

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, October 18, 1993
Volume 29—Number 41
Pages 2041–2088

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Connecticut, Yale University in New Haven—2047
- New Jersey, Robert Wood Johnson Hospital in New Brunswick—2041
- North American Free Trade Agreement—2064
- North Carolina, University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill—2058
- Radio address—2046

Appointments and Nominations

- Federal National Mortgage Association, Board of Directors, members—2086
- State Department Ambassadors
 - Bahamas—2075
 - Morocco—2075
 - Sweden—2075
- United States Trade Representative, Deputy—2075

Communications to Congress

- Bosnia-Herzegovina, letter transmitting report—2066
- Budget deferrals, message transmitting—2066
- Somalia, message transmitting report—2065

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchanges with reporters
 - Oval Office—2075
 - Roosevelt Room—2064
 - South Lawn—2056
 - New Haven, CT—2054
- News conferences
 - October 14 (No. 28)—2068
 - October 15 (No. 29) with Prime Minister Ciller of Turkey—2076

Interviews With the News Media—Continued

- October 15 (No. 30)—2081

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

- Turkey, Foreign Minister Ciller—2075, 2076

Proclamations

- General Pulaski Memorial Day—2055
- National Down Syndrome Awareness Month—2073
- National School Lunch Week—2045
- White Cane Safety Day—2085

Statements by the President

- See also* Appointments and Nominations
- Action by the House of Representatives on Goals 2000—2074
- Award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Nelson Mandela and F.W. de Klerk—2085
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—2074
- Support for the North American Free Trade Agreement—2064
- Withdrawal of Shirley Chisholm's nomination to be Ambassador to Jamaica—2068

Statements Other Than Presidential

- Death of Justice Minister Guy Malary of Haiti—2075

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—2088
- Checklist of White House press releases—2087
- Digest of other White House announcements—2086
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—2086

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, October 15, 1993

**Remarks at Robert Wood Johnson
Hospital in New Brunswick,
New Jersey**

October 8, 1993

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, Governor and Mrs. Florio, Congressman Menendez, Congressman Klein, Mayor Cahill. To the distinguished participants in this program, Mr. Holzberg, Dr. Hammond, Sheriff Fontura. I hope he doesn't decide to run for President anytime soon. He gave a fine talk, I thought.

Mrs. Jones, thank you for coming here and sharing your story with us, and I thank your son sitting over here, and two other fine young men who were the victims of violence, for helping to describe their condition to Governor and Mrs. Florio and to me today and what happened to them.

I am delighted to be back here not only in New Jersey but in New Brunswick. I started one of my other crusades here not very long ago, the crusade to pass a national service bill that would give tens of thousands of our young people a chance to earn credit against their college educations by working in their communities. A few days ago, we signed that bill into law, and I think it will change the face of America.

That is one of the many changes that I hope we can make as we move toward the 21st century. But I believe very strongly that in order for us all to have the courage to make those changes, we need a higher level of personal security in this country. And I wanted to come back here to this magnificent health facility to talk today for a moment about the relationship between health care and the need for health security and violence and the need for personal security.

As you've already heard, these two things are very closely related. I'm honored to be here with my good friend and former colleague, Governor Jim Florio. You know, I was elated when Jim was awarded the John

F. Kennedy Profiles in Courage Award earlier this year, because I think he really earned it. My guess is, he earned it by making even some of you in this audience mad from time to time. But I know what it's like to be a Governor and to have to work on a balanced budget, and I know what kind of trouble New Jersey was in, and you now have the best credit rating in the Northeast. I know, too, how hard it is to stand up and fight for things like an end to assault weapons, and what a long struggle it is; just passing the law is only the beginning before the final impact is felt, perhaps a year, perhaps 5 years down the road.

But we need more people in our country who will call them like they see them, who will try to identify the problems and try to get up every day and try to do something about it. And I'm just proud to be associated with Jim Florio, and I appreciate what the sheriff said about him.

Today I saw a lot of things that I have seen before over the last 3½ years since I started looking into the health care system and long before I even dreamed of running for President. I saw at this great American health institution, the very best of American health care, as well as what is wrong with America's health care. And indeed, if we want to finally, at long last, join the ranks of every other advanced country in the world and provide health care security to our people, health care that's always there and that can never be taken away, we have to work vigilantly to keep what is right with our health care system as we work to change what is wrong.

What is right is obvious about this place. I saw the care that the nurses and the doctors were giving. I saw the concern that this hospital administrator had for the way each part of this hospital worked as I worked my way through it. And I saw the way a lot of these patients, many of them very young, responded to their caregivers. I saw the grati-

tude in the parents' and the family members' eyes. That is the core, the kernel, the heart, the spirit, of our health care system. And we can't do anything to interfere with that. Indeed, we have to be committed to enhancing that.

But I also heard three different stories about people who showed up here without health care coverage or with an insurance policy that wouldn't pay or with two different groups arguing about who owed and about long delays before the hospital got paid, and massive, massive expenditures of time and money filling out first one form and then another, and then hassling people to try to get them to pay the bill. And that is what is wrong with this health care system.

We are the only country in the world with an advanced economy that can't figure out how to cover all of our people. So what happens? They get health care all right, and then the rest of you pay the bill or the hospital goes broke. And so many of our people get health care when it's too late and too expensive because they have no coverage; so they don't get the primary and preventive services that keep people well.

And of course, as I already said, the administrative costs are absolute nightmares. I was in the Washington Children's Hospital the other day and was told that every year they spend in that one hospital alone \$2 million filling out forms that have nothing to do with keeping patient records for health care purposes, that the doctor spends so much time, the 200 doctors on staff there, on paperwork that has nothing to do with patient health care and keeping records of it, that they could see another 10,000 children a year collectively, just 200 doctors if they didn't have to do it.

So the question for us is, how do we change what's wrong, keep what's right, and how can we deal with the burden of our health care system? We now spend over 14 percent of our income in America on health care. Canada spends 10. No other nation in the world spends over 9. Even Germany and Japan, two very wealthy advanced nations, spend less than 9 percent of their income on health care, and their health outcomes are roughly similar, if not better, than ours.

Now, how did this come to be, and how can we change it? We don't want to do anything to undermine the quality of health care. If you cover everybody, if you give them primary and preventive health care services, if you do as our plan and you increase investment in medical research, you can improve quality. You certainly don't erode it. We don't want to destroy people's right to choose their health care system. Under our plan, each employee in each workplace would get at least three choices. Today, only one-third of workers who are insured in the workplace have more than one choice. Contrary to some of the complaints about it, our plan will increase consumer choice, not decrease it.

We do have to simplify the system. I said that before. And we do have to achieve savings in some areas where they can be achieved. Plainly, if you reorganize the system, you won't have as much fraud and abuse, and you'll have dramatic savings in paperwork. Your administrator was telling me that this hospital has 25 percent administrative costs. The average hospital has hired four clerical workers for every direct health caregiver in the last 10 years. The average doctor 10 years ago was taking home 75 percent of all the money that came into a private clinic. Today, that figure is down to 52 percent, 23 cents gone to a system of 1,500 separate insurance companies, thousands of different policies, thousands of different forms, and Government paperwork and bureaucracy on top of that.

And finally, we have to ask people to assume some more responsibility. Two-thirds of our plan will be paid for by asking employers and employees who don't pay anything into the system now to do their part, while giving discounts to very small businesses with lower wage workers to avoid breaking them. We have to ask people who can afford to pay, to pay, because the rest of you are paying for them. And then when they get really sick, they get their health care, and you still pay for them. So we need some more responsibility.

Now, if you did all this and you look again at this American health care system, even if you just forget for a moment about the human element—and it's very hard to do

with all these wonderful young people here—and you see us way up here at 14.5 percent a year of our income, everybody else at about 9. And we're losing 100,000 people a month, permanently, who are no longer covered with health insurance and 2 million people a month lose their health insurance, but the rest of them somehow get it back. But the system is hemorrhaging.

What can we do nothing about, and what do we want to do nothing about? We wouldn't want to do anything about the fact, I don't think, that we invest more in medical research and technological advances than other countries. We should be proud of that. It contributes to our economy. The fact that we have the strongest, in this State, pharmaceutical companies in the world, and they do a lot of research to find new drugs, we shouldn't begrudge that. Indeed, in our plan I'd like to make more use of pharmaceutical treatment where appropriate by giving people on Medicare and people with health insurance policies some coverage for drugs so that they can manage their health care better, I think many times at lower cost.

Then you look at the things we plainly want to do something about, the bureaucracy, the unnecessary procedures, the fact that the system is rigged for defensive medicine, a lot of problems with it. Then you ask yourself about, what's the rest of the difference? The rest of the difference is, this country has more teen pregnancy, low-birth-weight births, AIDS rates, and other kinds of serious, highly costly illnesses and much more violence. There is nothing I can do in a health care bill that will do away with that. We have simply got to be willing to change our behavior or admit that we are going to tolerate living in a country where homicide is the second leading cause of death among Americans between the ages of 15 and 25 and the leading cause of death among teenage boys today.

We just have to say, "Well, we've just decided we're going to continue to live in the only country where police routinely find themselves outgunned by out-of-control teenagers." We'll just have to say, "We have decided that we're not going to make our streets, our parks, or even our schools safe

again." You heard the story of this fine family over here that Governor Florio cited.

I was in California this week on a town meeting. We were interconnected with four big cities in California. This fine, young Korean-American businessman stood up and talked about how his brother was shot dead by somebody that wasn't even mad at him in one of these arbitrary shootings. And then a young African-American boy, a junior high school student, stood up and told me how he and his brother did not want to be in a gang, did not want to have weapons, just wanted to be good students. And they were so concerned about the lack of safety in their school that they changed schools. So they went to the newer, safer school. And on the first day of school, they were lined up registering for school, and this young man's brother, standing right in front of him, was shot down because he got caught in the crossfire in a gunfight in the middle of the safer school.

Now, there are a lot of people who say things like, "Well, people do these things. Guns don't." I'll tell you what, I'll make them a bet. You give me the guns, and I'll see if the people can get it done.

This is a huge economic problem, all right. You've already heard this. Most of the people who are victims of the \$4 billion of gun violence every year in this country, 80 to 85 percent of them have no health insurance. So you pay for them. The system pays for them. It's part of the escalating cost of health care. It's part of why we can't close the gap between where we are and where other countries are. But the human tragedy is the most important thing.

Why should this young man have to worry about how well he's going to walk for the rest of his life? And let me just say this: I come from a State where over half the people have a hunting or fishing license or both. There are towns in my State where you have to shut the schools and the factories down on the opening day of deer season, because nobody's going to show up anyway. I was in the woods with a .22 when I was a kid. I love the outdoors. This has got nothing to do with people having the right to train, to learn how to use, to care for a sporting weap-

on and to do it under controlled circumstances. It's got nothing to do with this. But I also live in a State now where kids get shot in their schools with weapons that were designed solely for the purpose of killing people.

And Dr. Hammond told me when we were making this tour something I didn't know. He said that just in the last few years, when people go to sites where people were shot with guns, they are three times more likely to see the gunshot end in a fatality because of the use of semiautomatic and automatic weapons and multiple bullets in a body, just in the last few years.

And so, I tell you, my fellow Americans, we have a decision to make. And this is the time to make it. We can't keep saying that we deplore these things and it's terrible and keep extolling our American values on how much more law-abiding we are than other people and put up with this. We either need to say this is a level of chaos and human degradation and waste of human potential and incredible cost in society that we are willing to tolerate because we cannot bear to do something about it, or we need to get up, stand up, and be counted and do something about it.

We have to make a decision, and it's time to make it. And it directly bears on the ability of your Nation to develop a health care system that fixes what's wrong, keeps what's right, provides security, and doesn't break the bank. It is directly related.

We have a crime bill—Governor Florio mentioned it—before the Congress. It does a lot of things, but most importantly, here's what it does. It requires the Brady bill, which is a national 5-day waiting period, to establish background checks to check for age, criminal history, and mental health history. It matters. You must do it nationally. Why? Just near here in New York City, of the many thousands of weapons confiscated last year by the police, 85 percent of them came from other States. If you don't have a national system, you will never fix this. It is a huge deal.

The second thing the crime bill does is to provide for the 50 percent of the downpayment of the commitment I made when I was running for President, that I wanted to ask

the Congress to give the American people another 100,000 police officers in the next 4 years, not just to catch criminals but to deter crime. And lest you think it doesn't work, I can cite you many examples: places in New Jersey which have more police officers, where the crime rate has gone down; in New York City where the crime rate has gone down in all the seven major FBI categories where community policing has been deployed; in the city of Houston which had a 17 percent drop in crime in 1 year, because when people are there in force, it prevents crimes from occurring in the first place. So that's an important part of this.

Another part of the crime bill gives States funds to establish innovative programs for kids when they get in trouble before they do shoot somebody, to try to get them back into the mainstream of life. After all, a lot of these young people who get in terrible trouble are not really bad people. They have no structure, no order. They cannot imagine the future. There are no rules that bind them internally to the things the rest of us take for granted. And we've got to try to get as many of them back as we can before they do something terrible which will require us to put them away for a long time.

We do have to deal with these things. And we need to pass a crime bill this year. These Members of Congress can do it. There are still people who are holding them back, and you need to urge them on. And I'll guarantee you, I'll sign it as quick as they'll put it on my desk. We have to do it.

But the second thing I want to say to you is that we need a national law to do what New Jersey has done here with the assault weapons. Again because we have a constitutional right to travel in this country. New Jersey can make a big dent in New Jersey's problems by abandoning these weapons here and then by setting up a system to try to collect them, but people are still crossing the State line all the time.

We need national legislation. There are several bills in the Congress and arguments about which one is better than which other one, but I will guarantee you they are all better than nothing. And the Congress should pass one of those bills and send it to me this

year. It would be a great Christmas present to the American people to stand up for safety.

Finally, let me just say that each of us in our own way are going to ask ourselves what we can do to deal with this. We have a culture of violence. We glorify it. I was delighted to see some of the television networks voluntarily say that they were going to do their best to try to monitor the content of violence and reduce it and degradation of people during prime time television.

We have got to take a whole generation of young people who have very short attention spans for whom the future has no claim because they cannot even imagine the future, and slowly, carefully, and one-on-one, neighborhood by neighborhood, community by community, help them to rebuild the kind of inner strength and sense of values and discipline and control and hope that will permit us to go where we need to go. No law will do that, but that is not an excuse not to pass these laws.

So I ask you today, here in this great place, let us recommit ourselves to keeping what's right about the health care system and to expand the reach of what is right when we can, with universal coverage by giving pharmaceutical products to the elderly who are not poor enough to be on Medicaid but are on Medicare and the working people whose children may need it. Let us do that.

And let us have the courage to admit that some of these problems we will never fix until we change our ways as a Nation, and let's start with violence, begin with guns, and prove that we can do in America what you are doing here in New Jersey. Thank you and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:41 p.m. in the Atrium. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Jim Cahill of New Brunswick; Sheriff Armando Fontura of Essex County; Harvey A. Holzberg, president and chief executive officer, and Dr. Jeffrey Hammond, chief, trauma surgery and critical care, Robert Wood Johnson Hospital; and Patricia Jones, mother of a current patient who suffered from a gunshot wound. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 6609—National School Lunch Week, 1993

October 8, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Since 1946, the National School Lunch Program has demonstrated a partnership between Federal, State, and local officials in providing nutritious low-cost and free meals to America's schoolchildren. Our commitment to the National School Lunch Program reflects our recognition of the importance of nutrition to our children's health and to our Nation's future.

Currently, the National School Lunch Program operates in more than 90 percent of the Nation's public schools and serves about 25 million lunches a day. Many of our children receive their only nutritious meal of the day at school. These school meals not only increase students' attention span and learning capabilities, but also improve their overall health. School lunches also teach children good dietary habits. Cafeterias become learning laboratories, putting into practice the classroom lessons learned by the students on the importance of nutrition to health and well-being.

There is no longer any question that diet is related to good health, and school meal programs should meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans so that children get nutritious meals. Like preventive medicine, the value of school lunches will multiply and the benefits will last a lifetime. National School Lunch Week affords us the opportunity to take a fresh look at the National School Lunch Program to determine what changes are necessary in order to meet these dietary guidelines. We also can recognize health professionals, school food service personnel, teachers, principals, parents, community leaders, and others for their commitment to ensuring that the lunches served in their schools will provide the nutrition so important to young students.

In recognition of the contributions of the National School Lunch Program to the nutritional well-being of children, the Congress, by joint resolution of October 9, 1962 (Public

Law No. 87-780), has designated the week beginning the second Sunday in October in each year as "National School Lunch Week" and has requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of that week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning October 10, 1993, as National School Lunch Week. I call upon all Americans to recognize those individuals whose efforts contribute to the success of this valuable program.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eighth day of October, 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, 4:09 p.m., October 12, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 9, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 14.

The President's Radio Address

October 9, 1993

Good morning. For many Americans today is the beginning of a long weekend, a time to bring out the wool sweaters and coats, our security against the change of seasons. In this remarkable period of our history, our Nation is facing changes longer lasting than fall and winter. But these changes require a certain security, too.

