

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, February 7, 1994
Volume 30—Number 5
Pages 167–215

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Appointments and Nominations
American Hospital Association—176
Department of Labor Conference on
Reemployment—191
Kramer Junior High School—195
National Conference of Mayors—167
National Governors' Association—171, 180
National Prayer Breakfast—194
Radio address—169
Vietnam embargo—205

Appointments and Nominations

African Development Foundation, Board of
Directors, member—194
Justice Department
Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights,
remarks—186
Assistant Attorney General for Environment
and Natural Resources—212
Inspector General—212
National Labor Relations Board, member—
211
Superior Court of the District of Columbia,
associate judges—169
State Department, Ambassadors
Azerbaijan—176
Hungary—176
Micronesia—176

Communications to Congress

Great Egg Harbor Study, message
transmitting—210
Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, letter
transmitting report—193
Iraq, letter—174
Maurice and Manumuskin River and
Menantico Creek Study, message
transmitting—211
Privacy Act implementation, letter
transmitting report—210
Railroad safety, message transmitting report—
193
Small business, report—188

Communications to Federal Agencies

Somalia, memorandum—190
Vietnam, memorandum—212

Executive Orders

Amending the Civil Service Rules Concerning
Political Activities—207
Garnishment of Federal Employees' Pay—208

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Cabinet Room—190
Oval Office—172, 186
Roosevelt Room—205

Letters and Messages

See Resignations and Retirements

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

German Chancellor Kohl—172

Proclamations

American Heart Month—208
National Women and Girls in Sports Day—
209

Resignations and Retirements

Deputy Attorney General, letter—171

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations
Oregon Governor Barbara Roberts' decision
not to seek reelection—169

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—215
Checklist of White House press releases—214
Digest of other White House
announcements—212
Nominations submitted to the Senate—213

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, February 4, 1994

Remarks to a National Conference of Mayors

January 28, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, all the members of our Cabinet who are here, and all those who have been here. I trust they've done such a good job that they've taken care of all the heavy lifting. [*Laughter*]

Mayor Abramson, I'm glad to be here with you and all your colleagues. And I thank you for coming to the White House and for coming to Washington. We need your help. I look out in this crowd today, and I see a lot of people with whom I have worked, people I know, people I consider my friends, and most importantly people I consider to be Americans in the best sense now, trying to come to grips with these problems.

This is going to be a good week for me. I long for the days when the mayors and the Governors come to town. It is in those days that this city is at its least partisan. When we have people who are responsible for running things, getting results, dealing with problems that have no necessary partisan content, I feel that at least there is a moment of hope in the air that we will be able to break out of this crazy paralysis that too often dominates this city. And so I am delighted to see you all.

I also want to thank you for the contributions you have made and will continue to make to the life and the ideas of this administration. I saw the press conference yesterday that Mayor Daley, I think, and Mayor Johnson, maybe some others had, on the meltdown of the weapons. I received a copy of Mayor Rendell's letter to the Vice President on suggestions for an urban agenda, gave the instructions that we should review those ideas in a hurry. I've had a lot of talks in the last few days with Mayor Archer, Mayor Riley, and Mayor Rice. Mayor Webb has talked to me about his efforts.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Mayor Abramson for the op-ed piece that he wrote about—I think it was called your Russell Project, is that what—because you made the point that I have seen in Louisville, in Cleveland, in Chicago, and many other places, that there really are things that we can do if we have the right sort of partnership. There are ways to use the relatively modest amount of Federal money now available to match with local funds and private sector funds to really do things to get a lot of our troubled urban areas going again. And that was a very important point because there's a lot of cynicism about that around this town. And you helped to put a fresh note of reality into our discussions, and I appreciate that very much.

We're working hard up here to do a number of things, and I won't go through all of them. The Cabinet has doubtless discussed them with you. I would prefer, if I might, just to talk for a few moments about the crime bill. Yesterday I received a letter from the mayors of eight of our largest cities—Mayors Guiliani, Daley, Riordan, Rendell, Lanier, Archer, White, and Goldsmith—all backing the plan to put another 100,000 police officers on the street.

In the days following the quake in Los Angeles, the number of police officers on patrol, on actual patrol, was tripled, and crime in Los Angeles dropped so much that there were just 50 arrests per day in the whole huge city. That's one-tenth, I'll say again, one-tenth the normal number of arrests on any given day. In other words, crime dropped by 90 percent. I want to ask each of you here today, therefore, to help us to pass this crime bill and to do it in a timely fashion, to come back here with your colleagues without regard to party, and when you can, to bring your police chiefs and work for the next 60 days walking a beat in the Halls of Congress. You can be the community police for your cities here for the next 60 days.

With the crime bill, we'll get the police. We'll get drug treatment for those charged and convicted of crimes. We'll get boot camps for first time offenders. We'll get a ban on assault weapons and a number of other useful features. Just yesterday, the Vice President went to Dunbar High School where the day before there were shootouts in a hallway and in front of the school. In too many of our schools, guns have transformed the environment from one of learning to one of fear. And I looked at the television news last night, and I saw one of the young women looking at the Vice President saying, "If you guys can send a person to the Moon, why can't you get guns out of our streets and schools?" Inconveniently, the television switched to another subject before I heard his answer. But the young woman certainly asked the right question.

This administration does favor stronger punishment when it's appropriate. I do believe in the "three strikes and you're out" concept for violent criminals. It is clearly true that a small number of total criminals commit a large portion of violent crimes. So that is something we ought to do. But I think every one of us know, if you've ever walked the streets, really walked the streets of the crime-infested area, have ever really talked to the people who live there, who ever really focused on the fact that most people in the highest crime areas of America still obey the law, get up every day and go to work, try to raise their kids, try to do the very best they can. What they really want is safety in the first place, which means that we have to follow strategies that can also prevent crime, and we have to bring hope back to those places. We have to support the families and rebuild the communities and give people work.

I know of no example where you have a successful civilized society without strong elements of work, family, and community. And when all three break down at once, it should not be surprising to anyone that the vacuum created leads to crime and gangs and guns. So we have a lot of work to do.

Our community empowerment agenda is the beginning of that work, and it can lead to a lot more projects like the one that Mayor Abramson discussed in his fine op-ed piece.

But let me say for now, if you want me to be able to go out across this country and tell the American people they need to take more responsibility for their children and their neighborhoods and their communities, to try to help you to mobilize the support of the private sector to invest in the empowerment zones and take advantage of other opportunities in cities, the first thing we have to do is to do our part by passing a good crime bill and by doing it in a timely fashion. When I discussed this with some of you recently, one of the things you wanted to do is to make sure that if we said that bill would fund 100,000 policemen, that it would in fact do that on the terms as advertised. I think you need to make sure that's going to happen.

Another thing we discussed is to make sure that we had some initiatives which would also provide incentives for people to avoid crime or young people to turn away from crime. We need to experiment with things to see what actually lowers the crime rate. We know for sure that more people on patrol lowers the crime rate. I mean, Los Angeles just taught us that one more time. And we know there are some other things that do as well.

So, as you come up here to lobby, I ask you to give us the benefit of your ideas, your experience, and make sure we get the best possible bill. But the main thing is, we do not need to fool around with this for 6 months. I mean, there's already been a crime bill passed the Senate; there's already been a number of bills passed the House. We know now how we're going to pay for this and within range how much money we can spend on it, and we have it paid for. And our administration's budget, tight though it is, actually provides the funding for it. So let's do it, and let's do it with the benefit of the mayors and the chiefs of police who know what it is to do it right.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:57 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Jerry Abramson of Louisville, KY; Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago, IL; Mayor Paul Johnson of Phoenix, AZ; Mayor Edward Rendell of Philadelphia, PA; Mayor Dennis W. Archer of Detroit, MI; Mayor Joseph P. Riley, Jr. of Charleston, SC; Mayor Norman B. Rice of Seattle, WA; Mayor Richard Riordan of Los Ange-

les; Mayor Bob Lanier of Houston, TX; Mayor Michael White of Cleveland, OH; and Mayor Stephen Goldsmith of Indianapolis, IN. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Statement on Oregon Governor
Barbara Roberts' Decision Not To
Seek Reelection**

January 28, 1994

It was with regret that I learned of Oregon Governor Barbara Roberts' decision not to seek reelection.

I have been very fortunate to work with the Governor on issues affecting the people of the Northwest and the Nation: health care, economic opportunity, and the protection of our natural resources. Her leadership on these and other issues will be missed.

I commend Governor Roberts for her dedication to the people of Oregon throughout her 20 years of public service. My best wishes go out to the Governor and her family.

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Nomination for Associate Judges on
the Superior Court of the District of
Columbia**

January 28, 1994

The President today announced that he intends to nominate Judith Bartnoff and Zoe Bush to serve as Associate Judges on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

"Judith Bartnoff and Zoe Bush have both distinguished themselves throughout their legal careers as dedicated and accomplished professionals," said the President. "I am confident that they will serve the people of the District of Columbia well on the Superior Court bench."

NOTE: Biographies of the nominees 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

January 29, 1994

Good morning. If I sound a little hoarse today it's because I haven't completely recovered my voice which I lost after I gave the State of the Union Address to Congress. You know, I don't like losing my voice, but frankly, it wouldn't be a bad thing in Washington if more people had to lower their voices and listen to you a little more. I think if they did, it would strengthen their determination to keep fighting to change this country for the better.

A lot of changes have occurred in the last year, and you, basically, deserve the credit for it, even though Congress had to enact the laws that I proposed. There's been an economic plan that cuts the deficit by half a trillion dollars, more than 1.6 million new jobs in the private sector, tax relief for 15 million low- and moderate-wage workers to reward work over welfare, a family and medical leave law to enable people to take a little time off when there's a child born or a parent sick without losing their jobs, the Brady bill to keep more guns out of the hands of criminals, more affordable loans for the middle class, and a national service program for young people who want to give something back to their communities and their country and earn credit toward a college education.

And it's beginning to pay off. Yesterday we received very encouraging growth figures for the last 3 months of 1993. This economic plan is promoting the right kind of recovery and growth through smaller deficits, lower interest rates, lower inflation, and productive investment. It's not the kind of growth we had too much in the 1980's, where there was ballooning debt and paper prosperity.

I know a lot of you aren't yet feeling the benefits of these changes, and our work won't be done until every American has the security to face the future without fear. But because you've demanded change, Washington finally is addressing America's agenda, the problems you face in your jobs, your communities, and your families.

Because good skills are the only tickets to good jobs and growing incomes, I'm asking Congress this year to invest more in education and training, to transform the unem-

ployment system into a reemployment system that teaches new skills for new jobs. We need to do more to help people who don't go to college to move from high school to work. And we need to improve all our schools with our Goals 2000 plan, which links world-class standards to grassroots reforms.

Because the welfare system discourages work and destroys families, I'm asking Congress to help to revolutionize it. For those who depend on welfare, we should provide the support, the job training, and the child care needed for up to 2 years. But after that, anyone who can work must work.

Change is never easy, and I especially need your help on two crucial challenges: fighting crime and reforming our health care system. We need to make the criminal justice system work for the victims, not the criminals. And we must make the health care system work for all the hard-working families in this country, and put an end to the inefficiency, the fraud, and the abuse that has made our system the world's most expensive and the only one in the advanced world that doesn't provide some coverage to every family.

I'm asking Congress to pass a strong, smart, tough anticrime bill. We must tell career criminals if you commit a third violent crime, you'll be put away for good, "Three strikes and you're out." We should hire 100,000 more police officers to protect our communities. They help to reduce the crime rate. We must ban assault weapons that make criminals better armed than police. And we need more drug training and alternative punishments for young people, like boot camps.

And this year, we must make history by reforming the health care system and providing guaranteed private insurance for every American. The First Lady and I have traveled across the country; we've received almost a million letters. And you know, the only place where people say there's really no health care crisis is right here in Washington where so many enjoy secure health benefits at reasonable cost paid for by the taxpayers.

Let's face it, the health insurance system is rigged against ordinary families and small businesses. Insurance companies control it: They pick and choose whom they cover; they charge more if your business is too small; they might not cover you at all or a member

of your family or one of your employees if you have what they call a preexisting condition. Unless we change things, 58 million Americans may have no coverage at all for some time this year, and experts say 3 of every 10 small businesses may be forced to stop covering their employees in the years ahead because small business costs are going up so much faster than big business and Government costs.

