AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, November 15, 1993
Volume 29—Number 45
Pages 2283–2342

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

North American Free Trade Agreement Endorsements—2303
Telephone conversation with Congressman Ed Pastor—2330
Telephone conversation with the Vice President—2310
Radio address—2285
Veterans Day breakfast—2323
Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Martinsburg, WV—2327
Vietnam Women's Memorial Project—2311
Wreath-laying ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, VA—2325

Appointments and Nominations

Commodity Futures Trading Commission, member—2301
Communications Satellite Corporation, Board of Directors, member—2310
Education Department
Regional representatives—2339
Senior Executive Service—2284
Environmental Protection Agency, Senior Executive Service—2284
Justice Department, Senior Executive Service—2284
National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Senior Executive Service—2284
Office of Personnel Management, Senior Executive Service—2284
State Department
Ambassador to Angola—2302
Senior Executive Service—2284
Transportation Department, Senior Executive Service—2284
Peace Corps, Senior Executive Service—2284
U.S. District Court, judge—2323
U.S. Information Agency
Associate Director—2302
Director—2302
U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Senior Executive Service—2284

Bill Signings

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994, statement—2329
Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1994, statement—2330

Communications to Congress

Balanced budget proposed amendment, letter—2283
Chemical and biological weapons proliferation, letter—2338
National emergency with respect to Iran, message—2321
Panamanian Government assets, message—2310
Rhinoceros and tiger trade by China and Taiwan, message—2300

Executive Orders

Order of Succession of Officers To Act as Secretary of the Navy—2299

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

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.*

Contents—Continued

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Oval Office—2332
Interview on "Meet the Press"—2287
News conferences
November 10 (No. 32)—2313
November 12 (No. 33) with Prime Minister Rabin of Israel—2332

Letters and Messages

Attorney General, letter on child pornography—2323

Notice

Chemical and biological weapons proliferation—2338

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Israel, Prime Minister Rabin—2332

Proclamations

National Women Veterans Recognition Week—2312
Veterans Day—2302

Resignations and Retirements

Deputy Secretary of State—2301

Statements by the President

See Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings; Resignations and Retirements

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—2341
Checklist of White House press releases—2341
Digest of other White House announcements—2340
Nominations submitted to the Senate—2340

Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Proposed Balanced Budget Amendment

November 5, 1993

Dear Mr. Leader: (Dear Mr. Speaker:)

I write to express my firm opposition to the proposed balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States (S.J. Res. 41 and H.J. Res. 103). While I am deeply committed to bringing down our Nation's deficit, this proposed balanced budget amendment would not serve that end. It would promote political gridlock and would endanger our economic recovery.

The Administration fought hard to pass a historic deficit reduction plan because we believe that deficit reduction is an essential component of a national economic growth strategy. As you know, I worked tirelessly with the Congress to gain passage of the largest deficit reduction package in the Nation's history. This legislation includes a "hard freeze" on all discretionary spending, a virtually unprecedented constraint on Federal spending. Through the National Performance Review, a new rescission package, and a major proposal to limit the growth of Medicare and Medicaid through comprehensive health care reform, we are taking continuing steps to keep the deficit on a downward path. I have also long supported such procedural innovations as enhanced rescission authority or a line-item veto and would consider workable budget proposals that distinguish between consumption and investment. The Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform will come forward with suggestions on controlling entitlement costs and other serious budget reforms. Thoughtful, specific reforms are better policy than a rigid Constitutional amendment.

The balanced budget amendment is, in the first place, bad economics. As you know, the Federal deficit depends not just on Congressional decisions, but also on the state of the economy. In particular, the deficit increases automatically whenever the economy weakens. If we try to break this automatic linkage by a Constitutional amendment, we will have to raise taxes and cut expenditures whenever the economy is weak. That not only risks turning minor downturns into serious recessions, but would make recovery from recession far more difficult. Let's be clear: This is not a matter of abstract economic theory. Contractionary fiscal policy in the 1930s helped turn an economic slowdown into a Great Depression. A balanced budget amendment could threaten the livelihoods of millions of Americans. I cannot put them in such peril.

Moreover, at presently anticipated growth rates, the deficit reduction required by this amendment could be harmful to average hard-working American families. Supporters of this amendment must be straight with the American people. Given the current outlook for the FY 1999 budget, the amendment would require some combination of the following: huge increases in taxes on working families; massive reductions in Social Security benefits for middle class Americans; and major cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that would make it impossible to pass meaningful health reform legislation. This latter result would be particularly ironic and counterproductive because comprehensive health reform is our best hope not only for providing health security for all Americans, but also for bringing down the long-term structural deficit. The fact that these consequences will not be clear to most Americans for a few years does not relieve us of the responsibility of facing them today.

We must reject the temptation to use any budget gimmicks to hide from the specific choices that are needed for long-term economic renewal. The amendment by itself would not reduce the deficit by a single penny. The only way we can continue to make progress on bringing down the deficit

while investing more in our future is to continue the process of making tough and specific policy choices. If we avoid such straightforward debate now, the likely outcome will be accounting subterfuge and gimmicks when the easy promise of a balanced budget amendment runs up against difficult political realities. A gridlocked Congress would encourage members to look for an easy way out—for example, by moving more Federal programs off budget or by imposing more unfunded mandates on the States. Ironically, the amendment might encourage less rather than more fiscal responsibility.

The amendment's potential impact on our constitutional system is as troublesome as its effect on the economy. The proposed amendments are so vague and complex that budgets quickly could be thrown into the courts to be written by appointed judges with life tenure, rather than the people's elected officials in the Congress. Surely, we can do better than this.

Finally, I believe that economic and budgetary decisions should distinguish between investment and consumption. Those who manage a family budget know that there is a fundamental difference between spending money on a lavish meal, and paying the mortgage on a home that is an investment in one's future economic security. Under this balanced budget amendment, there is no distinction between cutting a dollar in waste and a dollar in a valuable investment in technology that could make us a richer and more competitive Nation in the future. That is unacceptable to me. We need to find ways to reduce the deficit and increase investment in ways that enhance not undermine the economic security and potential of our people and their communities. We must bring down the budget deficit at the same time we make progress on bringing down the investment deficit through investments in those who helped us win the cold war, through more resources to fight drugs and crime, and by giving all Americans the opportunity for quality education and training throughout their lifetimes.

I remain firmly committed to the goal of deficit reduction. But I am just as firmly opposed to this balanced budget amendment, because it would simply delay honest debate over the hard choices needed for long-term economic growth and could imperil the economic stability of the Nation and our fledgling recovery.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and George J. Mitchell, Senate majority leader. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Appointments to Senior Executive Service Posts

November 5, 1993

The President today named 22 men and women to Senior Executive Service positions in a number of Federal Agencies and Departments, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Office of Personnel Management, the Peace Corps, and the Departments of State, Transportation, Education, and Justice.

"This group of talented men and women will provide solid support for our Cabinet Secretaries and agency heads who have taken on the challenge of making our Federal Government work better for the American people," the President said.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Alan Ladwig, Senior Policy Analyst, NASA

Department of State

Toni Grant Verstandig, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Near Eastern Affairs

Department of Transportation

Eugene A. Conti, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary, Budget and Programs

Environmental Protection Agency

Felicia A. Marcus, Regional Administrator, Region IX

Peace Corps

Frederick M. O'Regan, Regional Director, Eurasia Middle East Region
Margaret Goodman, Regional Director, Asia Pacific Region
Victor C. Johnson, Regional Director, Inter-America Region
John P. Hogan, Associate Director of International Operations, International Operations
Judy Harrington, Associate Director for Volunteer Support, Volunteer Support

U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency, Overseas Private Investment Corporation

Charles D. Toy, Vice President/General Counsel

Office of Personnel Management

Valerie Lau, Director of Policy, Office of the Director
Lorraine Pratte Lewis, General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel

Department of Education

Linda G. Roberts, Special Adviser on Education Technology, Office of the Deputy Secretary
Jamienne S. Studley, Deputy General Counsel, Regulations and Legislation Service

Department of Justice

Diane P. Wood, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division
Lois J. Schiffer, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources
John A. Rogovin, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division
Mark I. Levy, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division
Irvin B. Nathan, Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General
Merrick B. Garland, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division
Eva M. Plaza, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division
Nancy E. McFadden, Deputy Associate Attorney General, Office of the Associate Attorney General

NOTE: Biographies of the appointees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

November 6, 1993

Good morning. This week I spoke with American workers and farmers who are succeeding in our competitive global economy. On Thursday, I went to Lexington, Kentucky, and visited the Lexmark factory, where they make computers, printers, and keyboards for sale all over the world. Anybody who thinks our American workers can't compete and win should have gone there with me. Yesterday I spoke with farmers from Illinois, Missouri, Montana, and North Carolina. They produce corn, soybeans, timber, and wheat, and they raise cattle. Just like the workers in Lexington, these farmers are eager to export more products all across the world, including to our neighbors in Mexico. The folks I spoke with on Thursday and Friday understand what's at stake in the debate about the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA for short. For them the debate is simple; it's about paychecks, not politics.

In Lexington, I also met with workers from Monarch Tool and Manufacturing. Their sales in Mexico have grown dramatically over the last 3 years. Teddie Rae True, who works at Monarch, told me she supports NAFTA because, she said, "Without it, I might not have a job." A lot of what we do depends on foreign trade. Roberta Canady has worked at Lexmark for 16 years. She said she still wants more facts about NAFTA, but she knows that, and I quote her, "The bottom line is whether it will promote more jobs for the people of the United States." Let me assure Roberta Canady and all of you: NAFTA means more exports, and more exports means more jobs for Americans.

There's been so much fog surrounding this issue that it's time to shed some light. NAFTA is good for us because it will cut the tariffs on trade between the United States and Mexico. Tariffs are taxes that countries put on products from other coun-

tries. NAFTA will eventually cut these taxes down to zero. It will also reduce Mexican laws which now require some products sold in Mexico to actually be made there.

Now, that makes a much bigger difference for the United States than for Mexican products that would be sold here. Let me tell you why. Right now, Mexico's tariffs on our products are 2½ times higher than our tariffs on theirs. NAFTA will remove those barriers, opening up a growing market for our goods and services and creating hundreds of thousands of new jobs for our people.

The fact is that today Mexican consumers are already buying over $40 billion worth of American products. And if NAFTA passes, they'll buy even more. Seventy cents of every dollar that Mexico spends on foreign products are spent right here in the United States. And when Mexico takes down its tariff barriers, that means more sales and more jobs for our industries, from cars to computers.

Right now, Mexico puts a 20 percent tariff on cars and virtually requires that cars sold in Mexico be made there. With NAFTA, those barriers will be lowered. That's why the big three auto companies predict that in just the first year after NAFTA, they could go from selling only 1,000 cars in Mexico to selling 60,000.

It's the same with computers, which also face a 20 percent tariff. Three years ago, by one estimate, Mexico bought 120,000 computers from us. Last year they bought 390,000. This year it's estimated they'll buy 600,000. And that's with a 20 percent tariff. When NAFTA lowers the tariff barrier, the United States will gain a 20 percent advantage over our competitors from Europe and Japan. And Mexico, with a population of nearly 90 million, could buy millions more of our computers, creating tens of thousands of new jobs here in our country.

For our country, for every wealthy country, the only way to create new jobs and to raise incomes is to export more products. For the past 5 years about half the growth in our economy has come from exports. And jobs related to exports pay 17 percent more than other jobs in the American economy. That's why NAFTA is part of my overall strategy to sell our products all over the world at a time when our leading rivals are also expanding their own markets in their own backyard. Western Europe is becoming a giant trading bloc. Japan is expanding its investment and trade in much of Asia. And now with NAFTA we can create the biggest trading bloc in the world, starting with Canada and Mexico and then expanding to the rest of Latin America. Many of the Latin American countries really want to buy more American products, to be a part of our trading bloc. They're just waiting to be asked, and they're waiting to answer, depending on what happens to NAFTA.

Given a fair chance, I know American workers can compete and win in our own hemisphere and throughout the world. Those who believe otherwise underestimate the American people. We still have the most productive workers in the world, and they've gotten more productive in the last 15 or 20 years.

On Tuesday night, Vice President Gore will debate a leading critic of NAFTA. The debate will be facts against fear, the fear that low wages and lower costs of production in Mexico will lead to a massive flight of jobs down there. Well, if we don't pass NAFTA, that could still be true. The lower wages and the lower cost of production will still be there. But if we do pass it, it means dramatically increased sales of American products made right here in America. It reduces the incentive to move to Mexico to sell in the Mexican market. And remember, the tariffs that we put on their products are already low.

So we have to face the choice of facts versus fear. When Americans have faced that choice in the past, they've always chosen honesty and hope. Ultimately, this debate is a test of not only our purpose in the world but our own confidence in ourselves. I know the last several years have been tough on hard-working middle class Americans. I ran for President to change that, to give people health care security and security in their education and training and security as family members and workers. But I also promised to challenge you to embrace the world economy, because we can't run away from these change. Will we hunker down and say, ''My goodness, we're going to be overcome by a trade agreement with Mexico,'' a country with an economy only 5 percent as big as

ours, or are we going to reach out to the rest of the world and say we can compete and win again?

My visit to Lexington, Kentucky, and my talk with those farmers on the phone yesterday reminded me that Americans are hopeful and hard working. When the moment of decision comes, I believe ordinary working Americans will agree with every living President, every living Secretary of State, every living Secretary of the Treasury, every living Nobel Prize-winning economist, and over 40 of the 50 Governors that NAFTA means expanding markets. And we have to have expanding markets, not shrinking horizons. Our jobs and our children's jobs depend on it.

Thanks for listening.

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

Interview With Timothy Russert and Tom Brokaw on "Meet the Press"

November 7, 1993

Mr. Russert. Welcome again to "Meet the Press," today a special edition live from the White House. I'm with my colleague, Tom Brokaw.

Mr. President, this is our 46th birthday. You're 47. You strike me as the kind of guy who maybe watched the first program from your cradle. [*Laughter*]

The President. I wish I could. I didn't have a television then. I was 1 when you started, but I was 9, I think, when we got our first television in 1956. So I couldn't start, but I did watch it often after that.

NAFTA

Mr. Russert. Well, it's great to have you here. Let's start—we'll have to talk about it today—let's start with NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. Your closest supporters say that if the vote were held today, you're still 30 votes short. True?

The President. I don't think we're quite that short, but we're 30 votes short of having explicit expressed commitments. I think we'll make it, however.

Mr. Russert. What role has Ross Perot played in this debate?

The President. I think he's kept things stirred up. That's what he likes to do. But I think, frankly, the vociferous organized opposition of most of the unions, telling these Members in private they'll never give them any money again, they'll get them opponents in the primary, the real roughshod, muscle-bound tactics, plus the fact that a lot of the business supporters of NAFTA have not gotten their employees and rank-and-file people to call and say they're for it. In any issue like this, the intensity is always with people who are against it. Those things are difficult.

But again I will say I have been quite heartened by the responses of the last 10 days, more and more of these Members of Congress, men and women who want to do right by their country, don't want to hurt the United States, and understand that NAFTA means more jobs, not just in Mexico but throughout Latin America, a huge trading bloc of people helping to take us to the 21st century.

NAFTA Debate

Mr. Russert. Bob Dole mentioned last night that you were elevating Ross Perot. Are you concerned that you're going to recreate a monster?

The President. No, Ross Perot has got enough money to elevate himself. He can buy his way on national television and buy his own exposure and have very little accountability, except when he makes the mistake of coming on this program with you.

Mr. Russert. Without his charts. [*Laughter*]

The President. Yes. The same mistake I made today. [*Laughter*] I think the Vice President will do well. Ross Perot is the master of the one-liner and the emotional retort, but I believe that the Vice President has an unusual command of the facts and a real commitment, a profound commitment to this issue. And the American people who watch Larry King will see that it's no accident that all the Presidents, living Presidents, and all the living Nobel Prize-winning economists and 41 of the 50 Governors are for this. It's good for the American economy.

Mr. Russert. Are you trying to demonstrate to the undecided Democratic Congressmen, listen, this is a choice between Clinton-Gore and Perot?

The President. Absolutely not. He is a visible spokesperson for this. As I said to you, at least for the undecided Democrats, our big problem is the raw muscle, the sort of naked pressure that the labor forces have put on.

Mr. Russert. Are you afraid the Democratic Congressmen are in the pocket of labor?

The President. No, I didn't say that. But I said that a lot of them are saying, ''Well, I'm not hearing from these business people who are for it; their employees are not telling me they're for it. And I'm hearing from all these people either pleading with me based on friendship or threatening me based on money and work in the campaign. And I don't hear it.''

So I think what we want to do and what the Vice President's trying to do here, and this was his idea, is to let the American people listen. Yes, Ross Perot is against it. Yes, a number of other people, Pat Buchanan and others, are against it. But if all the Presidents are for it, all the Secretaries of State, all the Nobel Prize-winning economists, who've never agreed on anything the rest of their lives probably, and virtually all of the Governors are for it, it must be good for the American economy.

Mr. Russert. We have, in fact, lost jobs to Mexico. And their concern is we'll lose more, and also the depressed wages. There's a clause in the treaty which, with 6 months' notice, any side can void it. Would you say to the American people that if the treaty passes, you'll monitor it? And if, say, in 2 years you are convinced there is a sucking of jobs and a depression of wages, you would move to abrogate the treaty?

The President. If I thought the treaty were bad for the American economy, of course, I would do that. But let me tell you, there's another provision of the treaty that we negotiated that I also want to emphasize because it goes more to the heart of what many Americans are worried about. It deals with the so-called surge problem. That's a term of art which in common language means, well, what if this is a good deal for America and a good deal for Mexico, but some part of our economy, or theirs, to be fair, has an overwhelmingly negative impact? If something that nobody ever dreamed happened, there's also a provision that allows us to slow the agreement down as it applies to that.

So there's no question that we have the protections we need. We can get out in 6 months if it's bad for us, and we can stop anything horrible and unforeseen. This treaty is going to make the problems with Mexico of the last 15 years better. It will raise labor costs in Mexico; it will raise the environmental investments in Mexico; it will reduce the trade barriers to our selling products in Mexico. It means more sales and more jobs.

And also keep in mind, Mexico is just 5 percent of the American economy. It will improve our relationships with our biggest neighbor and thereby help us to take this kind of deal to the rest of Latin America so that we can establish a 700-million-person trading bloc. That's real jobs for America.

NAFTA and the APEC Meeting

Mr. Russert. The day after the vote November 17th, the next day, on the 18th, you leave for Seattle to meet with 14 other nations, China, Japan. If you go there having lost NAFTA, what does it do to your standing?

The President. Well, I'd say I'd sure rather not do it. Let me give you the flip side. If I go there and NAFTA passes in the House, it will be a clear statement to Asia, number one, that the United States is not withdrawing from the world, that we are determined to be the world's leading economic power by competing and winning, not from running away. Number two, I will be able to say what I have been saying to the Asians: Asia is important to us, but we want free trade, we want access to your markets.

They will see us developing the NAFTA market, which is not just Mexico, it's Latin America, Canada, the whole 9 yards. And that will be enormous pressure on them to conclude these world trade agreements, these GATT talks by the end of the year. It will also help us with Europe to do that.

So I can't tell you how important I think it will be. If we go out there without this agreement, they may say, "Well, President Clinton wants to have an open door to Asia, but is he really going to be a tough competitor? They ran away from Latin America, their best friends and best consumers. And can he deliver? Will the Congress run away from him even if he tries to expand trade?" My ability to get done what is plainly in the economic interest of this country will be weakened.

Now, that's very important, because almost all these people who are against NAFTA are still for the GATT talks, for the big treaty on world trade. They all know it will create hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs for America. They should consider how much harder it's going to be to get GATT if the House votes NAFTA down and how much easier it will be to get GATT if the House adopts NAFTA.

Health Care Reform

Mr. Brokaw. Mr. President, let's talk about health care. There's been a lot of confusion about the numbers coming out of the White House. Mrs. Clinton went to the Hill and said that if the Clinton plan passes, costs will go up for about 35 percent to 37 percent of those now covered. Then Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services, said 40 percent. Last week, Leon Panetta said 30 percent. Even your strongest advocates, like Jay Rockefeller, were holding their heads, in effect, in anguish. Another Democrat said, "We've got to prove that Democrats can count." Hasn't your credibility been hurt on the whole cost issue?

The President. Maybe, but what I would like to emphasize is we're the only people who have a plan. It's very easy for everybody else to sit up in the peanut gallery. This is a very complex thing. And keep in mind, you're talking about small amounts of money, is this person going to pay $6 more a month or $60 less a month, trying to calculate how it would go if this plan would be passed just as it is.