Throughout the campaign for this office and since I became your President, I've been asking that we have the courage to change, to compete in the world economy, and to bring prosperity back home. But we can't embrace change fully unless our own people feel a high level of personal and family security, a security about our place in the world. I'm happy to report that we're making real progress on that, too. Our first job was to address economic security with a budget that seriously cuts the Federal deficit, that has led to record lows in long-term interest rates and

that has led to good news in increasing bank lending and housing starts and business investments.

Since I became President, our economy has created more than a million private sector jobs, more jobs in 8 months than all those created in the previous 4 years. But it's just a beginning. Many of our people are still struggling, and we won't quit fighting for them. As long as the economy isn't working for working people, we'll be working to fix it.

We took on the issue of medical security because true security for our families and for the economy is clearly incomplete without it. Our administration's plan for health care reform will reduce waste and cost, and most importantly, will give our citizens health care that's always there, that can't be taken away. And the blanket of security for Americans has another side to it: personal security. Our people have the right to feel safe where they live, work, play, and go to school. But too many of our people are denied that right.

I've talked with parents who were afraid to send their children to schools where other kids carry guns. I've talked with children who were so afraid of becoming caught up with gangs, they didn't ever want to leave their homes. I've talked with police officers who felt anger and frustration at trying, sometimes against overwhelming odds, to stem an epidemic of violence, especially from children, better armed than police, who shoot other children. And most important, I've talked with the victims.

Yesterday, I visited a trauma center in New Jersey and saw what people with guns can do to other people. I met a woman who couldn't speak anymore because her husband shot her in the throat. I met a man who took a bullet in his chest during a robbery attempt. I met a child whose mother was killed by an assault rifle. It was heartbreaking, and it was an outrage.

These kind of attacks happen too often. They shatter lives. They destroy families. And more and more, they kill children. Violent crime crowds our emergency rooms and drains our medical resources. And it is siphoning away our humanity. Gunshot wounds are now the major cause of death among teenage boys.

My visits with these victims yesterday made me more determined than ever to win passage of our crime bill. This bill will help to restore a system where those who commit crimes are caught, those who are found guilty are convicted, those who are convicted are punished, sometimes by imposition of the death penalty for especially serious crimes. I support that.

Two months ago I asked Congress to pass a tough crime bill. This month, your lawmakers will consider it. And they should pass it this year. But what really makes this crime bill effective and different is this: more police, fewer guns. Our bill would help to prevent crime by putting 50,000 more police officers on the street in America and by expanding community policing.

Here in Washington recently, a beautiful 4-year-old girl was caught in the line of fire, and she died from a bullet wound. Her name was Launice Smith. All she was doing was watching other children at play. How did that become the wrong place at the wrong time? The fact is, with so many handguns and assault weapons flooding our streets, a lot of places can be the wrong place at the wrong time. That's why we have to pass the Brady bill. It requires a 5-day wait before a gun can be purchased, time enough for a real background check to stop guns from getting into the hands of convicted criminals. And we can't go on being the only country on Earth that lets teenagers roam the streets with assault weapons better armed than even the police.

Our crime bill also gives a young person who took a wrong turn a chance to reclaim his life by learning discipline in a boot camp. Every major law enforcement group in our country supports these measures: more police, boot camps, and alternative punishment for young people, the Brady bill, and a ban on assault weapons.

The men and women on the front lines know our country needs this kind of action on school grounds, on streets, in parking lots and homes in our biggest cities and smallest towns. The silliest of arguments, arguments that might have ended in a fist fight in bygone days, now they're too easily ended with the sound of a gun. And often, the sound of a gun leads to death.

A gunshot wound is three times more likely to lead to death today, in part because there are so many assault weapons, and the average victim of a gunshot wound now has over two bullets in him or her. It's getting hard to find a family that hasn't been touched by this epidemic of violence. Often, it means another empty chair in a classroom, an empty place at a dinner table, an empty space in the hearts of those who lost the loved ones.

Tell your Representatives on Capitol Hill you want the crime bill, and you want it now because it's important; it's long overdue. I guarantee you this: The minute I get it, I'll sign it. For we can never enjoy full economic security in our professional lives without real personal security in our homes, on our streets, and in our neighborhoods. I pledge to you today that we'll keep working to restore both.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks at Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut October 9, 1993

Thank you very, very much. To my good friends Guido and Anne Calabresi, President and Mrs. Levin, to Mr. Mandel, and to all the people at the head table. Let me say a special word of thanks to the artist who did that wonderful portrait, unduly flattering, also a gifted flack. You see, he's got me holding Stephen Carter's book "The Culture of Disbelief." We now know he took no money from Yale because Carter took care of him. [Laughter] Actually I'm deeply honored to be holding that book. I read it. I loved it. And the dean said that a person ought to be painted with a book he's read, since no one is very often.

I thank Mr. Laderman for that wonderful fanfare for Hillary and for me. I enjoyed it very much. As far as I know, it's the first piece of music ever written for someone who is a mediocre musician but loves music greatly. I want to say, too, to all of my former professors, to my classmates, and to my

friends here, I thank each and every one of you for the contributions you made to my life and to Hillary's and for the work you did to make it possible for me to be here today. I thank you, Dean, for mentioning our friend Neal Steinman, who doubled the IQ of every room he ever walked into. And I thank all my classmates who are here who contributed to the last campaign in so many and wonderful ways.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to the people who taught me in class and to the people I just knew in the halls who were on the faculty in Yale Law School. It was a rich experience for me that I still remember very vividly. I was especially glad to see my fellow southerner, Professor Myres McDougal, out there. I'm delighted to see you here, sir. Thank you for coming today.

My wife did a magnificent job today, as she always does. This is our 20th reunion, and Monday will be our 18th anniversary. It's been a humbling experience, you know. I mean, she was so great talking about health care on television the week before last and having the country follow an issue that we have cared about for so long. And shortly after that, the U.S. News or somebody—USA Today—had the poor grace to commission a poll in which 40 percent of the American people opined, in an opinion agreed with by 100 percent of our classmates and faculty members here, that she was smarter than I am—[laughter]—just when I was beginning to feel at home in the job.

Then as if to add insult to injury, I went to California and did a town meeting on television and went down to L.A. And I was very excited; they put me at the Beverly Hilton. And I knew Merv Griffin owned it, and I thought, well, maybe he'll come out and say hi, and I'll begin to really feel like a President again. And sure enough, he did. He came out and said hello, and there he was. And he said, "I put you on the floor where I thought you belonged. And you have a very nice suite. But there is one permanent resident of the floor, and he'll be there to greet you when you get there." So my imagination was running wild. I got up to the floor where the suite was, and guess who the permanent resident is? Rodney Dangerfield. As God is my witness, he met me there, gave me a

dozen roses with a card that said, "A little respect. Rodney." [Laughter]

You know, I was thinking just sitting here about the incredible events that our country has seen unfold in the last 3½ weeks at home and abroad: the developments in the Middle East and in Russia; the efforts we are making here to deal with health care; and the signing of the national service bill, which was one of the things that drove me into the campaign for President; the efforts we're making to pass the trade agreement with Mexico and Canada; the continuing troubles of Somalia. And I was thinking about what it was like 20 years ago when we were here, a time of student demonstrations when we were about to get out of Vietnam and about to get up to our ears in Watergate, when the culture of heavy rock music and drugs began to blur the sensibilities of a lot of Americans. And I noticed last night when I was reading a book on that time to Hillary that while we were at law school, the gifted singer Janis Joplin died of a drug overdose, sort of symbolic of the tragedy that was those years.

It was also a time of great hope, as Hillary pointed out, a time of advances in civil rights, a time where the environmental movement really got going in our country, a time that the real strength of the women's movement began to be felt. It was a time, too, when we assumed that if we could just fix whatever it was we thought was wrong, that everything else would be okay.

I remember at the end of my tenure here the Yale workers were on strike. And the head of the local AFL-CIO, Vinnie Sirabella, who just passed away recently, was a great friend of mine. And we were all thinking of ways we could support him and still go to class.

The idea then was that if we could divide the pie a little more fairly, everything would be wonderful. Connecticut for the last several years has been obsessed with a deeper question, which is how to get the pie to grow again and whether there will be enough for people.

Today as you look at where we are after 20 years, virtually all of us in our class have done pretty well through a combination of ability and hard work and, even though we may hate to admit it, blind luck. We have

done pretty well. And we live in a world without many of the burdens that we grew up with. The most important one is that the threat of nuclear annihilation is receding, that the end of the cold war gave birth to new movements for democracy, for freedom, for market economics, not just in Russia where it has recently been reaffirmed but also in Latin America and in many new nations in Africa, all across the world.

There was someone holding a sign when I drove in here through East Haven and New Haven that said "Rabin and Arafat, Mandela and de Klerk, Clinton and Yeltsin: It's a lot to feel good about." And there is, to be sure. But it's also true that there are a lot of troubles in the world today causing the deaths of many people. Some of them we know a lot about; others we don't see very often on television, the problems of the Sudan or Angola. We now see more of what is going on in Georgia and not so much about Armenia and Azerbaijan.

We know, too, that the world hasn't quite figured out, in this post-cold-war world, how we're going to deal with a lot of these problems and whether we can actually, those of us who live in stable societies, reach into others and shape a different and more human course. And so we argue about what our responsibilities are and what is possible in Bosnia, in Somalia, in Haiti. And we do the best we can in a time of change, without some quick, easy theory like containment which helped us in the cold war.

Here at home, there's an awful lot of good, too. The movements toward opportunity for people from diverse backgrounds have continued and reached an enormous degree of success for those who can access them. We saw it when Colin Powell retired and Ruth Bader Ginsburg ascended to the Supreme Court, when there are now five African-Americans in the Cabinet of the President of the United States, when over 20 percent of our Presidential appointments are people of Hispanic or African-American origin. We are moving in the right direction in opening up opportunities in this country to all people. When we were here, there were only five women on the Federal bench. Now there are 91, and there are about to be a whole lot more.

And this is an exciting time where technology is changing the nature of work and leisure and shortening the time of decision and bringing people closer together all across the globe. It is also a time when education still largely bears its own rewards, and those who get a good education can do pretty well in this old world. It's also well to remember that with all of our problems, most people in this country get up every day, go to work, obey the law, love their families, love their country desperately, and do what is right. I saw a big slice of that coming in from the airport as there were hundreds and hundreds of people in East Haven and New Haven waving their American flags. A postman stopped and put his hand over his heart because the President of the United States went by. I still marvel every day when I travel at how much people love this Nation.

And what I want to say to you today is that the same is true even in the most distressed areas, in south central Los Angeles or the south Bronx. Most people who live there work for a living, pay their taxes, care desperately about their children, want the best for the future, and obey the law. But we also have to face the fact that we have a whole new and different set of challenges at home, some of which we could have imagined in 1973, others of which have grown all out of control.

In 1973 we now know that real average hourly wages for our working people peaked. Median family income today is only \$1,000 higher than it was 20 years ago, \$1,000 higher. The growth in income inequality between those who are educated and those who are not has escalated dramatically, so that even though there are 50 percent more people in the work force of minority origin with 4 years of college education or more, the aggregate racial gaps in income are deeper because the education gap has grown so great and because of the escalating inequality of income in the last several years.

We know that our country needs to invest more in creating a new world, but we're so riddled with debt it's hard to do it. And we know that like other wealthy countries—and maybe they're the company that misery loves—almost no rich country, including the

United States, understands how to create more jobs at a rapid rate.

We also know that there are a lot of changes we have to make. Many of you have written about them, talked about them. A lot of you are living them. And we see the reluctance, the aversion to change in the United States at a time when we are being caught up in all the realities of the global economy. I believe that one of the reasons we haven't been able to come to grips with these great challenges is that too many of us are too personally insecure in our own lives, our family lives, our work lives, our community lives, to have the courage and self-confidence it takes to take a different course. You can see it when people are worried about losing their jobs, or they know they're working harder for less. The average working family is spending much more time on the job now than they were when we were here in law school.

I see and listen to the opposition to the North American Free Trade Agreement, something which I believe will make better the problems of the eighties that most people grieve about and clearly open a whole new world of opportunity to us with democracies in Latin America who care about us. And as I listen closely, I find that the overwhelming majority of opposition really reflects the insecurity of the people in opposition, based on the experience of the last 12 to 15 years. It has in short become the symbol, the receptacle, for the accumulated resentments of people who feel that they have worked hard and done their best and they are still losing ground. So that here is a case, which at least from my point of view, it is self-evident that we should take a course that will benefit the very people who are fighting against it. Why? Because of the insecurity people feel.

People feel rampant insecurity on our streets. The leading cause of violence among teenage boys today is death from gunshot wounds. I learned yesterday at a trauma center in New Jersey that a person who is shot is now 3 times more likely to die from the shot than 15 years ago, because they're likely to have more bullets in them with the growth of automatic and semiautomatic weapons and the spread on the street.

We see crisis in America's families. Do you know, at the end of the World War II there

was no difference in divorce rates and out-of-wedlock birth rates among the poor and the nonpoor in America, absolutely none. We were literally a pro-family society in a traditional way. Today there is a breathtaking difference in the rates of out-of-wedlock birth among the poor and the nonpoor. And that is only one symbol of the pressures on the American family today and the fact that we are creating, especially among younger people in poor distressed areas, mostly males but a lot of females, not just an underclass but an outer class, people for whom the future has no claim.

If you look across this vast sea of people today, if you look at the Democrats and the Republicans, the liberals and the conservatives, the people who identify with the whole range of speakers who have been here today, you will see that we at least all pretty much have one thing common: The future had a claim on all of us. We dreamed of what life might be. We imagined what we might become. We gave up things we would otherwise have wished to do at various stages along our lives, first for ourselves and our own future, and later for our children because we wanted them to have a future, which required us to do or not do certain things in the moment.

And now we live in a country with millions of people for whom the future is what happens in 10 or 20 minutes or maybe tomorrow, people who are often better armed than the local police, who act on impulse and take other people's lives, not so much because they are intrinsically bad but because they are totally unrooted and out of control, not bound in by the things that guided our behavior.

And I say to you today, my friends, without regard to your age or your politics, we've all done pretty well. We were really fortunate to be able to come here; I don't care how smart we were or how hard we worked. There are young geniuses in cities today whose lives are being destroyed by what they are doing or not doing. And our job in this last decade of this century is to try to give people, without regard to their station in this country, the same chance we had to live up to the fullest of their God-given capacities

and in the process to revitalize the American dream in our time.

This is a challenging time. It is an interesting time. Nation states are in some ways less control over their own affairs than ever before. They have to cooperate with others to get things done in a global economy. And yet the forces of the global economy are taking away their autonomy at home. But we in America, if we are going to do our job by our people, we have got to face our problems here and get our collective acts together.

And all of us, each in our way, have a responsibility for that. I would argue that there are at least three things on which we should be able to agree. Number one, we have to have a change in the way we approach our economy. It means different economic policies, different education policies. It means reaching out to the world, not turning away from the world. We are now only 20 percent of the world's GDP, where we used to be 40 percent at the end of the Second World War. No rich country creates jobs except through expanding its relationships with others.

We also have to face the fact that a lot of our institutions are just plain old out of date. There are Members of Congress here; I appreciate their presence. They're going to have to go back next week and try to figure out how to expand or extend the unemployment benefits because so many of our Americans have been unemployed for so long. But really what they're doing—and they should do it, and I'm going to help them—but what we're doing is trying to put a Band-Aid on a seriously inadequate system because the unemployment system, just for example, was created for a time when people lost their jobs in a down economy; the economy got better; they got their jobs back. So you gave them a check in between because it wasn't their fault.

Today, more and more people never get their old jobs back. The average person changes work eight times in a lifetime. We don't need an unemployment system. What we need is what my classmate and our Labor Secretary, Bob Reich, calls a reemployment system. And as long as we keep extending unemployment benefits alone instead of

turning the whole thing upside-down and aggressively starting training programs and job education programs in the beginning of the unemployment period, we're going to have a lot of very frustrated, angry Americans who desperately want to do right and who are losing their confidence and their courage to change.

The second thing we have to do is to frankly face the fact that this Nation has spoken one way and acted another when we have to organize ourselves in a different way to become more secure. And we're either going to have to make up our minds to frankly acknowledge that, or we're going to have to bring our actions and our organization as a society into line with our rhetoric. And I just would like to mention three examples.

First, family: There are now well over half the women who are mothers in this country are in the work force. We have got to make up our mind that as long as the economy mandates this—and the economic pressures of the time do—we have to find ways for people to be successful workers and successful parents. And that means we have to organize ourselves differently with regard to child care, family leave, and the incomes of people who have children and who work but they still don't make enough money to support them.

Perhaps the most important thing we did in the economic program which passed the Congress, in addition to bringing the deficit down and keeping interest rates at a historic low, was to provide an increase in tax refunds and benefits to lower income working people so there would never be an excuse to be on welfare just to support your children. And so, you can say, "You can work and still be a good parent and take care of your family."