Let those who say there's no crisis tell it to Rick Tarnow of Longview, Texas. He left his job and secure benefits at a large corporation to start a small business. Then his son was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis. Because of the disease, the son can't get coverage. Every insurance company tells the Tarnows, "Until there's a cure for cystic fibrosis, we will not cover your child." As Rick's wife, Tracy, told my wife, "It's devastating enough to learn that your child has a chronic illness and then have to deal with the nightmare of insurance."

Those who say there's no crisis should tell it to the Janetakos family of Woburn, Massachusetts. Twelve years ago, Corrine Janetakos had a stroke, leaving her partially paralyzed. Now she and her husband, who owns a painting business, have trouble getting insurance because of her preexisting condition. She wrote to Hillary because, quote, "It's been very frustrating arguing my dilemma to the numerous insurance companies that we've applied to for coverage."

Well, with our approach it will be illegal for companies to deny anyone coverage for any reason, and every family will have comprehensive benefits that can never be taken away. The Tarnow family, the Janetakos family, and millions of other Americans live every day with the health care crisis. It's time we stopped denying there's a crisis and started fixing it.

Now is the time to debate and decide America's real agenda: health care, crime, jobs and skills, welfare reform, more hope for our young people. The debate is between those who don't even understand how you live and those who understand the urgency of change, between those who don't even see these problems and those who are working to solve them, between those who are comfortable with deadlock and drift and those

who call for continuing the American journey of progress and renewal. If you raise your voice, the forces of change will prevail.

With your help, I'll keep speaking out for reforming health care, fighting crime, ending welfare as we know it, and improving our skills, our schools, and our future. And I'll try not to shout myself hoarse tomorrow on Super Bowl Sunday.

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

Letter Accepting the Resignation of Philip B. Heymann as Deputy Attorney General

January 29, 1994

Dear Phil:

It is with deep regret that I accept your resignation as Deputy Attorney General, effective upon the availability of a successor.

You brought a most impressive history of service to the Department of Justice and distinguished yourself at every turn. During your time as Deputy Attorney General, you consistently demonstrated intelligence, integrity, sound judgment, and an unyielding commitment to the cause of justice.

I am very grateful for all of your many contributions to my Administration and our nation. I wish you the very best as you return to your academic career at Harvard Law School.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association

January 31, 1994

I want to thank you all again for coming. Since we're running a bit late, I want to be brief and get on to hearing from Governor Campbell and Governor Dean. The primary thing that I was hoping we could talk about in this morning's session is the crime bill.

I wanted to emphasize that I am very aware that this is an issue that historically

has been dealt with primarily at the local and State level, one that I spent an enormous amount of time on as a Governor and as attorney general.

There are things that I think should be and indeed almost have to be done at the national level. We passed the Brady bill at the end of the last session of Congress, which I think was a very important thing. And many of you were helpful in that regard, and I appreciate that. We have a number of grants to cities and communities to help with law enforcement, and we had enormous application, actually a terrific surplus of applications for the Attorney General's discretionary funds on community policing. This summer—Eli Segal is here—our summer of service program, as part of the national service this summer, will be called the summer of safety. And we hope thousands of our young people will be out there working with law enforcement people all across the country.

I really appreciate a lot of the things that all of you have done in this regard. Let me just say that the crime bill itself has a number of provisions that I think are quite important and some with which you may or may not agree. Two things that I feel very strongly about are the community policing provisions and the "three strikes and you're out" provision. I'd like to say something about each of them.

One, we know that there's been a dramatic reversal in the ratio of police officers to crime in the last 35 years. Thirty-five years ago, there were three police officers for every serious crime reported. Today, there are three crimes for every police officer, particularly in the high crime areas of the country. We have ample evidence that community policing actually works to reduce crime by having people on the block who are well-trained and know the people who live there. Dr. Lee Brown, our Director of Drug Policy, instituted community policing programs in major cities all across this country and can speak to that. The mayors were here last week. They were exceedingly enthusiastic about that provision, and we're looking forward to working with them and with you about it.

The second thing I'd like to say about stiffening the penalties is I know many of you have included versions of the "three strikes

and you're out" in your own legislative programs. I believe Washington State even had a referendum on the issue. I would just like to urge that we be both tough and smart on this issue. We know that a small number of people commit a significant number of the truly violent crimes and are highly likely to be repeat offenders. If, therefore, this law is drawn properly, it will affect a small percentage of the prison population at the Federal level and a somewhat larger percentage at the State level. But you actually will be keeping people in prison who will be overwhelmingly likely to commit a serious violent crime if they get out.

I think it is important not to make these provisions too overbroad to undermine the flexibility that people at the State and at the local level need to run their criminal justice systems and, at the same time, to keep people off the street who are involved in crimes like the terrible tragedy involving Polly Klaas.

So I want to invite you not only to do whatever you were doing at the State level but to be involved with us here as we work through this crime bill to make sure that it is well-drawn, well-drafted, and achieves the objectives it is designed to achieve.

The third thing I'd like to say is there are a number of other things in the crime bill which I think are worthy of your attention. There's the provision which bans possession of handguns by minors except in limited circumstances, which many of you have already done at the State level. There is the ban on several assault weapons. There are funds for alternative incarceration, like boot camps, and for drug treatment. And of course, there are significant funds, which I heard you all discussing yesterday in the committee chaired by Governor Wilson, about jails and Federal funds for jails. I heard the discussion on television yesterday. I think you need to have a committee that works with us on it to make sure that it makes sense to you. Many times I think things come up in the context of crime here in Washington which sound good here but which may or may not make sense out there on the front lines of the fight against crime. So I want to invite you all to be a part of that.

Just one other thing I'd like to say. In addition to the focus on the crime bill this morn-

ing, I'm obviously open to any questions or comments you want to have about the other areas of our partnership, on welfare reform, health care reform, what we're going to do on the budget, which will be a very tough budget, difficult for us, difficult for you. And Mr. Panetta is here. We have tried to be good partners. We've granted 5 comprehensive health care waivers, 90 smaller waivers in the health care area, 7 welfare reform waivers already. We have tried to make good on our commitment to push through a new partnership with the States. And I think that you will find that we'll continue to do that and we're eager to do it.

But the first major thing that will happen in this legislative session is, in closing, the crime bill. After we pass the education bills—I think that Secretary Riley is in pretty good shape with Goals 2000 and the school-to-work transition. But then the next thing that will come up is the crime bill. Then we'll go to the other measures I mentioned. And I really look forward to working with you on them.

I ask you for your help. I asked the mayors, and I will ask you to put together a bipartisan committee to come up here to work with us, to be willing to lobby with us, and to help us pass a bill that is tough and smart.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:03 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., of South Carolina; Gov. Howard Dean of Vermont; and Gov. Pete Wilson of California.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany

January 31, 1994

Interest Rates

Q. Mr. President, do you agree with Chairman Greenspan's comments this morning that interest rates need to be raised to get ahead of inflation?

The President. Well, I agree that there's no evidence that inflation is coming back into the economy. There is still a kind of a gap between short- and long-term rates, so it may be that—if they make that decision on short-

term rates, what I hope is that it won't raise long-term rates, because there's no need to do it. And I hope that the stock market won't take an adverse view because we've still got good, strong growth in this economy.

But we want to manage it with real discipline, that is we don't want to have one of these roller coaster things. We want the economy to grow in a very stable, solid way. And obviously, low interest rates are critical to that. I consider that part of the kind of compact we've all made where we'll continue to reduce the deficit, and we've got to keep inflation down and interest rates down so that people can afford to borrow money and invest.

Sinn Fein Leader Gerry Adams

Q. How does letting Gerry Adams into the U.S. advance the cause of peace?

The President. Well, we hope it will advance the cause of peace. You know, that's a very thorny problem. But his comments over the last several days on the questions of violence and the joint declaration, I thought, justified not a general visa but a very narrow visa for the purpose of coming to this conference in the hope that it will advance the peace process. Ultimately, of course, that's an issue that's going to have to be worked out by the parties themselves, as all these matters do. But I thought it was the appropriate thing to do for those reasons, because of what he said and because he's in a position, I think, to push this process forward.

White House Press Corps

Q. Have you been sneaking out on us?

The President. No. I was amazed when I read that. We tried to remember if that happened. I don't think so. George and I couldn't think of a time.

Q. You're always willing to take us with you?

The President. You know, once I went running when the press had gone home, but I think they found me before it was over. And then when I was home for my mother's funeral, I went out in the town there and went to my old high school, but the press found me. I don't think we have. We were trying to think of—we can't—we've not been

successful in thinking of five or six instances in which that has occurred. I saw the story. All I know is what I read this morning, but I'm not aware of it.

Q. Do you feel cloistered in here, Mr. President?

The President. Oh yes, I do. I mean, I wish it weren't so. And as far as I know, no other—maybe President Bush had these same sort of understandings where the press went everywhere but—I take a pool when I go to a Christmas party. Hillary and I went to Christmas parties; we took the pool with us.

Q. And we enjoyed it.

The President. You do enjoy it? Did somebody say that? [Laughter] I don't believe that. A lot of times you'd like to dump me.

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

Discussions With Chancellor Kohl

Q. Mr. President, are you going to discuss the Bosnia situation with the Chancellor?

The President. I'm sure we will.

Q. What will you—

The President. I want to talk to him about it.

Q. Are you looking forward to the restaurant, Filomena's, Mr. President?

The President. Oh, yes. You know, he told me about it, and so I went there. I took my family and some friends, and we had a wonderful dinner there. And I would not have even known about it if Chancellor Kohl hadn't mentioned it. So I told the people when I was there that the next time he came, perhaps we would both come together.

Chancellor Kohl. And we'll do that today.

Q. Will there be—[inaudible]—for Russia today?

The President. We might discuss Russia.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:10 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. During the exchange, the President referred to Senior Policy Adviser George Stephanopoulos. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Iraq*January 31, 1994**Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1), and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council.

The U.N. Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have effectively put the Iraqi nuclear weapons program out of business in the near term. The United Nations has destroyed Iraqi missile launchers, support facilities, and a good deal of Iraq's indigenous capability to manufacture prohibited missiles. It has reduced Iraq's ability to produce chemical weapons; UNSCOM teams continue to inventory and destroy chemical munitions. The United Nations has inspected, and will monitor, several facilities identified by Iraq as capable of supporting a biological weapons program.

Iraq's formal acceptance of UNSCR 715 (long-term monitoring) in November was an important step, although long overdue. It is necessary to ensure that Iraq does not break its promise on long-term monitoring as it has many times in the past on other commitments. Continued vigilance is necessary because we believe that Saddam Hussein is committed to rebuilding his weapons of mass destruction (WMD) capability, especially nuclear weapons. We also remain seriously concerned about the many contradictions and unanswered questions remaining in regard to Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability. It is therefore extremely important that the international community continue its efforts to establish the long-term monitoring regime required by U.N. Security Council Resolution 715. Although Iraq has said that it is ready to comply with that Resolution, it still must take significant steps, including the provision of new data about the suppliers of its WMD program and acceptance on the ground of a functioning monitoring program for a sustained period. Iraq has provided

some further data on suppliers which is still being evaluated by UNSCOM.

Rolf Ekeus, the Chairman of UNSCOM, has told Iraq that it must establish a clear track record of compliance before he can report favorably to the Security Council. We strongly endorse this approach and reject any establishment of a timetable for determining whether Iraq has complied with Resolution 715. There must be a sustained period of unquestionable, complete compliance with the monitoring plans.

The "no-fly zones" over northern and southern Iraq permit the monitoring of Iraq's compliance with Security Council Resolutions 687 and 688. Over the last 2 years, the northern no-fly zone has deterred Iraq from a major military offensive in the region. Since the no-fly zone was established in southern Iraq, Iraq's use of aircraft against its population in the region has stopped. However, Iraqi forces have responded to the no-fly zone by stepping up their use of land-based artillery to shell marsh villages.

The U.N. Special Rapporteur on Iraq, Max van der Stoep, published a report in November describing the Iraqi military's ongoing repression against civilian populations in the marshes. The Rapporteur has judged that Iraq is in violation of UNSCR 688, which demands that Iraq cease repression of its civilian population and allow immediate access by international humanitarian organizations to all those in need of assistance in all parts of Iraq. On January 4, the United States—along with the Governments of France, Russia, and the United Kingdom—presented a demarche to the Iraqi government strongly condemning its repression of the Iraqi people.