Now, let me say what was wrong with the early figures, where they said 40 percent of the people with insurance would pay more. Here's what was wrong with them, why they were too high. Of the people who have insurance today, we now think that 70 percent will pay the same or less for the same or better benefits. Why did they say 60 before? Because they neglected to calculate this: A lot of people who have insurance don't really have it. That is, they have $5,000 deductibles, so they're paying every year. They just may not be paying it in their insurance premium. So they went back and calculated based on what we now know about how much out-of-pocket people pay. You have $2,500, $3,000, $5,000 deductible. That is something they neglected to think about.

So now who will pay more under this, who has insurance already? People who have essentially catastrophic policies, that have very limited benefits, and young, single workers will pay more because if they pay more it will enable us to have what's called community rating, so that if a working family—middle-aged working family—with a sick child can still get insurance at an affordable cost. And all young workers who don't have insurance will be brought into the insurance system, and even they will get something for it. That is, what they get for it is knowing their insurance can ever be taken away. There will be a floor.

Finally, let me say this: If you look at the experience of the last 12 years when health costs really started to take off, and then you think about what it will be like 5 years from now, 100 percent of the American people will pay more 5 years from now than the rate of inflation if we don't do something. In other words, at least what we're trying to do will lower the rate of increase for all the American people. So within 5 years everybody will be better off, I believe.

Mr. Brokaw. Mr. President, no one disagrees with the idea that you have engaged the country in a debate about health care which is long overdue. But the fact is that you want to add 37 million people to the insurance pool. There are new technologies coming on board all the time that cost a lot more money. You're willing to pick up the early retirement benefits for corporations. You've added mental health and free prescriptions. It seems to a lot of folks that you ought to be going slower and that you ought to accept kind of phased-in universal health

care coverage in 5 years. Would that be acceptable to you?

The President. But the problem is—we are phasing it in over 3 years, through all of '90. We're anticipating passing this program in '94 and then letting people have '95, '96, and '97. But let me emphasize, Tom, the people who make that argument assume something that we assume all the time in America, that we just can't do things that other people can do. We tolerate conditions in America that are intolerable in other countries.

Now, the condition we tolerate by not having everybody insured is higher health care costs. That is, you've got folks in medicine in your family, you know this, not insuring everybody raises health care costs because all those people without insurance, if they need health care, will get it. They'll get it when it's too late, too expensive, and someone else will pay for it. And that rifles the cost. So by accelerating the moment of universal coverage, you not only do the morally right thing by finally letting America join the ranks of all these other advanced countries in giving everybody health security, you immediately begin to lower the rate at which costs increase.

So you can argue about all these other things, but it seems to me delaying the time of universal coverage will aggravate the price battle, not make it better. We assume that universal coverage will cost more when every other country that has universal coverage is paying much less than we are and having less inflation.

Living Will

Mr. Brokaw. Would you sign a living will publicly? About one-third of our health care costs in America go to the last year of life. Mrs. Clinton has talked about you doing that. Are you prepared to do that?

The President. I certainly would sign one. I don't know if I would do it in public, but I'd be glad to tell you what's in it. I don't know, I've never thought about a public demonstration of a private act like that. But we've given a lot of thought to it because of the experience I had with my stepfather when he died, when Hillary's dad died earlier this year. I think families should think about living wills and should have them. It's not something that Government should impose on them. But we do have a lot of extra costs that most people believe are unnecessary in the system, and that's one way to weed some of them out.

Health Care Reform

Mr. Brokaw. And ultimately, are we going to have to come to health rationing in America, especially those heroic procedures that are long on odds and very expensive, take that money and spend it on prenatal care and other procedures that might extend life at the beginning, not at the end?

The President. Well, let me say before we make that decision, we should acknowledge two things. One is, we're rationing health care right now. There's a huge rationing going on now. It's just a roll of the dice whether you have it or not and what you get.

What we do know is that if our plan passes and we put more emphasis on primary and preventive health care and primary physicians getting out there and taking care of people and stopping bad things from happening, we'll have less need for those extreme procedures.

I do not believe we want America to pull back from the technological advances that we all treasure. I do not believe we want to tell people they can't have procedures that have a realistic chance of saving their lives or returning them to normal. So I suspect they'll always be willing to pay a little more than any other country in the world to do that. But if we do more on the primary side, we'll be better off.

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, you're still confident we'll get a health care bill by next year?

The President. Oh, I think we will, absolutely.

Mr. Russert. We have to take a break. We'll be back with more from President Bill Clinton in the Oval Office. We'll talk a little bit about foreign policy.

[*At this point, the television stations took a commercial break.*]

North Korea

Mr. Russert. We're back live from the Oval Office.

Mr. President, a lot of growing concern about North Korea, a country that we fought some 40 years ago. Will you allow North Korea to build a nuclear bomb?

The President. North Korea cannot be allowed to develop a nuclear bomb. We have to be very firm about it. This is a difficult moment in our relationship with them and, I think, a difficult moment for them. They're one of the most, perhaps the most isolated country in the world, with enormous economic problems, trying to decide what direction to take now, sometimes seeming to reach out to South Korea, sometimes seeming to draw back.

I spend a lot of time on this issue. It's a very, very major issue. We have got to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and particularly North Korea needs to stay in the control regime. They don't need to withdraw. Now, there is a lot of disagreement about what we should do now. I just want to assure you and the American people that we are doing everything we possibly can to make the best decisions, to be firm in this. We are consulting with our allies in South Korea and Japan. They are most immediately affected by what we do and how we do it. And we have worked with the Chinese who, despite our other differences, have helped us to try to work through this.

Mr. Russert. Would one of the options be a preemptive strike, the way the Israelis took out the Iraqi nuclear reactor?

The President. I don't think I should discuss any specific options today. All I can tell you is that I tried to issue the sternest, clearest possible statement about this when I was in Korea. Nothing has changed since then. I think you asked me a question about it one time also, Tom. This is a very grave issue for the United States.

Mr. Russert. There are 800,000 North Korean troops amassed on the South Korean border. If the North Koreans invaded South Korea, would that, in effect, be an attack on the United States?

The President. Absolutely. We have our soldiers there. They know that. We still have people stationed near the Bridge of No Return. I was up there on the bridge; I was in those bunkers with our young Americans. They know that any attack on South Korea is an attack on the United States.

Russia

Mr. Brokaw. President Yeltsin of Russia has said over the weekend that he wants to now delay the Presidential election until 1996. That is a full term for him, but he had said publicly that he would do it in the spring of next year. You had endorsed that. Now for him to pull back from that public commitment to elections next spring, is that a mistake on his part?

The President. I have not spoken with him directly, because I didn't—late yesterday evening I was made aware of his comments, so I'm not sure exactly what he said and exactly what he meant. His comments are subject to more than one interpretation. I do think the following things. I think he had always assumed he would run for reelection, and his comments seem to indicate that he may not want to do that and he may want to simply finish his term. As long as he is promoting democracy, as long as he is promoting human rights, as long as he is promoting reform, I think the United States should support him. He has been brave and consistent. I think on this issue, we'll have to see how it plays out. I'm sure after the elections of the Parliament in December, they will have something to say about it.

One of the things that Boris Yeltsin has really understood is that it's not good if he's the only source of legitimate democratic power in Russia. And he is now. He's been elected twice by the Russian people in the last couple of years. After December, we'll have another major player, sort of like the President and the Congress here. And as we know, there will be a different source of legitimate democratic power, and we'll see how it works out.

China

Mr. Brokaw. Let me ask you about China. You said during the course of the campaign that President Bush coddles China despite a continuing crackdown on democratic reformers, the brutal subjugation of Tibet, the irresponsible exportation of military and nuclear technology. Your administration now is demonstrably warming up toward China. Have conditions changed there?

The President. Well first of all, let's talk about what we've done. The Chinese have complained because they think we've been so much firmer and colder. We imposed sanctions because of weapons technology transfers that the Chinese engaged in that we opposed. So we have taken steps there that were not taken previously.

But we also have had a consistent economic relationship with them. The United States this year will purchase 38 percent of China's exports—little-known fact. The American people, not the American business community that wants to invest there. American people have been very good to the Chinese people in supporting their economic advances. We believe their movement toward market reform and decentralization will promote more democracy in China and better policies.

I want to engage President Jiang on that, and I think we can do so. But we also have to be very firm on these issues of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and human rights. But I think we have to pursue both courses at once. I don't think you can isolate a country as big as China, as important to the world's future as China, but neither can you simply turn away from things that you cannot abide. And that's what we've tried to do. We've tried to strike the right balance, and I think we have.

United Nations Peacekeeping Efforts

Mr. Brokaw. Even some of your partisans on Capitol Hill believe that you've not shown a strong enough hand on foreign policy. After your experience in Somalia, will you be as eager to get involved with the United Nations in operations of that kind in the future?

The President. I think what we have to do is to recognize that the United Nations peacekeeping function is still very important and sometimes works very, very well. What they've done in Cambodia, with our financial support but with no Americans there, is truly remarkable. Will it transform Cambodia? Who knows? Maybe it will all go back to the way it was, but at least the United Nations has given Cambodia a chance. That is what we are doing for Somalia. Will they be able to overcome their historic, deeply embedded clan warfare? I'm not sure. But at least we're giving them a chance.

What's wrong with the United Nations peacekeeping operations is that it's too much of an ad hoc thing: Some work, some don't, and a lot of the command and control operations, a lot of the training details, a lot of the simple organizational things that are important have not been worked through. So the United States favors a substantial restructuring and upgrading of the peacekeeping operations in ways that would permit us to participate in the future with a much higher level of confidence.

Somalia

Mr. Russert. Let's turn to Somalia, Mr. President. The reports yesterday that the United States troops will take again a very visible role. What does that mean?

The President. Well, when I announced that we would pursue the political objective a few weeks ago, I also said we would stay there and complete our mission. Our mission there is to deliver the humanitarian supplies and to keep the lines of communications open. We stood down from patrolling the roads when the voluntary cease-fire was announced in Somalia, to try to let things calm down and to try to get the political process going. Now that there is a political process, as always is the case, there's also a lot of maneuvering in a quasi-military sort of way. We cannot allow that to undermine the humanitarian mission, and our people cannot be expected, our young soldiers there cannot be expected to just sort of hunker down and stay behind walls. It almost puts them at greater risk. So we have to go out now and make sure the ordinary conditions of the U.N. peacekeeping mission are continued even in Mogadishu. And that's what we're doing.

Mr. Russert. The Secretary-General of the U.N., Boutros Boutros-Ghali, said that unless you disarm the warlords and the clans and put together and fashion a political settlement before you leave, the mission will have been a failure.

The President. I disagree with that. First of all, that's the argument he made to the Bush administration. President Bush's administration simply refused to get involved in disarmament. Arguably, it would have

been easier then, at the moment when we came in, when everybody was starving and we were at our moment of maximum popularity and leverage, but I'm not sure that decision is wrong.

In the end, the international community will have to broker political resolutions within countries. But our ability to stop people within national boundaries from killing each other is somewhat limited and will be for the foreseeable future. I mean, they are going to have to make up their mind. I think the better course is to get these African nations, to get Ethiopia, to get Eritrea, to get their neighbors involved in trying to work out a political solution.

Those people now remember what it was like before we came there. We're going to do everything we can in the next several months to get this political solution going. But for us to go in and disarm would run the risk of our becoming, in effect, combatants on one side or the other, particularly if some said, yes, we'll disarm, and others said no.

Mr. Russert. In retrospect then, it was a mistake for you to send the Rangers to try to capture Mr. Aideed?

The President. No, that was a different issue. The mistake was—and I want to clarify this, because I am proud of what those Rangers did. The ones who gave their lives did not die in vain. The ones who gave their lives and were wounded in the last instance did it because of the tradition of the Rangers of never leaving anybody behind, even someone who has been killed. And I feel terrible about what happened.

But what they were doing is trying to enforce the law. Their mission was to try to arrest people who were suspected of murdering the Pakistani U.N. soldiers. The mistake was not that they were trying to do that. The mistake was that we were out doing that, and while we were doing that the political dialog shut down, so that the people that were associated with Aideed thought we, the U.N., not we, the U.S., but we, the U.N., were trying to cut them out of Somalia's future. And what we had tried to do is to lower our profile on the military police side so that the political dialog can start again. Now that that's going on, we're going to do the U.N. mandate.

Mr. Russert. And all troops will be out by March 31st?

The President. Yes.

Mr. Russert. Quickly on Haiti.

The President. If I can go back to my statement. They'll be out by March 31st, except for a couple of hundred support personnel who may be there to do just logistical things that——

Mr. Russert. Which is what you said before.

The President. That's right.

Haiti

Mr. Russert. Haiti. The military leaders have refused to meet. Your policy, the United States policy is to reinstate Mr. Aristide. Is it now time to broaden the embargo from just fuel to everything?

The President. We have to strengthen the embargo. There are two options. We can, in effect, have a total embargo and try to shut the country down. That will be more painful in the near term to the average Haitians who are already suffering. We can also try to do something that will target those people that are causing this problem, which is to get all of the other nations in the world to side with us in freezing the assets of the wealthy Haitians who are plundering that country, keeping democracy from taking root, and supporting the police chief and the military. I would prefer to do that, but I'm not going to rule out the other things. And we're following this on a daily basis, spending a lot of time with it.

Mr. Russert. So we could have a complete embargo on all goods?

The President. That is an option, but I also hope that the other wealthy nations of the world that have assets deposited from these Haitian interests who are keeping democracy from returning will join us in freezing those assets. That would really help. That would do more in less time to change the political climate than anything.

Mr. Russert. President Bush invaded Panama to remove Noriega. Would you consider invading Haiti to reinstate Aristide?

The President. I don't want to rule anything in or out. But let me just say that there's a difference here, though. He went to Panama not only to remove Noriega for the Pan-

amanians but because Noriega, himself, was wanted for violating American law as a drugrunner.

Prime Minister Malval and President Aristide have both not called for us to do that. In fact, one of the problems we had with the Governors Island Agreement is that neither they nor the other side wanted the United States or the U.N. there in a police function. That is, those folks we were trying to land there the other day were supposed to train the army to be the army corps of engineers, to rebuild the country. Neither side has wanted that and they had these bad memories of invasion. Last time the Americans went there in 1915, we stayed nearly 20 years. So they have not asked for that. But I don't think we should rule anything in or out.

Mr. Russert. Your stated policy of the United States is to reinstate Mr. Aristide. The CIA has gone around this town saying that Aristide is mentally unstable. Can you as Commander in Chief tolerate that insubordination by the CIA?

The President. Well, I think you have to ask yourself whether it's insubordination or not. And let me tell you what I mean by that. The CIA is duty-bound to tell the Congress what it knows. That's the law. Just like the Joint Chiefs of Staff are duty-bound to go, when asked, express their personal opinion if they have an opinion different than the President, even though they work for me.

In secret hearings the CIA told the Senate what they told me before, which is that they thought they had some evidence which questioned Mr. Aristide's ability to be President of Haiti. All I can tell you is—and I'm glad in a way that it came out, since it had been whispered around—that based on my personal experience, the Vice President's repeated contacts with him, the willingness of Aristide to work with our people, he has done everything he said he would do. And more importantly, he agreed to put in Mr. Malval, who is a respected businessman, to give some balance.

Aristide may not be like you and me; he's had a very different life. But two-thirds of the Haitians voted for him, and he has shown a willingness to reach out and broaden his base. So I just disagree with—and I also disagree that the old CIA reports are conclusive in their evidence. But they had a legal responsibility to tell the Senate. If I had put the thumb on them, you'd be asking me, ''Why are you gagging the CIA from giving American intelligence to the Senate Intelligence Committee?''

Mr. Russert. I might ask you that.

The President. You would.

Foreign Policy Team

Mr. Russert. Finally in this round, a lot of calls or suggestions that Secretary of Defense Aspin, Secretary of State Christopher resign. Are they secure in their positions?

The President. I don't think that the President should even discuss that sort of thing, those personnel things. Let me say this: I think they deserve credit for doing well on many big things. This administration has secured the interest of America in dealing with Russia, in dealing with the Middle East, in raising economic issues to a new high, in conducting a thorough security bottoms-up review of the Pentagon and our military operations, and in many other areas.

We found three problems that we inherited here, when we got in, that are very difficult problems, in Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti. And every day you can pick up the newspaper and see opinions on both sides about what we should do or a myriad of sides. We're doing the best we can on those. And we're going to do it, and we're going to do it with the team we've got, as long as we're all working together. I think that they have worked very hard, and I think that some of the attacks on them have been quite unfair.

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, we have to take a break. We'll be back with more from the Oval Office and talk about crime and kids in America.

[*At this point, the television stations took a commercial break.*]

Mr. Russert. We're back on ''Meet the Press.'' I'm with my colleague, Tom Brokaw, talking to the President of the United States in the Oval Office.

Decline of the American Family

Mr. President, in recent months on ''Meet the Press,'' we've talked to Senator Pat Moynihan, Washington Post columnist William

Raspberry, the Reverend Jesse Jackson about the problem of kids and crime. And they are in agreement that the breakup of the traditional family as we know it—two out of every three black kids born this year will be born out of wedlock, two out of five white children born out of wedlock—is the breakup of the traditional family unit a national crisis?

The President. Absolutely. It is absolutely a crisis.

Mr. Russert. And what can you do about it as President?

The President. I think that as President I have to do two things. One is to speak about it and to focus the attention of the Nation on it. I went to the University of North Carolina recently and spoke to the 200th anniversary there of the university and gave a major speech trying to deal with the combined impact of the breakdown of the family and the rise in violence and the rise in drugs and the lack of economic opportunity and——

Mr. Russert. Is there a correlation between crime and drugs and breakdown of the family?

The President. Absolutely. Let me back up and say I think America has two big challenges. One is to change in ways that will permit us to go into the 21st century winning as a country and as individuals. The second is to provide security in the face of all these changes so that people can have a coherent life and that we can't do that with economic stagnation or with social disintegration, and we're fighting with both. I mean, today in the Washington Post, there's a story of four people killed over the weekend, nine people wounded. A guy picks up a 1-year-old daughter—maybe his daughter—a 1-year-old child, drives away, and people drive after him, shoot him in the head, and the bullet then goes through the girl's body and blows her shoe off. You know, 3 or 4 days ago, an 11-year-old girl planning her own funeral, I mean, these things are terrible.

Let me just say, I've called the Attorney General last night; we talked for 30 minutes about this on the phone. We have got to use this administration to awaken in all Americans an understanding of this and to get everyone to ask what their personal responsibility is to try to help rebuild the family and the conditions of community. Then we have to follow policies which will do that.

Mr. Brokaw. Mr. President, do you think that there has been enough dialog within the black community about this whole issue, families without fathers? Jesse Jackson recently has started a campaign on black-on-black violence. But there really—among the activists in the black community, there hasn't been much public dialog. Has that disappointed you?

The President. Well, let me say this. I think there should be more. And I think that we should all be willing to face up to all the reasons why this has occurred. The famous African-American sociologist—at least he's famous in our circles—William Julius Wilson at the University of Chicago wrote a little book a few years ago called "The Truly Disadvantaged." It's only about 180 pages long, but it graphically shows you what has happened to black families in the inner cities and how the decline of the black family is associated not simply with the rise of welfare but with the evaporation of jobs for black males in those areas.

So I think, first, we ought to pass our crime bill here and put another 100,000 police on the street and do it right in community policing. But we also have to get work back into the lives of people. You know, you can't have generation after generation not knowing work and expect there to be structure and order in people's lives. That's one of the things that Colin Powell—retired as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—he talked about maybe he could be a role model for people outside of the military who have none of the structure that's what makes the military go in this country.

Mr. Brokaw. So much of this is driven by drugs. Your administration has kind of taken drugs off the radar screen. Do you think you're going to have to take a harder line on drugs?

The President. Well, first of all, I don't think that's a fair characterization. The administration has had to subject the drug budget to the same ruthless discipline that nearly every other budget has been subject to. So that while we have increased some drug funding, like in the block grant program, some of the rest of it has not been

increased. What I have tried to do is to get people to see the drug problem, first of all, in terms of stopping the major sources, and then here at home, focusing on drugs in terms of treatment and education and integrating it with our overall strategy on law enforcement and violence.

I think this country needs a community strategy which deals with the crises of drugs, violence, crime, the family, and work. And we need to go not only nationally, but at the grassroots level. And we need to understand that there's some basic things we have to do. If you want families to stay together, you've got to make it possible for people to be successful workers and successful parents.

If I could just briefly tell this one story: A couple of Sundays ago, we had a family in here taking a tour, a man, a wife, three daughters. One of these children was in a wheelchair. She was in this Make-A-Wish program, you know, a sick child wants to go see the President. I say hello. We have a picture. On the way out, the man says, ''Mr. President, just in case you think that one person doesn't make a difference,'' he said, ''you signed the family leave bill, which gives me the right to spend time with my sick child and not lose my job. If you hadn't done that, if Congress hadn't passed it, I would have had to choose between spending this precious time with my daughter, who's probably not going to live, or keeping my job for my other two daughters and my wife. And I don't have to choose now. Don't ever think that what you do doesn't make a difference.''