That's why I felt so strongly about the family leave law. I'll just tell you one story, so you don't think it is just about programs. I went for my morning jog a couple of Sundays ago, and when I came in there was a family taking a tour of the White House, a rare occasion on Sunday morning. There was a father, a mother, and three children. The middle child was in a wheelchair. And my staff member said, "Mr. President, this is one of those Make-A-Wish families. That little girl has cancer and is probably not going to make it,

and she wanted to come to the White House, take a tour, and see the President." So I went over and talked to the family and had a nice visit. They were fine people, dealing with their grief and their problem with great dignity. And then I went upstairs and got cleaned up and came down and took a picture with them after I had my Presidential uniform on. And I bid them goodbye. But as I was walking away, the father grabbed me by the arm, and I turned around, and he said, "Mr. President," he said, "I want to tell you something. My little girl's having a tough time, and she may not make it. And these times I've spent with her are the most important times of my life. If it had not been for the family leave law, I would have had to choose between working at my job and supporting my family or giving up my job and my support for my family to spend this critical, precious time with my daughter. Don't ever believe it doesn't matter what decisions are made in this town." I say that not to be self-serving, but to remind you that there are real, practical consequences in the lives of families in this time in public policy.

The second thing I want to mention is violence. This is the only country in the world where police have to go to work every day on streets with teenagers better armed than they are. This is the only country in the world that would be fiddling around after all these years. How many years has it been since Jim Brady got shot in the attempt to assassinate Ronald Reagan? And we still haven't passed the Brady bill, because people are fiddling around the edges of it making parliamentary arguments because they're trying to find some way to please the people who don't like it. It's unconscionable.

I'm telling you, when I was in California earlier this week, I talked by television on this interconnected town hall meeting to a young African-American teenager. He and his brother left the school they were in because it was too violent. He said, "I don't want to be in a gang. I don't want to own a gun. I want to study. I want to do well. So does my brother. We went to a safer school." And the day they showed up at the safer school, they're standing in line to register for class, and his brother was shot down in front of him, just happened to be in the

way of one of these arbitrary shootings. This is crazy, folks.

How can I preach to people about NAFTA, education, think of the future, and you've got to worry about whether your kid's going to get shot going to school? We can do something about it. And it is time to close the massive yawning gap between our rhetoric and the way we are organized in this society.

And finally with regard to security, I see this health care issue as a defining moral challenge for our people. Not in the details—maybe Hillary and I don't have it all right; I'm open to that—but in the essence. How can we justify—here we are, we talk about America and the American dream and what a great country this is. And it's all true. But we have 37.4 million people, according to last week's study, who don't have any health insurance. We have 2 million people a month who lose their health insurance; 100,000 of them lose it permanently. We have a system in hemorrhage. We find it necessary to spend 14.5 percent of our income for a health care system when Canada spends 9 percent and more appropriately Japan and Germany, which have a lot of medical research, spend less than 9 percent.

And some of it we want to spend more on, medical research and technology. Some of it we have to spend more on right now because we have more poor people, more people with AIDS, more teen births, more low-birthweight births, and a lot more violence, and that's all true. But we also have hospitals spending 25 percent of their money on paperwork. We also spend a dime on the dollar more on paperwork than any country in the world for health care. And we can't figure out how to have primary and preventive health care and give everybody health insurance. We want people to have the courage to change. We say, "Well, we'll give you a good training program; you may have to change jobs eight times in a lifetime; you'll go from a big company to a little company to a medium-sized company." And we're saying to every American, "You could lose your health insurance tomorrow." And it is not right. How can you expect people to have the courage to change if they don't know whether in the change they will be able to

take care of their children's most basic needs?

The time has come for us to join the ranks of the civilized world and provide health security and comprehensive decent benefits to all of our people. We have got to do it. It is a huge problem in trying to guarantee labor mobility, high productivity in the small business workplace, and the ability of small business people to continue to function. I met a small business person this week with 12 employees whose premiums went up 40 percent this year, even though they did not have one single claim except for normal checkups. We have to do it. This is a security issue. And if you want Americans to change—just about everybody in this room never gives a thought to your health care, but I'm telling you tens of millions of people do. And we have got to do better. We have got to quit saying this is too complicated or there's this or that or the other problem, and so maybe it'll go away. It is a security issue closely tied to whether we will change.

So there's an economic change argument. There's a security argument. The third thing I want to say to you is that we somehow have to recover, each in our own way, a sense of personal stake in the American community. We have to ask ourselves if we really believe we don't have a person to waste, if we really think everybody's important, if we really think people who follow our laws, no matter how different they are from us, should have a place at the American table, and if we really think that we all have a responsibility to do something about it.

That's why I wanted this national service program to pass so badly, because there are now millions of young people who are tired of the "me, too," "let me have it first; forget about everybody else" ethic that dominated too much of the 1980's. And they want to give something back. They need a way to do it.

But I picked up the paper today, and some of these kids I'm going to see when I leave here, school kids, were saying, "We want the President to know that we have a good school," and "We want the President to know that we're trying to be good kids," and "We're going to tell the President that we hope somebody will show up and paint the

walls in our schools." Well, somebody who lives here ought to show up and paint the walls in their school. That ought to be done.

And I tell you, the reason that I have done my best to promote Professor Carter's book "The Culture of Disbelief" is that I believe a critical element of our reestablishing a sense of community in America is trying to unite the inner values that drive so many Americans with the outer compulsion we have to have to work together. The problem that I have with so much of the religious right today is not that they may differ with me about what is or is not morally right. That has always been a part of America. The problem I have is that so many of them seem to believe that their number one obligation is to make whatever they think is wrong illegal, and then not worry about what kind of affirmative duties we have to one another.

But I think there ought to be ways we can talk. Let me just give you one example. I gave a speech in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in the campaign. And the folks that disagreed with me on the abortion issue were demonstrating, as they did during the campaign. And that's their American right, and welcome to it. And on the front row at this speech in the parking lot of the Quaker Oats Company in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, was a woman who had a pro-choice button on. But she was also holding a child of another race who had AIDS, that she adopted from another State, after she had been abandoned by her husband and was raising two kids in an apartment house. And she still adopted a child of another race, from another State, dying of AIDS, because she said it was her moral responsibility to affirm that child's life.

Now, which group was more pro-life? We have a friend who is pro-choice but adopted an Asian baby with no arms. There is a Member of Congress who has adopted six children, who is pro-life—pro-choice, I mean. The point I make here is not an attack on the pro-life. The point I make is, surely we have something to say to each other about this. Surely we do. If you look at the work of the Catholic Church and the Pentecostal Church, to mention two, in promoting adoptions—I say to you, surely there is a way we can breach these great divides and talk together about how our actions ought to affirm

what we can agree on. That is the point I want to make.

Surely there is a way we can acknowledge, too, that no matter how important we Democrats think programs are, a lot of the changes we need in this country have to come from the inside out and require some personal contact with people who can give context and structure and order as well as love to a whole generation of Americans we are in danger of losing. There is a lot we have to talk about in this American community.

And I did not come here to attack any group today motivated by their own version of what they think God wants them to do but simply to say I think God wants us to sit down and talk to one another and see what values we share and see how we can put them inside the millions and millions of Americans who are living in chaos. I believe we could do better if we talked to one another more and shouted at one another less. And I hope that together we can make that decision.

Let me just say this, most everybody my age who came to Yale Law School could have gone someplace else to law school. And most of us came here at least in part because we believed that Yale would not only teach us to be good lawyers in the technical sense, not only to understand individual rights and individual contractual obligations and how particular areas of law work so that we could be successful as practitioners, but also how it all fit into the larger society. A huge percentage of our crowd came here because we thought Yale would teach us how to succeed as professional lawyers and how to be good citizens as well.

And as we look toward the 21st century with the need for America to change, with the desperate need for us to reestablish the security that most of us took for granted when we were children, with the need to rebuild the American community, I say to you, my fellow classmates, we have much to do. Yale gave us the tools to do it with. We owe it to the rest of the country because of our success to share what we know and what we can give to the future so that we can enter the next century with the American dream alive and the American family strong.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:05 p.m. in The Commons. In his remarks, he referred to Guido Calabresi, dean, Yale Law School, and his wife, Anne; Richard C. Levin, president of the university, and his wife, Jane; Joseph D. Mandel, president, Yale Law School Association; Ezra Laderman, dean, Yale School of Music; Neal Steinman, Yale Law School class of 1971 alumnus, who died in January; and Myres S. McDougal, Sterling professor emeritus of law.

Exchange With Reporters at Yale University in New Haven

October 9, 1993

Somalia

Q. —with General Aideed?

Q. —offering a cease-fire?

The President. We haven't offered a cease-fire. I expect it, that there would be a cessation of violence against the United States and the U.N. forces when I made it clear what I said at the U.N., that we wanted to support a political process in Somalia that would permit the termination of our involvement and when I made it clear I was going to send stronger forces there to reinforce our position. But there's been no direct communication. In fact, Ambassador Oakley went there to meet with President Meles and other leaders of the African nations in the region and to try to work out a political process that they would manage. We believe that over the long run, the only way that Somalians can live in peace with one another is if their neighbors work out an African solution to an African problem. So, that's just not true. We didn't extend an offer of a cease-fire. And there's been no direct negotiations of any kind.

Q. —apparently he is offering one now.

The President. Well, if he's offering one, that's fine. He ought to stop the violence, because that's a good thing. He ought to do it. But it's not accurate to say that we have initiated it. But I welcome it. I think that he should stop the violence. And I want Ambassador Oakley to have a chance to go over there and meet with President Meles and others. And let's see what kind of political process that the African leaders themselves can get going.

Q. —part of these negotiations, sir, or are you trying to cut them out of it?

The President. No, I didn't say that. As a matter of fact, I think the Secretary-General is going to the region just in the next couple of days, which I would welcome. So that's up to him to decide. I wouldn't say that at all. But all the nations that are there on the humanitarian mission have supported in varying degrees the idea that we didn't want to go there for nothing. We didn't want to go there, pull out, and have chaos, anarchy, starvation return.

But I think it's clear to all of us who have been involved in this that the greatest likelihood of a successful political resolution of this would be if the African leaders of the adjoining states took the initiative and they tried to work out a solution which reflected what is possible and what is desirable as they define it. And I don't think we ought to be defining it for them. I have never been for—

Q. —your instructions been to Oakley?

The President. My instructions to Oakley were to go first to meet with President Meles, decide whether there are any other presidents of other countries in the region he needs to meet with, discuss what the role for the OAU or some other African role might be, and see what can best be done to start, really generate a lot of energy behind the political process. We think that ultimately whatever peace would be brokered, if it's brokered from forces outside Somalia, should come from the Africans. And we would hope the U.N. would be able to bless—

Q. —prospects for the release of Chief Warrant Officer Durant? Is there any report there?

The President. Well, we're obviously encouraged by the fact that he seems to be in reasonably good shape. And we expect that he will be released. I can't give you any other specific comments now. I am very hopeful that there will be no Americans in captivity anytime soon.

Q. —make a deal for his release?

The President. —and I expect that that's what the rules will be. But there has been no negotiations over that at all, none.

Q. —can't say anything now—is there some sort of sensitive process ongoing now—the process—

The President. No, I wouldn't characterize it in that way. It's just that I believe that I think that any Americans who are held captive must be released. I think they know the United States has no intention of leaving Somalia until that is done. We're going to have all of our people present and accounted for before we go home. And that's just going to be a part of whatever happens from now on in. It is the priority that we have to pursue and for our own people.

But I'm encouraged that Mr. Oakley was welcomed there by President Meles. And I'm encouraged by President—I mean, by the Secretary-General wanting to go to the region. So I think that the peace process sort of got derailed over the last several months. I think it's going to get back in gear. And I think that's a good thing for everybody.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:30 p.m. at the Rotunda in Woolsey Hall. In his remarks, the President referred to Ambassador Robert B. Oakley, special envoy to Somalia; President Zenawi Meles of Ethiopia; U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali; and captured U.S. Army pilot Michael Durant. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Proclamation 6610—General Pulaski Memorial Day, 1993

October 9, 1993

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

Each October 11, on the anniversary of his death in battle, America honors General Casimir Pulaski, a hero of two nations.

A patriot to the core, Pulaski loved his native Poland dearly. In unequal battle against far stronger enemies, he fought for his country's freedom.

But Pulaski's love of liberty transcended national boundaries, and when the American War of Independence began, he took the colonists' struggle as his own. He came to the United States, put his battlefield experi-

ence at the service of the Continental Army, and commanded a cavalry unit. On this day in 1779, during the siege of Savannah, General Pulaski gave his life for the cause of American freedom.

Pulaski's spirit and example have inspired Americans for more than two centuries. Across this country, you will find counties, towns, schools, parks and highways named after that patriot; in my own home state of Arkansas, Pulaski County is the seat of the capital, Little Rock.

But eager as we are to claim General Pulaski as our own, we are also proud to share him with Poland. What Pulaski fought for in the latter part of the 18th century, his compatriots have achieved at the end of the 20th: a free Poland, welcome and respected in the community of independent nations. And the courage General Pulaski displayed in battle is matched by that of his present-day countrymen, who have carried out Poland's history-making revolution without bloodshed.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Monday, October 11, 1993, as General Pulaski Memorial Day, and I encourage the people of the United States to commemorate this occasion appropriately throughout the land.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of October, 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, 4:10 p.m., October 12, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 14.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Departure for Chapel Hill, North Carolina

October 12, 1993

Haiti

Q. Do you have a message for the military leaders in Haiti who have——

The President. Yes.

Q. ——so far thwarted our mission?

The President. First of all, the objective of the United States is to restore democracy and President Aristide to Haiti. The instrument of that was the sanctions. It was the sanctions. We never intended, and we have no intention now, of interfering in the internal affairs of the Haitians, except to say that we want democracy and the will of two-thirds of the Haitian people to be honored.

Now, the Governors Island Agreement, which all the parties signed off on, invited the international community to come to Haiti: French speaking forces; advisers to come in and help to train the police; the Canadians and the Americans to come and help to train the army, particularly for civilian purposes. One of the reasons we have so many Seabees going in, for example, is to help the military people change their mission so they can rebuild their own country.

This is different from the other missions we have been discussing. This is not peacekeeping. This is not peacemaking. This is an agreement that has been made, that if honored, would enable our people to come in and simply serve as trainers, 600 of them. So I have no intention of sending our people there until the agreement is honored.

What I intend to do now is to press to reimpose the sanctions. I will not have our forces deposited on Haiti when they cannot serve as advisers, when they can't do what they were asked to do. So we're going to press for the reimposition of sanctions. Mr. Cédras is supposed to resign his post as soon as the parliament can pass a bill separating the military from the police. Mr. François is supposed to leave his post. And they're going to have to go through with this if they expect to have a normal existence. And otherwise the United States is going to press to reimpose the sanctions.

Q. And what else can you do to try to get Aristide back in power? Isn't this whole thing coming unraveled, sir?

The President. No, I think that what happened is they agreed to the Governors Island Agreement. They invited all these nations to come help train the police and train the military and move them away from the kind of

state they've had to a democracy where they can rebuild the country.

Now, some of the people who have held onto power obviously are resisting letting it go when the pressure of the sanctions has been let up. President Aristide himself, number one, asked us to lift the sanctions, and number two, granted the amnesty to the people that were involved in kicking him out, just as he promised to do. So he has done his part. The international community has done its part. And they are reneging. There's no point in our even trying to land there until we can do what we were asked to do as advisers. This is not peacemaking, this is about restoration of democracy. So we're going back to the sanctions until those people do what they said they'd do.

Q. With those who are unarmed, is there a chance that the military will go in and then turn around and get in a hostile kind of situation once they're on the ground?

The President. The Department of Defense and our military leaders are convinced that the relatively light arms that our people were supposed to carry as advisers are more than adequate to protect themselves as long as the Governors Island Agreement is being honored. But I am not about to let them land to test it. We have to know. And we don't know yet. And so until we know, we're not going in there. We were not asked to come in there to make peace or to keep the peace. They said they would do that. All they asked us to do is to go in there and help them rebuild their country and train their forces, which we agreed to do.

Q. What's your view of the status of the Governors Island Agreement? Is it dead, has it been abrogated? What's your view of it as the legal standing of—

The President. —do not think it is dead. I still think it will come back to life. But right now it has been abrogated by people who have decided to cling to power for a little bit longer, apparently once the pressure of the sanctions has been off. We agreed to lift the sanctions because President Aristide asked us to do it, believing that in good faith that if he honored the Governors Island Agreement, the others would. Until they do it, the rest of the international community cannot proceed.

Q. What did Cédras tell you? I mean, what have they told of why they've done this?

The President. Well, they have a lot of different explanations. Mr. Cédras basically denies that he did it, although the soldiers plainly got out of the way for the people that were staging the demonstration against the landing. And so what we want to do is we want to see action. I have no intention of asking our young people in uniform or the Canadians or the people from the French-speaking countries to go in there to do anything other than implement a peace agreement that the parties themselves agreed to. I will say again, this is very different from what we have been engaged in, even in Somalia, very different. So they're going to have to honor this agreement. Otherwise, I'm going to press very hard to put the sanctions back on and enforce them strongly.

Q. Mr. President, how about the *Harlan County*? What's going to happen to the ship? Is it going to remain offshore, is it going to move somewhere else?