The United States is working closely with the United Nations and other organizations to provide humanitarian relief to the people of northern Iraq, in the face of Iraqi government efforts to disrupt this assistance. We have provided temporary generators and spare parts to preserve supplies of electricity in the region since the Iraqi government cut off power on August 5, 1993. We continue to support U.N. efforts to mount a relief program for persons in Baghdad and the South, provided that supplies are not diverted by the Iraqi government. We are continuing to

work toward the placement of human rights monitors for Iraq as proposed by the U.N. Special Rapporteur, and to support the establishment of a U.N. commission to investigate and publicize Iraqi war crimes and other violations of international humanitarian law.

On January 18, after a review of Iraqi compliance with Security Council resolutions, the President of the Security Council issued a statement noting that there was no consensus to modify the existing sanctions regime. That regime exempts medicine and, in the case of foodstuffs, requires only that the U.N. Sanctions Committee be notified of food shipments. The Sanctions Committee also continues to consider and, when appropriate, approve requests to send to Iraq materials and supplies for essential civilian needs. The Iraqi government, in contrast, has maintained a full embargo against its northern provinces and has acted to distribute humanitarian supplies only to its supporters and to the military.

The Iraqi government has so far refused to sell \$1.6 billion in oil as previously authorized by the Security Council in Resolutions 706 and 712. Talks between Iraq and the United Nations on implementing these resolutions have ended unsuccessfully. Iraq could use proceeds from such sales to purchase foodstuffs, medicines, materials, and supplies for essential civilian needs of its population, subject to U.N. monitoring of sales and the equitable distribution of humanitarian supplies (including to its northern provinces). Iraqi authorities bear full responsibility for any suffering in Iraq that results from their refusal to implement Resolutions 706 and 712.

Proceeds from oil sales also would be used to compensate persons injured by Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The U.N. Compensation Commission has received about two million claims so far, with another 500,000 expected. The U.S. Government has now filed a total of eight sets of individual claims with the Commission, bringing U.S. claims filed to roughly 3,000 with a total asserted value of over \$205 million. At a meeting on January 13, the Commission's Government Council continued discussions on how to allocate future funds

among different claimants but did not make any decisions. Meanwhile, a panel of commissioners began to work on the first set of individual claims for serious personal injury or death. The panel is expected to report its findings to the Governing Council in the spring.

Security Council Resolution 778 permits the use of a portion of frozen Iraqi oil assets to fund critical U.N. activities concerning Iraq, including humanitarian relief, UNSCOM, and the Compensation Commission. (The funds will be repaid, with interest, from Iraqi oil revenues as soon as Iraqi oil exports resume.) The United States is prepared to transfer up to \$200 million in frozen Iraqi oil assets held in U.S. financial institutions, provided that U.S. contributions do not exceed 50 percent of the total amount contributed. We have arranged a total of about \$107 million in such matching contributions thus far.

Iraq still has not met its obligations concerning Kuwaitis and third-country nationals it detained during the war. Iraq has taken no substantive steps to cooperate fully with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), as required by Security Council Resolution 687, although it has received more than 600 files on missing individuals. We continue to work for Iraqi compliance.

The Iraq-Kuwait border has been demarcated, and the U.N. Iraq-Kuwait Observer Mission (UNIKOM) continues its monitoring mission. However, the Iraqi government continues to refer publicly to Kuwait as a "province" and "governorate" of Iraq.

Examples of Iraqi noncooperation and noncompliance continue in other areas. For instance, on December 22, Iraqi military forces attacked a four-vehicle coalition military convoy near the Faydah checkpoint. This was the first time Iraqi forces have fired directly on coalition forces since the Gulf War. We, along with the British and the French, issued a demarche to the Iraqi government, warning Baghdad that a repetition of the incident would have consequences.

Iraq can rejoin the community of civilized nations only through democratic processes, respect for human rights, equal treatment of its people, and adherence to basic norms of international behavior. Iraq's Government

should represent all Iraq's people and be committed to the territorial integrity and unity of Iraq. The Iraqi National Congress (INC) espouses these goals, the fulfillment of which would make Iraq a stabilizing force in the Gulf region.

I am grateful for the support by the Congress of our efforts.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

Nomination for Ambassadors to Hungary, Micronesia, and Azerbaijan

January 31, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate three United States Ambassadors: Donald M. Blinken to the Republic of Hungary, March Fong Eu to the Federated States of Micronesia, and Richard Dale Kauzlarich to the Republic of Azerbaijan.

"Donald Blinken, March Fong Eu, and Richard Kauzlarich have all proven themselves to be dedicated to public service and capable of achievement at the highest levels," said the President. "I expect that they will do an outstanding job of representing our country abroad."

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

Remarks to the American Hospital Association

February 1, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, Dick, and thank you, Carolyn. And thank you also for bringing my tea out here. The Hospital Association is giving care to the President for his sick voice today. *[Laughter]* I thank you.

I appreciate so much what both Dick and Carolyn said, and I want to begin by thanking all of you here who have ever had me in your hospitals—*[laughter]*—which is a large num-

ber of people. Especially all the people who represent my native State and who have done so much to help educate me on these issues over the years.

The time that I have spent in hospitals since I was a small boy has made a very big impression on me. I always learn something. I always leave with a sense of inspiration about the dedication of the people who work there. And I want to say a special word of thanks to this association for the work that you have done with our administration over the last year, in a very constructive way, in helping us to try to develop an approach which would solve the problems of the American health care system and protect and enhance what is good about it.

I know that there will still be some issues on which there will be disagreement as we go forward, but I think it's important that we clarify today, as Dick did so well in his introduction, that we agree on the most important issue: We have to preserve what is right; we have to fix what is wrong; we have to guarantee private insurance to every American so that everybody will be covered. That is the only way to stop cost shifting, the only way to be fair, the only way to solve this problem.

The problem with the health care system in this country did not just happen overnight. It happened because of the way this system is organized. Anybody who thinks there are no serious problems, no crisis in the health care system, I would say go visit your local hospital.

Over the years, because of the insurance system we have in America, which is unlike any in the world and which, I will say, is irrelevant to the fact that we have the highest quality care in the world for the people who can afford it and access it, we have created a system which often makes it impossible for hospitals to do their jobs. While insurance companies have set up a system which enables them to slam the door on people who aren't healthy enough to get covered, hospitals open the door to everyone, whether they're covered or not.

We have created in this country, through the systems of hundreds of different insurance companies writing thousands of different policies, a giant bureaucracy which on

the insurance side sorts the healthy from the sick, the old from the young, the geographically desirable from the undesirable. And as more and more insurance companies sell more and more customized insurance policies to smaller and smaller groups, each of them has created its own set of forms and different sets of what would cover, spelled out in endless fine print. The result, as all of you know, has been a bureaucratic nightmare.

And what about the hospitals? You have had to create your own bureaucracy to deal with the insurance bureaucracy and the Government's as well, to fight redtape, close loopholes, and to try to get reimbursed somehow. And that only covers the patients who have good insurance. For those without insurance or with barebone coverage, you're forced to jump through a whole lot of other hoops. And you probably still often don't get any reimbursement.

Hospitals did not invent this system. You didn't choose a system which has resulted in hospitals hiring clerical workers at 4 times the rate of doctors being added to hospital staffs in the last 10 years. You did it because of the redtape of the present system, the insurance redtape and the Government program redtape.

Meanwhile, your mission didn't change, it's still to treat the people who are sick who need to be in the hospital. Regardless of their age or medical history, of what may or may not be covered, you have to deal with the people that the insurance industry decides are not profitable. You can't ask whether an illness was a preexisting condition, it's still an illness.

So what are we left with today? A system where we're ruled by forms and have less time to make people healthy. A system that forces doctors and nurses and clerical workers in hospitals to write out the same information six times in six different ways just to satisfy some distant company or agency. It doesn't make sense, and you shouldn't have to put up with it anymore.

Just listen to Joan Brown, a registered nurse who works at a teaching hospital in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. She wrote to the First Lady that she spends, and I quote, "more time with paperwork than with any

other aspect of health care." They've got a joke at her hospital, she said, "We'll do the patient care after we finish the paperwork, if we have time." It's not just a joke; it's a sign of a crisis and one we've got to do something about.

I visited Children's Hospital here in Washington last year. The pediatrician, who is from this community and who has dedicated her life to the children of this community, told me she spends up to 25 hours a week filling out forms instead of tending sick children. "It's not what we trained all these years to do," she said. "Reducing paperwork would enable me to practice medicine again. It would free me," she said, "free me from the shackles and the burdens of the paperwork maze."

Let's be honest. In his wildest dreams, Rube Goldberg could never have designed a system more complex than the present health care system. You in this room understand this better than anyone else in the world today. You see the crisis when people without insurance come to emergency rooms with serious injuries or illnesses. Many of those illnesses could have been prevented if only they had been covered and had access to a doctor, to primary and preventive care. The emergency room is the most expensive place to treat people. It should be reserved for emergencies. I know you believe that, and you can make sure it happened if everybody had access to health care coverage.

You see the crisis when people come in who aren't fully insured, and you become loaded up with what's called uncompensated care. The smallest estimate of that is \$25 billion a year. It either comes out of your budgets, which hurts your ability to provide health care at a high quality, or you have to shift the cost on to the bills of those who can pay them.

A lot of people who complain about hospitals overcharging, about inflated bills, have no idea how much of this cost shifting occurs simply because of the insurance setup that we have in the United States. No other country in the world is burdened with it. And we should not tolerate it any longer.

You also see it because a lot of the people who come to you, either before they come or sometime during their treatment, deal

with the problems of preexisting conditions or lifetime limits on insurance policies. Three out of four policies have such lifetime limits. I know a lot of times you wind up having to send a collection company after a patient that you know is not going to be able to pay the bill anyway because of these problems.

You see this crisis when a doctor prescribes prescription drugs, but then a person comes back to the hospital 3 or 4 weeks later because she couldn't afford to fill the prescription. So the illness got worse. One study says that problems related to the lack of appropriate medication lie at the root of up to 25 percent of all hospitalizations and cost over \$21 billion a year. Our plan is the only one that takes account of this and covers prescription drugs along with other medical services.

You see it with the crisis of violence in the emergency room. We have to learn to treat violence as a public health problem. Billions of dollars a year again are loaded onto the health care system because we are the most violent country in the world. Many people in health care supported the Brady bill, support our attempts to restrict assault weapons, to put more police officers on the street. That also will help alleviate the health care problem. So I hope you'll be out there after we deal with this the best we can, also supporting what the administration is trying to do on crime.

I came here today once again to thank you for the work you have done with us and to appeal once again for your support, for the real battle is now being joined in Congress. And though we may disagree about the details, we all agree the time has come to do something. We have to do it now. And what we have to do includes providing guaranteed private insurance to every single American. That is what I need your help to do.

I implore you to go to Capitol Hill and tell your Members of Congress again what is going on in your hospitals. Go home and talk to your friends and neighbors about it and the people who come in to your hospitals. Talk to business leaders in your communities and local media people.

One of the biggest problems we have in this fight today is that this issue is so complex and people are naturally enough so con-

cerned that they don't want to lose anything good that they have now, that it is easy to confuse people about what the real issues and the real facts are.

I love having a discussion with your representatives, even if there is some disagreement around the edges of policy. We come to the table with an accumulated knowledge of how the world really works. Our biggest problem in passing this is that there are too many people even in the Congress who have not had the opportunity to study this program in all of its complexity. This is a tough, tough issue. And as I could tell from your applause, you know that the most complex system that could ever be designed is not the one in the administration's bill, it's the one you're living with right now.

Our approach is not to tell you how to deliver health care, not to build barriers or bureaucracy. What we want to do is to establish a framework in which people are covered, provide the right incentives, help to remove the barriers to access, and get out of the way. We agree that local community-care networks must be the center of any reform system, groups of providers who see their mission as keeping people well, treating the sick when they are sick, and having the right incentives to do exactly that. We need to look no further than your own NOVA award winners for examples of providers who come together and make collaboration work.

One example, the Health Partners of Philadelphia, where six urban teaching hospitals came together and worked together to deal with violence and drugs and teen pregnancy in one community—this is a very moving sort of thing. This can be done throughout America. And we could do more of it if we covered everybody. It would lower the cost to the overall health care system if we did it, because we could practice prevention, we could give more primary care. The system as a whole would be less burdened, and we could have more networks like the one in Philadelphia you have honored.