A few days later that little girl died. But that man knows that he was a good parent and a good worker. That's just one example of the kind of things we have to do that have moral content even though they may be public policies.

But no matter what we do, there has to be a reawakening of responsibility in every community. That goes back to your other question: Should the black community be debating this? They should. Should the white community be debating this? We should.

Racial Tension in Urban Areas

Mr. Brokaw. All of this, it seems to me, is fueling greater racial tensions, especially in the urban areas. Do you think that the racial tension and the racial climate in urban America now is better or worse than it was, say, 10 years ago?

The President. I think for middle class people it's much better. I think the level of comfort among people of different races is much higher. I think the appreciation for diversity is greater. I think for people who are outside the economic mainstream, it is much, much worse.

My God, we've got kids planning their funerals, 11-year-old kids. But the crying shame is, those people also want to be a part of mainstream America. I mean, look at these children. When they make these plans for their funerals, are they out there breaking the law? And one thing I'd like to say to the rest of America is, you read these horrible stories about how many people get killed on the weekends—most of the people that lived in all of those neighborhoods never break the law, work for a living for modest wages, pay their taxes, trying to do right by their kids. I mean, this country is falling apart because we have allowed a whole group of us to drift away. It's not an under class anymore, it's an outer class.

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, can we talk about this in direct terms without a cloud of political correctness hovering over the subject?

The President. I think we have to. I think we've got to. I think Jesse Jackson, frankly, has performed a good service by going out and starting this debate again when the American people are willing to listen. We've got to be able to sit down and tell people what we think. I think that the American people are willing to put aside political correctness. But if we want to say tough things about the breakdown of the family and the responsibility of people who live in these communities, we also have to say tough things to the rest of America about how you can't just ignore these people until you have to read about how they're having children, children having children, and nobody's married and they're having babies and these kids are dying. You've got to have some structure in these communities and some opportunity. If you want to preach the American dream to them, there's got to be something there at

the end of the road. So there's something for all of us to do here.

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, we have to take another break. We'll be back in just a moment to talk about Bill Clinton's first year in office.

[*At this point, the television stations took a commercial break.*]

The President's Approval Rating

Mr. Russert. We're back with the President of the United States in the Oval Office.

Mr. President, your poll numbers are low, but the one that's most striking to me is that since you've been President, the number of people who think the country is on the wrong track has doubled. What happened?

The President. Well, they may not know what's going on. And I think we should all ask ourselves what responsibility that has. Let's look at the facts. Let's just look at the facts. Since I became President, we have lowered the deficit, lowered interest rates, kept inflation down. This economy has produced more private sector jobs in the first 9 months than in the previous 4 years. Jobs are up and investment is up. We have shown discipline and direction in the budget. It was a remarkable achievement. Not only that, in that budget we did something that has not been done for 20 years, we tried to reverse the inequality of incomes. We asked the wealthy to pay more, and we gave over 15 million working families, comprising about 50 million Americans, a tax cut because they're working hard and still hovering around the poverty line. Most Americans don't know that.

Mr. Russert. So it's just a communications problem?

The President. Well, let me finish.

Mr. Russert. Please.

The President. In that program, one of the things I promised the American people to do to try to add more security to their lives was to open the doors of college education to everybody. We reformed the college loan program; we lowered the interest rates; we strung out the repayments. Most Americans don't know that. We passed the family leave law, which I just spoke about. We have a major health care proposal on the table. We have opened any number of economic avenues of opportunity that everyone agrees with. We've got $37 billion more in high-tech equipment up for exports now, created hundreds of thousands of jobs.

So the economic record of this administration in only 9 months is very good. The educational record of this administration is good. What we're doing on health care is unprecedented in our lifetime. The foreign policy record on the issues that really affect our national security is good.

There are the problems that nobody's figured out how to resolve; I concede that. I do not know what the answer to this is. But I know this: I believe that when historians look at this first year, they will be hard pressed to find many first years of Presidencies that equal ours. The Congressional Quarterly said the other day that only President Eisenhower had had a higher success rate in Congress than I have. If you go out and ask the average American, they think I hardly ever get anything passed.

Mr. Russert. But the voters——

The President. Now, that may be—that's right, that may be my fault, it may be somebody else's fault. But the reality is, the economy is going in the right direction, I'm keeping the commitments of the campaign to empower people through education and through health care initiatives and through all these other things. Why don't they know that? I don't know. I gave a speech the other day to 250 people from my home town, my home State who were up here, and I just went through these specific things. And they said, ''There must have been a conspiracy to keep this a secret; we didn't know any of this.''

Mr. Russert. But in six States since you've been President, Senate seats in Texas and Georgia, Governorships in Virginia, New Jersey, mayoralties in New York and Los Angeles have all gone Republican. There must be some small message in there for you.

The President. Well, I think the message is people still want change. But you know, you're from Buffalo. Don't you believe that all politics is local? I was a Governor for 12

years, and I can honestly say, with 150 Governors I served with I never heard one say, not one, that he or she won or lost an election because of the President.

Now, what are these things saying? They say people are still upset at crime, they're upset at the lack of jobs, they're upset when they're paying more taxes and think they're not getting something else for it. But we are addressing each of those things. Whether it's in the economic program, the health care program, the reinventing program, expanding trade, we are addressing those things.

I think that what I have to do is to do a better job of getting out there and getting the record there. But what happens here is every day is just a new battle. I don't know anybody who's out there who believes that all these elections are any more than a referendum on what people want for their mayors and their Governors.

Media Coverage

Mr. Brokaw. Mr. President, Jimmy Carter used to complain that the White House press was here simply to play "gotcha." Are you saying, in effect, that the press coverage has failed you and failed the country?

The President. No. Well, I think it may have failed the country some, but I don't take it personally, and I don't think it's a "gotcha" thing. I think, in a way it may be my fault. I go from one thing to another, so we have one moment on national service, for example—a signature idea of my campaign, something we know the American people care about—and it happens, but it happens in the middle of all these other things so nobody knows it happened. I think that's the big problem.

Mr. Brokaw. Let me ask you about 1996. You had a meeting in the White House the other day with Colin Powell; he endorsed NAFTA. Do you think Colin Powell is a Democrat or a Republican? And do you think he'll run for office in '96?

The President. You'll have to ask him that. I don't think I should speak for him.

Mr. Brokaw. Well, what's your instinct?

The President. I don't have an instinct. Let me just say this: What I have determined to do is to get up every day and do what I think is right and try to move this country forward and keep the commitments I made to the American people and follow it through with real conviction and just let everything else happen. I can't control a lot of the events. But I do think it is astonishing to me, and I take this on myself maybe more than you, but that—is to go back to Al Gore's line in the campaign, "What should be up is up; what should be down is down." We're moving in the right direction, and people should know that. And if they don't, then I have to examine why they don't. But perhaps you do, too.

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, we have to take a break. We'll be right back after this break.

[*At this point, the television stations took a commercial break.*]

Mr. Russert. We're back with the President. Tom Brokaw, you have a question.

The President's Health

Mr. Brokaw. Even in the Oval Office, you can hear the local protest outside about firefighters or something in Washington, DC. You know that it is like living in a fishbowl here. Comedians have had a lot of fun with the fact that you run every day, but you don't seem to lose any weight. In fact, what can you tell us about your personal health? Have you lost weight?

The President. A little bit.

Mr. Brokaw. And have you changed your eating habits?

The President. Yes, quite a bit since I've been here. I have lost weight. I gained a lot of weight in the campaign. I'm now almost back to where I was 2 years ago. I've lost weight, and lost, I don't know, 2 or 3 inches off my waist. But I run 6 days a week, and I just try to—it's like everything else, I think you just have to get up, sort of show up every day, and try to make a little progress. I think that's what you do in life.

The Presidency

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, a friend of yours told me that you jokingly sometimes refer to life in the White House as ''the crown jewel of the Federal penitentiary system.''

The President. That's right.

Mr. Russert. How confining has it been?

The President. Well, it's pretty confining. I always say I don't know whether it's the finest public housing in America or the crown jewel of the prison system. It's a very isolating life. And one of the things that frustrates me is that I get more easily out of touch and maybe even out of harmony with the American people—that's the question you asked me earlier. I also know that every little word I say can be sort of twisted, you know. And again, I don't fault anybody, but I just have to be careful.

Mr. Russert. We have just a few seconds.

The President. Did you see what Gergen just did? He brought in this thing saying that the headline is now that Clinton accused labor of roughshod tactics. I mean, those guys are my friends. I just don't agree with them on NAFTA. We're going to all work together——

Mr. Russert. We have just a few seconds. Is there one thing that, a year ago, you were absolutely certain of that you're not quite sure about now?

The President. Yes. I was absolutely certain a year ago that I could pursue this aggressive agenda of change and that every step along the way I'd be able to tell the American people what I was doing and convince them that we're going right. We are pursuing it, we're making in a way a little more progress than I thought we would, but there's a big gap between what we've done and what I've been able to tell the people about. I've got to do a better job.

Mr. Russert. Thank you for letting us join you in the Oval Office today. I take it this is the room you'll invite the Buffalo Bills after they win the Super Bowl?

The President. That's right. The Buffalo Bills will be here if they win the Super Bowl this year.

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, thank you very much.

Mr. Brokaw. You'll be in office a long time if that's the case. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The interview began at 9 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Executive Order 12879—Order of Succession of Officers To Act as Secretary of the Navy

November 8, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 3347 of title 5, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Succession to the Authority of the Secretary of the Navy*. (a) In the event of the death, permanent disability, or resignation of the Secretary of the Navy, the incumbents holding the positions designated below, in the order indicated, shall act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Navy:

(1) The Under Secretary of the Navy.

(2) The Assistant Secretaries and General Counsel of the Navy, in the order fixed by their length of services as permanent appointees in such positions.

(3) The Chief of Naval Operations.

(4) The Commandant of the Marine Corps.

(b) In the event of the temporary absence or temporary disability of the Secretary of the Navy, the incumbents holding the Department of the Navy positions designated in paragraph (a) of this section, in the order indicated, shall act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Navy.

(1) In these instances, the designation of an Acting Secretary of the Navy applies only for the duration of the Secretary's absence or disability, and does not affect the authority of the Secretary to resume the powers of his office upon his return.

(2) In the event that the Secretary of the Navy is merely absent from this position, the Secretary of the Navy may continue to exercise the powers and fulfill the duties of his office during his absence, notwithstanding the provisions of this order.

(c) Precedence among those officers designated in paragraph (a) of this section who have the same date of appointment shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy at the time that such appointments are made.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraph (a) and (b) of this section, an officer shall not act for or exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Navy under this order if that officer serves only in an acting capacity in the position that would otherwise entitle him to do so.

Sec. 2. *Temporary Nature of Succession.* Succession to act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of the Navy pursuant to this order shall be on a temporary or interim basis and shall not have the effect of vacating the statutory appointment held by the successor.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 8, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:59 p.m., November 8, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on November 10.

Message to the Congress on Rhinoceros and Tiger Trade by China and Taiwan

November 8, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 7, 1993, the Secretary of the Interior certified that the People's Republic of China (PRC) and Taiwan are engaging in trade of rhinoceros and tiger parts and products that diminishes the effectiveness of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Five rhinoceros species and the tiger are listed in Appendix I of CITES, which means that the species are threatened with extinction and no trade for primarily commercial purposes is allowed. Although recent actions by the PRC and Taiwan show that some progress has been made in addressing their rhinoceros and tiger trade, the record demonstrates that they still fall short of the international conservation standards of CITES. This letter constitutes my report to the Congress pursuant to section 8(b) of the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (Pelly Amendment) (22 U.S.C. 1978(b)).

The population of the world's rhinoceros has declined 90 percent within the last 23 years to the present level of less than 10,000 animals, and the tiger population has declined 95 percent within this century to the present level of about 5,000. Neither the PRC nor Taiwan has fully implemented the international standards established by CITES for controlling the trade in these species, and the poaching of rhinoceroses and tigers continues in their native ranges fueled in part by the market demand in the PRC and Taiwan. These populations will likely be extinct in the next 2 to 5 years if the trade in their parts and products is not eliminated.

To protect the rhinoceros and tiger from extinction, all countries and entities that currently consume their parts and products must implement adequate legislative measures and provide for enforcement that effectively eliminates the trade, including taking actions to comply with the criteria set down by CITES in September 1993 and fully cooperating with all CITES delegations. The PRC and Taiwan have made good faith efforts to stop the trade in rhinoceros and tiger parts and products, and have, since the announcement of Pelly certification, undertaken some positive legislative and administrative steps in this regard. These efforts, however, have yet to yield effective reductions in trade.

I wish to support and build on these good faith efforts undertaken by the PRC and Taiwan. At the same time, I would like to make clear the U.S. position that only effective reductions in the destructive trade in these species will prevent the rhinoceros and tiger from becoming extinct. Accordingly, I have established an Interagency Task Force to coordinate the provision of U.S. technical assistance to the PRC and Taiwan to help them eliminate their illegal wildlife trade. I have

also instructed the Department of the Interior, in coordination with the Department of State and the American Institute in Taiwan, to enter immediately into dialogue with the PRC and Taiwan regarding specific U.S. offers of trade and law enforcement assistance.

Actions by the PRC and Taiwan that would demonstrate their commitment to the elimination of trade in rhinoceros and tiger parts and products could include: at a minimum, consolidation and control of stockpiles; formation of a permanent wildlife or conservation law enforcement unit with specialized training; development and implementation of a comprehensive law enforcement and education action plan; increased enforcement penalties; prompt termination of amnesty periods for illegal holding and commercialization; and establishment of regional law enforcement arrangements. I would expect that in taking these actions, the PRC and Taiwan would take account of the recommendations by the CITES Standing Committee and other CITES subsidiary bodies. In that regard, I am pleased to announce that the United States will participate in a delegation to the PRC and Taiwan organized by CITES to evaluate their progress between now and the March 1994 CITES Standing Committee meeting.

At its last meeting, the CITES Standing Committee unanimously recommended that parties consider implementing "stricter domestic measures up to and including prohibition in trade in wildlife species now" against the PRC and Taiwan for their trade in rhinoceros and tiger parts and products. The United States is prepared, through close dialogue and technical aid, to assist the PRC and Taiwan. I hope that both will demonstrate measurable, verifiable, and substantial progress by March 1994. Otherwise, import prohibitions will be necessary, as recommended by the CITES Standing Committee.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 8, 1993.

Statement on the Resignation of the Deputy Secretary of State

November 8, 1993

I accept with regret the resignation offered today by Clifton Wharton, who has served our country honorably as Deputy Secretary of State. My administration has benefited greatly from his dignified presence, and it will be diminished by his departure.

Clifton Wharton's service as Deputy Secretary has been outstanding. Over the past 10 months, he has made many important contributions to our Nation's foreign policy. Through his leadership on reform of AID and other foreign assistance programs and his important work on the reorganization of the State Department, as well as through his successful mission to Southeast Asia and his prodigious efforts in Latin America, he has distinguished himself at every turn. Every aspect of his service has demonstrated the same drive and talent that marked his earlier successes in the worlds of business and education.

I know that Cliff is dedicated to our country's service. I continue to need and value his insights and counsel, and I hope to be able to continue calling on him for specific assignments in the days ahead. He and his family have my fondest wishes for a successful future.

Nomination for a Member of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission

November 8, 1993

The President today announced his intention to nominate John E. Tull, Jr., as a member of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

"As a farmer who has dedicated years of service to State commodity boards, John Tull has the experience to serve as an informed and effective member of the CFTC," the President said. "I am pleased to name him to this important board."

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

Nomination for Posts at the United States Information Agency

November 8, 1993

The President announced today that he intends to nominate John P. ''Jack'' Loiello to be the Associate Director of the U.S. Information Agency for Education and Cultural Affairs, and that he has appointed Charles Fox to be the Director of USIA's WORLDNET TV and Film Service.

''Jack Loiello's long experience in promoting international goodwill makes him an outstanding choice for this position,'' said the President. ''Likewise, Charles Fox brings a distinguished record in academia, the media, government, and business to this post at WORLDNET.''

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

Nomination for Ambassador to Angola

November 8, 1993

The President announced today that he intends to nominate career Foreign Service officer Edmund T. DeJarnette, Jr., to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola.

''I am very pleased to be making this announcement today,'' said the President. ''Edmund DeJarnette's extensive experience in Africa makes him an outstanding choice for this post.''

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

Proclamation 6621—Veterans Day, 1993

November 5, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Veterans Day is a time for Americans to thank our Nation's military veterans for the sacrifices they have made to defend and preserve the blessings of liberty. During times of war and times of peace, these men and women have ensured that future generations would enjoy the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness promised by our Nation's Founders. We have much to learn from all who have served.

In the major wars and numerous smaller conflicts fought by our Nation's Armed Forces, our men and women in uniform have shaped our Nation through their great sacrifices to safeguard our freedom. Through the War of Independence and the many wrenching conflicts of the 19th century, Americans preserved our Nation with their bravery and their commitment to duty and country. In the conflicts of our century, men and women in the Armed Forces have successfully defended our security, freedom, and ideals, helping to build America into a greater Nation.

On this day, we should pay special tribute to the more than 27 million living American veterans. Seventy-five years ago on November 11, the Armistice was signed, ending World War I, ''the war to end all wars.'' More than 32,000 soldiers of the nearly 5 million who fought in World War I are still living, serving as a reminder of the struggles through which they secured our safety. Many more veterans from World War II and the Korean Conflict still serve their country as career soldiers and civilians, tempered with the experience of war. Vietnam veterans continue to help our Nation adjust to a new international security environment often characterized by regional conflicts similar to the war in which they fought.

Living veterans, having once served our country in uniform, now fill such key roles as teachers, police officers, business owners, doctors, lawyers, government officials, and

volunteers, sustaining our society secured by their service.

In a greater sense, this day cannot fully honor America's veterans who have risked and sacrificed their lives. But we can resolve to continue the struggle for freedom that they made their duty and to dedicate our lives to ensuring that their valiant efforts shall never have been in vain.

In order that we may pay due tribute to those who have served in our Armed Forces, the Congress has provided (5 U.S.C. 6103(a)) that November 11 of each year shall be set aside as a legal public holiday to honor America's veterans.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Thursday, November 11, 1993, as "Veterans Day." I urge all Americans to honor the resolution and commitment of our veterans through appropriate public ceremonies and private prayers. I also call upon Federal, State, and local government officials to display the flag of the United States and to encourage and participate in patriotic activities in their communities. I invite civic and fraternal organizations, churches, schools, businesses, unions, and the media to support this national observance with suitable commemorative expressions and programs.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:47 a.m., November 8, 1993]

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

Remarks on Endorsements of the North American Free Trade Agreement

November 9, 1993

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much for being here. After what David and Kathleen said, I'm not sure there's much left for me to say. I thought they were terrific, and I thank them for coming, for what they said, and for putting this issue squarely where it ought to be: on the questions of jobs and opportunity for the American people.

We asked you to come here today in the hope that together you would help us to pass the NAFTA legislation through Congress, and that if you have questions about this you could ask them. So I want to basically spend this time to open the floor to questions to you. But I would like to make just a few remarks if I might by way of introduction.

First of all, it's important to put this NAFTA agreement into the larger context of our Nation's economic strategy. And it's important that I at least tell you from my point of view how it fits. Our Nation is a churning cauldron of economic activity now, with a lot of opportunity being created and a lot of hardship being developed at the same time. The world is changing very rapidly. The American economy is changing very rapidly. For 20 years the wages of the bottom 60 percent of our work force, more or less, have been stagnant as people work harder for the same or lower wages. We know that over the last 20 years, as we've become more and more enmeshed in the global economy, the jobs have been changing more rapidly. We know now that when a person loses a job, for example, usually a person will find another job, but it's not the same old job. It used to be the normal course of events was you'd have a lay-off, but you wouldn't just lose a job. Those things are all changing now.

We know that through the discipline of the market economy our productivity now is the highest in the world again in manufacturing and in many other areas. But we also know that there's been a whole lot of reduction

of employment in many areas to get that higher productivity, with fewer people producing more output. So this is a time of enormous opportunity and enormous insecurity. We have to have a full-court-press, comprehensive economic strategy to achieve what should be the objective of every American, more jobs and higher growth rates.

In our administration, we began with trying to get the deficit down, trying to drive interest rates down, and trying to keep inflation down. Those historically low interest rates have led to literally millions and millions of people refinancing their home mortgages, refinancing their business debt, increasing investment in our country. The result has been that even though we don't have as many jobs as we'd like, the private sector has produced more jobs in the last 10 months than in the previous 4 years. And if we can keep interest rates and inflation down and investment up, we're going to have more and more and more growth. That's encouraging.

The last budget bill provided special tax incentives for people to invest in new and small enterprises where most of the new jobs are being created. Extended research and development tax credits provided for extra incentives to convert from these defense technologies to domestic technologies. We recently took $37 billion worth of high-tech equipment off the restriction list for export so we could put American products into play in the global economy.