The President. I'm going to remove it from the harbor and put it at a base first and then we'll see what happens. I want the Haitians to know that I am dead serious about seeing them honor the agreement they made. President Aristide has done his part. He issued the amnesty personally. They said that's what they wanted; he did it. He asked us to relieve the Haitian people of the suffering and the sanctions, and the United Nations did that. And now the time has come for the people who are clinging to their last gasp of power to honor the agreement. They made the agreement; they've got to honor it.

Q. Mr. President, does that mean that Aristide won't be coming back to power at the end of the month?

The President. I still think there's a chance that'll happen. But it does mean that we are going to have to reimpose the sanctions. Of course, it's up to the U.N., but I'm going to push strong for it. We've got to get this agreement honored. If the agreement is honored, he can go back without fear of his personal safety. And the Canadians, the French-speaking nations, the United States can go in there not as peacemakers, not as

peacekeepers but to help to train people to rebuild their country.

We know what two-thirds of the Haitians wanted; they voted for it. We know that President Aristide has now honored his part of the Governors Island Agreement. I still think we can get the others to honor it. But the way to do it is to press for the sanctions, to show total intolerance of this kind of behavior and not to get into a position where the Canadians, the French, the United States, anybody else's motives can be misunderstood. We are waiting to go there as we were invited by all the parties: to be advisers. That's it. Meanwhile, we're going to push for democracy.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:08 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to Lt. Gen. Raoul Cédras, commander of the Haitian armed forces, and Lt. Col. Joseph Michel François, chief of the Haitian police. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill *October 12, 1993*

Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very much, President Spangler, President Friday, Chancellor Hardin, my good friend, Governor Hunt, and other distinguished platform guests, ladies and gentlemen.

I must say I have thought for a long time about what it might feel like to be in a vast crowd of North Carolinians and have them do something besides root against one of my athletic teams from Arkansas. *[Laughter]*

I began to think of this moment in August when I was on vacation, and I spent an evening with a person who used to be one of your great sons, James Taylor. And I asked him to sing "Carolina on My Mind," so that I could begin to think about what this day might mean to all of us. Five other Presidents have come to this great university to speak. None has ever had the opportunity to speak to a crowd like this, on this occasion of your 200th birthday as a university.

I'd like to begin by thanking the students whom I have met, and especially those who gave me this beautiful leather-bound book of essays, three of them, about the theme for this bicentennial celebration that the students chose: community. For it is in many ways what ought to be America's theme today, how we can be more together than we are apart.

This university has produced enough excellence to fill a library or lead a Nation; and novelists like Thomas Wolfe and Walker Percy; in great defenders of the Constitution like Senator Sam Ervin and Julius Chambers, now one of your chancellors; and Katherine Everett, a pioneer among women lawyers; and Francis Collins, a scientist who discovered the gene for cystic fibrosis; and journalists like Charles Kuralt and Tom Wicker and Deborah Potter and my Pulitzer Prize-winning friend, Taylor Branch; and leading business men and women like the head of the Small Business Administration in our administration, Erskine Bowles, who's here with me tonight and who, I dare say, is the ablest person ever to hold his position, probably because of the education he got here at the University of North Carolina. These are just a few of the many thousands of lives who have been brightened by what Mr. Kuralt so warmly referred to as the light and liberty this great university offers.

There are few certainties in this life, but I've also learned that when March madness rolls around, I'll be hoping my Razorbacks are there, but I know that Dean Smith's Tar Heels will always be there.

As one who grew up in the South, I have long admired this university for understanding that our best traditions call on us to offer that light and liberty to all. Chapel Hill has always been filled with a progressive spirit. Long before history caught up with him, as Mr. Kuralt just said, your legendary president, Frank Porter Graham, spoke this simple but powerful truth, "In the South, two great races have fundamentally a common destiny in building a nobler civilization, and if we go up, we go up together." What a better life we might have had if more had listened to that at a single time.

Your great State has also understood that education goes hand-in-hand with the expan-

sion of democracy and the advancement of our own economy. Under the leadership of men like Luther Hodges and Terry Sanford and Bill Friday, this university joined with your other State's great universities, the State government, and the corporate community to begin building an advanced research center to attract new businesses and jobs. Now the Research Triangle has more than 60 companies, more than 34,000 employees; it is the envy of the entire Nation of what we can do if we strive to make change our friend.

Tonight we celebrate the day this university began, the laying of a cornerstone that marks a milestone in the entire American journey, because on this day, near this place, 200 years ago, the cornerstone was laid for the first building in the first university in a Nation that had only recently been born.

It was, to be sure, a time of hopeful and historic change, when the future was clear to those who had the vision to see it and the courage to seize it. It was a time of heroes such as William R. Davie: a fighter in the Revolution, a framer of the Constitution, a Princeton graduate who wanted a State university here to make education accessible to more than a privileged few. On October 12th in 1793, when General Davie laid the foundation for this university, he laid a foundation for two centuries of progress in American education.

Historians tell us now that there was then a joyous ceremony, that "the maple leaves flamed red in the eager air." Great joy there was, but remember now, it was in the face of great uncertainty. The ruins of the Revolutionary War had yet to heal. The debts had yet to be repaid. And a new democracy seemed still untested and unstable. Yet, in spite of all these problems, the Americans of that time had the courage to build what had never before existed, a great new republic and a public university.

In spite of the obstacles, they decided to bet on the future, not cling to the past. That is the test for us today, my fellow Americans. Alexis de Tocqueville carried this uniquely American optimism, this faith in education, this commitment to change, when he wrote in his wondrous "Democracy in America", "The Americans have all a lively faith in the perfectibility of man. They judge that the dif-

fusion of knowledge must necessarily be advantageous, and the consequences of ignorance fatal. They all consider society as a body in a state of improvement, humanity as a changing scene, in which nothing is or ought to be permanent, and they admit that what appears to them today to be good, may be superseded by something better tomorrow."

For two centuries now, we've held fast to that faith in the future. For two centuries we've kept the courage to change. And for two centuries we've believed with Frank Porter Graham that we must go up together. Our founders pledged their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor to a common cause. We fought a vast and bloody Civil War to preserve that common cause. Every battle to expand civil rights has been to deepen and strengthen that common cause, our ability to go up together.

Now, after 200 years, and after 200 years of this university, we find ourselves a people of more than 150 different racial and ethnic groups confronting a challenge in this new era which tests our belief in the future, tests our courage to change, and tests our commitment to community, to going up together. Tonight we can best honor this great university's historic builders and believers, a dozen generations after our Nation and this university began, by meeting those tests.

The cold war is over. The threat of nuclear annihilation is receding. Democracy and free markets are on the march. Mandela and de Klerk, Rabin and Arafat have given people hope that peace can come out of any conflict.

A global economy is taking shape in which information and investment move across national borders at stunning speed. And competition for jobs and incomes is intense. Expanding trade is critical to every nation's growth, and our greatest asset is no longer natural resources or material structures. It is the strength, the skills, the mind, and the spirit of our people.

This is a world America has done a very great deal to make through two World Wars, the Civil War, the cold war, the establishment of global economic and trading missions, through the attempts to build a United Nations and other instruments of peace and

harmony, of progress and democracy. It is full of hope. But as we all know, it is not without its heartbreak.

There is less danger of a nuclear war between two nations but more danger of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of people irresponsibly prepared to use them. The oppression of Communist control has disappeared, but that disappearance has opened ugly ethnic and religious divisions. The United Nations can do more good than ever before, but clearly there are limits to what outside forces can do to solve severe internal problems in some nations. We cannot withdraw from this world we have done so much to make, and we must face its difficulties and challenges. Through great trials we have stood with President Yeltsin for democracy, peace, and economic reform in Russia. In so doing we have helped the Russians, but we've made ourselves safer and better, too.

We have sponsored and supported the peace process in the Middle East, for which you just clapped. And so doing, of course we have contributed to a better life for the Arabs and the Jews, but we have enhanced our own security as well.

We have helped to save nearly 1 million Somalis from death, starvation, anarchy, and strengthened our argument that the world's poor and deprived need not turn to terrorism and violence for redress. In so doing we have advanced our interests, but some of our finest young soldiers have perished.

Tonight before going on, I want to express here in North Carolina, my profound gratitude and deep personal sympathy to the families of the six servicemen from Fort Bragg who were killed in Somalia: Sergeant Daniel Busch, First Class Earl Fillmore, Master Sergeant Gary Gordon, Master Sergeant Timothy Martin, Sergeant First Class Matthew Rierson and Sergeant First Class Randall Schugan. May God bless their souls and their families, and may we all thank them.

Our Nation is grateful to them, so are most of the people of Somalia. I have ordered strong new steps to protect our troops, to ensure the return of our missing or captive Americans, to complete our mission in that nation in no more than 6 months, to finish that job quickly but to finish that job right.

Just as we know we cannot withdraw from the world, we know here at this great university, that we cannot lead the world unless we are first strong at home. After all, in the beginning it was our values, our ideals, our strength, our willingness to work, to make the most of what was here on this continent that made us the envy of the world.

And here at home, this new economy of ours offers much hope and opportunity. Yet every positive development seems to bring with it some jarring dislocation. The global economy not only rewards the educated, it punishes those without education.

Between 1972 and 1992, while the work year got longer for most Americans, our wages stagnated. The 75 percent of our people who don't have college degrees felt it profoundly. Those who began but didn't finish college saw their wages fall by 9 percent just since 1979. For those who didn't go on to college, wages fell 17 percent. For those who left high school, wages dropped 20 percent. We got a lot of new jobs out of international trade, but we know we also lose some every year to competition from countries with lower wages or higher quality or sometimes unfair practices. We know that our health care is the finest in the world, but millions of us are just a pink slip away from losing their health insurance or one illness away from losing a life's savings.

Most of our people are law-abiding citizens who love their families more than their own lives. But America leads the world in violent crime, has the highest percentage of its people behind bars, has 90,000 murders in the last 4 years, and more and more of our children are born into and grow up in family situations so difficult that it is hard even to make the arguments that the rest of us have taken for granted all of our lives.

More and more of our children are growing up in a world in which the future is not what happens when they graduate from the University of North Carolina but what happens 15 minutes from now. We cannot long survive in a Nation with young people for whom the people has no allure and on whom the future has no claim. All of us who come here in gratitude to this great university, and others like it, are here because we believe in tomorrow. And that must be our urgent

task: to restore that tomorrow for our young people.

What is the point of all this for today? It is simply this. We are living in a time of profound change. No one can fully see the shape of the change or imagine with great precision the end of it. But we know a lot about what works and what doesn't. And we know that if we do not embrace this change and make it our friend, if we do not follow what de Tocqueville said we were about 150 years ago, if we do not follow the traditions on which this university was founded, then change will become our enemy. And yet all around our great country today I see people resisting change. I see them turning inward and away from change. And I ask myself why.

At a time when we know it's a matter of fact that every rich country in the world gains many new jobs through expanding trade, I see people saying, "Well even though my industry will get more jobs, we shouldn't have a new trade arrangement with Canada and Mexico which could one day engulf all of Latin America." And when I listen to the arguments, I hear instead of arguments against this agreement, I hear the grievances of the 1980's, the grievances of times when workers were fired without thought, when investments were not made, when people were abused. Instead of a reasoning argument about what will build America tomorrow, I hear a longing for yesterday.

But I tell you my friends, as certainly as it was true 200 years ago today, yesterday is yesterday. If we try to recapture it, we will only lose tomorrow.

But I think we can say we know some things about why we are resisting these changes and what we might do to make ourselves more like the founders of this great university, more like the founders of our great Nation, more like most of the students here on any given day at this university. When do people most resist change? When they are most insecure. Think of any child you ever raised. Think of any personal experience you ever had. Why is it that great universities provide wonderful libraries and beautiful lawns and space and time to study and to learn and to grow? So people can feel personally at peace and secure. It is that which enables us to learn and to grow and

to change. And I say to you tonight, my fellow Americans, the mission of this university, the mission of every university, must be to be in the vanguard of helping the American people to recover enough personal security to be able to lead the changes that we are so urgently called on to make.

What does that mean? What does that mean? I would argue among all things, it means at least three: First, we must make Americans more secure in their families and at work. In a world transformed by trade and technology it is no longer possible for a young person to go to work and keep a job until retirement or even often to stay with the same company. The economy is creating and losing millions of jobs constantly. Most people now who are laid off from their jobs never get the same old job back. Young people beginning their careers, on average, will change work seven times in a lifetime. The best jobs those young people here in the audience may ever have may be jobs yet to be created in companies yet to be founded based on technologies yet to be discovered.

Economic security, therefore, can no longer be found in a particular job. It must be rooted in a continuing capacity to learn new things. That means we must have a system of lifelong learning beginning with higher standards in our schools. Almost two decades ago, your Governor, Jim Hunt, began an education reform program that included higher standards in these schools. Those efforts inspired other Governors around the country, including the then Governor of South Carolina, now our Education Secretary, Dick Riley, and me. And I thank him for that.

Now, we are trying to adopt a whole new approach in our national effort to raise standards in education. We believe the right standard for America isn't whether we are better than we were but whether we're the best in the world. This cannot be a Democratic or a Republican concern. It must be an American imperative. We know we have to expect more of our students and our schools. We have to regulate their details less but hold them to higher standards and measure whether our kids are really learning enough to compete and win in the global economy.

Then we have to ensure that every young person in this country has the opportunity to get a college education, every last one who wants it. We have already this year reorganized the student loan programs to lower interest rates and ease the repayment terms and open the doors of college education to thousands of young people by giving them a chance to be in the national service program, to rebuild their communities from the grassroots up, and earn a part of their college education.

For the three-quarters of our young people who do not get 4 year college degrees, we must merge the world of learning and the world of work to offer young people classroom training and on-the-job training. And for those who lose their jobs, the unemployment system is no longer good enough. We must create a continuous reemployment system so that people are always learning, even into their fifties and sixties and seventies, as long as they are willing to be productive citizens and to keep going and growing.

Another big part of job security that is often missed is that most workers are now parents, or at least most parents are now workers. And we can no longer force people to choose between being a good parent and a good worker. They must be able to be both. That is why people who work hard for marginal wages should not be taxed into poverty but lifted out of it by the tax system, and it is what this Government has done. For the first time ever we can say now, if you work 40 hours a week and you have children in your home, you can be lifted out of poverty.

And that is why we have said you ought not to lose your job if you have a sick child or a sick parent. You ought to be able to take a little time off without losing your job because it is important to the fabric of America to stick up for the American family.

A couple of Sundays ago when I came into the White House from my early morning run, I saw a father, a mother, and three daughters there taking a tour on Sunday morning, an unusual time. And I went over and said hello to them and learned that the family was there with the Make A Wish Foundation, because one of the daughters was desperately ill, and she wanted to see the President and see the White House. I talked to that family for a

while, and then I came down and had my picture taken with them. And as I was walking away the father said, "Mr. President, don't you ever think it doesn't matter what goes on up here. If it hadn't been for the family leave law coming in this year, I would have had to choose between spending this time with my precious daughter who may not make it, or working to support my family so that the rest of us could go on. No parent should ever make that choice, and I don't have to now."

That is what I mean by providing the American people the personal security they need to proceed to change in this world.

The second element, after education and training, of our personal security must be health care. This is the only advanced nation in which people can lose their health care, where we don't have health care that is always there and that can never be taken away. Even though we spend 40 percent more than any place else in the world, what does that mean? Lost productivity in small businesses, people really insecure about changing jobs because they've had someone in their family sick and they know if they change jobs that preexisting condition will keep them from getting new health insurance. So people walk around like this, millions of us all the time, 37.4 million Americans without any health insurance but many millions more knowing they could lose it like that.

How can you be secure enough to change, to take on new challenges, to start new businesses, to take new risks, if you think that you may have to let your family go without basic health care? My fellow Americans, it does not happen in any other advanced nation, and it is time for us to say as a people it will no longer happen here. No more.

And this last point I would make to you: If we are to be personally secure enough to make the changes and meet the tests of this time, we must protect our people better against the ravages of violence. Our people have the right to feel safe where they live, where they go to school, and where they work.

My fellow Americans, I was in California the other night and I talked to people all across the State in a hooked-up town hall meeting. And this young African-American

boy, a junior high school student, said, "Mr. President, my brother and I, we don't want to be in gangs. We don't want to have guns. We don't want to cause any trouble. We want to learn. We want a future. And we thought our school was too unsafe. So we decided to go to another school and enroll in it because it was safer. And on the day we showed up to register for school, my brother was standing right in front of me, and he was shot," because he got in a crossfire of one of these mindless, arbitrary, endless shootings that occur among children on our streets and in our schools today. We have to stop this. We cannot let those children be robbed of their future.

I know this State grieved recently when your native son Michael Jordan's father was killed. And I know we all wish him well as Michael embarks on a new journey in his life. But let us not forget that 22 other men and women were killed in that same county in your State this year. Ten foreign tourists were killed in Florida this year, and the State grieved over it. But in our Nation's Capital, in 1 week this summer, more than twice that many people were killed. They were not famous, but they were the President's neighbors.