I know that many of you are already finding incredibly creative ways to serve your community and are forming these networks. That approach will be quite consistent with the administration's approach. We helped to do that with clear incentives for people to

join together in networks and guarantees that when they do there will be compensation there for the services that are provided. And we agree that reform must simplify the system for you by reducing the paperwork burden. There's no excuse for not having a single standard form to replace the thousands of forms that exist today. And we want to help you move forward; electronic billing, less regulation by the Government, and other ways to help get rid of some of this paperwork hassle. I am tired of trying to explain why we spend a dime on the dollar more on paperwork, regulation, and premiums than any other country in the world and we still don't even cover everybody. It cannot be explained, so it should be changed.

And I want you to help me do something else, too, when you go up to Congress. Ask every Member of Congress, the next time somebody comes to them and says, "What we really ought to do is tax the benefits, the health care benefits of middle class working people," say, "Well, before you tax the benefits of working people whose wages have been stagnant for 20 years, why don't you ask how we can justify spending a dime on the dollar more on paperwork, regulation, and insurance premiums than anybody else?" That is waste. Why take something away from hard-working people before you squeeze the system and its unconscionable burdens on hospitals, doctors, nurses, and the American people themselves? That is where we ought to start.

I also want to talk a little bit about the guarantee of private insurance. Most people, under our approach, would get insurance the same way they do today, through their employer. Each consumer, not an employer, not a bureaucrat, would have a choice of health care plans and doctors.

Let me point out something else on this choice. Today, 55 percent of the companies who insure their employees and 40 percent of the total work force insured through their employer have no choice today in doctors or health plans. They take the plan the employer has chosen. Under our plan, everybody would have at least three choices of plans, including the right to simply pick a doctor and have fee-for-service medicine. That is more choice than exists today, not

less. Again, the rhetoric of people who have attacked change defies the reality of what people face and deal with in their daily lives in the health care system today.

Once someone has picked a plan, if they need to go to a doctor for a checkup or if they get sick, they'll simply take a health care security card, show it, and get the care they need. Then they'll fill out one standard form, and they're done. That way, we can go back to seeing hospitals as places of healing, not monuments to paperwork and bureaucracy.

I have heard so many stories in so many hospitals, I could keep you here all day laughing, but it would be like preaching to the saved. The only thing I want you to do is to go tell the Congress about it and that we can do better.

Last week when I spoke to Congress, I said that I would veto any legislation that did not cover every American with guaranteed insurance. Now, again I want to say that I did that because you know that unless we do that we can't have everybody playing by the same rules, using the same forms, ending the cost shifting, and getting people the preventive and primary care they need so they don't simply wind up in the emergency room. That is, all the systematic problems that the Hospital Association brought to the administration when we began this discussion will continue unless we provide coverage to everyone.

Now again, I know there are issues to work out. There are differences about what level of Medicaid savings can be achieved. I'll tell you this: Our plan is the only one that takes the Medicare savings and puts it back into the health care system, which is very, very important. But the biggest thing you need to do, I would argue, to get a good health care bill out of Congress is make sure that the people in the Congress understand how the system works today and what these various approaches would do if they were passed.

Yesterday, Families USA issued a very valuable document which I just received a copy of this morning which takes 10 different families, 10 different health situations, and goes through in practical terms how they would be affected if each of the major plans now pending in the Congress were the law of the

land. I would urge you to read it. But it won't surprise any of you because you know how the system works today.

Again, I implore you to take this debate to Congress, get beyond the rhetoric, get beyond the ideology, talk to people in the Congress about the American people and how the American health care system affects them. That is the only way we can work through the real problems as opposed to the imagined one.

One distinguished Member of the House of Representatives who represents a district with a wonderful teaching hospital and who has been required by virtue of his membership—his constituency—to become an expert on health policy over the years, read our plan the other day, and he said, "It's the only one that really takes account of so many different problems that most people don't even know about. But I have no idea how to get my colleagues in the Congress to take this issue seriously and spend all the time it would take to absorb it all."

You can do that. Every Member of Congress has a lot of hospitals in his or her district. Every Member of Congress basically cares a lot about health care. And you can come to this debate with a perspective that is not ideological, not partisan, has no ax to grind, doesn't care who wins except the American people and the American health care system. That's what you can bring to this debate.

So I would ask you, at a time when some say we just need a little tinkering and others say there are ideological barriers to changing it, I just want to say that Dick Davidson, your president, in my view, said it as well as it could be said last December. He said, "Comprehensive reform is what the American people are asking us to do. To do nothing, or worse, to fall back on simplistic solutions, only postpones and complicates our task." And that's the truth.

Let us stand together for the health care of the American people. We have a chance finally for the first time in decades to do this right. You know what needs to be done. I pledge to you an open door, a listening ear, a firm partnership. Let's go out there and solve this problem for the American people.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:18 a.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to Dick Davidson, president, American Hospital Association, and Carolyn Roberts, chairman-elect, American Hospital Association Board of Trustees.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association

February 1, 1994

Thank you very much. If anyone ever asks you what do Carroll Campbell and Bill Clinton have in common, you could say they have the same throat disease. [*Laughter*] He's doing better today than he was yesterday. I'm doing slightly worse. The good news is, you get a shorter speech.

I want to thank you all for being here and for your common concerns. Yesterday we had a good meeting and especially, I thought, a very good discussion about the problem of crime in our country and the crime bill, the necessity to put more well-trained police officers on our streets and to take repeat violent criminals off the streets forever but also the necessity to be smart about the crime bill, to do things that make sense to you and to your law enforcement officials.

Today, I want to talk a little bit about two other fundamental challenges that we face: health care reform and welfare reform. They are linked inextricably to each other. And in order to meet these challenges, we will have to have an open and honest partnership both in passing the laws and, perhaps even more important, in implementing them.

We began our partnership, at least with me in this new job, about a year ago today when we had a very long and fruitful meeting at the White House. I think it ran in excess of 3 hours. That meeting resulted, among other things, in the approval of every major waiver for State health care reform that you have requested. There have been 5 of them and about 90 smaller waivers to enable different changes to be made at the State level. In addition to that, we've now granted waivers to nine States in the area of welfare reform.

I do believe the States are the laboratories of democracy. I do believe that where people are charged with solving the real problems of real people, reality and truth in politics

often is more likely to give way to making progress.

Last August you all said, Democrats and Republicans alike, that our health care system is in crisis. In the last several days we've had a big linguistic battle in Washington about whether we have a crisis or a serious problem. I think it's better, since we're at the Governors' meeting, to focus on the facts. We do have a system, unlike any other in the advanced countries in the world, in which insurance companies decide who's covered and who isn't, what the cost of insurance is, and what's covered in specific policies. We do have a system in which the number of uninsured people is going up significantly. We do have a system in which more and more Americans, therefore, who have insurance are at risk of losing it if they get sick or if their job goes away.

We clearly have a system, as our SBA Director Erskine Bowles, from North Carolina, never tires of telling me, where small businesses have premiums that, on average, are 35 percent higher than large businesses or Government. We have a system in which State budgets have been extraordinarily burdened by the exploding costs of their Medicaid match, so that last year, for the first time ever, States spent more money on health care than on State-funded higher education.

We have a system in which the lowest estimate of uncompensated care burdens on hospitals is \$25 billion a year; in which 58 million Americans, according to the Medical Association, are without coverage at some time during the year; in which 81 million Americans have a preexisting condition, which means either that their premiums are higher or that they can't get insurance or that they can't ever change jobs, which is an enormous burden in a system in which labor mobility is, I am convinced, the key to personal and family prosperity as we move toward the 21st century.

Finally, we have a system in which three out of four insurance policies have lifetime limits, which means if you get really sick you might run out of insurance in the middle of the time when you need it most.

Now, those are facts. They can be seen in the million letters, almost, that the First Lady has received since we started this whole

effort to deal with health care. On the way in, I was describing briefly to Governor Campbell a letter I got from—or she got from Jo Anne Osteen of Sumter, South Carolina, who owns a small business, works 6 days a week, raised three children by herself with diabetes and arthritis. Although she had diabetes and arthritis, when she wrote us she hadn't been in the hospital one time in the 12 years that she'd been with her insurers. But her insurance rates went up to \$306 a month, even though she was only taking home \$205 a week from her business. Her doctors told her that the answer was to quit and go on disability. So she wrote, "Those high premiums are going to force people like me to the welfare and food stamp lines with no insurance. I am a proud American, and I don't want this to happen to me. I have thought about nothing but this problem, and I don't know where to turn."

Well, I think we ought to heed her call for help. A lot of you do, too, and that's why you've tried to reform your health care systems. After all, this woman has values that keep this country together. They're the ones that built our Nation. And we shouldn't force people like that to consider seriously whether they should go on to public assistance in order to take care of their children.

There's a flip side to this, too, this connection between welfare and health care, which I want to mention. I talked about it a little in the State of the Union Address. But we often say to people they should leave welfare and go to work. And we know that welfare benefits themselves in real dollar terms are lower today than they were 20 years ago in most States. So that the welfare check has almost nothing to do with why people stay on welfare. They stay because of the medical care and because of child care and because they have low skills. But we have this incredible situation in our country where if someone on welfare leaves welfare to take an entry-level job that doesn't have health insurance, as soon as the coverage of the Family Support Act runs out, you have people making low wages paying taxes to pay for health care for people who stayed on welfare and didn't make the same decision they did.

So these two issues are clearly tied together, and we need to see them together

as a part of what it would take to make America a place where people who work hard, play by the rules, and believe in the kind of values that permeate the efforts that all the Governors around this table are making are rewarded for that.

Now, we've made a beginning. Last year, the Congress passed in the context of the budget act a huge increase in the earned-income tax credit which lifts families with children on modest wages out of poverty. When tax bills come due this April, 15 million families with a total of about, we estimate, 50 million Americans, will be lifted beyond the poverty line by getting tax reduction under the earned-income tax credit. That means that there will no longer be an income incentive for people to choose welfare over work.

But the welfare system has a lot of other problems as well. Too often it still rewards values other than family and personal responsibility. Instead of encouraging those to stay together as we should, it often encourages families to break apart. Instead of encouraging children who have children to live with their parents or grandparents, it often encourages them to leave home. Instead of enforcing child support and asking those who bring children into the world to take responsibility for them, it too often ignores—it's too difficult to collect the \$34 billion absent parents should be paying to their children.

Perhaps most important—we were talking about this on the way in—an enormous part of this problem is the explosion of births to people who have never been married at all. And there is nothing in the present system, except where the States have taken the initiative to do it, to stop teen pregnancy from occurring in the first place. Even in the Family Support Act of '88, and I want to say more about that because I'm really proud of what we did on it, there was nothing to stop the condition from occurring in the first place.

And we need to devote, as this debate takes place, an enormous amount of attention to some of the decisions that we ought to make, some of them quite politically courageous. Governor Campbell was talking about some of the things they're doing in South Carolina which mirror some of the things we

tried to do at home to try to stop these things from occurring in the first place.

This year I have committed, and Senator Moynihan, I think, and Senator Dole probably both talked about this—to offer in the springtime a comprehensive welfare reform bill to restore these values of responsibility and family. We want to help those who are on welfare to get on their feet. We want to help them for up to 2 years with training and child care and other supports. But after that, we need to have a system that says anybody who can work and support themselves and their families must do so, in the private sector where possible, with a community service job if that's the only work available, to make welfare a second chance, not a way of life.

Now, those of us in this room have worked on this issue for years. I was privileged, along with the then-Governor of Delaware, Mike Castle, to be the representatives of the Governors who work with Senator Moynihan and with Congressman Ford and others on the welfare reform effort that became the Family Support Act of 1988. Mike Castle is now in the Congress, having changed jobs with Tom Carpenter. Guess who thinks he got the better deal out of that?

We never fully implemented that act. You know it, and I know it. So we ought to begin asking ourselves: Did we do a good job then? What progress has been made in the States? There's a lot of evidence that significant progress has been made in the States that have been most aggressive.

Why was it never fully implemented? Partly because Congress never fully funded it, partly because—as you will never hear the end of it, they'll say, “Well, but the States never fully used all the money we came up with. States must not have really cared about this because they never provided the State match to use all the funds.” You know why the States never provided the State match, don't you? You had to spend all your money making the Medicaid match, which was not optional, it was mandatory, and building prison cells. That's where we spent all of our new money in the 1980's and the early nine-ties.