But with all of that, no one has shown how a wealthy country can grow wealthier and create more jobs unless there is global economic growth through trade. There is simply no evidence that you can do it any other way. About half America's growth in the last 7 years has come from trade growth. And the jobs that are tied to trade, on average, pay about 17 percent more than jobs which are totally within the American economy, so that it is impossible for all these other strategies to succeed—if by success you mean creating more jobs, more growth, and higher incomes—unless there is a level of global economic growth financed through expanded trade that Americans can take advantage of. We can't get there.

So that brings us to NAFTA, and how does it fit, and why should we do it. This agreement will, as all of you know, lower American tariffs but will lower Mexican tariffs and trade barriers more than American tariffs, because ours are lower anyway. This agreement will help us to gain access to a market of 90 million people, which has shown a preference for American products unprecedented in all the world. Seventy percent of all the purchases by Mexican consumers of foreign products go to American products. This agreement will unite Canada, Mexico, and the United States in a huge trading bloc which will enable us to grow and move together.

This agreement will also—and this is very important—produce most of its jobs by enabling us to use the Mexican precedent to go into the whole rest of Latin America, to have a trading bloc of well over 700 million people, and will also—and I see some of you in this audience I know who are interested in this—this agreement, if adopted by the Congress, will increase the leverage that I, as your President, will have to get an agreement on the world trade round, the GATT round, this year with Europe and with Japan and with the other nations involved because they will see, ''Well, we want access to that big Latin American market, and the way to do it is to adopt a world trade agreement. We don't want America to have an overwhelming preferential treatment in Mexico and other countries, so we'll have to give them more access to our markets in Europe and Asia.''

It will also make a statement that America intends to go charging into the 21st century still believing we can compete and win and that we intend to lead the world in expanding horizons, not in hunkering down. And believe you me, no one knows quite which way it will go. This is why the NAFTA agreement has acquired a symbolic and larger significance even than the terms of the agreement, because we know that if the United States turns away from open markets and more trade and competition, how can we then say to the Europeans and the Japanese they must open their markets to us, they must continue to expand? So the stakes here are very large indeed.

Now, let's deal with the arguments against NAFTA. The people who are against it say

that if this agreement passes, more irresponsible American companies will shut their doors in America and open doors in Mexico because the costs are cheaper and this agreement allows them to do that all over the country. To that I answer the following: Number one, I was the Governor of a State for 12 years that had almost 22 percent of its work force in manufacturing. I saw plants close and go to Mexico, brought one back before I left office. I know why they did it. I know how they did it. I understand the pressures, particularly on the lower wage companies with low margins of profit.

But my answer to you is, there is the *maquilladora* system now in practice in Mexico. If anybody wants to go down there to produce for the American market, they can do that now. And if we defeat NAFTA, they can continue to do that, and it will be more likely that they will do that. Why? This is the nub of the argument: Because clearly, with the agreements we have on labor committing Mexico to enforce its own labor code and make that a part of an international commission on the environment, clearly, we're going to raise the cost of production in Mexico. Clearly, when Mexico lowers its domestic content requirement on automobiles, for example, we'll be able to go from 1,000 to 60,000 American-made cars sold in Mexico next year. There will be less incentive to go to Mexico to produce for the American market, less incentive, not more.

What does Mexico get out of this then? What they get out of it is they have 90 million people there now producing for themselves. What they want is American investment in Mexico to hire Mexicans to produce goods and services for Mexicans so they can grow their economy from within. Is that bad for us? No, that's good for us. Why? Because the more people down there who have jobs and the better the jobs are, the more they can buy American products and the less they will feel a compulsion to become part of America's large immigration problem today. So that is good for us.

This is very important. I would never knowingly do anything to hurt the job market in America. I have spent my entire life, public life, trying to deal with the economic problems of ordinary people. I ran for this job to alleviate the insecurity, the anxiety, the anger, the frustration of ordinary Americans.

Tonight there will be a debate that a few people will watch on television in which, with a lot of rhetoric, the attempt will be made to characterize this administration as representing elite corporate interests and our opponent as representing the ordinary working people. Let me tell you something, this lady, I wish she were going to be on the debate against Mr. Perot tonight. He wouldn't have much of a shot against her because she so obviously disproves the argument. This is a debate about what is best for ordinary Americans.

Look around this room. The rest of us are going to do fine, aren't we? Let's not kid ourselves. If this thing were to go down, everybody in this room would figure out some way to be all right. That's true, isn't it? I mean, most of you are here as influence centers in your congressional district because you'll figure out a way to land on your feet. Unless the whole country goes down the tubes, most of you will figure out a way to be innovative and work around whatever the rules are. We are doing this because it allows our country as a whole to expand, to grow, to broaden its horizons, the people who can't be here.

You know, it's an amazing thing. Again I will say, the resentments, the hurts, the anxieties, the fears that have been poured into this debate are real and legitimate and deserve a response. And we should all recognize that. You just think how people feel when they've worked for 20 years and they get a pink slip, and they're just treated like a disposable can of soda pop. I mean, this is a tough deal. Think about the Members of Congress that are being asked to vote for this agreement when they've got 15 percent, 20 percent unemployment in their districts and they represent these big inner-city neighborhoods or these big, distressed rural areas where there's no investment going into their areas. There are legitimate problems out there.

What is wrong is that they have made NAFTA the receptacle of their resentment instead of seeing it as one step toward alleviating the problem. And that is my point, not that there's anything wrong with the worries and the fears and the hurts that are

brought to this table but that this country has never, never run from competition, except one time, and it helped to bring on the Great Depression. And with every evolutionary stage of the global economy in this century, we have always led the effort to broaden opportunity and always welcomed the rigor of competition and felt that we could do it. And we have got to do that again.

So I ask you as earnestly as I can to remember that you are speaking for the very people who may think they're arguing against this. This is about what's going to happen to our country. There is no evidence, I will say again, there is no evidence anywhere in the world that you can create jobs, raise income, and promote growth in an already wealthy country unless there is global growth, financed and fueled through expanded trade. There is simply no evidence for it.

I want to go out to meet with the President of China and the Prime Minister of Japan and the heads of all of those Asian countries and tell them we're happy to buy their products, they ought to buy more of ours, and they need to stimulate their economy. I want to go to the Europeans and say, ''Okay, give us the world trade agreement. You don't have to hunker down and close up. You can expand, and we'll do it together.'' But if we don't do this with our closest neighbor, it's going to be hard for us to have the credibility to make the case for the world.

Thank you very much.

Q. Mr. President, one of the concerns of the United States, as you're well aware, concerns the potential for job loss. We've all heard how the passage of NAFTA will create job loss in the United States. I'd like to share with you a different view, and that is that the passage of NAFTA will actually create jobs. I'm with the World Trade Center Association, and we're actually inundated by requests from our Pacific rim members, asking us to identify locations in the United States where, after NAFTA is passed, they can come in and build industry to protect their market share in the United States. They see NAFTA as taking jobs away from the Pacific basin, and they want to be able to counter that by coming over to the United States and actually building industry to satisfy this market share.

The President. That's a good point. You all heard what he said, didn't you? He just said that he's with the World Trade Center, and he gets a lot of requests for information about sites in the United States where people in Asia would look at putting up operations to protect their share of the American market if NAFTA passes.

Let me give you another example, more indirect, something I think you'll see a lot of. Mattel toy factory announced that they would in all probability move an operation from China to Mexico and buy all their products of plastic from the United States instead of from Asia. So there will be an indirect job benefit there. But there are millions of these things; it's incalculable. That's what always happens if you decide you're going to expand opportunity and growth and then let the ingenuity of the marketplace work for the interest of ordinary people.

Let me just say one thing about that. Every major study but one has predicted a job gain for NAFTA in the United States. And the major study that predicted a job loss predicted it in large measure because they estimated that there would be fewer immigrants coming into this country and taking jobs here as a result of it. So that still may not be a net increase in unemployment. All the others estimated net job gains.

Now, there obviously will be people who lose their jobs, as there are today. We're talking net. When somebody says there's a net job gain of 200,000, you say, ''Well, if you gain 210 and lose 10, the 10 who lose feel more pain than the 210 who gain, arguably.'' What does that mean? That means that this administration has an obligation, and the Congress, I want to emphasize has an obligation and the business community has an obligation to support a legitimate strategy for retraining all these workers at a high level of quality in a relevant way and developing a strategy for investment across this country. That is what we're working on. That's what we're going to give the working people.

The other point that needs to be made is there is no power to protect the people of this country from the changes sweeping through the global economy. I mean, the av-

erage 18-year-old is going to change work eight times in a lifetime anyway, whatever we do. But we do have an obligation to help them, those who are in difficulty, and we will meet that obligation.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. As an African-American, I have a basic question. As you know, historically, African-Americans have experienced high unemployment, lower pay. In fact, we created the phrase, ''Last hired, first fired.'' I would further suggest to you that we're probably the most vulnerable members of this society. Given those set of facts, I would like to hear your response to why African-Americans, in general, and African-American politicians should support NAFTA.

The President. African-Americans, in general, and African-American politicians should support NAFTA, first of all, because it means more jobs. Secondly, as we found when we had our products fair here, it means opportunities for a lot of small businesses. As Ms. Kaminiski said, there will be tens of thousands of small businesses who will be—and minority entrepreneurs, by and large, are smaller businesses. They should support it because anything that increases the job base of America will help; and finally because, even though this gentleman is from Utah, most of the big service industries that will expand their job base in America because of the opportunities in Mexico are located in larger cities and have a substantial percentage of their hires coming from the minority community.

And having said that, let me make one other point. That will not solve all the problems. We've got a crime bill. We've got to have a family strategy. We've got to have a whole economic strategy for the distressed areas of this country. We have to have a reemployment system instead of the unemployment system we've got. It will not answer all of the problems. But it is not an argument to vote against NAFTA that it doesn't solve every problem. In other words, that's what the other side's done. They've loaded all of the problems of the 1980's onto this NAFTA vote, which actually makes them better. We don't want to get in a position of overclaiming for it. This doesn't solve all of the problems of the American economy, but it does solve substantial ones that ought to be addressed.

Q. Mr. President, I'm from Texas, and I'm very concerned about the environment on the border. How will NAFTA affect the borders?

The President: It will improve the environment on the border. That's why we've gotten so many environmental organizations to endorse this. Not all the environmental groups are for it, but most of the environmental groups that are against it are against it for something that often happens to progressives: They're making the perfect, the enemy of the good. That is, they think it ought to be better, but it's very good.

This agreement, first of all, requires every nation to enforce its own environmental laws and can make the failure to do so the subject of a complaint through the trade system. Secondly, to support this agreement, the World Bank has committed about $2 billion in financing, and we have agreed to set up a North American development bank to have $2 to $3 billion worth of infrastructure projects in the beginning on both sides of the border.

So there are substantial environmental problems associated with *maquilladora* operations, substantial. They are significant; they are real. They affect Mexicans; they affect Americans. If this trade agreement passes, this will be the most sweeping environmental protection ever to be part of a trade agreement, and it will make the environment better, not worse. And by the way, it will create jobs for a lot of people on both sides of the border in cleaning up the environment, jobs that won't happen and environmental cleanup that won't happen if we vote it down.

Q. Mr. President, I'm a manufacturer from the great State of Arkansas. Is there anything in the agreement that's going to keep China from putting in a factory and importing into Mexico and then turning the goods right straight back to us?

The President. There is nothing in the agreement that will prohibit other countries from actually hiring people, but there are rules of origin. What we do have protection against, and what we are actually strengthening now, is using Mexico as a way station to get around, like, the multifiber agreement,

which provides a lot of protection to our apparel manufacturers. All the agriculture people are concerned about it, too. Everybody is concerned about the fact that if—well, let me back up, and for the benefit of everybody else, let me say this: Most of the trade restrictions that Mexico has and most of the restrictions we have on them are in the form of tariffs. Our tariffs don't amount to much; they're 4 percent. Mexican tariffs run between 10 to 20, by and large. They amount to much more. So we get a huge break on the tariff thing.

In the case of apparels and one or two other things, including some agricultural products, there are nontariff restrictions, like the multifiber agreement, that will give Mexico some greater access to the American market in apparels. The real problem there would be—but it's done over a 10-year period, as you know, it's phased in gradually over a 10-year period. The real legitimate problem would be, is if Mexico becomes a transshipment point for either beef, for jackets, for anything. And I want to be candid here: One of our big challenges is going to be to make sure that we have enough customs officials to stop the abuses that might happen in transshipment in agricultural and in the manufacturing sectors of our economy that are protected by things other than tariffs. We are working right now on setting up a special customs department section to do nothing but that. And I think we'll be able to satisfy the American people about it.

Let me make one other comment about that. There is a big incentive for Mexico not to let its country become a transshipment point, which is that under this agreement anybody who wants to can withdraw from it with 6 months notice. There's another big incentive in this agreement that almost no one has talked about. The term of art is called "surge." But basically what it means is, under this agreement, if there is an unanticipated adverse impact, bad impact on some sector of our economy or the Mexican economy, either side can raise that and say, "Listen, we talked this through, nobody anticipated this happening; this is terrible." And that portion of the economy can, in effect, be shielded for a period of 3 years while we work that out.

So there are some good protections built in here from both our side and from their side against adverse reactions. Again, fairly unique things, but we owe you a good customs section, and we're doing our best to set it up.

Q. Mr. President, I'll try not to make this sound like a speech, but we've been weaving fabrics in central Pennsylvania since 1896. We have fifth-generation employees. I have been courted by the State of Mississippi to move there for years, but we're not going to; we're staying in Pennsylvania. My people have suffered job loss because of flawed policy for many, many years. They understand that NAFTA is the first trade policy that opens markets for us. They understand the security that that brings. And I've committed to them to bring back some of those jobs we've lost when Congress approves NAFTA on the 17th or whenever they make up their minds to do so. So thank you.

The President. Good for you. Thank you.

Let me just say, I want to emphasize this. The evidence is, the evidence is clear: We have seen a productivity increase in the American manufacturing sector at 4 and 5 percent a year for more than a decade now. You'd have to look real hard to see any example like that of economic improvement of performance.

Now, why didn't it manifest itself in economic growth? Because one way we got more productive was we used more machines and fewer people, we used more technology, and it takes time for those kinds of changes to manifest themselves in economic opportunity. But you just heard him make the point: The only way you can be both productive and expand your employment base is if you got more people to buy your stuff, which means you either have to raise the incomes of the jobs of the people in your own country. And even when you do that, if you're a wealthy country, it's not enough, you have to have global markets.

I really appreciate what you said, sir.

I can take one more, I think.

Q. Mr. President, will NAFTA allow for labor organizations to—[*inaudible*]—its support, or help labor organizations move into Mexico and bring the standard of the Mexican labor up?

The President. Well, let me tell you, let me answer the question this way: NAFTA requires Mexico and the United States and Canada to follow their own labor laws. Mexico has a very good labor code on the book. But President Salinas would be the first one to tell you, it has been widely ignored. The Salinas government has also promised, in addition—but let me just explain what this means. It means that if there is evidence that they are violating their own labor laws, that that can be the subject of a trade complaint and can be worked through the trade system just like putting up a trade barrier.

There is no precedent; no trade agreement has ever done this before. I know a lot of my friends in labor say, ''Well, it ought to be stronger. It ought to have this, that, and that other thing.'' There has never been a country ever willing to subject its labor code to trade sanctions before, never happened. So I think it's a pretty good first step.

The other thing they've agreed to do is to raise their minimum wage on at least an annual basis as their economy grows. And their wage structure works just like ours: When you raise the minimum wage, it bumps up through the whole system. And their wages have been growing rather rapidly.

Right now all the basic analyses show—and this is ultimately the best hope that I think will happen in the apparel industry over the next 10 years—is that our productivity edge is slightly greater than their wage edge. And if we can keep growing at a normal rate in terms of productivity—that is, our productivity is roughly a little over 5 times greater than theirs and our wage levels on average are about 5 times higher than theirs. But if our productivity continues to grow, their wages are rising much more rapidly than ours, as they would because they're on such a low base. I think over the next 10 years what their objective is, is to grow into a full partner, like Canada, where the cost of living is about the same, the trade is more or less in balance, but the volume is huge. I mean, that's really what our objective ought to be. Canada has the biggest two-way trade relationship with the United States of any country in the world. And it benefits both countries because both of us have about the same cost of living.

And what we've tried to do is to get this thing worked out right, including putting the labor code in there, so that Mexico can't do what so many Latin American countries have done before to kill their economic programs and their political programs. They've given up on democracy, and they haven't had the courage to develop a middle class. This government is committed, I believe, down there to developing a middle class, and they've certainly done more than any other government in history to do it. And they can't do it without observing their labor code.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—to support strikes and labor actions?

The President. Yes. That's what the labor code requires. Their labor code permits that. And they'll have to honor that now or just be constantly caught up in all these trade actions. And again I say, I know our friends and my friends in the labor movement wanted Mexico to agree to put the average manufacturing wage into the trade agreement. But you have to understand, they have allowed us to have a trade agreement that gets into their internal politics more than any country in history on the environmental policy and on labor policy. Also, I will say again, we can compete with these folks. We can do it. And I need your help to convince the Congress. Thank you.

Before I go, let me ask you one more time: Please personally contact the Members of Congress about this, whether Republican or Democrat. This is not a partisan issue, this is an American issue. I had a little trouble when I got here, but I'm determined by the time I leave that we will see economic policy as a part of our national security and we will have a bipartisan economic policy, the way we had to have a bipartisan foreign policy in the cold war. We have got to do it, and expanding trade has got to be a part of it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:55 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to David Boyles, senior vice president of operations and systems, American Express Travelers Check Group, Salt Lake City, UT; and Kathleen Kaminiski, co-owner, Triseal Corp., Chicago, IL.

Message to the Congress Reporting on Panamanian Government Assets

November 9, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report on April 21, 1993, concerning the continued blocking of Panamanian government assets. This report is submitted pursuant to section 207(d) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1706(d).

On April 5, 1990, President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12710, terminating the national emergency declared on April 8, 1988, with respect to Panama. While this order terminated the sanctions imposed pursuant to that declaration, the blocking of Panamanian government assets in the United States was continued in order to permit completion of the orderly unblocking and transfer of funds that the President directed on December 20, 1989, and to foster the resolution of claims of U.S. creditors involving Panama, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1706(a). The termination of the national emergency did not affect the continuation of compliance audits and enforcement actions with respect to activities taking place during the sanctions period, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(a).

Since the last report, $400,000 has been unblocked by specific license. Of the approximately $5.9 million remaining blocked at this time, some $5.3 million is held in escrow by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York at the request of the Government of Panama. Additionally, approximately $600,000 is held in commercial bank accounts for which the Government of Panama has not requested unblocking. A small residual in blocked reserve accounts established under section 565.509 of the Panamanian Transactions Regulations, 31 CFR 565.509, remains on the books of U.S. firms pending the final reconciliation of accounting records involving claims and counterclaims between the firms and the Government of Panama.

I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on the exercise of authorities to prohibit transactions involving property in which the Government of Panama has an interest, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1706(d).

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 9, 1993.

Nomination for a Member of the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation

November 9, 1993

The President announced today that he intends to nominate Peter S. Knight, a former top aide to Vice President Gore, to serve on the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation.

"Peter Knight, through his many years of work for the Vice President and his private sector accomplishments, has established himself as an expert on communications matters with a solid grasp of business management," said the President. "I think he will be an outstanding addition to COMSAT's board."

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

Remarks in a Telephone Conversation With the Vice President on the NAFTA Debate

November 10, 1993

The President. Hey, how are you?

The Vice President. I'm doing great, thank you.

The President. Well, you were great last night.

The Vice President. Well, I appreciate that.

The President. It was really wonderful. I was so proud not only of what you said but of how you said it, kind of appealing to people's hopes instead of their fears. It was terrific, and of course all the results today

show that you really can make these arguments to the American people and tell the truth and prevail. I'm just elated.

The Vice President. Well thank you, Mr. President. We've got a few days left now as you well know, and your voice is being heard by hundreds of people here at Storage Technology who have been working in behalf of NAFTA because they're trying to sell products into Mexico, and they have a 20 percent tariff they have to overcome now, which would go down to zero if NAFTA passes. It's already zero coming in the opposite direction, and if NAFTA doesn't pass, these folks have to worry about a Japanese company coming in to locate in Mexico to serve that growing market and then use it as an export platform to compete right here in the United States. They want to base these jobs here in the United States instead. So you're talking to the right audience here, Mr. President. We're trying to get the message out all over the country. So thank you so much for your call.

The President. Well I want to say to all the people who are there, first, thank you for receiving the Vice President and Tim Wirth today, and thank you for your support of this. I urge you to do what you can in the next few days to communicate your feelings to as many Members of Congress as you can reach, because there is a lot of justifiable fear and anxiety and insecurity in this country about the changing economy. And we have to show the Members of Congress that Americans can compete and win in this global economy if we're given half a chance and that this agreement is the beginning of our reach for the rest of the world in a way that will create jobs.