It is heartbreaking. What can we do about it? We can put more police on our streets, not to catch criminals just alone but also to prevent crime. It works. Thirty years ago there were three police for every violent crime. Today there are three crimes for every police officer. We have to give these people the help they need. And when they work the same neighborhoods and walk the same streets and talk to the same kids, they help to prevent crime.

And I say this in North Carolina, coming from a State where in my home State, half the people have a hunting license or a fishing license or both, and we have to shut down factories and schools and towns on the opening day of deer season because nobody shows up anyway. But we still ought to pass the Brady bill so we don't sell guns to people with a criminal or a mental health history.

And we should not allow in city after city after city our police officers to go to work every day knowing they will walk the mean streets of our cities with people who are bet-

ter armed than they are, because this is the only country in the world where teenagers can have assault weapons designed only to kill other people and use them with abandon on the streets of our cities. We can do better than that.

Do you know, my fellow Americans, that I learned just last week that someone shot today with a bullet is 3 times more likely to perish because they are likely to have 3 times as many bullets in them as they did just 15 years ago. It is time for us to stop talking about law and order and thinking about how we can organize ourselves to protect our culture, to protect our heritage, to keep our rights as sports men and women but to protect our kids' lives and their future. The time has come to face this problem.

What has all that got to do with this? Because this is what the founders did. They faced the problems of their time and gave the rest of us a chance to live in the most successful democracy ever known. The idea of the public university, born here in North Carolina, played a major role in revolutionizing opportunity for millions and millions and millions of Americans who never even came into this State but got that opportunity in other States because of the example set here.

This is the challenge of our time, and we must meet it so that we can change: economic security, health care security, personal security. None of us can be secure until we are prepared to take personal responsibility for making these changes, and of building a new sense of community, each in our own way. Our jobs won't be responsible unless we are willing to learn new skills for a lifetime and until we all treat each other like indispensable partners, not disposable parts.

Our health care won't be secure, even if we pass our health care bill, until all of us practice more preventive care. Our families won't be secure until fathers and mothers begin to realize that they have to put their children first. Our communities won't be secure until people who disagree on everything else stop shouting at each other long enough to realize that we have to save the kids who are in trouble the same way we lost them, one child at a time. And it imposes a responsibility on each and every one of us.

But I tell you, my fellow Americans, I honestly believe that as you start the third century of this university's life we could be looking at the most exciting time America has ever known, if we have the security and the courage to change. We want to revitalize the American spirit of enterprise and adventure. We want to give our people new confidence to dream those great dreams again, to take those great risks, to achieve those great things.

The security I seek for America is like a rope for a rock climber, to lift those who will take responsibility for their own lives to greater and greater pinnacles. The security I seek is not Government doing more for people but Americans doing more for ourselves and for our families, for our communities, and for our country. It is not the absence of risk. It is the presence of opportunity. It is not a world without change but a world in which change is our friend and not our enemy.

We honor today the men and women who had the courage to create a new university in a new nation. We must, like them, be builders and believers, the architects of a new security to empower and embolden America and the University of North Carolina on the eve of a new century.

The only difference between America two centuries ago and America today is the difference between dawn and high noon of a very beautiful day.

In the words of your great alumnus, Thomas Wolfe, "The true discovery of America is still before us. The true fulfillment of our spirit, of our people, of our mighty and immortal land is yet to come." Let us believe in those words and let us act on them, so that 200 years from now our children, 12 generations removed, will still celebrate this glorious day.

Thank you, and Godspeed.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:24 p.m. in Kenan Memorial Stadium. In his remarks, he referred to C.D. Spangler, Jr., president, William C. Friday, president emeritus, and Paul Hardin, chancellor, University of North Carolina; James Taylor, entertainer; and Luther H. Hodges and Terry Sanford, former Governors of North Carolina. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Support for the North American Free Trade Agreement

October 12, 1993

I am very pleased today to acknowledge the efforts of President Bush, President Carter, and President Ford in convening a group of prominent citizens for NAFTA. Never before have former Presidents joined forces to speak to the Nation about such a pressing issue.

This group includes distinguished Americans who have demonstrated achievement in such diverse fields as government, industry, and civil rights. These individuals have taken many paths to prominence, but they have come to a common conclusion that this trade pact is good for America and good for America's economic fortunes.

This debate is fundamentally about creating jobs and defining America's role in an increasingly competitive global economy. Our fundamental choice is whether we will respond to change and create the high wage jobs of tomorrow or attempt to cling to the jobs of the past. America is always at its best when we look to the future.

While I continue to be concerned about America's rate of economic growth, it is increasingly clear that exports are a key factor in boosting our economy. NAFTA represents the best immediate opportunity to expand our markets and create new jobs at home.

I am increasingly confident that this agreement will be approved by Congress. When thoughtful people look at the facts about NAFTA, they will come to the same conclusion as this group of distinguished Americans. I am hopeful that this group will elevate the debate about NAFTA and participate vigorously in the discussion about which direction America should take.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Members of Congress on NAFTA

October 13, 1993

The President. Let me make a brief comment and then I'll answer a question or two.

I want to thank the Members of Congress who are here today. This is, as you can see, a fairly large bipartisan group of House Members who have come for one of a series of meetings I've been having to try to persuade them to vote for the North American Free Trade Agreement. I want to reiterate that the thing that has impressed me is that more and more Members are trying to look beyond the politics of this issue and just ask what's good for America, whether it will create jobs for America, whether it opens the opportunity for more growth. I strongly believe that. I think we're making progress, and I'm looking forward to having a good discussion.

I thank Mr. Michel for coming, and the Speaker who was going to come and couldn't come at the last minute. But we've had good support there, and I'm looking forward to this discussion this morning.

Somalia

Q. Mr. President, Senator Byrd has just announced his intention to introduce an amendment which would cut off funding for the U.S. forces in Somalia February 1st, as opposed to your March 31st. (a) Do you know about this? (b) What are you going to do about it; what does it mean?

The President. Well, I just talked to him. He said that he has—he started off at December 1st as a hard deadline and now says February 1st, and the President can ask for an extension and the Congress can give. So I appreciate Senator Byrd working with me on it. I've not read it so I can't comment on the substance of it. I'm very interested in what the details are. It's not just a question of a deadline, it's also of not tying not just my hands but any President's hands in foreign policy too much.

Our policy in Somalia, I believe, is beginning to work. I think the obvious import of what's happened in the last few days is that we're moving in the right direction, and I hope we can continue to do that. I can't comment about the specific resolution until I've read it and until I know what the alternatives are.

Q. Are you going to get Durant out? Is there a movement there—the pilot, the captive American?

The President. We're working very hard to get him out.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:48 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Robert H. Michel, House minority leader. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Somalia

October 13, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

In response to the request made by the House and Senate for certain information on our military operations in Somalia, I am pleased to forward the attached report.

In transmitting this report, I want to reiterate the points that I made on October 6 and to the American people in remarks on October 7. We went to Somalia on a humanitarian mission. We saved approximately a million lives that were at risk of starvation brought on by civil war that had degenerated into anarchy. We acted after 350,000 already had died.

Ours was a gesture of a great nation, carried out by thousands of American citizens, both military and civilian. We did not then, nor do we now plan to stay in that country. The United Nations agreed to assume our military mission and take on the additional political and rehabilitation activities required so that the famine and anarchy do not resume when the international presence departs.

For our part, we agreed with the United Nations to participate militarily with a much smaller U.S. force for a period of time, to help the United Nations create a secure environment in which it could ensure the free flow of humanitarian relief. At the request of the United Nations and the United States, approximately 30 nations deployed over 20,000 troops as we reduced our military presence.

With the recent tragic casualties to American forces in Somalia, the American people want to know why we are there, what we are doing, why we cannot come home imme-

diately, and when we *will* come home. Although the report answers those questions in detail, I want to repeat concisely my answers:

- We went to Somalia because without us a million people would have died. We, uniquely, were in a position to save them, and other nations were ready to share the burden after our initial action.
- What the United States is doing there is providing, for a limited period of time, logistics support and security so that the humanitarian and political efforts of the United Nations, relief organizations, and others can have a reasonable chance of success. The United Nations, in turn, has a longer term political, security, and relief mission designed to minimize the likelihood that famine and anarchy will return when the United Nations leaves. The U.S. military mission is not now nor was it ever one of "nation building."
- We cannot leave immediately because the United Nations has not had an adequate chance to replace us, nor have the Somalis had a reasonable opportunity to end their strife. We want other nations to assume more of the burden of international peace. To have them do so, they must think that they can rely on our commitments when we make them. Moreover, having been brutally attacked, were American forces to leave now we would send a message to terrorists and other potential adversaries around the world that they can change our policies by killing our people. It would be open season on Americans.
- We will, however, leave no later than March 31, 1994, except for a few hundred support troops. That amount of time will permit the Somali people to make progress toward political reconciliation and allow the United States to fulfill our obligations properly, including the return of any Americans being detained. We went there for the right reasons and we will finish the job in the right way.

While U.S. forces are there, they will be fully protected with appropriate American military capability.

Any Americans detained will be the subject of the most complete and thorough efforts of which this Government is capable, with the unrelenting goal of returning them home and returning them to health.

I want to thank all those who have expressed their support for this approach during the last week. At difficult times such as these, when we face international challenges, bipartisan unity among our two branches of government is vital.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 13, 1993.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Budget Deferrals

October 13, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report eight deferrals of budget authority, totaling \$1.2 billion.

These deferrals affect International Security Assistance programs as well as programs of the Agency for International Development and the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health and Human Services, and State. The details of these deferrals are contained in the attached report.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 13, 1993.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Bosnia-Herzegovina

October 13, 1993

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

Six months ago I provided you with my initial report on the deployment of U.S. combat-equipped aircraft to support NATO's enforcement of the no-fly zone in Bosnia-Herzegovina. I am now providing this follow-up report, consistent with the War Powers

Resolution, to keep Congress fully informed on our enforcement effort.

The United Nations Security Council has been actively addressing the humanitarian and ethnic crisis in the Balkans since adopting Resolution 713 on September 25, 1991. As a significant part of the extensive United Nations effort in the region, the Security Council acted through Resolutions 781 and 786 to establish a ban on all unauthorized flights over Bosnia-Herzegovina. In response to blatant violations of these Resolutions, the Security Council adopted Resolution 816, which authorized Member States, acting nationally or through regional organizations or arrangements, to take all necessary measures to ensure compliance with the no-fly zone. NATO and its North Atlantic Council (NAC) agreed to provide NATO air assets to enforce the declared no-fly zone.

As I stated in my April 13 report, this enforcement effort began on April 12, 1993. Since that time, the participating nations have conducted phased air operations to prevent flights over Bosnia-Herzegovina that are not authorized by the United Nations Protection Forces (UNPROFOR). The United States has played a major role by contributing combat-equipped fighter aircraft as well as electronic combat and supporting tanker aircraft to these operations in the airspace over Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Militarily, enforcement of the no-fly zone has been effective. Since the operations pursuant to Resolution 816 began, we have seen no recurrence of air-to-ground bombing of villages or other air-to-ground combat activity in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Although nearly 400 violations have occurred, most have been by rotary-wing aircraft. These flights are difficult to detect because they are of short duration and are flown slowly, at low altitudes, and in mountainous terrain. Consequently, such flights sometimes can complete missions after being detected but before being intercepted. In addition, the violators appear to have learned the limits of our rules of engagement (ROE) and have become adept at playing "cat-and-mouse" games with the interceptors. When intercepted, violators heed the warnings to land, but sometimes the flights continue after the interceptors depart.

These enforcement operations have been conducted safely, with no casualties to date. Consideration has been given to strengthening the ROE to enforce the no-fly zone more aggressively. Because the violations have been militarily insignificant, however, the ROE have not been changed.

The United States continues to make extensive and valuable contributions to the United Nations efforts in the former Yugoslavia. More than 50 U.S. aircraft are now available to NATO for the continued conduct of no-fly zone enforcement operations and possible provision of close air support to UNPROFOR in the future. In addition, U.S. airlift missions to Sarajevo have numbered more than 1,900, and we have completed nearly 1,000 airdrop missions to safe areas, including Mostar. U.S. medical and other support personnel are providing vital services in support of UNPROFOR, while our U.S. Army light infantry battalion deployed to Macedonia has become an integral part of the UNPROFOR monitoring operations there. Finally, U.S. naval forces have completed more than 14 months of enforcement operations as part of a multinational effort to implement the Security Council's mandate with respect to economic sanctions and the arms embargo covering the former Yugoslavia.

Although the no-fly zone enforcement operations have been militarily effective and have reduced potential air threats to our humanitarian airlift and airdrop flights, this is only part of a much larger, continuing effort to resolve the extremely difficult situation in the former Yugoslavia. I therefore am not able to indicate at this time how long our participation in no-fly zone enforcement operations will be necessary. I have continued the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces for these purposes pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

I am grateful for the continuing support of Congress for this important deployment, and I look forward to continued cooperation as we move forward toward attainment of our goals in this region.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Statement on the Withdrawal of Shirley Chisholm's Nomination To Be Ambassador to Jamaica

October 13, 1993

I deeply regret that illness has forced Shirley Chisholm to ask that her nomination to be our country's Ambassador to Jamaica be withdrawn. As I said when I first announced my decision to nominate her, Shirley Chisholm is a true pioneer of American politics. Even before she ran for elective office, she had made her mark through her work teaching the children of New York and through the force of her remarkable personality. As the U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica, she would have been a powerful voice for cooperation and justice.

Hillary and I both wish Shirley Chisholm all the best at this difficult time. She is in our thoughts and in our prayers.

NOTE: The President's statement was included in a White House statement announcing the withdrawal of Shirley Chisholm's nomination to be Ambassador to Jamaica.

The President's News Conference

October 14, 1993

The President. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm sorry I am a little late, but I just finally got through to Ambassador Oakley, and I wanted to have a chance to speak with him directly for a couple of minutes before I came out here.

I also spoke with Mrs. Durant this morning to congratulate her and to wish her well. Obviously, she is very happy. She has now had an extended conversation with her husband. And he is, as you know, in the U.N. field hospital in Mogadishu. But he will be going to Germany as soon as the doctors say that he can travel. And then, as soon as possible, he'll be back home with his family and his

friends. I welcome his release, and I want to express my deepest thanks to the African leaders who pressed hard for it and to Bob Oakley, the International Red Cross, and to the United Nations, to all who have worked on this for the last several days.

Over the past week, since the United States announced its intention to strengthen our forces in Somalia, as well as to revitalize the diplomatic initiative and send Bob Oakley back, we have seen some hopeful actions: the release of Michael Durant and the Nigerian peacekeeper, the cessation of attacks on the United States and U.N. peacekeepers. That demonstrates that we are moving in the right direction and that we are making progress.

Our firm position on holding Durant's captors responsible for his well-being and demanding his release, I think, sent a strong message that was obviously heard. Now we have to maintain our commitment to finishing the job we started. It's not our job to rebuild Somalia's society or its political structure. The Somalis have to do that for themselves. And I welcome the help of the African leaders who have expressed their commitment to working with us and with them. But we have to give them enough time to have a chance to do that, to have a chance not to see the situation revert to the way it was before the United States and the United Nations intervened to prevent the tragedy late last year.

I want to also emphasize that we made no deals to secure the release of Chief Warrant Officer Durant. We had strong resolve. We showed that we were willing to support the resumption of the peace process, and we showed that we were determined to protect our soldiers and to react when appropriate by strengthening our position there. I think the policy was plainly right. But there was no deal.

If you have any questions, I'll be glad to try to answer them.

Somalia

Q. Mr. President, there's still a \$25,000 bounty on Mr. Aideed. Would you still like to see Mr. Aideed arrested? Do you think that's appropriate? And do you think that the

United Nations now should release Mr. Aideed's forces that it's captured recently?

The President. Well, let me answer the first question. The United States position is that we have a U.N. resolution which says that there must be some resolution of the unconscionable incident which started this whole thing, which was the murder of 24 Pakistani peacekeepers who were not there in battle but were simply there doing the job that we all went there to do, the humanitarian mission. I think that it's very important to remember that.

It is further our position that we cannot afford to have any police work that we were asked to do as part of the U.N. mission be transformed into a military endeavor that, in effect, made many people believe that there was no longer a diplomatic initiative going on in Somalia. So there still has to be some resolution of that. We have a U.N. resolution, and we ought to pursue it. Now, there may be other ways to do it, and I am open to that.

As far as the release of any people is concerned, that will obviously be up to the United Nations. But they have to consider what our obligations are with regard to the murder of the Pakistani peacekeepers. That's what started this whole thing.

Q. Mr. President, isn't it pretty clear, though, that Aideed must have been given some immunity from arrest, because he talked to reporters? He seems to be pretty available. You don't seem to be laying a glove on him. Have you called off the dogs?

The President. There was no deal made, I can tell you that. We have taken account of the behavior of others on the ground there, and we will continue to do that. But for the next few days, we have to work through what the resolution will be of the U.N. requirement that got us all into the position we were in last week, which is that we have to have some means of resolving what happened to the Pakistanis, who were clearly not in anybody's combat, were just doing their jobs. And we have to do it.