So I point this out not to do any finger-pointing but just to say one of the things we need to do is to go back and look at that

bill, see what's good about it, figure out what will be necessary to change so that the States can take full advantage of that bill, because it had incentives to work, it had supports for families. It was never fully implemented because you had to spend all your money on mandatory explosions and medical costs and building prison cells, many of which were also mandated by the Federal courts, not the Congress. So we need to begin there.

We also need to know that—to recognize again—though I will say that we estimate that about one in five, just under one in five people who get back on welfare after they get off do so for a health-related reason. Because so many people on welfare, virtually everyone has younger children, the loss of the health care coverage for the younger children for people who leave welfare is an enormous disincentive to get off of it.

That's why I think that a year ago in the winter meeting, the Governors hit the nail on the head when they said the kinds of structural changes that must occur in the health care system can't be effective until every legal resident of America has health insurance. I believe that the health care solution and the welfare solution are inextricably linked.

Let me say just a few words about health care. I'm encouraged by what I understand was said by the speakers before I got here today. And again, I wish I could keep you in constant session here. You seem to have a leveling effect on the political rhetoric of the Nation's Capital. Guaranteed private insurance for every American is the only way we'll ever be able to control the cost of this system, simplify it, and provide the American people with security of health benefits that can never be taken away. Unless we do that, too many will continue to get their care in emergency rooms, which will add billions of dollars to the health care bill. Too many will continue to not have certain things covered. Too many, for example, will be part of the Americans who add an estimated \$21 billion to our health care bills every year because they can't afford medicine that would keep them out of hospitals, so they wind up going to the hospitals and costing the American people much more. We certainly won't be

able to simplify the system and reduce the unnecessary bureaucracy.

One of the things that I challenge all the folks to do who believe that the beginning of health care reform is to tax the benefits of middle class workers who have generous health care packages, is to say: How can we do that? How can we start with that when we know we have a system where we spend 10 percent more on paperwork, bureaucracy, and insurance premiums than any other nation in the world? And these things have nothing to do with health care. We just have a system that is organized so that we spend a dime on the dollar more on paperwork than any other country in the world, paperwork in the insurance office, paperwork in the hospitals, paperwork in the doctor's office.

I just left the American Hospital Association, and they have said, clearly, the only way you'll ever fix this is to have a system that provides basic coverage to everybody, so that you can have a single claims form which will be imposed on the patients, single claims form for the hospitals, single claims form for the doctors. It is imperative that we do that.

There was a study in the *New England Journal of Medicine* a year or so ago: two hospitals, one in the United States, one in Canada, same number of beds, same rate of occupancy, same general mix of treatment, one of them had 200 people in their clerical department, the other had 6. Now, I don't advocate going to the single-payer system for other reasons; there are other problems in the Canadian system. And it is the second most expensive in the world. I think managed competition will work better. But it is clear that we cannot justify, in my view, taking something away from the working people of this country before we clean up the administrative costs of the present system.

I also will say without full coverage, I don't see any way to avoid the conclusion that States will continue to bear a disproportionate burden of skyrocketing health care costs. The Lewin study showed that States would pay less under our approach than if we just left things the way they are and that health care would improve.

I still believe in the requirement for employers to cover their employees. First of all, that's the way most people get their health

insurance today. Under our approach people would have a choice in their health care program. There's been a lot of discussion about this. Let's go beyond the rhetoric to the reality today.

Today, fifty-five percent of all employers and 40 percent of all employees who are covered with health insurance through the workplace have no choice in the health care plan or the doctors they get, they are selected by the employer, today. Under our plan, every employee would have to get at least three choices once a year, one of which would be just picking your doctor and having fee-for-service medicine.

So I'm all for choice, but we need to recognize that if we want the benefits of competition and the benefits of choice, we have to move away from the trend that we are setting now. We are moving in the direction of getting the benefits of competition and market power for big business and Government. And some of you have asked for reforms, Governor McWherter, among others, to put Medicaid into a managed competition environment to get the benefits of that. But the problem is some people will get the benefits of that, other people on the other end will lose choice. So if you want to pursue both values at once, we plainly have to change the direction in which we are going. And we have to have a different framework if you wish to have both.

Now, in spite of some of the interesting art work that you've seen in the last couple of weeks, the Washington Post said that our approach would create, and I quote, "a surprisingly simple world for consumers." You make a decision once a year, among at least three plans, based on what you want. I wish we could even have more choice. We haven't figured out how to do that yet. But Federal employees have a great deal, for example, and many of you in States have given your State employees more and more choices. And because you have market power, you can do that, which is why you have to give some framework for the small businesses to have the same market power that big business and Government does.

Now, a lot of this approach builds on what I have seen a lot of you do in the States. Hawaii proved a long time ago that if you

did it right, you can have an employer requirement to cover employees without bankrupting small business but providing better coverage, stronger work force, and lowering health care costs because of the way the market can be organized. The Governor of Hawaii has spoken eloquently about this. You can say, "Well, Hawaii is geographically isolated and, besides that, we all like to go there and surf and play golf or whatever." Well, that's why we want to do it for the whole country instead of just impose it on one State or another.

We learned from Minnesota that health care cost targets can be set and met through strong leadership, market-forces competition, and high quality. And I might say, Governor Carlson, that the Mayo Clinic stands—if there were no other example in this country, and there are—but if you just take that one example, it is a sterling and a stunning rebuke to those who say you cannot provide the world's highest class health care and control costs.

We learned from the example of Washington State and of Florida and most recently of Maryland that you can pool businesses and families together to change the David-and-Goliath equation, and then small businesses and families can get affordable health insurance that covers the things which need to be covered. We learn from Pennsylvania—we learn two things from Pennsylvania. The first thing is that the Governor of Pennsylvania proves that you can do anything in the health care system. We also learn that better tracking of costs and outcomes improves the quality and lowers the cost. This is an amazing thing they did, and our approach encompasses this. Whatever the Congress does, this should be a part of it. Pennsylvania actually took the time to study and report on the cost of different procedures in different hospitals in different parts of the State and then measured the cost against the results, proving that there was not a necessary connection in many areas between cost and quality and changing the whole environment in terms of what consumers then could ask for and get. This sounds like a simple thing, but in a system this complicated this information, available in a way that people can act on it, is a rarity, not the rule, in American health care.

So I believe that if we at the Federal level can learn from these things and finally solve this problem in a comprehensive way, we will go a long way toward dealing with the welfare reform issue, and we will lay to rest one of the biggest problems for American families and for the long-term stability of our society.

Now, what normally happens around here is that everybody gives their speeches, and then we have Washington-style reform where we tinker at the edges, expand the Medicaid program a little more. That's what we've been doing for years, you know, just kind of backing toward universal coverage by expanding Medicaid mandates. And then at the same time, we try to ratchet down the Federal spending a little more and pass some other incremental reforms. You know what's going to happen? We do that, more mandates on you and less money for you to pay. That's what's going to happen. More State money put into a system that is fundamentally broken, without enough security, where someone else is making the fundamental policy decisions.

I talked to you a few moments ago about Jo Anne Osteen from Sumter, South Carolina. She wrote us last June, struggling to hang on to both her small business and her insurance. She had to make a choice, and she chose her business and lost her coverage. After decades and decades, it's time to solve that woman's problem, because her problem is our problem. And her problem is now the State government's problem.

We really can do things around here when we put our minds to it. We've got the deficit going down instead of up. We all got together, some of you mentioned it yesterday, in a bipartisan and Federal, State way and passed NAFTA when it was given up for dead. That enabled us to get a GATT agreement which was stalled for 7 years. Congress passed the Brady bill after a 7-year stall. We actually can do things around here when people work at it and they keep pushing us to make a decision and they keep us all in the right frame of mind and they keep us thinking about real things. You cannot escape the real world and the rhetoric. You can't do it because you're too close to your folks.

Here, we communicate most often with the American people through an array of

intermediaries. And most times, too many times people can't get to us with their real problems. So there is always a danger here that the policy apparatus will just slip the tracks and that we'll forget what this is about.

Yesterday, Families USA issued this report, which I urge you all to get and read. It just takes 10 typical health care situations that actually happen to real Americans and identifies how those things would be dealt with under the major bills pending before Congress. In other words, it's not about politics and rhetoric and theory, it's about real lives.

So I ask you to help us do this. You all differ among yourselves; we have some differences with you. That's fine, that's good, that's what this is all about. But I remember in 1987 and 1988, we were struggling to deal with welfare reform. And every Governor in the country wanted to do something about it. And the political rhetoric—the Governors were converging around an issue, but the political rhetoric in Washington was diverging right and left. And we sat around here and talked; we tried to get agreement on a policy position. And Governor Campbell had just left the Congress where he had been the minority leader of the subcommittee that dealt with welfare. And he said to the Democrats and Republicans alike, "Look, I had to go talk to a bunch of people on welfare, and here is the way this works. Here is the intersection of welfare, health care, food stamps, the whole thing."

It was an incredible moment where all of us had to say, this is not about rhetoric, this is about real people. And we went on and passed the Family Support Act, which Senator Moynihan said was the most significant piece of social reform in the welfare area in three decades.

Now, we can do this on health care. I don't believe we can do it unless everybody gets coverage. But we can do it, and you can help us do it if you push the thing together around real problems, real facts, and real issues, and don't let Washington rhetoric pull the country apart. The country needs you, and I hope you'll stay with us until the job is done.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:46 a.m. at the J.W. Marriott. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Carroll Campbell of South Carolina, Gov. Ned Ray McWherter of Tennessee, and Gov. Arne Carlson of Minnesota.

**Remarks Announcing the
Nomination of Deval L. Patrick To
Be Assistant Attorney General for
Civil Rights and an Exchange With
Reporters**

February 1, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. For tens of millions of Americans the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has historically embodied what is best about our country. It's helped us to keep the promise of our Constitution, to provide to every American equal opportunity and equal protection under the law, regardless of race or gender or disability. Because of our pursuit of equal treatment under the law, we've made a lot of progress in this country in the workplace, in the schools, in the voting booths, and in the courts. But there is still much more to be done. We need a strong and aggressive Civil Rights Division and a strong and compassionate advocate for freedom and fairness at the helm of that Division.

Today I am proud to nominate Deval Patrick to be Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. I believe he is uniquely qualified to lead this Division in this decade. He's been chosen because he has distinguished himself as a lawyer whose wise counsel, keen negotiating skills, and mastery at litigation are held in the highest esteem.

He's fought successfully against discrimination and for civil rights for his entire life, both professionally and personally. He understands that the law is a tool to help real people with real problems. He's here with his family today, having come a long way from his childhood on the south side of Chicago through a distinguished academic and professional career of which any American could be proud.

The quest for civil rights gives life to our highest ideals and our deepest hopes. For his entire career Deval Patrick has played a role in that struggle, and he has made a real difference. Therefore, I know he will per-

form in a very outstanding manner in his new role as Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

Mr. Patrick?

Attorney General? [Laughter] I don't know what order he's in.

Mr. Patrick. Stick with me.

The President. That's the idea.

[At this point, Attorney General Janet Reno and Deval Patrick made brief remarks.]

Conservative Groups

Q. Mr. President, conservative groups are already attacking Mr. Patrick, the same groups that attacked Lani Guinier, saying that he is the "Stealth Guinier." How are you going to sell this nomination and make sure that your view of his record gets out accurately?

The President. Well, I think that this nomination may be about those groups and whether they're proceeding in good faith. That is, you know, before those groups said, "Well, we don't object to Lani Guinier's career as a lawyer. We just don't agree with her writings about future remedies." So now when they say "Stealth Guinier," what they mean is that both these people have distinguished legal careers in trying to enforce the civil rights laws of the country. I hope that Mr. Patrick would plead guilty to that.

And the truth is, a lot of those people are going to be exposed because they never believed in the civil rights laws; they never believed in equal opportunity; they never lifted a finger to give anybody of a minority race a chance in this country. And this time, if they try that, it's going to be about them, because they won't be able to say it's about somebody's writings, about future remedies. If they attack his record it means just exactly what we've all suspected all along, they don't give a riff about civil rights.

Well, those of us who care about civil rights were elected by the American people to take care of them. That's what we intended to do.

Death Penalty

Q. Mr. President, do you agree with his argument that the death penalty is racially discriminatory against blacks?

The President. Do I agree? He's made that argument in court. I don't agree with that, no.