There is no evidence that the United States or any other rich country can create a lot of new jobs without expanding trade. NAFTA is a big first step for us, and you know that very well. And if you know it and you believe it, I ask you not only to cheer for the Vice President today—he deserves it, he was terrific last night—but help us to win this fight next week. Tell the Members of Congress that this means American jobs and a better and brighter future for our country. We need your help. We need your help. We've got to have hope win out over fear next week in this NAFTA vote. We can do it with people like you. I thank you, and I thank you, Vice President Gore.

The Vice President. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. See you when you get home.

The Vice President. See you back in the office tomorrow.

The President. Bye-bye. Thanks

[*At this point, the telephone conversation ended, and the President answered a reporter's question.*]

Ross Perot

Q. Mr. President, what was Perot's big mistake?

The President. Well, I just think that the Vice President appealed to the hopes of the American people and also talked about the facts and also cited specific examples. He called the names of people who worked in factories, who were in small businesses, who would specifically benefit from this expansion of trade. And he also appealed to the Members of the Congress to do what was right for the country and to make this straightforward argument to the people.

Mr. Perot basically said anybody that didn't agree with him, no matter how deep their conscience was, they were going to try to get rid of them out of the Congress. One appealed to hope and reasoning, the other appealed to fear and threat. And I think you can see what the results were in the public opinion polls. The American people said, "This makes sense to us." And I think the more people who hear it, the more sense it will make.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:08 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Tim Wirth, Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs. The exchange portion of this item could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks Honoring the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project

November 10, 1993

The President. I want to welcome Diane Evans and all the members of the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project who are here to do an unveiling of a model of the statue which will be formally commemorated tomorrow on Veteran's Day. I have a few other remarks I want to make in a moment, but let me just say that the people who have worked on this project deserve the thanks of the Nation. They have worked for years and years, and today and tomorrow are very big days for them.

I wanted to give them the opportunity to be seen today by the United States in bringing this model to the White House, where it will be on permanent display. And I want to introduce Diane now to say whatever she'd like to say and then do the unveiling.

[*At this point, Ms. Evans thanked the President and presented a replica of the monument to him. Following the presentation, sculptor Glenna Goodacre explained how the monument was designed to honor the women who served in the Vietnam war.*]

The President. This is wonderful.

Secretary Babbitt, Mr. Brown, do you want to say anything?

Secretary Babbitt. It's a great pleasure to be here. It's really incredible. I sense that this brings this Mall together in its meaning and in its remembrance and its healing effect. I guess I'm just really pleased, Mr. President, to be the landlord.

The President. And you're about to witness the transfer.

Secretary Brown. Mr. President, I'd just like to make one observation. It appears to me that this memorial here is a living memorial. It speaks to all people who pass by, that freedom is not free, that there is a cost for war when you place people in armed conflict. And that I think in that respect, it will serve our Nation very, very well as a symbol of peace and the extent with which we will go to make sure that peace comes about in our world.

The President. These documents, first of all, are witnesses that I am going to sign attesting the conveyance of the memorial to the Department of the Interior. This is a proclamation which names the National Women's Veterans Recognition Week, that on this year is Veteran's Day, to recognize the special importance of that. So I am going to sign these with all these pens so that all the people here can have——

[*At this point, the President signed the memorandum of understanding and the proclamation, and Ms. Evans presented the President with a commemorative program.*]

The President. Thank you. Thank you all very much.

NAFTA Debate

Q. Mr. President, we know you're happy with the performance of the Vice President. Is there going to be any effect on Capitol Hill?

The President. I think so. We'll talk more about it in the press conference in a few minutes.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:17 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Diane Evans, chair, Vietnam Woman's Memorial Project, and Jesse Brown, Secretary of Veterans Affairs. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Proclamation 6622—National Women Veterans Recognition Week, 1993

November 10, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

American women have served with distinction and courage in every overseas combat theater of conflict since World War I. Some have been wounded in the line of duty, and others have given their lives for our country, but all have contributed tremendously to the

success of America's Armed Forces. Bringing their talent, skill, and vision to a variety of occupations within each of the service branches, women have made an everlasting mark on the military history of the United States.

The loyalty and the sacrifices of the women who have served our country merit the respect and admiration of all of us. It is fitting then that we set aside a special time to honor these veterans, to salute them for their tireless devotion to duty while in uniform and for their patriotism and commitment to democratic ideals in civilian life.

The Vietnam Women's Memorial is a monument dedicated to the many women who volunteered to serve in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era. Appropriately, it recognizes the living as well as those who died. It is part of the important ongoing process of healing, both for veterans and for our country as a whole. It is a remembrance of the brave and compassionate service that is so worthy of our esteem.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim the week of November 7, 1993, as National Women Veterans Recognition Week, and I encourage all Americans to join in acknowledging the contributions and sacrifices of these veterans.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this tenth day of November, 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, 10:38 a.m., November 12, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on November 15.

The President's News Conference

November 10, 1993

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. As we approach the end of this congressional session, just before Thanksgiving, it's important that our people know that here in Washington we are finally tackling issues that are central to the lives of all Americans, replacing gridlock and inaction with progress in the pursuit of the common good.

In the last few months, we passed the largest deficit reduction package in history. Interest rates and inflation have remained at historic lows. Millions of Americans have been able to refinance their homes. Investment is up, and more new jobs have come into our economy in the last 10 months than in the previous 4 years. There's been a real effort to improve security for America's working families with the dramatic expansion in the earned-income tax credit, to help working Americans with children who live on modest incomes to do better through tax reductions. We've opened more of our products in high-tech areas to exports. We've passed the family leave law. We've expanded opportunities for people to invest in new businesses in this country. And we've presented a comprehensive plan that will put real health care security within reach of every American. We're working on reinventing our Government to do more with less, and I am proud to say that the Congress is clearly signaling today its determination to move on reforming campaign finance laws. A bill passed the Senate several months ago. Today the House committee is voting out a bill which I believe the House of Representatives will pass.

This is a record of real achievement. But in the next few weeks before we go home, Congress will be challenged to take even greater strides in protecting the personal security of Americans and in creating more opportunities for us to compete and win in the global environment.

The Senate is completing work now on our crime bill, legislation that will fulfill the campaign promise I made to put 100,000 additional police officers on the street, to keep

felons behind bars, to take criminals off the street, to provide boot camps and alternative service for first-time youthful offenders, and to remove guns from the hands of people who should not have them. We have a real shot now to pass the Brady bill. After years, 12 years, of heroic activism by Jim and Sarah Brady, Congress is finally determined, I believe, to stand up to the interests against the Brady bill and to take action on crime, which is the number one personal security issue for most Americans.

A week from today, Congress will decide whether to expand exports and jobs by passing the North American Free Trade Agreement. The case for NAFTA could not have been made more forcefully or eloquently than it was by Vice President Gore last night in his debate with Mr. Perot. Last night the Vice President showed that just stating the facts about NAFTA and showing our concern for the interests of working Americans can overcome the fears, the distortions that have been leveled against this agreement. NAFTA means exports; exports means jobs. No wealthy country in the world is growing more jobs without expanding exports.

When the American people hear that case, they showed last night they are willing to listen and willing to join not only millions of other Americans like those the Vice President called by name last night but every living former President, former Secretary of State, Nobel Prize-winning economists, and over 80 percent of the sitting Governors.

The contrast we saw last night was clear. Mr. Perot warned Members of the House of Representatives that they would face awful retaliation if they voted their conscience on NAFTA. The Vice President urged the Members of the House to vote for hope against fear; to vote for the proposition that Americans can compete and win in the global economy; to vote their conscience and tell the constituents back home why they were voting as they were. And if the preliminary results on the debate last night are any indication, the Members of the House of Representatives can trust the American people with the facts and with their own convictions.

This vote comes at a defining moment for our Nation. We have been through a very tough period. For 20 years—20 years—60 percent of the American people have been working harder for the same or less wages. We have had great difficulty in increasing the productivity that is absolutely essential to creating jobs and raising incomes. But we have now done it. This country is now the most productive country in the world across a broad spectrum of manufacturing and service activities in this economy. We can win. And we have to decide, beginning next week, whether we're going to reach out to compete and win or try to withdraw.

I will say again one point I want to make about NAFTA, before I open the floor to questions, that was not emphasized last night simply because it didn't come up as much. This agreement means more jobs, but the real job growth for America will come when two other steps are taken. It will come when all the other Latin democracies and free market economies also join in a great trade group with Mexico, Canada, and the United States. And it will come because once this happens, we will have enormously increased influence in the world community to argue that we ought to adopt a worldwide trade agreement before the end of the year, to get that new GATT agreement. That will influence Asia, it will influence Europe, if the House votes for NAFTA. The stakes for this country, therefore, are quite high. I believe the House will do the right thing.

I want to say, too, that I am grateful that today Congressman Hoagland, Congressman Kreidler, Congressman Dicks, Congressman Valentine, and Senator Nunn announced their support for NAFTA. I think that we will see more coming in the days ahead, and I think by the time we get to vote counting, we'll have enough to win.

Thank you.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]?

Foreign Policy Team

Q. Mr. President, U.S. foreign policy endeavors have been less than successful in Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia. And on Sunday on "Meet the Press" you seemed to be lukewarm about your foreign policy team. Is Secretary Wharton being made your sacrificial lamb? And are you planning a shakeup of

your foreign policy team? I mean, is that the signal?

The President. No to both questions. First of all, I did not mean to be lukewarm. I have always followed a policy as long as I've been a chief executive of not discussing a lot of personnel issues. But I will say again what I said on Sunday. This team has worked hard on a lot of difficult issues. I think they deserve high marks for dealing with the central, large, strategic issues of this time, dealing with the former Soviet Union, working on bringing down the nuclear threat, working on stemming nuclear proliferation, working on peace in the Middle East, working on putting economics at the forefront of our foreign policy.

Secondly, Mr. Wharton is not being made a scapegoat in any way, shape, or form. What he worked on at the State Department, in my judgment, he did a good job on. He worked on reorganization; he worked on the aid programs; he worked on a number of issues that have nothing to do with the controversies which were thorny when I got here and are still thorny today in Somalia, Haiti, and Bosnia. It would be a great mistake for anyone to misinterpret what happened. I think you have to take his remarks on their own terms. But believe me, his departure has nothing to do with scapegoating. I have the highest regard for him. And I am grateful for the service he rendered.

Israel

Q. Mr. President, there's a growing expectation that Israel and Jordan are going to sign a peace treaty when Prime Minister Rabin visits the White House on Friday. Could you tell us what's the likelihood of that? And also on Mr. Rabin, Israeli radio says that he's written you a letter asking you to cut the prison sentence of convicted spy Jonathan Pollard to 10 years. Are you going to do that?

The President. First of all, I am delighted by the reports of progress in the relationships between Israel and Jordan. And as you know, we are talking with both of them. And we've been involved with that. But I don't think anything will happen Friday on that. I would be pleased if it did. But the truth is, we have no reason to believe that anything will be happening Friday.

On the Pollard case, it is true that the Prime Minister has written me about Jonathan Pollard. I have asked the Justice Department to review his case, as I do in every request for executive clemency. I have not received a report from them yet. And I will not make a decision on the Pollard case until I get some sort of indication from them.

Yes, Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN]?

Ross Perot

Q. Mr. President, there are some who suggest that you deliberately wanted to have the Vice President debate Mr. Perot in order to elevate Mr. Perot as a potential threat to Republicans down the road more than Democrats. Did you have those kinds of interests in mind?

The President. I wish I were that Machiavellian. It never occurred to me. I wanted the Vice President to debate Mr. Perot because I believed—and I know that the conventional wisdom around here was that it was a mistake—but first, I want to give credit where credit's due. The Vice President, not the President, the Vice President had the idea that maybe this was the time to have a debate and to do it on Larry King.

My immediate response, however, was very positive, because I believe the American people—first of all, we know they're hungry for debate. They know we have to change, and they're deeply skeptical of people in politics. So the more direct access people have to this issue, one that affects their lives, the more feeling they get for the facts and the arguments as well as for the conviction of the parties involved, I just think it's better. So there was no ulterior motive in that whatever.

Q. Mr. President, the polls indicate that Vice President Gore did do well in the debate last night and that Mr. Perot did not do so well. You clearly believe he was wounded on the issue of NAFTA. Do you think that carries over into his role in politics in general? Does it hurt his standing as a political force in this country in the future?

The President. Well, I don't have any idea. I don't know about that. I will say this: I think there are a lot of people out there who are alienated from the political system for good reasons. One of the greatest frustra-

tions I have as President is that it is often difficult for me to cut through the din of daily events here to keep speaking to those people and to try to keep them involved.

I think that they will feel more supportive of not only this administration but of the American political system, if we can produce sustained economic growth, greater security for people who work hard and play by the rules; if we can produce a genuine effort to fight crime and to deal with the problems of the breakdown of the society and family in many of the troubled areas of our country; and if we can produce political reform, if we can produce campaign finance reform and lobby reform, and if the Congress sometime in the next few weeks passes a law that says they'll live under the laws that they pass and impose on the private sector.

These are the things that you keep hearing from people who voted in the last election for Mr. Perot. I think what we should focus on, those of us who are here, is addressing the concerns, the hopes, and the fears of those people. And the rest of it will take care of itself. We'll just have to see what happens.

NAFTA

Q. Mr. President, the White House has complained and Mr. Gore has scored some points about Mr. Perot's exaggerations and exaggerations of the anti-NAFTA forces. But last night the Vice President said that 22 out of 23 studies have shown job increases. He cited a figure of 400,000. The Joint Economic Committee, a bipartisan committee of Congress, said that's not true. Doesn't it hurt your arguments for NAFTA when——

The President. What did they say was not true?

Q. Well, they said that the studies were being double counted and that he did not cite the job losses so he wasn't giving a net figure and that actually in the overall size of the economy, that those really are not that significant, or can't be properly counted.

The President. Let me just respond to that on the specific allegations—I have always tried to couch NAFTA as a job winner, a net job winner. That is, I think that the evidence is clear that not just in the long run but in the near run, we'll have more job gains than job losses out of this. There will plainly be some job losses. But the point I have tried to make always is, we have a lot of job losses every year in America we can't prevent. So when we have an opportunity to create more jobs, we are almost morally bound to do it, when we can have a net job gain.

I don't think the Vice President willfully misstated that, because we've had this conversation a long time—many times. But a lot of the extreme claims on both sides ignore the fact that Mexico itself, on its own terms, only comprises 4 to 5 percent of the size of the American economy. The size of the Mexican economy today is about the size of California's economy from the Los Angeles County line, the north line, down to the Mexican border. And therefore, the ability of the Mexicans in the near term to hurt the American economy, or to totally inflate it, is somewhat limited.

As you know, we said that we thought we would gain 200,000 jobs over the next 2 years. Well, last month our economy produced 177,000 jobs. Let me reiterate what I said in my opening remarks. The thing that's important about this is that it makes a statement that we're reaching out to expand trade. It really will; 200,000 jobs is nothing to sneeze at. And almost all of our people believe that the net will be well above 150,000. That is, that's nothing to sneeze at in 2 years, especially since they will be higher paying jobs.

But the important thing is that by showing we can have this relationship with Mexico, we will rapidly be able to move to conclude similar agreements with other market-oriented democracies, with Chile, with Argentina, with a whole range of other countries in Latin America. And this then will give us the psychological leverage—just as for the anti-NAFTA people this has become the repository of all their resentments, for us that are for it it's become the symbol of where we want to go in the world. This will give me enormous leverage when I get on the airplane the day after the NAFTA vote and go out to meet with the General Secretary of the People's Republic of China, when I go out to meet with the Prime Minister of Japan and all the other leaders of Asia, when I try

to convince the Europeans that it's time for a worldwide trade agreement.

And nearly everyone who has analyzed what we agreed to about the time of the G–7 on the GATT round, the new trade agreement, concludes that it will add hundreds of thousands of jobs, significant jobs near-term, to the American economy. So I say that, on balance, this is a huge deal for America, but both sides need to be very careful not to make extreme claims. This is a job winner for our country, more jobs with Latin America, even more jobs when we have a new world trade agreement. It all begins with NAFTA.

Labor Movement Opposition

Q. Mr. President, do you have any regrets about your comments about labor during the Sunday television interview, your comment about the naked pressure that they've exerted on Members of Congress on NAFTA? And what are you going to do to kiss and make up with them?

The President. I sent a little note to Mr. Kirkland the other day and said I hoped my comments Sunday morning didn't ruin his Sunday afternoon. And I told him basically what I said before. I have enormous respect for many of the people who are fighting us on this. I just think they're wrong. But specifically, I don't think a Congressman who has been a friend of the labor movement for 20 years should be told that he or she will get an opponent in the next election or never get any more help on this one vote. I just disagree with that.

If you go back and look at the interview, I was trying to make the point that I thought in the Congress the labor movement was a bigger force in keeping this from passing than the Perot folks were. I didn't mean to hurt their feelings, but I can't retract what I said because I don't think it's right for people to be told, "If you vote your conscience on this vote we're through with you forever, no matter what you've done with us before." I think that's bad and it's not conducive to good government.

NAFTA

Q. We seem to be heading for one of those cliffhangers next week in the House, kind of high political drama that Washington enjoys. I can't imagine, though, sir, that perhaps you enjoy it quite as much. And I wonder as you look back on this if you feel that this issue could perhaps have been managed differently, perhaps an earlier start that would have enabled you to make what you seem to feel is a very strong case a bit more easily?

The President. I think the only way we could have started earlier is if we'd been able to conclude the side agreements sooner; because keep in mind, first of all, I ran for this job with a commitment to support NAFTA if I could get the right side agreements. This thing was dead in the water in January when I became President. It was gone. There was no support among the Democrats in the House. There were Republicans who thought they weren't going to be able to vote for it. Yes, the opposition then got geared up and made a lot of charges against it. But the only thing we had to hold out was the promise that we could conclude side agreements that would improve the environmental issues and that would deal with the labor issues and that would give us some leverage for people to move forward. If we had been able to conclude those agreements more quickly, then we could have started the campaign more quickly.

Q. You don't think these side agreements added credence to the idea that it was a flawed agreement and perhaps hurt politically?

The President. No, I don't think so. But I don't know. Anybody can always second-guess. But what I always tried to say about NAFTA was that the concept was sound and that we needed an agreement with Mexico. One of the things we haven't talked about very much is it means a lot to the United States to have a neighbor with 90 million people that is moving toward democracy, that is moving toward an open economy, and that is moving toward greater friendship with us. I mean, this is a big deal. If you want cooperation in the immigration problem, the drug problem, this means a lot to us.

I always felt that we would get there, but in dealing with at least the people in our party, we had to be able to have something to show that would indicate we were making progress in these areas. So that's all I can

say. We may be able to be second-guessed, but the thing simply wasn't ready, and I didn't have anything to argue with.

Q. Mr. President, a moment ago you stated that your leverage would be increased in Seattle if you get a NAFTA victory. Could you come at it from the other side? If you have a NAFTA defeat on Wednesday, would that in any way diminish your prestige in Seattle or your ability to conduct foreign policy?

The President. I don't think it would diminish my ability to conduct foreign policy except in the economic area. I think it would limit my ability to argue that the Asians should open their markets more. And after all, our trade problem, in terms of open markets—if you look at it, where is our trade deficit: $49 billion with Japan, $19 billion with China, $9 billion with Taiwan. We have a $5.4 billion trade surplus with Mexico. So I think my ability to argue that case forcefully that ''You ought to open your markets; look at what we're doing,'' will be undermined. And I think, more importantly, my ability to argue that the Asians and the Europeans should join with me and push hard, hard to get a world trade agreement through the GATT round by the end of the year will be more limited. There's no question about it.

Look, the anxieties that we have here, the same thing is going on in Japan, where they're not generating jobs and they've got staggering income. Same thing in Europe; it's been years since the European economy as a whole has generated new jobs. So in each of these great power centers of the world there are these debates every day just like the one that went on last night between the Vice President and Mr. Perot. They're debating it: Are they going to be more open or more closed? Which way are they going to go? And so I think that my ability to tip the scales in that debate in the right direction for history and for the American people will be limited significantly in the short run if we lose NAFTA. It will not be good for the United States.

Crime

Q. Mr. President, beyond signing a crime bill, if and when one hits your desk, what else can you do? What else will you do about crime and violence?

The President. Well, I think that there's a lot more we have to do. I think the administration has got to examine everything we can do to try to put together an approach that will challenge every community in this country and every organization in this country and every individual in this country to make a contribution with us in restoring the conditions in which civilized life can go on.

I think that the crime bill is very important. I don't want to minimize that. I know some disagree that it is. It really will make a difference if you put another 100,000 police out there. We're losing the ratio of police to crime. We have been for 30 years. This is an important issue. It matters whether we get these police out there, if they're properly trained and properly deployed in community policing.