Q. Well, do you hold him responsible?

The President. Well, he offered, if you remember, an independent commission to look into that. The United Nations asked the United States to attempt to arrest him and

to go out of our way not to hurt him while arresting him because he was suspected of being responsible. So if he's willing to have somebody that we can all trust look into that, then that's something I think that Mr. Oakley is certainly willing to entertain over there.

Foreign Policy Accomplishments

Q. Mr. President, despite your success today, there's been a lot of criticism that U.S. foreign policy has been run in a naive and somewhat disorganized way. What's your response to that?

The President. Well, I can tell you first of all, I've had people who were involved in the two previous administrations say that our national security decision-making process was at least as good as the two in the previous ones, perhaps better. Secondly, I think on the biggest issues affecting the future and the security of the United States, we have a good record. We have done very well with Russia, the most important issue. We have set up a system that did not exist before we came to office to deal with the other republics of the former Soviet Union and to work on nuclear issues and other issues. I think we have done quite well with the Middle East peace process and with its aftermath. I think we have done well to establish the groundwork of a new basis of a relationship with Japan and with Asia generally. We have certainly put nonproliferation on a higher plane than it was there before. I think we did very well. The United States had the most successful meeting of the G-7 in over a decade. That was clear: the first time in 10 years we were complimented instead of criticized, making real progress there.

So I think that the people who say that, because of what happened in Somalia last week, have a pretty weak reed to stand on. And in terms of Haiti,—and maybe we can get to that—when I took office, what we had was everybody in Haiti thinking about whether they could leave and come to the United States because they thought there was no way that anybody would ever stick up for the democratic process in Haiti, and the fact that two-thirds of the people voted for somebody to lead their country that was then ousted by the old regime. At least we have made an effort to try to change that. And I assure

you that my determination there is as strong as ever.

It's easy to second-guess. When you get into something like Somalia, I think anybody who really thought about it at the time the decision was made—I supported it. I think it was the right thing to do. I think we went there for the right motives. But you had to know when we went there that (a) that there was no way America was going to get out in January because there was no political process in place there that could have given the Somalis a chance to survive, and (b) that there was every chance that someone, for their own reasons, at some point during this mission might kill some peacekeepers, which would complicate the mission.

We are living in a new world. It's easy for people who don't have these responsibilities to use words like "naive" or this or that or the other thing. The truth is, we're living in a new and different world, and we've got to try to chart a course that is the right course for the United States to lead, while avoiding things that we cannot do or things that impose costs in human and financial terms that are unacceptable for us. But I think that in this new world, we've made a pretty good beginning and clearly on the things that affect us most.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, you were very clear last week in saying that you did not want your reaction to events in Somalia to be the wrong signal to the world's thugs and bullies. I wonder, sir, if it occurs to you that the events of Haiti may indicate that that signal was sent anyway?

The President. No. The problem we had in Haiti with the boat was that we sent 200 Seabees over there who were commissioned specifically to train military officers to do more work to rebuild the country. They were lightly armed; they were not in any way—they were not peacekeepers or peacemakers.

I would remind you that the Governors Island Agreement basically was an agreement among all the major parties in Haiti which clearly set forth the fact that they did not want other countries' forces or a U.N. force coming in there to provide law and order. They wanted French-speaking forces to

come in and retrain the police force. They wanted French-speaking Canadians and the United States to come in and retrain the army to rebuild the country.

So those people were simply not able or ever authorized to pursue any mission other than that. I was not about to put 200 American Seabees into a potentially dangerous situation for which they were neither trained nor armed to deal with at that moment. And I did not want to leave the boat in the harbor so that that became the symbol of the debate. I pulled the boat out of the harbor to emphasize that the Haitian parties themselves who were still there in Haiti are responsible for violating the Governors Island Agreement. We moved immediately to reimpose sanctions to include oil. We are going to do some more things unilaterally in the next day or two. And I think that we still have a chance to get this done, because the people who were there who don't want to give up power agreed to the Governors Island Agreement, and we're going to do our best to hold them to it.

Q. You don't think that those thugs on the dock there in Haiti were encouraged by the events in Somalia to try what they tried?

The President. They may or may not have been, but they're going to be sadly disappointed. I think those people on the docks in Haiti were probably the hired hands of the elites that don't want democracy to come to Haiti. So I don't think they had drawn any sophisticated interpretation from world events. But if they did, they ought to look at what else has happened in Somalia. Look at the way we have bolstered our forces. Look at the reports in the newspaper today.

What we've done in Somalia—let me go back to that—is consistent with our original mission. We did not go there to prove we could win military battles. No one seriously questions the fact that we could clean out that whole section of Mogadishu at minimum loss to ourselves if that's what we wanted to do. The reports today say that 300 Somalis were killed and 700 more were wounded in the firefight that cost our people their lives last week. That is not our mission. We did not go there to do that. We cannot let a charge we got under a U.N. resolution to do some police work—which is essentially what

it is, to arrest suspects—turn into a military mission.

But the people in Haiti would be sadly misguided if they think the United States has weakened its resolve to see that democracy—the expressed will of two-thirds of the people of Haiti. I noticed Congressman Kennedy on the television this morning saying that President Aristide won an election victory with a higher percentage of the vote than any leader in the Western Hemisphere. And he can't even get into office. We're going to try to change that.

Let me just make one other comment about Haiti. This is very important to me. In addition to President Aristide, there is a government that has been struggling mightily to function in Haiti, headed by Prime Minister Malval, a business person, a person who basically did not ask for the responsibilities that he has undertaken. I want to send a clear signal today, too, that the United States is very concerned about his ability to function and his personal safety and the safety of his government. That is very important to us. Malval is key to making this whole thing work. He is recognized as a stabilizing figure, as a person who will work with all sides, as a person who will be fair to everybody. And it would be again a grave error to underestimate the extent to which this country regards him as an important part of the ultimate solution.

Somalia

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to go back to what you said about Aideed, because it appears that you've opened the door to leave him a way out this morning when you said that we have to take into account what others did on the ground there. Do you think there's a possibility that Aideed was not directly responsible for the attack on the Pakistani U.N. forces? And do you believe there's also a possibility that Aideed could now become part of the political process and indeed may someday become President?

The President. Well, let me answer the questions somewhat separately. First of all, to take the second question, what happened over the last several weeks—and let me back up and say I understood why the United States was thought to have the only capacity

to pursue the police function once the Pakistanis were killed. But keep in mind what that function was: That function was to arrest people suspected of being involved in that, not to be judge and jury, not to say we know exactly what happened, not to find people guilty in advance.

So our young soldiers, at significant risk to themselves, went out of their way to capture people without killing them. As a consequence, however, because of the circumstances, as we all know, several of them lost their lives, and hundreds of Somalis who were fighting them, either with weapons or by getting in their way, lost their lives. Now, that never should have been allowed to supplant—as I said at the United Nations before this incident occurred—that never should have been allowed to supplant the political process that was ongoing when we were in effective control up through last May.

So we had to start the political process again. We have no interest in keeping any clan or subclan or group of Somalis out of the political process affecting the future of their people. The clan structure seems to be the dominant structure in the country. It is not for the United States or for the United Nations to eliminate whole groups of people from having a role in Somalia's future. The Somalis must decide that with the help and guidance, I believe, primarily of the African states and leadership around them, first of all.

Secondly, with regard to the specific incident, what I want to do is to see the U.N. resolution honored. That is, we want to know that there is some effort, honest, unencumbered effort, to investigate what happened to those Pakistanis and to have some resolution of that consistent with international law. We cannot expect the United Nations to go around the world, whether it's in Cambodia or Somalia or any of the many other places we're involved in peacekeeping, and have people killed and have no resolution of it.

Aideed, himself, as you know, offered in a letter to President Carter to have a genuinely unbiased commission look into this and have evidence presented to it. The United Nations may choose to take a different course in this, but we should honor the resolution.

That is, you asked me a question about Aideed personally. I can't answer that. I can say that I believe in the strongest terms that the United States should continue to say, if you want us to be involved in peacekeeping, if peacekeepers get murdered doing their job the way the Pakistanis did, and others, there has to be an effort to look into who did it and to hold those accountable. If there is another way to do that, that's fine. What I said at the U.N., I will reiterate: The United States being a police officer in Somalia was turned into the waging of conflict in a highly personalized battle which undermined the political process. That is what was wrong, and that is what we have attempted to correct in the last few days.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, your statement reassuring Prime Minister Malval of Haiti about his personal security raises the question, of course: Is there a threat to his personal security, and what happens if something happens to Prime Minister Malval?

The President. If something happens to him, it would be a very difficult situation for the Haitians. It would make President Aristide's job more difficult, and it would further isolate the military and police authorities there and the people who are sponsoring them from the international community. I hope that he is not in danger. I do not have any information that he is in imminent danger. He's continuing to function, but if you know how he works down there, I mean, he has very limited security, he does a lot of work out of his home, he has not constructed a military apparatus around himself. He really is a good citizen serving his country, and he is a necessary part of the glue that would permit President Aristide to go back down there.

Keep in mind, Aristide gave these people amnesty. The truth is, a lot of them never thought he'd do it. I know there are people who have criticized Aristide, who say that, you know, maybe he's not really a political person, can't do this. All I know is that in our dealings with him, he has done what he said he would do. And I think they were disoriented by the fact that he issued the amnesty order when they didn't think he would.

And I am genuinely concerned that the forces in Haiti—let me back up and say, they signed off on the Governors Island Agreement because they realized that the sanctions were having a crushing blow on them. And in the end, they and the people who were funding a lot of their activities understood that it was going to cost them more to stay with the present course than to permit this transition to democracy.

And what we're trying to do now—our policy clearly is to remind them of why they signed off in the first place in the most forceful terms and to make it absolutely clear that no one in the international community is going to walk away from our previous policy toward Haiti if they don't honor their commitments under that agreement.

Peacekeeping Missions

Q. Mr. President, would your experiences this month in Somalia and Haiti make you more cautious about sending American peacekeepers to Bosnia?

The President. Well, my experiences in Somalia would make me more cautious about having any Americans in a peacekeeping role where there was any ambiguity at all about what the range of decisions were which could be made by a command other than an American command with direct accountability to the United States here.

Now, to be fair, our troops in Somalia were under an American commander. And even though General Bir was the overall commander, it was clear always that General Hoar here in the United States was the commanding officer of General Montgomery. But because we got a general charge from the U.N. to try to arrest people suspected of being involved in the killing of the Pakistani soldiers, not every tactical decision had to be cleared here through General Hoar.

What I've made clear all along, the reason I've said that I thought that any Bosnian operation would have to be operated through NATO—the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe is an American general that talks every day to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that works in very clear cooperation with the other NATO forces. They have drilled together. They have trained together. They have worked together. It is a much

more coherent military operation. And I would have a far higher level of confidence about not only the safety of our troops but our ability to deal with that as a NATO operation. It's a whole different issue, Bosnia, but I would have a much higher level of confidence there.

With the U.N., let me just say, to go back to the U.N., I still believe that U.N. peacekeeping is important. And I still believe that America can play a role in that. But when you're talking about resolving longstanding political disputes, the United States as the world's only superpower is no more able to do that for other people than we were 30 years ago, or 20 years ago.

That's why if you go back and look at Somalia, what's going to happen here, and compare it to what the U.N. did in Cambodia, where the U.N. went into Cambodia first of all with this theory about what they had to do to or with the Khmer Rouge, and then they moved away from any kind of military approach and sent a lot of very brave peacekeepers, none of whom were Americans and some of whom lost their lives, Japanese and others, they worked through the politics of Cambodia by, in effect, creating a process in which the local people had to take responsibility for their own future. If we are going to do that kind of work, we ought to take the Cambodian model in Somalia and everywhere else.

Where we have to do peacekeeping, if we're going to do that in a unified command, even if the Americans are always under American forces, we have got to make the kind of changes in the United Nations that I advocated in my speech to the U.N. We have got to have that international peacekeeping apparatus far better organized than it is now. And if you go back to the U.N. speech, it received little notice because of the momentary and important crises in Somalia and elsewhere. But the reorganization of the peacekeeping apparatus of the U.N. is an urgent mission because keep in mind, the U.N. peacekeepers, with no American soldiers there, are involved all over the world now, and they have done an awful lot of good work. But we plainly have to reorganize that and strengthen that. Got to go. Thank you.

Haiti

Q. Would you support the blockade in Haiti, President Clinton? Would you support a blockade?

The President. I support strongly enforcing the sanctions and—I want to answer that. I support strongly enforcing these sanctions, strongly. And over the next few days we will be announcing the form in which that sanctions enforcement will take place.

Thank you.

Q. Is that a yes or a no?

The President. Well, the word blockade is a term of art in international law, which is associated with a declaration of war, so I have to—

Q. How about patrols?

The President. I have to be careful in using that word, but I think that we have to enforce the sanctions.

NOTE: The President's 28th news conference began at 10:21 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Proclamation 6611—National Down Syndrome Awareness Month, 1993

October 14, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Down syndrome, the most common genetic birth defect associated with mental retardation, affects 4,000 babies a year from all ethnic and societal backgrounds. As little as twenty years ago, people with Down syndrome were stigmatized or, all too frequently, institutionalized. Now, happily, they are benefitting from important advances in research, education, and health care.

Over the past two decades, scientists have applied the technology of molecular genetics and other sciences to the study of Down syndrome. Researchers are looking for the genes, or combination of genes, on chromosome 21 that have a relationship to the development of intelligence and the physical disorders associated with Down syndrome. They are also looking for a possible relationship between Down syndrome and Alzheimer's disease.

There is a wide variation in mental abilities, behavior, and physical development in individuals with Down syndrome. However, individuals with Down syndrome benefit from loving homes, early intervention, special education, mainstreaming, appropriate medical care, and positive public attitudes—all made possible through the efforts of researchers, service providers, physicians, teachers, and parent support groups. In addition, such government agencies as the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the National Institute on Aging, components of the National Institutes of Health; the Maternal and Child Health Bureau; and the President's Committee on Mental Retardation have worked in concert with private organizations like the National Down Syndrome Congress and the National Down Syndrome Society to help those affected by this congenital disorder.

To help promote greater understanding of Down syndrome, the Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 92, has designated the month of October 1993 as "National Down Syndrome Awareness Month" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this month.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of October 1993 as National Down Syndrome Awareness Month. I invite all Americans to observe this month with appropriate programs and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourteenth day of October, 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, 10:41 a.m., October 15, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 18.

Statement on Action by the House of Representatives on Goals 2000

October 14, 1993

I am pleased by last night's overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives in favor

of my Goals 2000 education reform bill. This bill takes an important step towards codifying into law the national education goals.

Goals 2000 invites every State to participate in true systemic reform and will serve as the cornerstone of my administration's efforts to create a world-class system of education and training with high expectations and opportunities for every child.

I want to thank Chairmen Bill Ford and Dale Kildee and other Democratic members of the Education and Labor committee, whose experienced leadership and cooperation across party lines were crucial to attaining this important victory.

I am especially gratified by the broad bipartisan support that Goals 2000 enjoys. I want to thank the many distinguished Republicans, starting with Representatives Bill Goodling and Steve Gunderson, who worked hard over many months to improve this bill and who spoke out so forcefully on its behalf yesterday. And I congratulate Secretary of Education Riley and Secretary of Labor Reich, whose unswerving commitment and effective advocacy were essential.

The enactment of my comprehensive education and training agenda is crucial to achieving an economy that can compete effectively in world markets and create high-skill, high-wage jobs for all Americans. I urge the Senate to bring this legislation to the floor as quickly as possible and approve it with bipartisan support.

It will be a great day for the children of America and for all Americans when I am able to sign Goals 2000 into law.

Statement on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

October 14, 1993

Audiovisual services must be included in any GATT accord. The United States does not want any special favors for American audiovisual creative works, but we also cannot accept that audio products be singled out for unacceptable restrictions. The United States is ready to sign a GATT accord that is fair and just for all. But let me make it clear that fairness and justice must apply to audiovisual works as well as other elements

in a final GATT deal. This is a vital jobs issue as well as a fairness issue for America.

Finally, let me say once again that the Uruguay round is very important to the restoration of global growth, and that is why it is essential that we finish this agreement by December 15. That deadline is firm, and our trading partners must be prepared to settle with us on the many outstanding issues if we are to succeed.

Nomination for Ambassadors to Morocco, Sweden, and the Bahamas

October 14, 1993

The President announced his intention today to nominate Marc Charles Ginsburg to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, Sidney Williams to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, and Thomas L. Siebert to be Ambassador to Sweden.

"It gives me great pleasure to make this announcement today," said the President. "Each of these three outstanding individuals has contributed in his own way to the well being of his community. Through their efforts, they will ensure that our country maintains its strong relationships with our allies in Morocco, the Bahamas, and Sweden."

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

Nomination for Deputy United States Trade Representative

October 14, 1993

The President announced today that he intends to nominate former Washington Governor, Booth Gardner to be Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador. He will serve in USTR's Geneva, Switzerland office, representing the U.S. before the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the world body on trade policies and practices among nations.

"Booth Gardner was one of the very best Governors with whom I served. He has a solid background in business and trade" said the President, "and knows firsthand the importance of free and fair trade to keeping our economy strong and creating jobs for

American workers. I think he will do an outstanding job in Geneva."