Q. A 1987 Supreme Court case.

The President. No.

Q. Have you talked with him about—

The President. But I think the most compelling evidence that was introduced to support it, as I've said many times as a supporter of capital punishment, is that the race of the victim seems to determine the outcome of the verdict. There's a lot of evidence—the Supreme Court actually did not reject that evidence. They just said that that was not sufficient to outlaw the penalty as a constitutional matter. And I have repeatedly said I think that every State prosecutor ought to examine that. If there is evidence—every State ought to look and see, is there evidence that there's a disparity in the application of this penalty based on the race of the victim. If there is, States ought to take steps to try to do something about it.

Health Care Debate

Q. Mr. President, Senator Dole says that your staff shouldn't go around calling people liars just because they disagree with them on health care. Is this exchange beginning to escalate out of hand?

The President. No. I don't know what he's talking about. I'm sorry, I can't—I don't—

Q. Well, he's talking about the reply that your office put out to an article about the Clinton health plan in the New Republic last week, which goes in several places to say that they are blatant lies. He was addressing it specifically to Mr. Magaziner.

The President. Well, I hate to use that word, but the New Republic article was way off base. And the New Republic didn't make total disclosure about the source of the article.

But I think Senator Dole was quite conciliatory at the Governors' Association today, and I have certainly tried to be constructive. And I know it may make better news for you all to drive a wedge between us, but it's better for the American people if we work together and tone our rhetoric down.

Northern Ireland

Q. On a foreign policy matter, sir, Gerry Adams says the time has come for the United States to weigh in on the Ireland question. You had spoken in the campaign of becoming more involved or having the United States more involved in trying to find a peaceful solution there. Will you take a more aggressive stance toward trying to promote a peace settlement in Northern Ireland?

The President. Well, when I spoke about that in the campaign, we didn't have the evidence that we now have that the British and the Irish Government would take the steps that they have taken. Let's be fair. The people that have to resolve this are the Irish and the British, and since that campaign, I think it's astonishing what's been done. The joint declaration is something the United States very much supports.

I did believe that by giving Mr. Adams this visa, this limited visa to come here, that we might have a constructive role in pushing the peace process, which is why I did it. And I think that was an appropriate thing to do. But I think we should also support the work being done by the Prime Ministers of both Ireland and Britain in pursuing the peace.

Health Care

Q. Senator Rockefeller today said that he thought you were being a little bit too conciliatory to your good friends, the Governors, on health care, and he thought that maybe Mrs. Clinton could bring you back. [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, Senator Rockefeller made a big mistake today. He's a wonderful man, but he made a big mistake. He read a press report and assumed it was true. I mean—[*laughter*]—or fully accurate. That is, he read a report of someone else's characterization of what I said and assumed it was fully accurate. And the people who were characterizing it obviously were characterizing the conversation in the light most favorable to their position.

I don't mean that the press misreported it. I mean the press reported it accurately. But that's what they do. When you have private conversations with people, they often characterize it in the light most favorable to their position. I think that's what happened.

I didn't say anything differently in that meeting than I have said repeatedly, which is that we are and we should be flexible on the size of the alliances—that's already been said by Secretary Bentsen—and that in order to have a health care plan which passes muster in the Congress, we have to have some way of showing how much taxpayer money is at risk over a 5-year period. That's required of every bill passed by Congress.

That's all I said, and I think the interpretation of it—while I don't dispute whatever they said, I think that the folks who communicated that to the press were doing it in the light most favorable to their own position. I understand that; that's fair game. But I would caution Senator Rockefeller to not think that I'd left his position. In many ways he's the heart and soul of this fight for health care. And if we change positions, he and I, we're going to try to do it together.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:38 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Message to the Congress on Small Business

February 1, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to present my first annual report on the state of small business. This report covers data for fiscal year 1992, a period of slow economic recovery that occurred just before my Administration took office.

Small businesses create many new jobs and are an important part of our Nation's economic growth. That is why, in my first address to the Joint Session of the Congress, I proposed some of the boldest targeted incentives for small business in history. These measures will benefit not only small businesses, but the American work force, our Nation's economy, and our international competitiveness.

At the same time, we must undertake some major corrective efforts. As small business owners will testify, the best thing the government could do for small business and the economy is to reduce the deficit. The primary goal of the economic program is to set the economy on the proper course for

the short- and long-term future. Deficit reduction and shifting consumption to investment are the ways to accomplish that goal.

Reducing health care costs while ensuring that all Americans have access to health care is another national imperative. I have said it before: bringing health spending in line with inflation would do more for the private sector than almost any incentive or tax cut we could promote. At the same time, we must find a way to provide health care for everyone. Currently two-thirds of the Americans without health insurance are employed—many in small businesses. My health care task force has evaluated many proposals to ensure that health care is available to small business employees and affordable for small business owners. It will take time to change our health care system, but we are taking the important first steps.

We will also need to keep looking for better ways to provide for workers upon retirement. As this report documents, pension plans, like health plans, are much less available and affordable in small businesses. And as the baby boom generation moves toward retirement, issues related to Social Security and pension plan availability take on new urgency.

Beyond these long-range efforts, I have asked the Congress to join me in investing in small business and economic growth through specific tax incentives, capital formation initiatives, enterprise and empowerment zones, technology investments, and education and job training efforts.

To encourage long-term investment in small business, I supported—and the Congress passed—a 50 percent tax exclusion on capital gains from investments in qualified small business stock held for at least 5 years. This incentive, which will help small businesses raise critically needed capital, is projected to create 80,000 new jobs over the next 5 years. I also favored such an exclusion for investment in small business venture capital firms targeting investments to minority-owned businesses. Another small business incentive I supported increases the "Section 179" expensing limitation from \$10,000 to \$17,500, which will enable a number of smaller firms to purchase equipment needed for modernization and growth.

My Administration supports easing the regulatory burden on small firms so that more of the time spent filling out paperwork—especially complicated or duplicative paperwork—can be used for more productive activities. There are a number of measures we can take. We have already simplified the computation of certain taxes such as the alternative minimum tax and we have eased the safe harbor rules related to the individual estimated tax. And we can ensure that Federal agencies comply with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which requires them to assess the effects of their proposed regulations on small firms.

Recent low interest rates have made resources more available to consumers for purchasing the products and services of American business and have made loans somewhat less expensive for the business community. In addition, I have proposed a number of measures to make capital more available to small business. To ease the “credit crunch” faced by many small firms, new provisions are loosening restrictions on banks so they can more easily make “character” loans, easing appraisal requirements for real estate used as collateral for small business loans, eliminating overlapping Federal regulations on lending institutions, and establishing an appeals process for banks and consumers who believe they have been unfairly treated by regulators.

Small and minority-owned businesses would also benefit from a strengthened system of community development banks. A proposed Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Fund would support investment in community development financial institutions (CDFIs). These CDFIs would be a source for loans and technical assistance to individuals and businesses in communities underserved by traditional lending institutions.

Another way we plan to support the growth of new small enterprises, especially in economically depressed areas, is through the establishment of empowerment zones, enterprise communities, and rural development investment areas. The zones and communities will be nominated by State and local governments and chosen on a competitive basis after certain criteria based on popu-

lation, geographic area, and poverty level are met. Businesses in these designated communities can take advantage of expanded tax-exempt financing. Businesses in empowerment zones will be given additional employment credits and tax incentives.

Only by fully developing our technological and human resources can we expect to be leaders in the international marketplace. That means investment in technology and worker skills.

There are a number of actions we can take to remain technologically competitive. We can extend the research and experimentation tax credit to encourage more research activities by American small businesses. I would like to see an expansion of the Small Business Innovation Research program, which, as documented in this report, helps channel Federal research funding to innovative small firms. I support a strong Small Business Technology Transfer program in which small businesses work with Federal laboratories and universities to develop promising technology and introduce it into the marketplace. The manufacturing extension centers we have proposed would help small- and medium-sized businesses evaluate new manufacturing technology. And I'd like to see an expansion of the Commerce Department's Advanced Technology Program, which provides matching grants to companies working on generic technology. Finally, we need to speed up computer networks and coordinate Federal information and telecommunications policy.

We are looking at innovative ways to employ, train, and provide for a work force second to none. To begin with, we have extended the targeted jobs tax credit, which is available to employers who hire economically disadvantaged youth and members of specific at-risk groups. But that is just a small part of a large picture: many State, local, and private groups are experimenting with innovative ways to develop and train a competitive work force for the 21st century.

Clearly, our Nation faces many challenges. Fortunately, we face them with an almost limitless resource—the variety and ingenuity of the American people. If we can meet our national challenges with the energy and innovative spirit of America's small business own-

ers, we will be doing very well. So I encourage the Members of Congress, together with young people and small business owners and all Americans to reach into your imaginations: dream boldly and begin something new.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 1, 1994.

Memorandum on Somalia

February 1, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94-14

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Provision of Assistance to Support the Reestablishment of Police Forces in Somalia

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 614(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2364(a)(1) (the "Act"), I hereby:

(1) determine that it is important to the security interests of the United States to furnish up to \$12 million under Chapter 6 of Part II of the Act, from funds appropriated for Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) for fiscal year 1994, for purposes of supporting efforts to reestablish police forces in Somalia, without regard to section 512 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1994 (Public Law 103-87), and sections 620(q) and 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2151 *et seq.*), or any other provision of law within the scope of section 614(a)(1) of the Act; and

(2) authorize the furnishing of such assistance.

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

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 2.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Congressional Leaders

February 2, 1994

Bipartisan Cooperation

The President. Let me say just a word here. I can't speak very loud. This is our first but what will be the first of several bipartisan leadership meetings, and I'm looking forward to a productive year. We had a good year working together in 1993. We did a lot of things, and even though we have some differences to resolve, I'm convinced that we can resolve them and work together on crime and welfare reform and health care. And I'm looking forward to it.

Vietnam

Q. Mr. President, there seems to be a bipartisan majority, at least in the Senate, urging you to finally lift the trade embargo against Vietnam. Is this the moment that you're ready to move forward on that?

The President. Well, I've not made a final decision, but we are reviewing it and will be reviewing it over the next couple of days.

Q. —this week—have a decision this week?

The President. Well, I'll have a decision, I'd say, within the next several days.

Q. Is that decision harder, sir, because of your college-age protest against the war? Is it politically more tough?

The President. Not really. I mean, I think the fact that there are so many distinguished veterans who think that the embargo should be lifted and there are people on the other side who voted who were not veterans; this is an issue for the present day, and we just have to do what's right today.

Q. Is there any connection at all to the apparent exoneration of Commerce Secretary Ron Brown by the Justice Department and the grand jury, to this decision that could happen on Vietnam?

The President. No.

Business Roundtable

Q. The Business Roundtable today is supposed to support Cooper's bill. How will that affect you?

The President. They're trying to decide what their negotiating position would be.

They told me yesterday, the representatives, that they had no thought that it would pass. They're trying to decide what their best negotiating position is. I made an argument that their best negotiating position ought to be to say what they thought was wrong with our bill, because almost all of them—not all of them, but almost all of them—favor guaranteed private insurance for everyone to stop the cost shifting to them. Most big businesses have paid higher premiums than they should have because of the cost shifting. And since they all cover their employees, most of them favor some form of universal coverage.

And so I argued that if that was really their position, their best policy ought to be to give a laundry list of everything they thought was wrong with our bill and that that was an appropriate thing, but they'll have to make their own decision about what they want to do.

Q. Can you convince them?

The President. I don't have any idea. I only talked to a handful of them, so I didn't have a shot at most of them.

President's Health

Q. How are you feeling?

The President. Good. It's getting better.

Q. Are you going to do mostly listening or talking?

The President. What do you think? I never learned anything talking in my life. [Laughter]

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:13 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to the Department of Labor Conference on Reemployment

February 2, 1994

First of all, let me thank all of you for being willing to be a part of this program today, and all of you who are here. And let me thank whoever set the microphone up for my hoarse voice. I presume you can hear it out there, even in its depleted condition.