But we have to rebuild families and communities in this country. We've got to take more responsibility for these little kids before they grow up and start shooting each other. We have to find ways to offer hope and to reconnect people. When children start shooting children the way they're doing now, and little kids go around planning their own funerals, what that means is that there are a whole lot of people, millions of people in this country, who literally are not even playing by the same set of rules that all the rest of us take for granted. And we have learned in this country to accept many things that are unacceptable. And I think the President has a pulpit, Teddy Roosevelt's bully pulpit, that I have to use and work hard on and try to live by, to try to help rebuild the conditions of family and community and education and opportunity.

And I'll just say one last thing about that. What a lot of these folks that are in such desperate trouble need is a unique combination of both structure and order and discipline on the one hand and genuine caring on the other. It is impossible to structure life in a society like ours where there is no family or at least no supervising, caring adult on the one hand, and on the other hand where there is no work. If you go generation after generation after generation and people don't get to work—you think about your lives, think about what you're going to do today, what you did this morning when you got up, what

you'll do tonight when you go home. If you think about the extent to which work organizes life in America and reinforces our values, our rules, and the way we relate to one another and the way we raise our children, and then you imagine what it must be like where there is no work—I know the budget is tight. I know there are all kinds of tough problems. I know that people with private capital, even with our empowerment zones, may not want to invest in inner cities and decimated rural areas, but I'm telling you, we have to deal with family, community, education, and you have to have work; there has to be work there.

Q. Mr. President, on the issue of crime, could you explain a little bit more about how the White House, how your administration is going to accomplish some of those things?

The President. Yes. First of all, the Attorney General and Secretary Cisneros and a number of other people are now working in our administration on how we can develop a comprehensive approach to the whole issue of violence in our society and how we can merge that with what we want to do in terms of community empowerment and how it will fit with all the things that we are now doing. And I think what you will see from us over the next several months is a sustained, organized, disciplined approach so that we don't just respond to the horror we all feel when a little kid gets shot after being picked up off the street, like happened here last weekend, or when these children plan their funerals. I want to put this right at the center of what we're doing.

I have spent years going to neighborhoods and talking to people and dealing with issues that most politicians in National Government have not talked a lot about. I care a great deal about this. There is a lot of knowledge in this town about it. Senator Moynihan wrote a very powerful article just a couple of weeks ago on how we have defined deviancy down. I think there's an enormous bipartisan willingness to face this. What I think I have to do is to mobilize every person in my Government to do what can be done to address these problems. And you will see that coming out after the Congress goes home and in my address to the people next year when the Congress begins.

Q. Mr. President, you mentioned Senator Moynihan. He's proposed a Federal tax on bullets that would make certain kind of bullets, particularly cop-killer bullets, prohibitively expensive. Do you support the general idea of an ammunition tax? And would you like to see it to be part of the financing for your health care package, as Senator Moynihan has proposed?

The President. Well, Senator Moynihan has been very candid in saying that what he really wants to do is to try to use this to deal with the problem of gun violence in America. I think the health care plan that I put forward will finance itself in the way that we have, and I think we should proceed with that. I think that this idea of his, however, deserves a lot of consideration.

But one of the things that I question in my own mind is if some of these bullets are being manufactured solely for the purpose of having a devastating effect on someone's body if they hit someone's body, whether we ought not just to get rid of those bullets. Because if you look at the money that can be raised as a practical matter, in the context of this Federal budget or the health care budget, it's limited. I agree with the Treasury Secretary. Secretary Bentsen stated our position. We think the Senator has given us an interesting idea. We're looking at it. We're seeing what the objectives are. But some of that ammunition, it would seem to me, there might be a consensus that we ought not to make it at all in this country.

New Jersey Election

Q. Mr. President, it turns out that your friend Jim Florio in New Jersey may have lost the election by a narrow margin because of an approach dreamed up by the Republican strategists which depressed the black voter turnout. What do you think about that tactic?

The President. First, I think we should all acknowledge that people have died in this country, given their lives to give other Americans, especially African-Americans, the right to vote. And this allegation, if it is true—and I say if it is true—I don't know what the facts are, but if it is true, then it was terribly wrong for anyone to give money to anybody else not to vote or to depress voter

turnout. And it was terribly wrong for anyone to accept that money to render that nonservice to this country.

NAFTA

Q. Can you give us a count right now of how many votes you have in the House on NAFTA?

The President. No, because it's changing every day. But we're getting a lot closer. I honestly believe we're going to win it now, and that's not just political puff. I think we'll make it. I'll be surprised if we don't win now.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—what is going to happen to Latin America if NAFTA is not passed. What would be the impact in the United States, not in you but in the people of the United States if NAFTA is not approved?

The President. Well, if it's not passed, we'll lose a lot of opportunities to sell our products. We will not do one single thing to discourage people from moving to Mexico to set up plants to get low wages to sell back in here. We will depress the environmental and labor costs more than they otherwise would be depressed in Mexico, which will make it harder for us to compete. It'll be bad for America if we do it.

Haiti and Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, so far you haven't talked about Haiti and Bosnia. The situation in those two countries seems to have gotten worse in the year since you've been elected. Right now, what can you tell us you're doing to reverse the situation in the short term, or do you fear that this is going to go on all winter long in Bosnia as well as in Haiti?

The President. Well, the problem or the conditions in Bosnia at least seem to be that none of the parties now, including the government, at least at the moment we speak, based on what I knew this morning, are of a mind to make peace on any terms that the others will accept, because there are different military results being achieved on the ground there in different places in ways that make all the parties feel that they shouldn't agree now. Under those conditions, all we can do is to try to make sure that we minimize the human loss coming on for this winter, that we try to get the United Nations to agree to let the NATO position that the United States put together on the availability of air power in the event that Sarajevo is seriously shelled be an actual live option and not just something on the books, and that we make sure our humanitarian program works.

I will say this—I want to emphasize this—the airlift to Bosnia, which this Nation has spearheaded, has now gone on longer than the Berlin airlift. And it's one of the most comprehensive humanitarian aid efforts in history. And we'll have to keep doing it.

In Haiti, I'd like to say a word or two about that. First of all, it's important that the people of Haiti understand that the people who brought this embargo on were Mr. François and General Cédras, because they didn't go through with the Governors Island Agreement.

Now, I believe that Mr. Malval and President Aristide are willing to talk in good faith and try to reach an accommodation that would enable us to get back on the path to democracy and to implementing that agreement. I grieve for the people of Haiti. We feed almost 700,000 people a day in Haiti. We participate actively, the United States does. I don't want anybody else to be hurt down there. But I think it's very important that the people of Haiti understand that the people that brought this embargo on them were François and Cédras in breaking the agreement that was agreed to by all parties there. And we have to try to reach another agreement so that the country can go back to normal.

NAFTA

Q. The financial community has been worried about Mexico's policy of gradually devaluing the peso and saying that this would underscore the low-wage environment there. What would you foresee under a NAFTA pact that was approved as far as the relationship between the dollar and the peso? And would we end up finding the Federal Reserve having to support the peso because of our tighter economic relationship?

The President. Actually, I would think that—I want to be careful how I say this because I don't want anything I say now to have an impact in the Mexican financial markets today, but I believe that you have to just say that the peso would become stronger if NAFTA passes because it would strengthen

the Mexican economy. And normally, when you've got a strong economy that's growing, the value of the currency will rise.

Khanh Pham

Let me say, I know we've got—no, no, no, I'm sorry. I want to introduce someone before we go, because I think I would be remiss here at a press conference with all of you not to do this. I'd like to ask Khanh Pham to stand. Would you stand up?

I want to tell you a little bit about this young woman. She's here today with a program that puts role models and young people together. And she said that her role model was Dee Dee Myers; so she wanted to come here and be here. But let me tell you about her. Maybe she should be our role model.

When she was 2½ years old, she was cradled in her 5-year-old brother's arms as her mother made a desperate run for freedom from Vietnam. They forced their way onto an overcrowded small wooden boat after giving away their life savings for those spots. They endured heavy seas, were separated on the boat for a period of time. They watched people die before being picked up by a U.S. naval ship, the U.S.S. *Warden.*

After coming here, because of language barriers, her mother could only get jobs in manual labor. She also baked Vietnamese pastries to sell. She held two or three jobs at a time. Sometimes she didn't have enough money to wash the clothes so the family would have to wash them in their tub, while Khanh and her brother would try to teach their mother English.

A couple of years ago, she missed several months of school while she single handedly worked with all the agencies and authorities here to get her two sisters back from Vietnam into the United States. Finally, they were reunited a year and a half ago, and they now live with Khanh and her mother. She is 17, a senior at Reston High School in Virginia. She holds an office with her student government, and she's a student representative elected to the board of governors, a city office in Reston.

And as I said, she's spending the day here today. She's interested in being in the press today, but one day she hopes to be America's Ambassador to Vietnam.

Thank you for coming here.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

NOTE: The President's 32d news conference began at 3:05 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Col. Joseph Michel François, chief of the Haitian police; Lt. Gen. Raoul Cédras, commander of the Haitian armed forces; and Haitian Prime Minister Robert Malval.

Message to the Congress on the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

November 10, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report on May 14, 1993, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979, and matters relating to Executive Order No. 12613 of October 29, 1987. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c). This report covers events through October 1, 1993. The last report, dated May 14, 1993, covered events through March 31, 1993.

1. There have been no amendments to the Iranian Transactions Regulations, 31 CFR Part 560, or to the Iranian Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR Part 535, since the last report.

2. The Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) of the Department of the Treasury continues to process applications for import licenses under the Iranian Transactions Regulations.

During the reporting period, the U.S. Customs Service has continued to effect numer-

ous seizures of Iranian-origin merchandise, primarily carpets, for violation of the import prohibitions of the Iranian Transactions Regulations. Office of Foreign Assets Control and Customs Service investigations of these violations have resulted in forfeiture actions and the imposition of civil monetary penalties. Additional forfeiture and civil penalty actions are under review.

3. The Iran-United States Claims Tribunal (the "Tribunal"), established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims before it. Since my last report, the Tribunal has rendered two awards, both in favor of U.S. claimants. Including these decisions, the total number of awards has reached 547, of which 369 have been awards in favor of American claimants. Two hundred twenty-two of these were awards on agreed terms, authorizing and approving payment of settlements negotiated by the parties, and 147 were decisions adjudicated on the merits. The Tribunal has issued 36 decisions dismissing claims on the merits and 83 decisions dismissing claims for jurisdictional reasons. Of the 59 remaining awards, 3 approved the withdrawal of cases and 56 were in favor of Iranian claimants. As of September 30, 1993, the value of awards to successful American claimants from the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank stood at $2,351,986,709.40.

The Security Account has fallen below the required balance of $500 million almost 50 times. Iran has periodically replenished the account, as required by the Algiers Accords, by transferring funds from the separate account held by the NV Settlement Bank in which interest on the Security Account is deposited. The aggregate amount that has been transferred from the Interest Account to the Security Account is $874,472,986.47. Iran has also replenished the account with the proceeds from the sale of Iranian-origin oil imported into the United States, pursuant to transactions licensed on a case-by-case basis by FAC. Iran has not, however, replenished the account since the last oil sale deposit on October 8, 1992, although the balance fell below $500 million on November 5, 1992. As of September 28, 1993, the total amount in the Security Account was $213,507,574.15 and the total amount in the Interest Account was $5,647,476.98.

Iran also failed to make scheduled payments for Tribunal expenses on April 13 and July 15, 1993. The United States filed a new case (designated A/28) before the Tribunal on September 29, 1993, asking that the Tribunal order Iran to make its payment for Tribunal expenses and to replenish the Security Account.

4. The Department of State continues to present other United States Government claims against Iran, in coordination with concerned Government agencies, and to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran. In June and August of this year, the United States filed 2 briefs and more than 350 volumes of supporting evidence in Case B/1 (claims 1 and 2), Iran's claim against the United States for damages relating to the U.S. Foreign Military Sales Program. On September 29, the United States submitted a brief for filing in all three Chambers of the Tribunal concerning the Tribunal's jurisdiction over the claims of dual nationals who have demonstrated dominant and effective U.S. nationality. In addition, the Tribunal issued an order accepting the U.S. view that Iran has to support all aspects of its claim in Case A/11, in which Iran claims the United States has breached its obligations under the Algiers Accords, rather than to ask the Tribunal to first decide "interpretative issues" separate from the merits of its case. In another case, the Tribunal declined Iran's request that it stay a case against Iran in U.S. courts for an alleged post-January 1981 expropriation, where the plaintiffs' case at the Tribunal had been dismissed.

5. As reported in November 1992, Jose Maria Ruda, President of the Tribunal, tendered his resignation on October 2, 1992. No successor has yet been named. Judge Ruda's resignation will take effect as soon as a successor becomes available to take up his duties.

6. As anticipated by the May 13, 1990, agreement settling the claims of U.S. nationals for less than $250,000.00, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (FCSC) has continued its review of 3,112 claims. The FCSC has issued decisions in 1,568 claims,

for total awards of more than $28 million. The FCSC expects to complete its adjudication of the remaining claims in early 1994.

7. The situation reviewed above continues to implicate important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12170 continue to play an important role in structuring our relationship with Iran and in enabling the United States to implement properly the Algiers Accords. Similarly, the Iranian Transactions Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12613 continue to advance important objectives in combatting international terrorism. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 10, 1993.

Nomination for United States District Court Judge

November 10, 1993

The President today nominated Judge Daniel Hurley to serve as a U.S. District Court judge for the Southern District of Florida.

"Daniel Hurley has distinguished himself in close to 20 years on the bench as a judge of outstanding capability," said the President. "I expect him to meet that same high standard as a Federal District Court judge."

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

Letter to Attorney General Janet Reno on Child Pornography

November 10, 1993

Dear Madam Attorney General:

A dispute recently has arisen over the scope of the current federal child pornography law. This dispute impelled the Senate to adopt a "sense of the Senate" resolution expressing its view that the law reaches broadly. I fully agree with the Senate about what the proper scope of the child pornography law should be.

I find all forms of child pornography offensive and harmful, as I know you do, and I want the federal government to lead aggressively in the attack against the scourge of child pornography. It represents an unacceptable exploitation of children and contributes to the degradation of our national life and to a societal climate that appears to condone child abuse.

This Administration supports the broadest possible protections against child pornography and exploitation. I understand that the Justice Department recently filed a brief in which the Department concluded that the current child pornography law is not as broad as it could be. Accordingly, the Justice Department should promptly prepare and submit any necessary legislation to ensure that federal law reaches all forms of child pornography, including the kinds of child pornography at issue in the Senate resolution.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 11.

Remarks at a Veterans Day Breakfast

November 11, 1993

Good morning. Please be seated.

Hillary and I and Secretary Aspin, Secretary Brown are delighted to have you here. We wanted to begin this Veterans Day with the leaders of our veterans' organizations, with the officials of the Veterans Administration, with many of our men and women in uniform today, especially those who distin-

guished themselves in the very difficult firefight in Somalia on October 3d. Some of those brave soldiers are here with us today, and I know you've met them, but I'd like to begin by just asking them to stand and be recognized and asking all of us to thank them. [*Applause*] Thank you very much. Our Nation is very proud of them and their comrades for the bravery they showed on that day and for the work they continue to do.

This is an important Veterans Day, this is the 75th anniversary of the end of World War I, a defining war for our Nation, when our forebears decided that we could no longer be a totally isolated or isolationist country.

Later this morning, during ceremonies at Arlington Cemetery, I will present a commemorative medal to Mr. Stanley Coolbaugh, a veteran of the First World War who will accept it on behalf of the 30,000 living veterans of World War I. He was born in another century in a relatively young Nation protected by vast oceans. He was forced as a young man, along with our Nation, to answer a profound question which we still have to ask and answer today: To what extent must America engage with the rest of the world; to what extent can we just stay home and mind our own business? Sometimes that answer is easy, as it was when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor and entered the Second World War and as it became clear at the end of the Second World War when we had to try to contain the expansion of communism and engage in the cold war, an effort which ultimately led to perhaps the greatest peacetime victory in the world, the collapse of the Soviet empire.

Now today we have to ask some of the hard questions again, about how much we should engage and whether we can withdraw. Some of those difficult questions are being answered by our men and women in uniform all around the world. Some of them have to be answered by those of us here in Washington on nonmilitary matters. I want to say a special word of thanks in that regard to the American Legion for endorsing the North American Free Trade Agreement. I said the other day to Admiral Crowe, who is here, that I was amazed that there were so many senior military officers who had spontaneously come up to me and said that they favor this treaty. And he and others observed, "Well, if you've ever been in uniform and been around the world, you know what it means to have the opportunity to live in peace with your two biggest neighbors and to have commerce and friendly cooperation and competition and what it means to live and grow together. So I thank you all for that.

This is a day when the United States has to reaffirm its commitment to our veterans. On Memorial Day we thank those veterans who have given their lives for our country and their families. Today we thank those veterans who have given their service to our country and who are still here among us and for whom we feel not only great affection but a profound sense of obligation.

On Memorial Day, I pledged that our Government would declassify virtually all the documents related to all individuals held as prisoners of war or missing in action, to help answer questions that have haunted too many families for too long. Some of those questions may never be answered, but we have to try. And I can tell you that as of last night, in keeping with my commitment on Memorial Day to finish this job by Veterans Day, we have done that. We have declassified all the relevant documents that we can to answer the questions about the MIA's and the POW's.

Secondly, I had the opportunity yesterday to sign a proclamation to honor our women veterans and National Women Veterans Recognition Week, and to welcome to the office that I hold now, Diane Evans and the board of the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project. They presented me with this wonderful replica of the statue being dedicated today to recognize the sacrifices of all the veterans of the Vietnam War and to further the process of healing and reconciliation. It is a magnificent work of art, gripping in so many ways. And I know that today's ceremony will grab the attention and the emotions and the convictions of the American people.

Third, I am about to sign into law an increase in the cost of living allowance for our disabled veterans. With the leadership of the relevant chairmen in our Congress, Senator Jay Rockefeller and Congressman Sonny Montgomery, this new law will help 2.5 mil-

lion American veterans and their families to keep pace with the rising cost of living.

And finally, as you know, with the leadership of the First Lady and many others, we are doing our best to provide health security to all American people in a way that will improve the access and quality of veterans' health care in America. Of all the plans that have been addressed to deal with the health care problem, ours is the only one that has made a serious effort to address the concerns of our veterans. I'm very proud of that, and I thank all of you who had anything to do with it.

With these actions on this Veterans Day, we continue a contract we can never fulfill to defend our Nation's security, to defend the security in the interest of those who have served our Nation and made it secure. I know that your service can never be repaid in full, but it can always be honored and must never be forgotten. So today, as I sign this law, let me tell you on behalf of a grateful Nation, we honor you, we will not forget you, and we are grateful for the security that you provide for all of us.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Adm. William J. Crowe, Jr., USN (Ret.), Chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

Remarks at a Wreath-Laying Ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia

November 11, 1993

Thank you very much, Secretary Brown, General Brady, distinguished leaders of our veterans' organizations, Secretary Aspin and General Shalikashvili and the leaders of our Department of Defense and our military services, and to all of you, my fellow Americans.

Today we gather to honor those who have rendered the highest service any American can offer to this Nation: Those who have fought for our freedom and stood sentry over our security. On this hillside of solemn remembrance and at gravesides and in veterans' halls and in proud parades all across America, today we join as one people to appreciate a debt we can never fully repay.

Every American who ever put on this Nation's uniform in war or peace has assumed risks and made sacrifices on our common behalf. Each of the 1.6 million men and women now in our forces today bears our common burden. This day belongs to all of them, to all who have protected our land we love over all the decades and now, over two centuries of our existence. From the minutemen who won our independence to the warriors who turned back aggression in Operation Desert Storm, it belongs to those who fell in battle and those who stood ready to do so, to those who were wounded and those who treated their wounds, to those who returned from the service to friends and families and to the far too many who remain missing.

We honor our veterans on this day because it marks the end of the First World War. On the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month there crept an eerie silence across the battlefields of Europe, and 4 years of unbelievable destruction then came to an end. Today on the 75th anniversary of that Great War, it is fitting for us to recall and salute those from every service who contributed to the allied victory, embodied today by the fine figure of Mr. Coolbaugh who stood here and received this medal.

Our victory in that "war to end all wars" was a great test of whether our Nation then could reach out and become involved in the rest of the world. Many of the soldiers who fought in that war, including the men whom we honored here today, were born in another century, a time in which America felt secure on this great and vast continent protected by two oceans.

We entered World War I knowing that we could no longer run from the rest of the world. But in the end, while that war proved our strength, it did not prove our wisdom, for within the span of a short generation after it, we neglected during a careless peace what had been so dearly won in a relentless war. We turned our backs on the rest of the world. We ignored new signs of danger. We let our troops and arms fall out of readiness. We ne-

glected opportunities for collective security in our own national interest. We succumbed to the siren's song of protectionism and erected walls against peaceful commerce with other nations. Soon we had a Great Depression, and soon that depression led to aggression and then to another world war, one that would claim a half million American lives.