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

Statement by the Director of Communications on the Death of Justice Minister Guy Malary of Haiti

October 15, 1993

The President strongly condemns the killing of Haitian Minister of Justice Guy Malary, a desperate attempt to thwart the will of the Haitian people for democracy. The United States remains firmly committed to the Governors Island accord and the return to Haiti of President Aristide. The President is currently meeting with his advisers on the situation.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Tansu Ciller of Turkey

October 15, 1993

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, have you made a decision on Haiti? Are you going to send U.S. warships to intercept boats to enforce a U.N. embargo?

The President. I'll have a statement about it later this afternoon. When the Prime Minister and I conclude our talks and our public statement, then I'll make a statement about Haiti and take questions on it.

Q. Are you concerned at all about the safety of supporters for Mr. Aristide following the assassination?

The President. I'll talk about it later this afternoon.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:43 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

**The President's News Conference
With Prime Minister Ciller of Turkey**
October 15, 1993

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It's a great honor for me to welcome Prime Minister Ciller to Washington today. She knows our country well from her student days and many subsequent visits. And we had a very good first meeting. We agreed to work together to strengthen our relationship and to develop an enhanced partnership between the United States and Turkey.

For centuries, Turkey has stood at the crossroads of continents, cultures, and historic eras. As the winds of change have shaped both East and West, they have often blown across the Anatolian Plateau. That is why Turkey has always offered the world such a rich and fascinating mixture of peoples, religions, art, and ideas.

Like our own Nation, Turkey is a shining example to the world of the virtues of cultural diversity. And our relationship with Turkey proves that diverse peoples, East and West, Muslim, Christian, and Jew, can work closely together toward shared goals.

Since the time 40 years ago when we stood side by side in Korea, Turkey has served the cause of freedom as NATO's southern anchor and has been a valued ally of the United States. Turkey was a steadfast member of the worldwide coalition that drove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait and instituted international sanctions against Iraq. And for that, the United States remains very grateful. We've all had to pay a price for enforcing the will of the international community, and Turkey in that regard has certainly done more than its share. And we are grateful for its contribution.

We discussed Turkey's role in helping to play a stabilizing role in a host of regional trouble spots, ranging from the former Yugoslavia, through the Caucasus, into Central Asia and, of course, toward the Southeast where Iraq and Iran both continue to pose problems for peace and stability in the world.

We also discussed the need to work for an end to the tragic conflict in Cyprus, which is dividing too many people in too many ways. I am committed to preserving and strength-

ening our Nation's long tradition of close cooperation with Turkey.

Our security ties must remain strong, our friendship and mutual commitment as allies unswerving. But the focus of our relationship can now shift from a cold-war emphasis on military assistance to an emphasis on shared values and greater political economic cooperation, responsive to the needs of our own peoples and the changing world.

Next month the U.S.-Turkish Joint Economic Commission will convene to work on revitalizing our economic relationship. And I look forward to the results of that effort and to supporting it. The commission will guide a process in which private enterprise will increasingly become the dynamic focus of our enhanced partnership. As an economist, the Prime Minister is ideally suited to lead this endeavor.

Today, Turkey is on the cutting edge of change once again. Its commitment to democracy fulfills the ideals of Ataturk as Turkey enters the 21st century. It's reaching out to the new states of Central Asia, even as it strengthens its longstanding ties to the West.

The Prime Minister represents a new generation of leadership in Turkish politics at a time when the world needs new leadership for a new era. And at a point when our relationship with Turkey is evolving into a new enhanced partnership, it is reassuring to me to know that someone is at the helm in Turkey who understands the needs of the ordinary citizens of that country, their hopes, their aspirations, and is pursuing policies that will give them a chance to fulfill their dreams.

It is, therefore, a great pleasure, once again, to welcome Prime Minister Ciller and to present her to you today.

Madam Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Ciller. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate your kind words about my country and about myself.

President Clinton and I had good talks. I believe there was a meeting of minds. And I think it's natural, since we both represent the generation of change, both of us want to do things differently and better, I hope.

Turkey and the United States have a lot in common. However, without losing my

sense of dimension, since the United States is a continent and Turkey is a country, I must say that both are dynamic societies and, in some ways, both constitute a mosaic.

My visit takes place at a crucial juncture when our globe is witnessing sweeping and unprecedented changes. The collapse of communism is a victory for democracy and human rights. As representatives of a new generation of leadership, I know President Clinton joins me in welcoming these changes. Yet we both understand that they bring new uncertainties, challenges, responsibilities, and opportunities. Keeping peace is also a challenge. It is in this spirit that we have sent a unit to Somalia.

During our talks, President Clinton and I discussed at length our bilateral relations. I stressed to President Clinton that my government is strongly determined to develop, diversify, and further strengthen our relations to our mutual benefit, in our mutual interest. I am encouraged to see that the American side wishes to reciprocate our political will.

We discussed issues of mutual interest, such as the Middle East, the Gulf, the Russian situation, and the Caucasus. And I must say I am elated about the breakthrough in Arab-Israeli reconciliation. The United States, over a number of years, has shown steadfast leadership. The scene at the White House lawn with President Clinton, Mr. Arafat, and Mr. Rabin gave hope to everyone who have longed for peace in the region.

There is still substantial and difficult work ahead. On the other hand, the tragic situation in Bosnia and the aggression in Azerbaijan continue. Unilateral moves to keep peace, in particular in the Caucasus, are not acceptable.

Turkey, whose geographic position, literally centers her in the ring of fires blazing from the Caucasus and the Balkans, serves as a secular democratic model for her neighboring countries, seeking to develop pluralistic political systems. Likewise, Turkey's secularism acts to deflect the rising tide of fundamentalism. We must help consolidate the democratization process within the framework of this new era.

Turkey is totally committed to this process from Central Asia to the very heart of the European continent. And I am confident,

Mr. President, that you will agree that we have the complete support of the United States to assist us in this endeavor. In the long run, strengthening democracy in my region of the world not only promotes peace and stability there but also advances the cause of global peace.

We in Turkey are naturally happy over the fact that cold war has ended. However, we didn't let ourselves be carried away by the euphoria of the times, nor did we minimize the attendant risks. Events have proved us right. The threat perception in and around Europe has changed. But it has changed in different degrees and manners for each of us. I believe the world is passing through a truly transitory phase as recent events in the former Eastern Europe and in the Caucasus have shown. During such times, it is important for the allies to stick together.

The Atlantic Alliance continues to be valid. We attach importance to the transatlantic link and to continued American engagement and leadership in global affairs. After all, in the words of President Wilson, "America was best established not to create wealth but to realize a vision, an ideal, and maintain liberty among men."

Turkey's founding father, Kemal Ataturk, shared that vision. Way back in 1923, he explained it in the following words to an American journalist, "The ideal of the United States is our ideal. Our national pact, promulgated in January 1920, is precisely like your Declaration of Independence." I believe that Turkey and the United States can work together in many ways to the benefit of not only our two countries but to the benefit of all.

I would like to conclude by thanking President Clinton for the hospitality shown to us during this visit and by expressing my satisfaction with our comprehensive and very promising discussions for a more peaceful world.

The President. Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Presidential Prerogatives

Q. Mr. President, aren't you weakening the Presidential power by committing Congress to set a cutoff date on a foreign policy

mission, and also to cut off funding? I mean, doesn't this lead to future problems?

The President. In this case, I don't think so, because it's clear that the United States' mission in Somalia—when it was announced by President Bush, the American people were told it might well be over in January, just a matter of a couple of months. It's gone on for a long time now. What I asked the Congress to do was to express itself without unduly tying my hands. And I had set a deadline of March the 31st.

The resolution adopted by the Senate last night prescribes that date, but also says if there are problems, the President can come back and ask for an extension. So under these circumstances, given the unique and traumatic events of the last several days for America, I don't have a problem with the resolution. I was gratified by the margin by which it passed.

I do caution the American people and the Congress from becoming too isolationist on economic or political fronts. This is a time period, as I have said to you before I think, that is something like the time our country faced at the end of the Second World War, when the country was weary, we had paid an enormous price, and we wanted to get back to the problems at home. Today we paid an enormous price, trillions of dollars, for the victory in the cold war. We know that as the threat of nuclear war recedes and we remain the only country in the world with a major army, our immediate physical security is not so much threatened by other nations, but we have to have a sense of where our national interests are and where our values take us.

And I strongly believe that the mission in Somalia helps to build the notion that nations working together can promote peace and freedom and can reach across religious and racial lines to build the kind of common conditions of humanity that we should be supporting.

Turkey has supported us in that. General Bir is the United Nations Commander. The Prime Minister and I had—perhaps I won't embarrass her by saying this—we had a very candid conversation at lunch in which she said the Turkish people ask the same questions of the Turkish—why the Turkish soldiers are still in Somalia—that the American

people ask, and we understand that. So the answer to your question is, the exact wording of the resolution, which was carefully worked out—and I thank Senator Byrd and Senator Dole and Senator Mitchell and Senator Warner, Senator Nunn, and all those who worked on it—does not give me pause about the erosion of executive authority. What would give me pause is sort of a headlong rush into an isolationist position that the United States might live to regret.

Yes, Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Somalia

Q. Mr. President, may we take it from what you've said and not said over the past week that there will be no consequences for anyone in your military chain of command as a result of the firefight that led ultimately to the loss of 17 American lives in Mogadishu?

The President. I think that when young Americans are in peril, ultimately the President has to bear that responsibility. The President is the Commander in Chief. And even if the decisions are made down the line somewhere, if they are made in good faith within a span of authority granted to a commander, when people are at risk, it sometimes doesn't work out. And I know of no reason why anyone but me should bear the responsibility for that. If I were to find out someone had disobeyed orders or displayed flagrant incompetence, that would perhaps be a different thing. I have no reason to believe that that occurred.

I have said to you many times—I said before the incident in Mogadishu that I thought the United Nations had erred, and the United States had not pushed them hard enough in resuming the political process even while we were attempting to discover who was responsible for killing the Pakistani soldiers. I still believe that.

Anyone from the Turkish press? We'll take a couple of questions from you, too.

Turkey

Q. Mr. President, is the United States inclined to help Turkey for the losses suffered over the U.N. sanctions in Iraq, and in what way?

The President. Well, the Prime Minister and I discussed that today because—and I

guess I should say for the benefit of the American press something the press knows, but the American people should be reminded of—we could not have conducted the successful operation in the Gulf war, and we certainly could not have conducted Operation Provide Comfort to save the Kurds in northern Iraq, had it not been for the indispensable support of Turkey and the support of Turkey not only for Operation Provide Comfort but for the embargo on Iraq. They have paid a significant economic price.

We discussed today some ideas for helping Turkey in that regard, some of which did not involve the direct outlay of tax dollars or the transfer from one government to another. We agreed there would be further discussions between our people today and perhaps tomorrow. And I think if we reach an understanding, I should let the Prime Minister announce it at the appropriate time if we can work it out. But we're going to have a very serious dialog about that in an attempt to recognize the significant price that Turkey has paid for supporting not only the United States but the world's policies in this regard.

Q. Is the U.S. giving enough support to Turkey's fights against international terrorism threatening its territorial integrity? What is the joint policy toward countries supporting PKK's terrorism?

The President. To both of us, right? Well, that question has become far more immediate and important to the United States just in the last 24 hours as an American citizen has been taken hostage by the PKK. I guess I should start by restating our country's policies: We don't bargain or negotiate with terrorists. And we intend to work with Turkey. It's not fair for us to do, as we've done in the past, to urge Turkey to not only be a democratic country but to recognize human rights and then not to help the Government of Turkey deal with terrorism within its own borders. And so we discussed some ways today that we might cooperate further, and I think you will see some more cooperation between our two nations on this front.

Q. Actually, I had a question for the Prime Minister.

The President. Good. The more, the merrier.

Somalia

Q. As someone who has troops stationed in Somalia, does it concern you at all that the United States is now so committed to withdrawing on March 31st? Does it place you in a difficult position?

Prime Minister Ciller. Well, as Mr. President pointed out, we had a very candid conversation on that. And I pointed out to Mr. President that our people have concern over the issue as well. But if peace is to be maintained and if we will pursue the kind of cooperation we have shown in history, we should be acting together. And in that spirit and in the belief that this will help peace, we sent troops to Somalia. And we intend to have a peaceful solution there, and we hope to support that with that belief.

It is true that my people are concerned over the issue for one more reason. They feel that if our troops are in Somalia, then why aren't they in Azerbaijan as well? Why aren't we acting together in Azerbaijan where there is Armenian invasion? Of course, these are things that we further discussed, and there are ways of cooperation on this as well. And I feel that we should act together on all grounds and try to have a peaceful solution for the world in general.

Q. Are you thinking about withdrawing your troops around the same time as the U.S.?

Prime Minister Ciller. We haven't discussed the details on that during our conversation. As I said, the troops are there for the making of peace. And the sooner we make peace, the sooner we will be out of that. I know that the Congress has a firm date on that, as of yesterday. But it is not something that we have taken up in my country as of yet.

The President. Let me also remind you of one thing about this. The United States went there, as I said, with some people representing that we might even be through within a couple of months, on a humanitarian mission. The United Nations has decided to adopt the humanitarian mission and to try to help keep peace alive to avoid reverting to the conditions that existed before we went there.

That was inevitable and altogether laudable. But there are many other things that

have to be done in the world. And the United States will have borne the great mass of that burden. And if we stay through March—we may be able to finish our mission before then, but if we stay all the way, we will have stayed from December of '92 through the end of March of '94, much, much longer than anyone expected us to stay in the beginning, adopting a mission that is somewhat broader than the one we undertook in the beginning. And I think it will make it easier if there needs to be a smaller and less militarily oriented United Nations force continuing to work in a peace process. I think it will be easier, not more difficult, to do.

So this is not calling a halt to the international operation itself or to the end of our involvement in global affairs, but simply to say that to stay a year and 3 months, 4 months, on a mission that was originally touted as perhaps as short as 2 months is quite a long time and enough in terms of the contribution that we have made in this area. So that among other things, we'll be free to fulfill our responsibilities in other parts of the world.

Q. Mr. President, in the last couple of days President Bush, Secretary Cheney, former Secretary Baker have all criticized this administration's handling of the Somalia policy, from a lot of different angles, from naiveté to mission creep; that they said we just went there to feed people, and that's what we should have done. I'm curious, what is your reaction to that criticism, and do you draw the lesson from your own experience in Somalia that maybe there really is no such thing as pure humanitarian intervention, that some level of political authority building or nation building is almost by definition necessary in any of these missions?

The President. First of all, I think it would be inappropriate for me to react to what they said. I will say this. It may have been naive for anyone to seriously assert in the beginning that you could go into a situation as politically and militarily charged as that one, give people food, turn around and leave, and expect everything to be hunky dory.

We tried to limit our mission by turning it over to the United Nations. We recognized that in turning it over to the United Nations we would have to stay a little while longer

while the United Nations sought to bring in others to replace us, so that the feeding and the calmness of life that does pervade almost all of Somalia could continue. And what happened was, after the Pakistani soldiers were killed and the U.N. passed the resolution saying that someone ought to be held accountable, at the moment the United States was the only country capable of serving the police function.

You can say, "Well, we should have simply refused to do that and said that was someone else's problem." Then the question would have become, "Well, what kind of a friend is the United States?" The Pakistanis were there shoulder to shoulder with us; they were ready to put themselves in harm's way, just as we were. Should we walk away just because it was them that got killed instead of us? This was not an easy question.

The error that was made, for which I think all of the parties must take responsibility, including the United States, was that when the police function was undertaken, the U.N. mission lowered the political dialog so that the people that were involved over there in Mogadishu thought, "This is not police officers," to use an American analogy, "this is not police officers arresting suspects in a crime. This is a military operation designed to take a group out of a dialog about the political future of Somalia." We never intended that.

And that's where the U.N. mission went awry. And that's where if there was a mission creep, it happened there, and we did not contain it quickly enough. I thought I had done so at my speech to the United Nations. I did my best there. So I think that, if we're going to analyze the error, it seems to me that was where the error occurred.

And I think we learned a very valuable lesson there. The United States should avoid whenever possible being the police officer because it raises all these superpower military, all these other questions—and in any case, we can't go into any sort of situation like this ever and allow the political dialog to collapse, because in the end, all these folks, not just in Somalia but everywhere else in the world, ultimately have to resolve their own problems and take responsibility for their own destiny. So that's the way I would

characterize what has happened and what I think we have learned.

And in fairness, I think we ought to give another question or two to the Turkish journalists who are here.

Cyprus

Q. To which extent, Mr. President—to both of you—did you discuss the Cyprus issue? To which extent?

The President. Yes, we discussed the Cyprus issue, and I would like to compliment the Prime Minister. I was encouraged. As I think you probably know, this has been an important issue to me for some time. The Prime Minister expressed her strong support for having the elections in northern Cyprus by the end of November and for resuming a dialog on confidence-building measures and her hope that she would have a constructive relationship with the new Government in Greece. And I think for a Turkish Prime Minister, that's about all I could ask right now. I was very impressed with what she said, and I look forward to our common efforts to try to resolve this in the near future.