Before I became President, I worked, incidentally, with some of the people in this audience today as a Governor for a dozen years on a lot of these kinds of programs which

we know work. And we did an awful lot of work in my home State to try to help customize programs to meet the needs of not only the people who were losing their jobs but also to fit them to the economy that existed and the economy that was emerging in our State and to try at the same time to shape the economy so that there would be opportunities for people who were willing to go through the retraining programs. Nonetheless, I always had this frustration that there were a lot of people who were succeeding because they were good people, and there were good people running these programs and they were making them work sometimes against all the odds, but I never had the feeling that there was a system established in our country that made any real sense for the economy that exists today and the one that's going forward.

Now, Secretary Reich and I were talking on the way over here, and I had already reviewed all the materials on this conference, about the morning session focusing on what's wrong with the present system and the second session talking about things that work. We obviously have some real success stories here, and what I would like to do is to maybe just ask some of the panelists to talk a little bit about their own experiences and then to try to identify whatever was in their experience that ought to be part of a national program, that ought to be part of—in other words, every program with Federal money in it everywhere. That's really what we mean by national program because there's not a national economy in that sense.

I mean, the economy is different, and the pool of people and what their needs are is different in every place. But it seems to me there ought to be some common elements to these programs. So that's kind of what I hope will come out of this, and I hope that all of you who are out here will also be thinking of that. We have to shape in this year legislation that will, to use our common phrase that the Vice President's given us, reinvent the way we provide these training opportunities in the hope that we can create more success stories.

There are other things we have to do, too. And I'll say more about that at the end of the program. But that is what I'd like to focus

on, because we have to make some hard decisions in the next 30 to 45 days about what ought to be in these programs, what we can fund, and what we can't. Inevitably we'll come up against budgetary constraints, and there will be some things we'll be able to do and some things we won't. So, I'd like to start by asking each of you to talk maybe in a little more detail about your personal experiences. And then if you can say in your own words what you think ought to be in every program in every State that affects someone like you, I hope you will do that.

[At this point, the President participated in a panel discussion with formerly displaced workers and the people whose programs helped them to find jobs, and his remarks were not released by the Office of the Press Secretary. The President then made the following concluding remarks.]

Let me wrap up by just making a couple of observations. First of all, to thank all those panelists who were here, the ones on my panel and the ones who were here earlier and all of you for coming.

What we are trying to do in our administration with the leadership of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education and many others is to establish a system of life-long learning, to recognize that people are going to change work seven or eight times in a lifetime, that even if you're fortunate enough to have your employer able to keep you with the same company for a lifetime, doing that will require continuous changing skills.

The way we do things will be different tomorrow than the way we did things today. You heard Father Cunningham talking about making a clean car. Well, being a bank teller is a very different job today than it was 5 years ago, too. Working in most hospital jobs are different today than it was 5 years ago. Things are changing rapidly, and they will continue to.

We have some major pieces of legislation: Our Goals 2000 bill, which affects the way public schools operate and tries to give them some international standards against which to measure their own efforts; a school-to-work initiative which tries to recognize that a lot of young people don't go to college but

do need the kinds of skills that we've been talking about today. And we are going to propose transforming the whole unemployment system to try to deal with some of the problems you heard about today, to make it a continuous reemployment system so that there is at least no delay from the time a person stops getting a paycheck until a person starts into a retraining program, because we know that the old jobs don't come back anymore. And we're going to try to do it in a way that will give enormous incentives to support programs at the local level that get rid of bureaucracy and that aren't all divided up, not only consolidating the training programs but, with these one-stop centers, making sure that nobody who loses a job is left to the chance of whether some coworker says, "Well, here's a program that might work," and that no one on welfare wanders out of the welfare office and has to depend on the luck of someone else saying, "Here's something that will help you turn your life around." It seems to me that we have to do that.

The second thing we have to do, to follow up on what Linda said, is to reward programs that produce results and to make it absolutely clear that those results are what matter, that in the end, that the job training programs have to lead to work or they don't work.

Later this month we will introduce the "Reemployment Act of 1994" which will, hopefully, contain the wisdom that all of you have imparted to us today. And I hope you will help us to pass it. In a time in which we have to cut domestic spending, we have to find more money to spend on this. And I am presenting a budget to the Congress on Monday which will eliminate completely 100 Government programs and cut back over 300 others, so that we can squeeze the money out of this budget to put more money into people to get jobs in the private sector where the future of the country is.

And again, I will say that I hope all of you will support that, because we've got a lot of yesterday's programs in the Government, too, and we're just kidding ourselves if we just keep spending money on things that don't really move the whole economy forward, don't create more jobs, don't give people a different and a better future.

We know right now from what you've told us that we have to consolidate all these different programs for laid-off workers. And again, it won't be easy because there will be people, good people in the Congress who will say, "Well, there was reason we had this separate program. There were people we were trying to help."

We've got to learn to trust people like Father Cunningham and Linda Butler, and other people at the grassroots level who are producing jobs. We have to consolidate the programs in law and let them diversify, in fact, where it makes sense, out in the country. Instead of that, we had the reverse. We have diversified the programs in law so that they can't have any impact out there in the country. So I hope you will help us to do that.

The bill will create one-stop shopping centers, and it will create incentives to put the consumer first and to try to bring the business community into this so that employers, even when they don't have to, will want to give their workers more notice. Working people in this country are grownups. They understand the global economy. They know what is happening, and they deserve the right to control their destiny in a better way. And so we will try to engage the employer community in that and the labor community in that. And I'm very hopeful that we can.

And finally, we're working hard to get as much money as we can to make this training long-term, to have enough time to meet the needs of people, and to meet the needs of our future economy. And I have learned some very specific things today that we're going to go back and try to make sure we've got in that bill as well as in the welfare reform bill. Three years from now, I never want to hear another Cynthia Scott story like that again. The welfare office ought to be the work office; it ought to be the job training office; it ought to be the place where you can be a successful worker and a successful parent.

So, I thank you all for coming. I thank you for your contributions. I want to say a little about my friend of 25 years, our Labor Secretary. I think he's done a wonderful job because he cares about people like you, and we're trying to be relevant to your future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. in the Blue Room at the Omni Shoreham Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to the following panel participants: Rev. William Cunningham, executive director, Focus: HOPE, Detroit, MI; Linda Lyons Butler, job placement specialist, Tradeswomen of Philadelphia/Women in Non-Traditional Jobs (WIN/TOP), Philadelphia, PA; and Cynthia Scott, participant, Project QUEST, San Antonio, TX.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Railroad Safety

February 2, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1992 annual report on the Administration of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, pursuant to section 211 of the Act (45 U.S.C. 440(a)).

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 2, 1994.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund

February 2, 1994

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I transmit herewith the first annual report on the status of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund as required by section 330 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580). This report covers the history of the Trust Fund from its inception in 1987 through fiscal year 1992.

The Harbor Maintenance Fee and Trust Fund program now provides 100 percent of the operations and maintenance expenditures for those activities of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and the Army Corps of Engineers, which benefit commercial navigation. In fiscal year 1992, nearly \$500 million was appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for such purposes. This report provides an evaluation of the Trust Fund, including its administration, use, and prospects for the future.

I have delegated responsibility for transmittal of this report in future years to the Secretary of Defense.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Norman Y. Mineta, Chairman, House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and Max Baucus, Chairman, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Nomination for a Member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation

February 2, 1994

The President announced today that he intends to nominate John F. Hicks, Jr., to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation. The African Development Foundation is an independent, nonprofit Government corporation which seeks to provide self-help initiatives to the poor populations of Africa. Last week, the President announced his intention to nominate Willie Grace Campbell and Marion M. Dawson to be among the Board's members.

"John Hicks has served our country well for almost 20 years and knows what the developing economies of Africa need in order to prosper," said the President. "He will be a strong addition to the African Development Foundation's Board."

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

Remarks at the National Prayer Breakfast

February 3, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Senator Stevens. Ladies and gentlemen, you have to forgive me; my voice has not quite returned. The Vice President said earlier that being on the same program with Mother Teresa reminded him of the basketball player who scored one point in a game where Michael Jordan scored 68, and then he said for the rest of his life, "Well, we

scored 69 points together." I feel like the guy who comes in with 5 seconds left to go with—the team's gotten a 40-point lead, and all I have to do is hold the ball until the buzzer rings. [Laughter]

First of all, I thank you, Mother Teresa, for your moving words and more importantly for the lifetime of commitment, for you have truly lived by what you say, something we would all do well to emulate, and I thank you for that.

Like all of you, I was so moved by the profession of faith and the experiences of Mother Teresa that almost anything that any of us could say would be anticlimactic. However, I would like to make these points as briefly as I can, for we come here to pray for those in authority, those given, by the people of the United States under our Constitution and laws, responsibility and the opportunity of making decisions every day which affect all of us.

First I say that this prayer breakfast is an important time to reaffirm that in this Nation where we have freedom of religion, we need not seek freedom from religion. The genius of the book which I have promoted almost shamelessly for the last several months, "The Culture of Disbelief," by Professor Stephen Carter, is that very point, that we should all seek to know and to do God's will, even when we differ.

Second, if we really seek to do that, it requires certain personal characteristics that, very frankly, all of us in this room who have ever been elected to anything have abandoned from time to time, including me. It requires first that we be humble, that we know that even as we seek to do God's will, we remember what President Lincoln said, "The Almighty has his own purposes, and we are not capable of fully knowing them." It requires, second, that we be honest and that we be fair. Sometimes I think the commandment we most like to overlook in this city is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." Third, it requires that we give our bitterness and our resentments up.

I was thinking of this when Mother Teresa told the story of the person who died in her arms saying simply, "Thank you," not, "I'm cold, I'm hungry," a simple thank you, someone with more cause to be resentful, more

cause to be bitter, more cause to be angry than anyone in this room could ever be bitter or angry or resentful because of what one of us has said or done to the other; and still dying with a simple thank you. Somehow we all have to give up our resentments. We have to find the courage and the faith to forgive ourselves and to forgive our foes. And if we cannot, we will surely fail.

Finally, that will permit us to do what Mother Teresa has done, to focus every day on other people. If Christ said we would all be judged by how we treated the least of these—the hungry, the thirsty, the naked, the strangers, the imprisoned—how can we meet that test in a town where we all spend so much time obsessed with ourselves and how we stand on the totem pole and how we look in the morning paper. Five years from now, it will be nothing. Five hundred years from now, the papers will be dust. And all that will endure is the strength and the integrity and the beauty of what we felt and what we did.

Today, this headline is in our papers: “Nineteen Children Found Amid Squalor in Chicago Apartment,” not in Calcutta but in Chicago, 19 children living amid human waste and cockroaches, fighting a dog for food.

I say to you, we will always have our differences; we will never know the whole truth. Of course, that is true. But if we have learned today, again, that we must seek to know the will of God and live by it, that to do it we have to give up our bitterness and our resentment, we have to learn to forgive ourselves and one another, and we have to fight, as hard as it is, to be honest and fair, and if we can be focused on others and not ourselves, realizing that we did not get one whit of power from the Constitution and laws from the framers to do anything for ourselves, it all comes for the purpose of helping others. Then perhaps we can do honor to the faith and to the God who has brought us all here today.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:47 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session at Kramer Junior High School

February 3, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Give Carlotta another hand. Didn't she do a good job? [Applause] She was nervous. I told her there was nothing to it. She did a great job. Thank you, Carlotta. Thank you, Mr. Poles. I'm very, very glad to be here.

I wanted to come here the day after I gave the State of the Union Address last week, but I lost my voice. And as you can hear, I haven't quite gotten it back. But I think I can at least say what I came to say and hopefully answer some of your questions.

Every year the President gives the State of the Union Address to report to our whole country on the accomplishments and goals of the country and of the Government. But I came to Kramer this morning because I wanted to say something else. And that is that the future of our Union depends not just on the President and the Congress, on what I do or don't do, it also depends on you, every boy and girl in this school and every person like you all across this country, in the biggest cities, in the smallest towns and all the places in between, on how well you prepare for your life and how well you're able to lead it. That will shape what kind of country America is, and it will affect all the rest of us as well.

I think all of you know this, but this school has produced two graduates who are now part of what I do at the White House. And I want to formally introduce them. First, the Assistant Agent-in-Charge of my Secret Service detail, a person in charge of protecting me, Mr. Danny Spriggs. Stand up, Danny. He graduated from this school, went on to the University of New Mexico, and played football for the Dallas Cowboys, and then came back to the Secret Service and progressed through the ranks to his present, very important position. Second, I'd like to introduce one of my very talented White House photographers, also a graduate of this school, Ms. Sharon Farmer. Sharon, where are you? There she is, down in front. She graduated from this school, went on to Ohio State University where she was elected president of the student body, then became a photog-

rapher, and is so good at what she does that she is on the staff of the President. I'd also like to tell you that the head of our Secret Service detail, Rich Miller, grew up in this neighborhood. So there was a lot of interest in Kramer.