Now, once more we stand at the end of a great conflict. The cold war is over. The lesson America won in the Second World War led us to contain communism in the cold war and led to the greatest peacetime victory the world has ever known, the collapse of the communist system and the Soviet empire. Our long and twilight struggle against that expansionist adversary has ended. And even as the world marvels at this achievement, once again history is about to take the measure of our wisdom.

Our generation is being asked now to decide whether we will preserve freedom's gains and learn freedom's lessons. We are being asked to decide whether we will maintain the high state of readiness that stood behind our victory or fritter away the seed corn of our security, asked whether we will swell the global tide of freedom by promoting democracy and open world markets or neglect the duty of our leadership and in the process and, in the withdrawal, diminish hope and prosperity not only for our own people but for billions of others throughout the world who look to us.

One of the greatest honors we can pay to our veterans on this Veterans Day is to act with the sufficient wisdom necessary to preserve the gains they have won through their hard service and great sacrifice. To honor those who served in Europe and Korea and Vietnam and the Persian Gulf, in scores of posts at home and abroad, let us today resolve we will not shrink from the responsibilities necessary to keep our Nation secure and our people prosperous.

We also honor our veterans today by noting the outstanding service being rendered around the world at this moment by the most talented and the best prepared group of men and women who have ever worn our Nation's uniforms. This morning I had the privilege and the honor to host for breakfast not only the leaders of our Nation's veterans' organizations but also 17 of the Army Rangers, Special Operations forces and infantrymen who recently returned from our mission in Somalia. Afterwards, I invited them and their commanders into the Oval Office where we sat and had a visit. I was profoundly impressed by them and by their service.

Not enough of our fellow Americans know the real story of what happened during the terribly difficult firefight in Mogadishu on October 3d, a fight in which they demonstrated great ability, success, and unbelievable valor. During that raid, a Blackhawk helicopter was downed. Despite this setback, the Special Operations forces conducted their raid with precision, apprehending 20 people suspected of involvement in the murder of United Nations peacekeepers in the Somali mission. At that point, they could have pulled back to safety, confident in the success of their mission. After all, what they had come to do was over. But they share an ethic that says they can never leave a fallen comrade behind. So some 90 of them formed a parameter around the downed aircraft in an attempt to retrieve the wounded and the dead. They found they could not dislodge the body of one pilot, but they refused to leave him behind. They braved hours and hours of the fiercest enemy fire. Eighteen of them ultimately perished; over 70 were wounded. They exacted a terrible toll on their adversaries, casualties 10 times as great, fatalities 20 times as great.

I want to note their presence with us here today. I want to thank them, and I want you to let them know that we know they did their mission well and that we are proud of them. Please stand up. Here they are. Please stand up. [*Applause*] We owe it to them and to their colleagues to ensure that our forces remain the best trained, the best equipped, the best prepared in the world. And we will do that. We also owe those who serve in our Nation's military the assurance that what they have done for us will not be forgotten. We owe to our veterans a health care system that is there for them when they need it and provides high quality and compassionate care. We owe to our veterans a measure of

the security they have provided to us. And that is why, earlier today, I was proud to sign a bill which helps to increase the retirement benefits of our disabled veterans.

And as we remember all of those whom we see today and those whom we can imagine who are serving for us or who have served, we must never forget those who were never accounted for. That obligation never dies until we know the whole truth. Just this month, we secured an agreement from the Chinese to return the remains of three American aviators whose cargo plane crashed there in the Himalayas in 1943. Our Nation has a particular responsibility to pursue the fate of our missing from the war in Vietnam. On Memorial Day, I pledged here that our Government would declassify and make available virtually all documents related to those who never returned from that war and that I would do it by this day, Veterans Day. I can tell you that last evening, the Secretary of Defense completed that task. That promise has been fulfilled. I know that our Government, our Nation together have a solemn obligation to the families of those who still are missing to do all we can to help them find answers and peace of mind.

Every year, our humble words on Veterans Day can never do justice to the sacrifices made by our veterans, by those who returned and those who did not, by those who live among us today and those who live only in our memories. We know we can never repay the debt, but still we try because we know their sacrifices should be in our hearts every day.

So on this day let us simply repeat to America's veterans what is inscribed on the medals that have been awarded to thousands of those who served in World War I: A grateful nation remembers.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:35 a.m. at the Tomb of the Unknowns.

Remarks at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Martinsburg, West Virginia

November 11, 1993

Thank you very much. I want to say a special word of thanks to Tom Weaver and to all the people on the staff here at this wonderful, wonderful health facility for making me feel so welcome today and for taking me around at least one of the floors and giving me a feel for the kind of care that's provided. I really thank them.

I'd also like to thank Senator Rockefeller for flying down here with me today on the helicopter—I hope the helicopter didn't bother you too much when it landed—and my good friend Congressman Wise and Governor Caperton. All three of them in different ways have worked hard to try to provide quality health care for the veterans of our country and for all Americans. And as I'm sure all of you know, that's a big struggle that we're involved in now in Washington, and it's nice to have three allies from West Virginia.

I told Jay Rockefeller today that we wouldn't be up there fighting for national health care if it hadn't been for him fighting for it a long time before someone could run and win a Presidential race on that issue, and I thank Jay for that. I also want to encourage you, Governor Caperton; this health care is a complicated issue. You just have to keep fighting. It's like pushing a rock up a hill, but eventually we get to the top, don't we?

I want to also say to all of you here in West Virginia, I'm especially glad to be here on Veterans Day. This whole area of the country has the look and feel of my home State of Arkansas. And one of the men I met today when touring the hospital, a man named Overman, was actually born in Arkansas. So I sat on his bed and looked out the window and thought I was home. He didn't have an accent. [*Laughter*]

We're here today to honor all the Americans who have worn our Nation's uniform, those who have contributed in war and those who have stood in peace, people who have

protected our security and people for whom we now have a moral obligation to protect their security. I wanted to come here to this hospital today to drive that point home. I know we can never fully repay the debt that we owe as a country to our veterans. But we can honor that debt and partially repay it by making sure that we have quality, secure, and comprehensive health care for all the veterans of the United States.

This morning I had the honor of hosting a breakfast at the White House for the leaders of our veterans groups and for several of the brave young soldiers who have been serving our country in Somalia and who were involved in the ferocious firefight on October the 3d. And this morning I was also pleased to sign into law a bill, which Senator Rockefeller was the leading sponsor, which increases the cost of living allowance to our disabled veterans, which goes into effect on December 1st. Even though this is late in the year, thanks to the leadership of Senator Rockefeller who's the chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs committee and his counterpart in the House, my neighbor, Sonny Montgomery from Mississippi, this will be paid on time beginning in January of 1994.

Again, let me say how much I appreciate the leadership that Senator Rockefeller has exhibited, not only on the issue of health care for all Americans but on the special needs of our Nation's veterans. We stand together, along with Congressman Wise, in our determination to make sure that we do something about the health care issue to provide real and genuine and comprehensive security to all the people of this country before the Congress goes home next year. We have to do that.

The Veterans Administration today operates the Nation's largest health care system. And as I said today, I saw a health care facility here that any American, any American, would be proud to be a part of, to work in or to be a patient in. Under the leadership of Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown and the Deputy Secretary, Hershel Gober, who's here with me today somewhere—Hershel where are you? He's not up here on this stage because he's heard this speech before, he said. We're going to continue to work for that.

When I was out in the crowd outside shaking hands, I was pleased to see that one lady had already purchased a paperback copy of the administration's proposed health plan that was put together by the group that the First Lady headed. One of the things that I want to encourage all of you to do is to get a copy of that plan and read it. I'm very proud of the fact that the health care reform plan proposed by our administration is the only one that embraces the VA as a real resource for high-quality, affordable health care for our people. Under our plan, all veterans would be eligible to receive their comprehensive national health care benefit package through the VA system. Veterans with service-connected disabilities and low-income veterans who choose VA would receive this care with no copayments or deductibles. And no veteran in need of health care would ever be turned away from a VA hospital if our plan became law.

This Veterans Day is a special one. It marks the 75th anniversary of the armistice which ended World War I. And as all of you know, that was the occasion for commemorating Veterans Day. We are fortunate today that there are about 31,000 living veterans from World War I, and four of them are with us. I want to acknowledge them today and to tell you that today we'll be giving them this medal commemorating their service in World War I and a certificate. The medal says: 75th Anniversary, World War I. And then on the back, it has two great slogans: A grateful Nation remembers, and They came on wings of eagles.

Now, let me introduce them to you: Mr. Benjamin Valentine. Where are you? There's Mr. Valentine. He's right there. I want to tell you a little bit about him. He served in the Army from May 1918 through May 1919. He was assigned to the Quartermaster Corps and embarkation depot at Charleston, South Carolina. In his civilian life he worked in a brickyard, and his favorite leisure activities were hunting and fishing.

The next honoree is Mr. Ernest Deetjen. Where is he? Mr. Deetjen. Let me tell you

a little about him. He served in the Army as a cook with the 331st Supply Company. He enlisted in June 1918 and served in France from October of 1918 until October of 1919. In his civilian life, he opened the first A&P in Hagerstown, Maryland—good for him—and later opened his own store. And since we're here in this outstanding health facility, I should also mention that his uncle helped discover the X-ray process and brought the procedure to the Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore. I also learned today that this fine gentleman actually once met President Woodrow Wilson. I think in France, I believe, in Versailles in France, he met President Wilson. Now, let me tell you why that's important. Not only was President Wilson a member of the same political party as I am, but every year there's a new President, a famous American shoe company, Johnson and Murphy from Nashville, Tennessee, writes the President a letter and offers the President a pair of shoes and tells you what every other President's ordered since 1856. So when I got my shoes, they said, ''Dear Mr. President, you have the biggest feet in the White House since Woodrow Wilson.'' [*Laughter*] So, Mr. Deetjen, we're glad to see you.

Mr. Robert Hannah. Where is he? Let's recognize him. Here he is. Mr. Hannah served as a courier in the 317th Infantry from September of 1917 through June of 1919. He worked as a logger. He helped to build the Cass Railroad in West Virginia. He worked in an aircraft plant. His last job was with Bethlehem Steel in Sparrows Point, Maryland. He's certainly earned his way through life. Let's give him a hand. [*Applause*]

And our last honoree is Mr. Milton Garland from Waynesboro, Pennsylvania. Stand up, Mr. Garland. This man has an amazing story. He served in the first division of the Navy from July of 1918 through September of 1921. At the age of 98, he is still known as ''Mr. Refrigeration'' because, at his age, he still teaches refrigeration classes in Waynesboro for the Frick Refrigeration Company. He has designed ice rinks, food refrigeration units, and petrochemical controls, and he's still working at his chosen profession. Let's give him a hand. [*Applause*]

I close by asking you to remember that the service that these fine people rendered is being replicated today all around the world by the men and women who wear our uniforms. Today they are the best-trained, best-equipped, ablest people who have ever worn the uniform of the United States of America. They would not be able to do that today, had it not been for the contributions of people like these four men we honor. So I ask you to remember what this says: A grateful Nation remembers. Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:04 p.m. in the Domiciliary. In his remarks, he referred to Thomas Weaver, director of the Veterans Medical Center.

Statement on Signing the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994

November 11, 1993

Today I have signed into law, H.R. 2520, the ''Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994.''

H.R. 2520 provides funds for various programs of the Department of the Interior and Energy, the Forest Service (Department of Agriculture), and the Indian Health Service (Department of Health and Human Services). Funding for various independent agencies such as the Smithsonian Institution and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities is also included.

The Act provides funding to further the protection and rehabilitation of America's inventory of natural and cultural assets, including our national parks and forests.

I am pleased that the Act includes funding in support of the Forest Plan for the Pacific Northwest, which will help both to begin implementation of ecosystem management and to offset economic disruptions to forest communities in Washington, Oregon, and Northern California.

The Act provides funding for my proposal to establish a National Biological Survey. This new bureau within the Department of

the Interior will facilitate improvement in the quality of biological research. Better science will result in improved decision-making in the management of the Nation's federally managed lands and will enable Federal land managers to avoid future contentious actions under the Endangered Species Act.

The Act provides funding for a number of my investment proposals for energy conservation and fossil energy research and development. These investments are important for our Nation's energy future.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 11, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 2520, approved November 11, was assigned Public Law No. 103–138.

Statement on Signing the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1994

November 11, 1993

Today I have signed into law, H.R. 3116, the ''Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1994.'' H.R. 3116 supports the Administration's major defense priorities and reflects a spirit of cooperation between the Administration and the Congress to provide for a strong national defense. I am very pleased that the Congress has addressed budget issues in such a way that provides balanced support for my number one priority, the readiness of our forces. I also appreciate the support that the Congress has given to key investment and modernization proposals, especially my efforts to create a strong defense reinvestment program.

However, I do have serious reservations about a provision in section 8151 of this Act. I construe section 8151(b)(2)(ii) as not restricting my constitutional responsibility and authority as Commander In Chief, including my ability to place U.S. combat forces under the temporary tactical control of a foreign commander where to do otherwise would jeopardize the safety of U.S. combat forces in support of UNOSOM II. Such U.S. combat forces shall, however, remain under the operational command and control of U.S. commanders at all times.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 11, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 3116, approved November 11, was assigned Public Law No. 103–139.

Remarks in a Telephone Conversation With Congressman Ed Pastor on NAFTA

November 12, 1993

Congressman Ed Pastor. Good morning.

The President. Hello, Ed.

Congressman Pastor. Yes, good morning, Mr. President.

The President. How are you?

Congressman Pastor. I'm doing well, sir, beautiful weather here in Arizona.

The President. It's beautiful here, too.

Congressman Pastor. The reason I called you was to let you know that November 17, we'll be supporting you on the free-trade agreement.

The President. Thank you very much. We need your help.

Congressman Pastor. And I give a lot of credit to this to Congressman Esteban Torres. As you know, he worked very hard to get that nat. bank. And I know that with it we can do some things along the border.

I had a conversation yesterday with the EPA Administrator, and we talked about the resources that will be available. That was one of my concerns. So I look forward to working with her and with you to help the border communities along our Mexican-U.S. border.

The President. Thank you very much, Ed. As you well know, these environmental difficulties are going to get a lot better if NAFTA passes now that we've got the development bank there. And it also means more jobs along the border on both sides working

on environmental clean-up. So I'm very encouraged.

I also want you to know that since you've been gone we've had a pretty good run in picking up some folks. Congresswoman Anna Eshoo from California came out yesterday, and we got five Congressmen from the Rust Belt. David Mann from Ohio became the first Democrat in Ohio to come out for NAFTA along with Congressman Hobson and Congressman Kasich. And then we got two Republicans from Michigan and two Members of Congress in the last week switched from no to yes, Marilyn Lloyd and Rick Lehman.

Congressman Pastor. Well, Mr. President, you're doing very well.

The President. Well, we're making progress anyway. And we got Gerry Studds and Steny Hoyer when they came out last week. I think that was a good sign because they'll work hard and try to help us pass this thing. So I'm feeling much better than I did a few days ago. But I'm glad to have this phone call from you, and I just want to encourage you to try to sway every vote you can. And let's keep working until we bring it in.

Congressman Pastor. Well, I'm going to be working with Members of the Hispanic Caucus. I know that some are still undecided, so we'll be working with them.

The President. We've got about four outstanding that I think we can still get if we all work hard.

Congressman Pastor. Well, we're all going to work hard for you and, hopefully, at the final count we'll be past the 218 that we need. But I'm very happy to join you in this effort and at this time would like to ask you to consider coming to Arizona one of these days.

The President. I'd like to come back. You know it's been a while since I was there. I was there during the campaign, and the State was actually very good to me. I was amazed as we came so close to victory there. And I'm anxious to come back, and I want to be your guest.

Congressman Pastor. Well, you have a standing tee time, so let me know when you—and we've got a lot of mulligans. [*Laughter*] Let me know when you want to come out.

The President. Thanks. I've played golf in Arizona, and it was a good round for me; so I have wonderful memories of that. I'll do that. Thank you.

Congressman Pastor. Okay. Thank you Mr. President.

The President. Bye.

Congressman Pastor. Have a good day.

[*At this point, the telephone conversation ended, and the President answered reporters' questions.*]

Q. Where does this put you, roughly, in terms of the number of votes you need now? Sunday you said you needed about 30.

The President. Oh, no, we're much closer now. I think we'll get what we think we have to get on the Democratic side, and I'm working with the Republicans. I see all this stuff about their difficulties, but I don't buy that. I think that they've got some of the same problems our folks do.

I think it's clear to everybody now—let me say this again, if there were a secret ballot, this would pass by 50 votes or more. And I think everyone knows that. So now it's a question of getting the people who are in there harder for NAFTA and who know it's good for American jobs and who know it's an important part of our foreign policy for the future, that it will develop America by reaching out to the world, that it will lead to a trade pact with all of Latin America, that it will help us with the Pacific and Europe. It's a matter of sort of bringing that conviction to the fore.

And I will say again, I think that from the point of view of the Congress, the number one virtue of the debate between the Vice President and Mr. Perot is that Al Gore showed that if you are on the right side of an issue and if you believe it, you can convince your constituents that you're right and that it's in their interest. And so I'm still very upbeat about this. But I think there will be clouds around this issue right to the last.

Q. Well, just in a ballpark idea, I mean, is it fair to say less than 20 votes away or——

The President. It's fair to say that I've got a list that makes me think we can do what

we always thought we'd have to do. In fast track, I think the Democrats only had—when they voted for the fast track negotiations here, I think they only had 95 votes. But I've always thought we could do our part and we could get 218 votes on Wednesday, and I still believe we're going to.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:19 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel

November 12, 1993

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, are you considering a stop in the Middle East during your Europe trip in January to help the momentum of the Middle East peace process?

The President. The Prime Minister and I are going to talk about what we can do to keep this going, but that's not one of the things that's been raised so far by anyone.

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

Q. President Clinton, is King Hussein strong enough to make peace with Israel before President Asad?

The President. I think he's in a good position to proceed now. And of course, we all have come out for a process that will lead to comprehensive peace in the Middle East. But I think King Hussein obviously wants peace, and the recent elections must surely encourage him. I think the people of Jordan want peace.

Q. Do you think there's a chance to reach any progress with the Syrians?

The President. I hope so. We're going to discuss that today and a number of other issues. Over the long run, I think we'll have to make progress with everyone.

PLO Terrorism

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, what's your comment on the involvement of PLO people in the kidnaping and killing of an Israeli?

Prime Minister Rabin. We consider it as a great and dangerous violation of the commitment of the PLO. In the letter that was signed by the chairman of the PLO to me, he committed himself to renounce and reject terrorism. Keeping commitments is the basis for the advancement towards peace. We'll keep our commitments; we demand them to keep their commitments and to come up openly in renouncing and taking the disciplined measures to which he is committed, as it is written in the letter that he signed and sent to me.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:41 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 Yitzhak Rabin

November 12, 1993

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It's a great pleasure for me once again to have the opportunity to host my friend Prime Minister Rabin. I first welcomed him to the White House last March. At that time, he stated with great conviction that he felt the time had come to make peace and that he was ready to make the necessary steps and to take the necessary risks for peace. I told him that if that were to be the case, it was the job of the United States to minimize those risks. We both committed to make 1993 a year of breakthrough for peace in the Middle East.

On September 13, that commitment was transformed into history through the simple handshake on the South Lawn of the White House. Israel's historic effort with the Palestinians was due, in large measure, to the courageous statesmanship of Prime Minister Rabin.

Shortly thereafter, the United States convened a donors' conference to help provide

the funds necessary to speed and facilitate the reconciliation. Yet there is still much work to be done to turn the promise of September 13th into a comprehensive and lasting peace. The Prime Minister and I have agreed it must be a peace that secures Israel's existence and one that endures for generations. We agreed on the need for prompt and effective implementation of the Palestinian-Israel accord. We must not allow the opponents of that agreement to derail the new progress that this year has brought. And leaders who seek peace must speak out in a loud and clear voice against those who would destroy those aspirations for peace.

The Prime Minister and I discussed the next step toward our common objectives. We agreed that peace between Israel and Syria is essential to achieving that objective of comprehensive peace. I told the Prime Minister that I have been delighted by the progress Israel has made with Jordan following the historic meeting between Crown Prince Hassan and Foreign Minister Peres, which I hosted a few weeks ago. We discussed how the United States and Israel, working together, can achieve a peace agreement with Jordan and Israel in the near future. Morocco, Tunisia, Indonesia, and other Arab and Muslim states have also taken encouraging steps to respond to Israel's peace commitments.

I told the Prime Minister that I believe even more needs to be done to reinforce the progress already made by the PLO and Jordan. In particular, I think the time has come to end the Arab boycott of Israel, a relic of past animosity that simply has no place in the architecture of peaceful relations we are all working to build in the Middle East.

During our talks we discussed what the United States can do to enhance Israel's security as it comes to grips with the very real risks it is taking to achieve this peace.