Perhaps she would like to say something about it.

Prime Minister Ciller. Would you want me to comment on that further?

Q. Yes, please.

Prime Minister Ciller. Well, as I am having the 50th government and as a new Prime Minister, I feel that a solution in Cyprus should be found and as soon as possible. We feel that there are two communities there that need to come together. Maybe a new methodology can be searched for as well. But the fact remains that a solution should be found there at a time when other crises are emerging elsewhere in the part of the geography.

I was very happy to find out about what happened between Israel and Palestine. And I have to congratulate the leadership that was shown by the President and the United States throughout the history for that. But we are dedicated to finding a solution in Cyprus; very much so.

The only thing that might be of a retardance in that is using of this variable in domestic politics. I think we should not let that happen. We should not let that hap-

pen in Cyprus. We should not let that happen in Turkey. We should not let that happen in Greece, as well.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, on the way flying here, our Prime Minister said she has some concerns about Russian advances in the Caucasus, especially in Georgia and Azerbaijan, and that this could lead to a trend of new Russian expansionism. Do you share this concern?

The President. Well, I think Russia is like most other large countries with several million people, there are different currents and different views there. But let me say this: I believe that President Yeltsin does not want an imperialist Russia. I think President Yeltsin wants a Russia that can rebuild itself from within, economically.

As you know, in the conflict in Georgia over the last year there was all sorts of ambivalence and mixed signals from the Russian army stationed there, notwithstanding the position of President Yeltsin at times when the span of control seemed in question.

In terms of Azerbaijan, I think the Prime Minister has made a very important point, that the Russians should, of course, be involved in the resolution of that crisis, but that for the people to feel good about it within the country and Nagorno-Karabakh and beyond, they can't do it alone. Someone else should be involved also in some form or fashion. That's why the United States has strongly supported the so-called Minsk process, in the hope that we won't have an exclusive solution by anyone but that there can be a shared sense of responsibility there.

Thank you very much. Thank you.

Prime Minister Ciller. Thank you. And I have to thank Mr. President one more time for wearing the Turkish manufactured tie. Good sign of cooperation. [*Laughter*]

The President. That's right. This is my gift from the Prime Minister today, so I thought I should wear it.

Prime Minister Ciller. My people will be proud. Thank you very much again.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 29th news conference began at 1:48 p.m. in the East Room at the White

House. In his remarks, he referred to the PKK, the Kurdish communist party.

The President's News Conference

October 15, 1993

Haiti

The President. Ladies and gentleman, during the past few days, we have witnessed a brutal attempt by Haiti's military and police authorities to thwart the expressed desire of the Haitian people for democracy. On Monday, unruly elements, unrestrained by the Haitian military, violently prevented American and United Nations personnel from carrying out the steps toward that goal. Yesterday, gunmen assassinated prodemocracy Justice Minister Malary.

There are important American interests at stake in Haiti and in what is going on there. First, there are about 1,000 American citizens living in Haiti or working there. Second, there are Americans there who are helping to operate our Embassy. Third, we have an interest in promoting democracy in this hemisphere, especially in a place where such a large number of Haitians have clearly expressed their preference for President. And finally, we have a clear interest in working toward a government in Haiti that enables its citizens to live there in security so they do not have to flee in large numbers and at great risk to themselves to our shores and to other nations.

Two American administrations and the entire international community have consistently condemned the 1991 military coup that ousted President Aristide. In response to United States, Latin American, and United Nations sanctions and pressure, Haiti's military rulers agreed with civilian leaders on a plan to restore democracy. That plan was reached under the auspices of the Organization of the American States and the United Nations. It was concluded on July the 3d on Governors Island here in the United States.

Yesterday the United Nations Security Council, upon the recommendations of its special negotiator for Haiti, Dante Caputo, voted to reimpose stiff sanctions against

Haiti, including an embargo on oil imports, until order is restored and the Governors Island process is clearly resumed.

Those sanctions will go into effect on Monday night unless Haiti's security forces put democracy back on track between now and then. I will also be imposing additional unilateral sanctions, such as revoking visas and freezing the assets of those who are perpetrating the violence and their supporters.

The United States strongly supports the Governors Island process, the new civilian government of Prime Minister Malval, and the return to Haiti of President Aristide.

I have today ordered six destroyers to patrol the waters off Haiti so that they are in a position to enforce the sanctions fully when they come into effect Monday night. I have also offered and ordered an infantry company to be on standby at Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba just a short distance from Haiti. The purpose of these actions is this: to ensure the safety of the Americans in Haiti and to press for the restoration of democracy there through the strongest possible enforcement of the sanctions.

The military authorities in Haiti simply must understand that they cannot indefinitely defy the desires of their own people as well as the will of the world community. That path holds only suffering for their nation and international isolation for themselves. I call upon them again to restore order and security to their country, to protect their own citizens and ours, and to comply with the Governors Island Agreement.

Q. Mr. President, you warned yesterday about maintaining the safety of the provisional government in Haiti, and yet there was this assassination yesterday of the Justice Minister. You talk about the personal safety of Americans in Haiti, is there anything the United States can do to ensure the safety of President Aristide's Cabinet? Are there any steps that you can take to help this fledgling democracy?

The President. Well we've had discussions with Prime Minister Malval. The Vice President talked to him yesterday, as well as to President Aristide. We have, as you probably know, a significant number of security forces there that we've been working to train, and there may be some things that we can

do. But let me say this, we've had discussions with him. We're in constant communications with him, and we are working with him. He has been very forthright in his asking us to reinforce the sanctions strongly and to do whatever we could to try to remind people that there is no other way out for Haiti but democracy. But what we do with regard to his safety, I think, in some ways is going to have to be decided as we go along and with his heavy involvement and support.

Q. Mr. President, are the naval ships going to stop merchant ships going in and out of Haiti and maybe board them to make sure that their embargo is being complied with?

The President. That's what they're going to do. They're going to have a very wide berth to enforce the embargo, or the sanctions, very strongly. And we intend to use the six ships. One of them will be off the coast of Haiti within about an hour. They will be around Port-au-Prince by this evening, and they should all be in place by tomorrow.

Q. Mr. President, what if this embargo induces a new wave of immigrants who say they're political refugees? And what if these refugees come upon the U.S. destroyers, how will you handle that?

The President. Our policy has not changed on that. We still believe that we should process the Haitians who are asking for asylum in Haiti and that that is the safest thing for them. So we will continue to pursue the policy we have pursued for the last several months. But the purpose of these destroyers is different. These destroyers are going there to enforce the sanctions and to do it very strongly.

Q. But if they come upon refugees, how will they handle them, though? Will they just let them go by? Will they turn them back?

The President. We have no reason to believe that what we have been doing won't work there. And I want to emphasize that our policy has not changed, and we will continue to adhere to our policy with regard to refugees as we work with Haiti and the Prime Minister and the President are restored, the democratic government. But the purpose of the destroyers is to strongly enforce the sanctions.

Q. Mr. President, are you prepared to evacuate American citizens from Haiti if the security situation there does not improve?

The President. As I said to you, we are moving an enhanced infantry company into Guantanamo so that we can be in a position to deal with whatever contingencies arise. I have taken the steps that I think are appropriate at this time. And at this time I have not made a decision to evacuate our personnel. But there are 1,000 Americans there. There are also 9,000 people who have a dual nationality. The 1,000 Americans, most of them are working. There are a handful of tourists there, not many. And there are 140 Embassy personnel there.

Q. Mr. President, since you're dealing with people who agreed to the Governors Island accords in the face of sanctions and then reneged on their promise, what in your view will be sufficient indication of compliance and future compliance so that the embargo and other sanctions will be able to be lifted?

The President. Well, I can tell you one thing that would clearly show a fundamental change, and that is if all the United Nations forces that were supposed to be there to try to help retrain the police and to retrain the army were permitted to do so in a clearly safe atmosphere where they could also be protected. That would be some evidence that we had fundamental change. Keep in mind, this is a different mission than Somalia, different from Bosnia, different from any of the existing U.N. missions.

The purpose of these people—the reason we could not even think about landing the United States forces that were there a couple of days ago is that primarily they were Seabees going there for the purpose of, in effect, helping the Haitian army to become like the Army Corps of Engineers in this country. They were helping them transform their whole mission, not to be fighters anymore but to try to rebuild one of the most environmentally plundered and devastated lands in the entire world.

So if we were seriously proceeding, evidence of that would be all these French-speaking countries being able to bring their folks back in and retrain the police force to be a professional and ordinary, not a renegade, police force and having the French-

speaking Canadians and the United States in there showing the army how to build a country instead of tear up the fabric of the society.

Q. President Aristide is asking that the administration increase the Marine contingent at the U.S. Embassy in Port-au-Prince in order to protect the people in his government. Is that under consideration at this point? And if, let's say, members of his government should flee to the American Embassy, would the Embassy provide protection for them?

The President. The answer to your first question is that that is certainly something that I have not ruled out. I have not ruled out anything that I have spoken, just because I haven't spoken about it today. We had a good, long meeting this morning with Admiral Jeremiah and General Shalikhvili and others, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense. And I am very concerned about the security and safety of the Americans there and the very brave Prime Minister and his government.

Again, I would say to you, whatever specific things we do with regard to the Prime Minister and his government, I would rather come out of statements they make, because I don't want anything I say to upset the balance of forces in Haiti now. But I wouldn't rule out a change in the deployment around the Embassy.

Our first obligation, after all, is to protect the Americans there. But I think what I have done and the announcement I have made today, based on the facts that we have as of when I came out to speak to you, is sufficient as of this moment.

Q. I'm wondering, sir, if you have thought about and considered the possibility that you might need to have some kind of police force on the ground there in Haiti, much as has been necessary in Somalia in light of the fact that the place has been so violence-prone for so long?

The President. One of the discussions that we had when the gang showed up on the dock was the question of whether the protection for our Seabees, who were after all, as I say, not delivering food, not—their whole goal was to retrain army personnel to rebuild the country. And the agreement

under which they were going there was that they would have sidearms and access to rifles—was to whether that was adequate or not. That question will obviously have to be revisited depending upon the developments in the next few days. I wouldn't rule that out, Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News], but I think we ought to—let's see what happens over the next few days.

Q. Mr. President, how does this differ from the word blockade, which you the other day mentioned as a term of art associated with a declaration of war?

The President. Well, in a literal sense, a blockade would physically stop all traffic going in and out of the country, in this case by water. The United Nations resolution and the sanctions attempt to stop virtually all commercial traffic that could be of some commercial benefit. It does not render illegal every single entering into or exit from Port-au-Prince, Cap-Haitien, or the country in general. So there is a legal difference in that sense.

But if you use the word in the common-sense parlance, we would block any prohibited materials and goods and anything subject to the sanctions from going into the country. That is our goal.

Q. Mr. President, today was the day that Colonel François and General Cédras were supposed to resign their posts—went past. Are there any conversations between the American Embassy people and General Cédras and Colonel François going on? Has there been any attempt to have communications from both sides?

The President. Well, as you know, Mr. Pezzullo went back yesterday. And our Ambassador, Mr. Swing, is down there now. And they are working hard to make sure that everyone in the country knows that the United States is determined to see the democratic process restored. I think they've made their position clear.

NOTE: The President's 30th news conference began at 2:49 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to U.S. Special Envoy to Haiti Lawrence Pezzullo.

**Proclamation 6612—White Cane
Safety Day, 1993**

October 15, 1993

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

To thousands of visually impaired Americans the white cane means freedom—freedom to move safely and independently through their daily lives, participating fully in the activities of their homes, places of employment, and communities. White Cane Safety Day not only celebrates the accomplishments of the visually impaired, but also recognizes our Nation's commitment to remove any physical or attitudinal barriers that Americans with disabilities may still face.

This commitment underscores our continuing efforts to implement fully the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, which prohibits discrimination against persons with disabilities in such areas as employment, public accommodations, telecommunications, and transportation.

In tribute to the white cane and all that it symbolizes for our society, the Congress, by Joint Resolution approved in 1964, has designated October 15 of each year as "White Cane Safety Day."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 15, 1993, as White Cane Safety Day. I call upon all Americans to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifteenth day of October, 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,
2:32 p.m., October 15, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 19.

**Statement on Award of the Nobel
Peace Prize to Nelson Mandela and
F.W. de Klerk**

October 15, 1993

The Nobel Committee has made an inspired choice in selecting ANC President Nelson Mandela and State President F.W. de Klerk to share the 1993 Nobel Peace Prize. These two farsighted and courageous leaders have overcome a legacy of racial distrust to reach agreement on a framework which has set South Africa on the path of peaceful reconciliation and nonracial democracy. It is entirely fitting that, having worked so closely together for progress, they should share the most prestigious international recognition for their success in setting in motion the transition to a new political order in South Africa.

In selecting these two great leaders, the Nobel Committee has also chosen to honor the many other South Africans who have struggled for so long to achieve racial harmony and justice. It is a testament to the great strides for progress they have made and an endorsement of their hope for a free and democratic South Africa.

It is sadly ironic that just as Presidents de Klerk and Mandela receive the recognition they and their associates so richly deserve, others hesitate to join them in the creation of a new, fully democratic South Africa. Still others are committed to violence which could destroy their current and future achievements. I urge those who have withdrawn from the common political process to rethink their positions and contribute their efforts to complete the great work undertaken by Presidents Mandela and de Klerk.

The American people join me in offering their deepest congratulations to these two great statesmen and all the people of South Africa. I am certain that with similar courage and dedication they can face the challenges and tasks ahead. The many Americans from all walks of life who supported the struggle to end apartheid will be at the side of South Africans as they build a nonracial democracy.

Nomination for the Board of Directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association

October 15, 1993

The President announced his intention today to appoint five members to the Board of Directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association: William M. Daley, John R. Sasso, Russell G. Barakat, Jose Villarreal, and Thomas A. Leonard.

"These five people have consistently proven themselves among the most capable in the country," said the President. "I welcome their commitment to the work of ensuring sound and fair management at Fannie Mae."

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.

October 9

In the morning, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton traveled to New Haven, CT, where they met with a group of Special Olympics participants and a group of fourth graders from the Clinton Avenue School in Woolsey Hall at Yale University. Later that evening, they returned to Washington, DC.

October 12

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Raleigh-Durham, NC. He then went to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where he attended an opening ceremony commemorating the university's bicentennial. After the ceremony, the President attended a reception at George Watts Hill Alumni Center and returned to Washington, DC, in the late evening.

October 13

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton hosted a Hispanic Heritage Month reception.

October 14

In the morning, the President met with Members of Congress on NAFTA.

In the afternoon, the President spoke by telephone with Chief Warrant Officer Michael Durant in Mogadishu, Somalia.

October 15

The President announced his intention to nominate George W. Haley to be a Commissioner of the Postal Rate Commission. Haley recently completed a term as the Commission's Chairman.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted October 13

Kendall Brindley Coffey, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Florida for the term of 4 years, vice Leon B. Kellner, resigned.

Frances Cuthbert Hulin, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the Central District of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice J. William Roberts, resigned.

Nora Margaret Manella, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the Central District of California for the term of 4 years, vice Lourdes G. Baird, resigned.

Sherry Scheel Matteucci, of Montana, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Montana for the term of 4 years, vice Doris Swords Poppler, resigned.

Submitted October 14

John David Holum, of South Dakota, to be Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Ronald Frank Lehman II, resigned.

Michael F. DiMario,
of Maryland, to be Public Printer, vice Robert William Houk, resigned.

Bernard E. Anderson,
of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, vice Cari M. Dominguez, resigned.

K. Terry Dornbush,
of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Edward Elliott Elson,
of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

Marc Charles Ginsberg,
of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Morocco.

Thomas L. Siebert,
of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

Sidney Williams,
of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of the Bahamas.

J. Davitt McAteer,
of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health, vice William James Tattersall, resigned.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

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

Released October 12

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on Haiti

White House statement on the availability of emergency funds under the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act

Listing of Members of Congress meeting with the President on the North American Free Trade Agreement

Released October 13

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on legislation signed by the President

Statement by Vice President Albert Gore, Jr., on the Bell Atlantic-TCI merger announcement

Announcement of nomination of K. Terry Dornbush to be Ambassador to The Netherlands and Edward Elliott Elson to be Ambassador to Denmark

White House statement announcing the withdrawal of Shirley Chisholm's nomination to be Ambassador to Jamaica

Released October 14

Listing of Members of Congress meeting with the President on the North American Free Trade Agreement

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's telephone conversation with Chief Warrant Officer Michael Durant

Released October 15

Statement by Director of Communications Mark Gearan on the Vice President's telephone conversation with President Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti

Announcement of nomination of George W. Haley to be a Commissioner on the Postal Rate Commission

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved October 12

H.R. 38 / Public Law 103-104
To establish the Jemez National Recreation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes

H.R. 2608 / Public Law 103-105
To provide for the reauthorization of the collection and publication of quarterly financial

statistics by the Secretary of Commerce through fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes

S. 1381 / Public Law 103-106
National Forest Foundation Act Amendment Act of 1993

S.J. Res. 102 / Public Law 103-107
To designate the months of October 1993 and October 1994 as "Country Music Month"