Q. What do you think of your new surroundings?

The President. I like them very much. I think it's a beautiful rug. I like the couch. I like it.

Q. How much input did you have in this? I mean, is this you?

The President. I like it a lot. A little input. I thought a darker rug would be pretty and would lift the room and something other than white couches. I like it.

You ought to sit on the couches. He also made them stronger so people don't sink in when they come in here. Did you ever go into an office and sink into the couch, you know? I don't think that's very good, so I wanted people to feel good.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International], when Mickey opened his coat, did you think of President Johnson? [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:37 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Executive Order 12860—Adding Members to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States

September 3, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-418; 102 Stat. 1107), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and in accordance with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 106 Stat. 2315), to designate additional members to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Executive Order No. 11858, as amended, is further amended by inserting in Section 1(a), after the title "Director of the Office of Management and Budget," the following additional titles: "(9) the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy."; "(10) the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs."; and "(11) the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy.".

Sec. 2. This order shall take effect immediately.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
September 3, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:35 p.m., September 3, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order will be published in the *Federal Register* on September 8.

Proclamation 6587—National POW/MIA Recognition Day *September 3, 1993*

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

This year we have witnessed major changes in the global political landscape. Although democracy is taking root in many new areas, the forces of repression pose continuing challenges around the world. Throughout this dynamic period, one theme rings true to all Americans: Our Nation owes a lasting debt of gratitude to all those selfless members of our Armed Forces who have risked their own freedom and safety to defend the lives and liberty of others. As a measure of our thanks and as an expression of our determination to keep faith with those who faithfully serve and defend us, we take this occasion to remember those special Americans for whom an accounting has not yet been made.

In honor of these Americans, on September 10, 1993, the flag of the National League of POW/MIA families will be flown over the White House; the U.S. Departments of State, Defense, and Veterans Affairs; the Selective Service System headquarters; and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. This black and white banner—emblematic of America's missing—flies as a stark reminder to the world of our Nation's resolve.

We acknowledge a continuing obligation to these casualties of war, America's missing service members and civilians. Our Nation remains committed to this cause, a matter

of highest national priority. We renew our pledge to obtain the answers that the family members of these heroes deserve, recognizing the profound loss they have endured and their steadfast resolve to gain the peace of certainty.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim September 10, 1993, as National POW/MIA Recognition Day. I urge all Americans to join in honoring former American POWs as well as those Americans still unaccounted for as a result of their service to our great Nation. I also encourage the American people to express their gratitude to the families of these missing Americans for their dedication to seeking the truth and their determination to persevere through the many years of waiting. Finally, I ask State and local officials and private organizations to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this third day of September, 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, 2:58 p.m., September 3, 1993]

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

Message on the Observance of Labor Day, 1993

September 3, 1993

On this important occasion of Labor Day, we take time out of our active schedules to honor the working men and women of America whose diligence and energy have made this country great.

These are the men and women whose sweat and toil built this nation from the ground up. They laid the railways, highways, and runways that brought this far-flung land together. They created an industrial machine

that became and still remains the envy of the world. They answered the call in every time of need and forged the military might of a superpower. And, more recently, they have led the world into a new age of communications and services. Their labors have fed, clothed, and housed this nation in good times and in bad.

Despite labor's tremendous contribution to the growth and success of our country, those who worked hard and played by the rules were once frequently unrecognized and exploited. Yet the cause of labor has advanced greatly in this century because of the determined efforts of brave labor leaders who risked their own security to bring about fair working conditions and a decent standard of living for the rank and file men and women of this country. Labor Day gives us all an opportunity to recognize the pivotal role that working men and women have played in our history.

We are now at the dawn of a new era of prosperity. On this Labor Day, let us dedicate ourselves to the idea that hard work should be justly rewarded. We still have much to do. The challenges of remaining competitive in a global economy make it all the more imperative that we continue to embrace the ideas of innovation and industry. All of us have our own contribution to make to the success of America. We don't have a single person to waste. Recognizing this, we can celebrate this day by reflecting upon the dignity of labor and the pride felt in a job well done.

Best wishes for a wonderful holiday.

Bill Clinton

Announcement of Eight Senior Executive Service Appointments

September 3, 1993

The President today appointed eight individuals to senior executive service posts in the Departments of Agriculture and Transportation.

"I am pleased that these eight men and women have agreed to join our team and certain they will each work hard to support the great work being done by Secretaries Espy and Peña to make their Departments work better for the American people," the President said.

Department of Agriculture

Grant B. Buntrock, Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

Wayne H. Fawbush, Deputy Administrator, Farmers Home Administration

Lon Shoso Hatamiya, Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service

Patricia A. Jensen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Service

Bonnie Luken, Deputy General Counsel
Wilbur T. Peer, Associate Administrator, Rural Development Agency

Department of Transportation

Antonio Califa, Director of Civil Rights

Frank Weaver, Director of Commercial Space Transportation

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

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

August 29

In the late evening, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton returned from Martha's Vineyard, MA, to Washington, DC.

August 31

The White House announced the President has invited Prime Minister Carlo Azeglio Ciampi of Italy to the White House for a working lunch on September 17.

The White House announced the President sent to Congress FY 1994 budget

amendments for the Department of Justice to support the immigration initiative that the President announced on July 27.

September 3

In the morning, the President traveled to Dover, DE, where he was given a tour of the school-to-work program of Opportunity Skyway at the Sussex County Airport. He then returned to Washington, DC, in the early afternoon.

In the late afternoon, in a ceremony on the State Floor, the President received diplomatic credentials from Ambassadors Tuiloma Neroni Slade of Western Samoa, Carlo Jagmetti of Switzerland, Koumbairia Laoumaye Mekonyo of the Republic of Chad, Toomas Hendrik Ilves of the Republic of Estonia, Peter P. Chkheidze of the Republic of Georgia, Loucas Tsilas of Greece, Paul Boundoukou-Latha of the Gabonese Republic, Marc Michael Marengo of the Republic of Seychelles, Raul C. Rabe of the Republic of the Philippines, and Odeen Ishmael of Guyana.

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 in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released August 31

Statement on the FY 1994 budget amendments for the Department of Justice to support the immigration initiative that the President announced on July 27

Released September 1

Transcript of a Press Briefing by OMB Director Leon Panetta, Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers Laura D'Andrea Tyson, and Deputy OMB Director Alice Rivlin

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Released September 2

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by the Press Secretary on U.S. policy toward Nigeria

Statement by the Press Secretary on Nicaragua

Announcement of appointment of Special Adviser to the President for NAFTA

**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.