I reaffirmed my commitment to work with the Congress, to maintain our present levels of assistance, and to consult with Congress to consider how we can use loan guarantees and other forms of assistance to Israel to help Israel defray the cost of peace.

We also discussed ways the United States can help Israel defend itself from its adversaries and long-term threats to its security. And I renewed America's unshakable pledge to maintain and enhance Israel's qualitative security edge.

Mr. Prime Minister, as you go home, I hope you will tell your people that as they turn their energies and talents to the hard and daring work of building that comprehensive peace, the American people will stand by them.

Prime Minister Rabin. Mr. President, the Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, ladies and gentlemen. A few weeks ago we took part in the historical moment of signing of the Declaration of Principles between Israel and the PLO.

Mr. President, we appreciate and are thankful for the role that you have played in bringing the Declaration of Principles to its conclusion. We hoped and we continue to hope that this significant step will bring an end to 100 years of terrorism and bloodshed.

Today we are in the midst of negotiations to implement the Declaration of Principles signed here on the lawn of the White House on September 13th. I told you, Mr. President, that these are complicated negotiations, and in the process of reaching an agreement there will be ups and downs. But I am quite sure that we and the Palestinians have passed the point of no return in our efforts to implement the agreement.

This is why the PLO must condemn vigorously, openly, and immediately any action that is in flagrant violation of the commitment to renounce terrorism. The basis for our advance and progress in the implementation of the agreement is that each side must keep its commitments.

The signing of the DOP has created a new hope and opened many opportunities in our negotiations with other Arab parties to the Washington negotiations for peace. We hope and expect that with your assistance, Mr. President, that these talks will be continued as soon as possible.

We have found that direct and quiet contacts between Israel and its partners in the effort to achieve a comprehensive peace is the best way to overcome prejudices of the past. The less the talks are exposed to the limelight of the media, the better are the chances to achieve agreements.

We believe that you, Mr. President, and the Secretary of State can assist in facilitating this particular mode of negotiations. We are therefore ready to continue with your assistance the negotiation with Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon. We believe that the substantial common agenda concluded with Jordan and further efforts made since can serve as a basis towards a major development on the road to the treaty of peace.

We also look forward to achieve results in the negotiation with Syria and Lebanon, recognizing the importance of making progress in these areas. The positive conclusion of negotiations with the Arab neighbors will bring about a real comprehensive peace and will open the road to stability and prosperity for all the peoples and states in the region.

Mr. President, in a letter that I wrote to you at the beginning of this year, I expressed Israel's readiness to take risks for the sake of peace. I was more than thankful, Mr. President, for your statement in which you declared your readiness to minimize the risk that Israel is willing to take for peace. Indeed, Mr. President, you have taken effective steps in this spirit.

In our talks today, we discussed the ways and the methods by which we should proceed in the peace negotiations and also to find additional means to strengthen Israel in view of the threats to the security of the state and to provide safety to its population. Mr. President, peace and stability in the Middle East are threatened daily by yet another danger, the offensive mounted by the forces of radicalism and extremism. The offensive is twofold, against any Arab moderate, pragmatic regimes as such, and against the peace process. Our discussions today also dwelt on this issue, and we agreed to initiate on ongoing dialog between us as well as with the other concerned parties.

Mr. President, we all appreciate the firm position that you have taken against the Arab boycott. The boycott can never be accepted and certainly not when the peace process is being advanced. For the people of Israel to support the government's peace policy, they must feel that the attitudes and the atmosphere have actually changed after September 13th. We feel that our goodwill is yet to be matched.

On the plane that brought me to the United States, there came two parents, the Katz family, whose son, Yehuda, has been missing in action since 1982. We are investing serious efforts to bring back Yehuda and all the other MIA's and prisoners. Your government and other friendly nations have helped in this humanitarian mission. We trust that you will continue in this sacred task.

Today, you have gracefully told me and all the Israelis of your decision to strengthen the security of Israel. More specifically, your decision to continue the level of security assistance, to maintain our qualitative edge through the supply of advanced aircraft, the lifting of technological barriers, especially in the field of computers, and your decision to beef up our capacity to defend ourselves against missiles is most significant.

Mr. President, I return home stronger in many aspects, more confident in our ability to reach peace, and reassured that thousands of miles away from Israel, we have a true friend in the White House that we can rely on.

On this occasion I would like in very simple words to say to you and to you, to the Vice President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, your administration, and the American people, thank you, and God bless you.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, you said the peace between Israel and Syria is essential for reaching a comprehensive peace in the region. What does the administration intend to do to advance peace talks between Israel and Syria? And did you hear anything from the Prime Minister that would encourage you to either send Secretary Christopher back to the region or facilitate some sort of back-channel, behind-the-scenes talks to get those talks moving?

The President. You can see by the question, Mr. Prime Minister, it's hard for the United States to facilitate talks out of the press. [*Laughter*]

We discussed the whole question of the relationship between Israel and Syria, what the United States could do. The Prime Minister reaffirmed his belief that peace in the Middle East would require progress on all the tracks, including the tracks with Syria and

Lebanon. And we discussed some specific things that we will be exploring, the United States, over the next several weeks. Beyond that, I think I shouldn't go. But I feel confident that we'll be able to continue to pursue this.

Yes, ma'am?

PLO Terrorism

Q. Mr. President, we heard Mr. Rabin condemn the PLO for the recent attack on a Jewish settler 2 weeks ago. Do you share the view that it's a violation of the PLO-Israeli agreement? And were you just urging Chairman Arafat to renounce it?

The President. I agree with what the Prime Minister said. I think that Chairman Arafat now, under the terms of the agreement, is duty-bound at a minimum to condemn it. I think we all recognize that he may not have total control over everyone who acts in the name of Fatah, but he is now bound by the terms, the clear terms of the agreement, to condemn it.

Is anyone here from the Israeli press we could acknowledge?

Jonathan Pollard

Q. Mr. President, are you considering the release of Jonathan Pollard? And Mr. Prime Minister, did you raise this issue with the President?

The President. Perhaps I could answer both questions. The Prime Minister did raise the issue with me. We discussed it, and I explained that under our procedures here, I cannot make a decision on the Pollard case until the Justice Department makes a recommendation to me. Under the United States Constitution, I do not have to follow the recommendation of the Justice Department, but under our procedures I have to get one. And when I get one—it won't be too long in the future—I will then review it and make a decision.

Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Technological Support to Israel

Q. Mr. President, from Prime Minister Rabin's remarks it sounded like you have decided to sell Israel or make available to Israel, the F–15E fighter jet. Is that true? And can you tell us a little bit more about the technological and weaponry support that you're going to give the Israelis?

The President. Well, we are working on an agreement to make available a number of planes to the Israelis. The Prime Minister is going to meet with Secretary Aspin on Monday, and they are going to try to work through the details. And I think I should wait until they have done that, and we'll be able to make an announcement I think shortly after that. But there will be a number of planes being made available to Israel as part of this ongoing effort between us.

Someone else from the Israeli press.

Q. Mr. President, can we expect a new three-way handshake, I mean, this time with maybe King Hussein within the duration of the Prime Minister's visit in America?

The President. Not on this visit. But nothing would please me more than to have another visit where that would occur. But I think not on this visit.

NAFTA

Q. Mr. President, on the subject of NAFTA, a number of Congressmen from tobacco States, such as Congressman Steve Neal, have suggested that if the tobacco tax that has been proposed for health care were reduced from 75 cents to 40 cents, that they might bring along 6 or 10 votes. Is that something that you would consider if you were short of votes, or is that something that you would completely, categorically rule out?

The President. That issue has not been brought up to me, but I can tell you this: There were a lot of people who urged that we ought to have a $2-a-pack tobacco tax, if you remember. I asked for the 75 cents because that's what our searching effort, our agonizing effort to determine what the cost of this program would be turned up as what is needed. And therefore, I cannot foresee circumstances under which I would be willing to change that position, because it would imperil the whole health care program. So there has been no—I didn't want to raise any money from anybody to do anything other than to pay for the health care program, although I think that higher tobacco taxes discourage use, and that's a good thing. But that wasn't what was behind it. So——

Q. ——votes at the end of the game?

The President. I have no reason to believe that that will ever come into play. If it changes, I'll be glad to tell you, but I have no reason to believe that that will happen.

Someone from the Israeli press?

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, I have two questions actually. Are you going to send Secretary Christopher to the Middle East to activate the Syrian-Israeli track and to mount active support for the Palestinian agreement, or do you prefer to wait until Mr. Rabin gives you the green light to express desire to deal with Syria?

The second one for Rabin. Mr. Rabin, are you ready to go for the—are you going to fight as—are you going to fight——

Prime Minister Rabin. We are talking about peace, not the resumption of fighting.

Q. No, I mean, in a domestic battle. Are you going to fight a domestic battle for an agreement with Syria right now, or do you still think that the Israeli public is not ready for it yet?

The President. The answer to the first question is that we have not made a specific decision about when the Secretary will return to the Middle East. But we have ongoing contacts with Syria. You may know that I received the Foreign Minister of Syria here in the White House not very long ago. I have conversations from time to time with President Asad, and we will continue our dialog with them in working toward peace.

Prime Minister Rabin. Israel has a long tradition of keeping its commitments. Whatever we take upon ourselves, every agreement that we sign, we will carry out. We expect those who sign with us agreements to keep, to fully keep, their commitments as we do. There is no need to fight. It's true, in Israel there is an opposition to the position that the government has taken, to the agreement that has been signed, to the ways to carry it out. But we are a democratic country and once the decision is taken, it is carried out.

Arab Boycott

Q. Mr. President, both you and the Prime Minister mentioned the Arab boycott of Israel. You suggested in the past that should now be lifted. But so far, a number of America's closest friends in the Arab world have refused to take that step. Have you received any indications from the Saudis perhaps or from other Arab states that have been close to America, that they're now prepared to take that step? And what can you do to try to get them to do that?

The President. Let me answer you in this way: I have received some indications that the enforcement of the boycott is not as vigorous as it once was, but that some of the countries involved are reluctant to explicitly lift it. I wanted to raise the issue again today publicly because I believe that a big key toward achieving peace is maintaining support within the state of Israel for the peace process and for the risks that it entails.

Perhaps the most important benefit of the ceremony here on September 13th, even though it thrilled billions of people around the world, is that it clearly enhanced the willingness of the people of Israel to support the peace process.

So I intend to continue to work on that. And I have some ideas about how I should do it, but I would rather wait until we have achieved more concrete results before talking about it.

Someone else from Israel?

Middle East Peace Process

Q. If Arafat doesn't condemn terror, should Israel suspend the talks with the PLO?

The President. That will be a decision for Israel to make.

Q. Could the Prime Minister——

Prime Minister Rabin. I believe that we have to stick to our commitments. I expect another side to keep its commitment. I will not answer on a hypothetical situation.

The President. Mr. Friedman [Thomas L. Friedman, New York Times].

Q. Arafat has been rather slow in getting the PLO organized to fulfill these negotiations. We've seen that on both the political and security front. I wondered if you could elaborate on, (a) are you satisfied with the PLO's performance up to now in the negotiations, and, (b) what will you do if the PLO does not condemn these actions?

The President. On the second question, I don't think I can give a better answer than

the Prime Minister did. I used to give that response. I should return to it more often, I think. But let me go back to the first question, which I think is quite important.

I wish that the pace had been more rapid. But I think it is important to recognize that the PLO itself, by its very nature, by the nature of its organization and its activities over the last many, many years has never had the responsibility of going through the mechanics that have to be discussed in this agreement: How do the lights get turned on in the morning; how is the food distributed; how are the houses built? How are these things done? So I think, in fairness, I would be quite concerned if I thought that the fact that we're a little bit slow in the pace here was the result of some sort of deliberate desire to undermine an accord they had just signed off on.

At the present moment, I really believe it is more a function of the whole organization not being organized for or experienced in the work in which they must now engage. And so the Prime Minister and I talked about this quite a bit, and we still have high hopes that if the timetable is not met, at least it can be nearly met for the conclusion of these specific and concrete things. I think it is more a function of this is sort of an alien role for them, and I think they're working into it. But I'm hopeful now that there is a level of engagement which will permit us to push it through to success.

Press Secretary Myers. Last question.

Q. I would like to ask you a question concerning the agreement, the peace agreements. There was a discussion that what was needed was economic development. There were a number of projects on the Gaza concerning water, canals, energy resources, et cetera. I'd like to ask, what is your estimate of the magnitude of funding needed in order to get these projects into motion? And also, what are the consequences if these projects are not realized within a certain amount of time in the Gaza? And perhaps the Prime Minister would like to answer that question, too.

Prime Minister Rabin. As of today, Israel supplies all the electricity needs of the Gaza and the West Bank. There is no shortage of electricity there. The question, what will be the projects that will be built there, how much the consumption of energy and other items including water—we continue also to add to the water supplies of Gaza by a pipeline that supplies them water. We need to negotiate all this before we negotiate to tall figures. It will not be a serious statement.

The President. But let me respond, though, to that. When we had the donors' conference here, working both individually and multilaterally, we have commitments over the next few years for several billion dollars and a few hundred million dollars right off the bat. We think that's enough to make a big difference.

I have asked our people to identify some specific high return, quick investment infrastructure projects that could be instituted and effected quickly that would have a significant economic benefit to the people in the affected areas that we could proceed with just as quickly as the agreements make that possible. So I think there's money there to do what needs to be done in the near term once there is a system which guarantees that the investments, whether they be in infrastructure or new economic development, will have the result that we want.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to ask the Prime Minister, if I could, something about what you said to Mr. Clinton today about the Pollard case and why the matter continues to be such a priority with you, sir.

Prime Minister Rabin. I don't believe it would be advisable to me to add on this issue to what the President said.

The President. One last question from the Israeli press.

Q. I'd like to ask you, in the near future will you send a new ambassador to Tel Aviv? When do you think the time will come to move your Embassy to Jerusalem?

The President. I think from the question you ask you know what my long-standing position on that issue has been. But I have to resort to the position that I have taken on this ever since these talks began, and that is that the United States should not at this time make any statement which in any way injects the United States into a peace process that must be carried out by the parties themselves. And for me to say anything about that

one way or the other at this moment in my judgment would run the risk of throwing the process out of kilter. There will be time to discuss that and to make statements about that later on down the road at a more ripe occasion.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 33d news conference began at 12:11 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Jonathan Pollard, U.S. Navy employee convicted of selling national security information to Israel.

Notice on Chemical and Biological Weapons Proliferation

November 12, 1993

On November 16, 1990, consistent with the authority provided the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701, *et seq.*), President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12735. In that order, the President declared a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security posed by the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. Because the proliferation of these weapons continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, the national emergency declared on November 16, 1990, must continue in effect beyond November 16, 1993. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency declared in Executive Order No. 12735.

This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 12, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:48 a.m., November 12, 1993]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on November 15.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Chemical and Biological Weapons Proliferation

November 12, 1993

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

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

The proliferation of chemical and biological weapons continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I am hereby advising the Congress that the national emergency declared on November 16, 1990, must continue in effect beyond November 16, 1993. Accordingly, I have extended the national emergency declared in Executive Order No. 12735 and have sent a notice of extension to the *Federal Register* for publication.

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

The three export control regulations issued under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative are fully in force and have been used to control the export of items with potential use in chemical or biological weapons or unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction.

During the last 6 months, the United States has continued to address actively in

its international diplomatic efforts the problem of the proliferation and use of chemical and biological weapons.

More than 150 nations have signed the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and a number already have ratified it. In my speech to the United Nations General Assembly on September 27, I called upon all countries, including my own, to ratify the Convention quickly so that it may enter into force on January 13, 1995. The United States is also playing a leading role in the work of the CWC Preparatory Commission, which is meeting in The Hague to work out the procedural and administrative details for implementing the Convention.

The United States participated in the Ad Hoc Group of Government Experts convened by the Third Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) Review Conference to identify and examine potential verification measures. The consensus final report of the Group is expected to provide the basis for further consideration of this issue at a special conference of BWC states parties. As part of my new nonproliferation policy, I have decided that the United States will promote new measures that provide increased transparency of activities that could have biological weapons applications to help deter violations of the Convention.

The membership of the Australia Group (AG) of countries cooperating against chemical and biological weapons (CBW) proliferation stands at 25. At the June 1993 meeting, members agreed to honor each other's export license denials for AG-proscribed items (the "no-undercut" policy), thus enhancing the effectiveness of the Group's common export controls. At the same meeting, the AG finalized its package of comprehensive export controls on biological agents and related production equipment and agreed to promote broad contacts with nonmembers following all future Australia Group meetings. Members also resolved to expand their dialogue about CBW issues with non-member countries with a view to encouraging the introduction and implementation of effective CBW nonproliferation measures worldwide.

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

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

Appointment of Regional Representatives for the Department of Education

November 12, 1993

The President appointed five regional representatives for the Department of Education today. The five will serve as liaisons to State, local, and private education organizations and as advocates for the administration's education policies. They are:

Brenda Dann-Messier, Region I, Boston (serves Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont);

W. Wilson Goode, Region III, Philadelphia (serves Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia);

Sally H. Cain, Region VI, Dallas (serves Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas);

Lynn Osborn Simons, Region VIII, Denver (serves Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming); and

Carla Nuxoll, Region X, Seattle (serves Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington).

"As former Governors who spent years trying to improve our States' education systems, Secretary Riley and I are committed to an Education Department that is responsive to the needs of States and communities," the President said in making the announcement. "The people who will serve as the Department's regional representatives share that commitment and will work hard to fulfill it. I am very proud of these choices."

NOTE: Biographies of the appointees 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.

November 8

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

In the evening, the President hosted a dinner for Members of Congress at the White House.

November 9

In the morning, the President met with Members of Congress on NAFTA, and in the afternoon, the President met with Connie Chung from the news program "Eye to Eye."

The President announced that he has appointed the following senior officials of his administration to serve on special boards or commissions:

—Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt to the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission;

—National Security Adviser Anthony Lake to the Board of Trustees of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; and

—Chief of Staff to the Vice President, Jack Quinn; Office of Management and Budget Administrator of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Sally Katzen; and White House Staff Secretary John Podesta to the Council of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

November 10

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

November 11

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Martinsburg, WV, where he visited with patients at the Martinsburg VA Medical Center and returned to Washington, DC, in the late afternoon.

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 November 5 [1]

Togo Dennis West, Jr.,
of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of the Army, vice Michael P.W. Stone, resigned.

Joe Robert Reeder,
of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice John W. Shannon, resigned.

Richard Danzig,
of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, vice J. Daniel Howard, resigned.

John E. Tull, Jr.,
of Arkansas, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the term expiring April 13, 1998, vice William P. Albrecht, resigned.

Submitted November 8

Wally B. Beyer,
of North Dakota, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years, vice James B. Huff, Sr.

Christine Ervin,
of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy), vice J. Michael Davis, resigned.

Barbara Pedersen Holum,
of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the term expiring April 13, 1997, vice Fowler C. West, resigned.

Stuart George Moldaw,
of California, to be an Alternate Representative of the U.S. to the 48th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

[1] These nominations were not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Submitted November 9

Charles R. Baquet III,
of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, vice Barbara Zartman, resigned.

Submitted November 10

Melvyn Levitsky,
of Maryland, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

David Nathan Merrill,
of Maryland, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

Brian C. Berg,
of North Dakota, to be U.S. marshal for the District of North Dakota for the term of 4 years, vice Errol Lee Wood.

Daniel T.K. Hurley,
of Florida, to be U.S. District judge for the Southern District of Florida, vice James C. Paine, retired.

Floyd A. Kimbrough,
of Missouri, to be U.S. marshal for the Eastern District of Missouri for the term of 4 years, vice Willie Greason, Jr.

Charles William Logsdon,
of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of 4 years, vice Ralph A. Boling.

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 November 8

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen on the economy

Released November 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Announcement of the appointment of five senior administration officials to boards and commissions

Released November 10

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on declassification of documents relating to the Vietnam war and American POW/MIA's in Southeast Asia

Released November 11

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on sanctions by the United Nations Security Council against Libya

Announcement of the presentation of commemorative medals to four veterans of World War I

Released November 12

Announcement of the appointment of five regional representatives for the Department of Education

Acts Approved by the President

Approved November 8

H.R. 927 / Public Law 103–134
To designate the Pittsburgh Aviary in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania as the National Aviary in Pittsburgh

H.R. 2824 / Public Law 103–135
To modify the project for flood control, James River Basin, Richmond, Virginia

H.J. Res. 205 / Public Law 103–136
Designating the week beginning October 31, 1993, as "National Health Information Management Week"

S.J. Res. 115 / Public Law 103–137
Designating November 22, 1993, as ''National Military Families Recognition Day''

Approved November 11

H.R. 2520 / Public Law 103–138
Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994

H.R. 3116 / Public Law 103–139
Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1994

S. 616 / Public Law 103–140
Veteran's Compensation Rates Amendments of 1993