The Secret Service agents every year who protect the First Family give the President and the First Lady a Christmas gift. I don't know what those gifts have been in the past, but this year I got a letter from my Secret Service detail saying that because I had emphasized service so much and worked so hard to pass a national service bill, which gives young people like you the chance to earn some money to go to college by serving in their community, that they wanted their gift to me to be the adoption of this school. They wanted the people on the Secret Service detail to come into this school, to work with the young people, to try to make it a healthy, safe, growing place where you could learn more and where you could have contact with them, some very good people who have led very interesting lives. I can tell you, for my money, it was the best Christmas present I got this year. And I am very, very grateful for it.

When these two people who work for me went to this school years ago, our country had some problems then, too; the bigotry, the racism that then existed in our country was more overt than it is now. And they had some hills to climb to achieve what they have achieved in life.

In the years since, some of that open injustice has gone away, but all of you know now we have a whole set of new problems, our problems that were maybe there then but are worse now. There are too many neighborhoods where it seems that nobody has a job, too many places where families don't stay together, and too many places where kids are literally at risk of being shot or beat-up going to and from school and sometimes in school. To correct this problem we've got to work together. I've got to do my part, and you've got to help to create safe schools where learning occurs and to make sure that we have the kind of neighborhoods and the kind of futures that all of you deserve.

I know that a lot of you have lived with violence. I know you've seen it up close. I

imagine some of you have people in your own family who have been hurt. And maybe you know people who have given up on themselves and given up on our country, who've dropped out and are just angry all the time, doing their best to live from day to day, not thinking much about the future.

The first thing I want to ask of you is not to give up. Don't give up on yourselves, and don't give up on your country. I very much want you to go to school in safety, where you learn things and can look forward to a brighter and richer future. I want you to feel that you should and that you must stay off drugs and graduate from high school and go beyond. I want you to believe that you can do as much with your life as Danny Spriggs and Sharon Farmer have, or for that matter, that if you work hard and you really care enough about it, you might someday be in the United States Congress like Eleanor Holmes Norton or maybe even be running for President.

I came here, more than anything else today, to say I don't want you ever to give up on yourselves. I don't intend to give up on you as long as I am President. I'm going to keep working for better education, safer streets, and a brighter future, but it's for your life. And no matter what I do, I can't live your lives for you. No matter whether we do the right or the wrong things in public life, we can't live your lives for you. You have to do that. Every day you have to decide whether you're going to be here on time with a good attitude, learning as much as you can. Every day you have to decide whether the future is what happens to you 30 minutes from now or what happens to you 10 or 20 years from now. Every day you have to decide what you believe, what you care about, and what kind of person you're going to be.

I'm doing what I can to make the future better for you. Even as we are here today, the United States Congress is debating a bill that the Secretary of Education, Secretary Riley, introduced with my administration called Goals 2000. It embodies some ideas I have been working on for years and years, ever since I was a Governor. And I think it's fair to say that I have probably spent more time in public schools like this one all over America, as well as in my own State, than any person ever elected President. I have lis-

tened to teachers, I have listened to principals, and I have listened to students, not for just a year but for more than a decade.

What this legislation that Congress is debating does is to try to establish what kind of education every child needs in every school. It sets out some goals that will guarantee that if we reach them, all of our young people, wherever they are, whether they come from poor families or middle class families or wealthy families, if their schools work right, they'll be prepared to compete and to win in the 21st century.

One of those goals says by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning. No one should have to go to school afraid, and no school should operate in a way that makes learning impossible. But the truth is that while we have some legislation up there to make our schools safer, you have a lot to do with what goes on in this school and whether the environment is good for learning.

Another goal says that by the year 2000 the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent. That's the international standard. Another says that every adult should possess the knowledge and the skills needed to get and keep a good job, a job as good as people have in other countries.

When I drive up and down streets in some neighborhoods in this country and I see grown people standing on the street without work, it breaks my heart. And I know a lot of them would like to go to work, and I know a lot of them don't get work in part because they don't have a good education. These goals, all of these goals, are critical to your future. I want to start with the last one.

When I was your age, the unemployment rate in this country was 3 percent, more or less. When I graduated from high school, I knew a lot of people who dropped out of high school. I mean, that was a long time ago, lots of folks didn't finish school. But I didn't know a soul, black or white, with or without an education, who wanted a job who didn't have one. That's the literal truth when I was 17. That's the economy we had then. That was the reality then. Everybody I knew who was willing to work could find work.

Now, that's not true anymore, is it? It's just not true. Today, more than ever before, whether you have a job or not and how much you can earn at the job and what your future is depends upon how much you can learn, not just what you know, but how much you can learn. People who graduate from high school make twice as much as those who don't. Those who get training after high school make more. Those who graduate from college make twice as much again. And those who are willing to learn for a lifetime can deal with the hard truth that the average 18-year-old today will change work seven or eight times over the course of a lifetime.

Now, that can be a good deal. You might, if you do it right, live in the most exciting time America has ever known, because the world is changing so fast. You'll get to know people all over the world. By the time you're my age, you'll be routinely calling people around the world with a television screen along with your telephone, you'll be talking to people and there will be instantaneous translation. It will be an exciting time. But it will change so fast that you'll have to be able to learn new things all the time. And you have to decide whether you're going to do that, just like we have to decide whether we're going to give you the tools to do that.

I also think that we've got to say, all of us, there's something wrong. I heard the Vice President went to one of the schools here in DC last week, and I don't know if you saw it on television, but one of the students asked him, said, "How can we send a person to the Moon, and we can't make our schools safe?" Pretty good question, isn't it? What kind of country is it that can send somebody to the Moon and can't make our schools safe?

Well, we've got some legislation in Congress today designed to do that, designed to take guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them, to restrict semiautomatic and assault weapons, designed to provide more security for our schools, and designed to give our schools the tools they need; in high violence areas to teach young people to find other ways, nonviolent ways, to resolve their differences, to stop people from thinking about the future as what happens 5 seconds or 30 minutes from now and start thinking about what happens 4 years

and 10 years and 20 years from now, building a life, not acting on a violent impulse. We're working on that.

What the Secret Service did in adopting this school is also a wonderful thing because, you know, you can see me today and you can ask me questions. And then these good folks in the media, they'll report it all over the country. And a lot of young people like you will identify with what happened. They'll say, "Well, he didn't come to my school, but at least he came to a school like my school and talked to kids like me." But the President can't see everybody. So I hope that my Secret Service detail, by adopting this school, first of all, will make a difference in your life. I hope it will make your education more rewarding, more interesting, and I hope you'll get to know these people because they're good people. And secondly, I hope they will set an example, and all over America now more people will say, "Well, maybe I ought to go out into the schools. Maybe I ought to help. Maybe I ought to do something for these kids." And if that happens, Kramer will have done a great service for young people all across the United States.

I want to ask you all, before I open the floor to questions, to think about what I said today. Yes, we need to do a better job in making the streets safer and the schools safer. Yes, we've got to do a better job of creating more jobs so you have some opportunity out there. Yes, we've got to do a better job of giving your schools the tools they need so that you can get the best possible education. But you've got to decide what happens to you. You have to decide whether you're going to give up on you or whether someday you're going to play football for the Cowboys and be in the Secret Service or go off to a fine school like Ohio State and come back and have a job at the White House. You have to make that decision. No President, no politician can make that decision for you.

I haven't given up on the young people of this country. I think you are as smart and as good as any generation we have ever produced, and you deserve better, than you are getting. And I am going to try to make your streets safe, your schools better, and the job future better. But you also have to say, "I

am going to do the most I can with my life. I'm going to be what God meant for me to be." I'll try to keep up my end of the deal, and I want you to keep up yours.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

Principal Ray Poles. Thank you, Mr. President. At this time, we will have some questions from our student body before the President comes—I would also like to take the opportunity to introduce to you our school board president, Ms. Linda Moody. It was an oversight on my behalf. Thank you, Ms. Moody. We will proceed with the questioning period. You have a mike, okay.

The President. Now, where are the mikes out in the audience? Where are they? Oh, okay. Now, how are we going to do this? The mikes have a long cord so that the ladies can go all the way up. If you've got a question or a comment, raise your hand, and they'll bring you the microphone. Don't be shy. There you go. Take mine. Tell us who you are and what grade you're in.

Coed Lunch

Q. I'm in the ninth grade. And I would like to know why Kramer ain't got coed lunches.

The President. Coed what?

Q. Lunch.

The President. Lunch? That's one thing I don't know the answer to. I don't know why Kramer doesn't have coed lunch, but surely the principal can answer the question before I leave. But if I were you, I'd want it, too. [Laughter]

Go ahead, listen now. You all be quiet and listen to your classmates, one at a time.

Crime Bill

Q. I am in the ninth grade, and I would like to know, in respect to the crime bill, what happens on the first or second strike?

The President. I'm sorry, I didn't—what?

Q. In respect to the crime bill, what happens on the first or second strike, since we're trying to avoid the third strike?

The President. What are the strikes?

Q. What happens on the first and second strike?

The President. Yes. Well, on the first or second, what happens—he's asking—the crime bill, there's a provision, that will be

a provision which says if you commit three violent crimes, you can't be paroled. No parole after three violent crimes. You asked what happens on the first or the second crime. It depends on, frankly, what the offense was. In other words, those people will go through the criminal justice system. And let's suppose it's an armed robbery, and the maximum sentence is 20 years, and a jury gives 15 years. Then the person will go to prison under a 15-year sentence and will be eligible for parole after serving a certain amount of that time.

So then most States—and the Federal Government has sentencing guidelines on this—most States have laws which say if you commit a second crime, you have to serve a much longer period of time before you're eligible for parole. But under this provision we say if the crimes are violent, if you're really hurting somebody, then you shouldn't be paroled at all if you do it three times, because you've obviously shown that you're going to spend your life hurting other people, and it's not worth the risk.

But the first two will be covered by whatever the law is now. And it depends on what the crime is and what the circumstances are.

Safe Drinking Water

Q. Good morning, Mr. President. I'm in the seventh grade. In your State of the Union Address, you mentioned the Safe Water Act. What are some of the specifics of this act?

The President. It's a drinking water act, safe drinking water act, and what we have to—we have to reauthorize it, but basically what it does is to set standards. It's important now in Washington, you know, because you just had some problems with that, serious problems. What it will do is to set standards for the testing of water throughout the country and all municipalities, all cities, and the evaluations of the water systems and will have certain requirements to upgrade those systems, hopefully before something terrible happens like this; that the whole idea of it is to find out problems, if the drinking water of a given community—normally it will start to get bad and will slowly deteriorate. So the idea is to have a testing procedure so that the quality of the water can always be monitored. And if it starts to deteriorate, there

will be a requirement that it be cleaned up so that people will always have a safe water supply all over the country.

Crime

Q. Hello, Mr. President. I would like to know, what can I do in my community to stop crime?

The President. Give her a hand. [*Applause*] That's great. Well, I think there are several things that you can do as a young person in your community to stop crime. But let me just mention, if I might, two or three.

One is, people always talk today about gangs, people joining gangs and how bad it is, right? But the truth is, everybody wants to be in some kind of gang. If you play on a football team, it's a gang, right? If you belong to a certain church, that's a group of people who believe like you do, and you're with them every Sunday, and they're part of your crowd, and it's part of your identity. In other words, all of us want to be with other people who are like us, who make us feel good and important because we're a part of their group. In a way, the Kramer School is a gang, right? It's a group of people who go here, and there's a limited number of people, and others don't go here. So the first thing I want to say to you is, I think that the more you can do as a young person to get other young people to associate with each other in positive ways, the less likely they'll be to associate with each other in negative ways. You can't just tell kids no all day; sometimes you've got to have something to say yes about. There has to be something to say yes to. And you can ask adults to do what they need to do; if there needs to be more opportunity for recreation or something else that adults should do, provide for you, so that people can have positive associations, I think that counts, first thing.

The second thing I think is important is that we know crime goes down where police officers work in neighborhoods on a consistent basis, know the young people, know the adults, and work to prevent crime instead of just to catch criminals. So the second thing you could do is to help organize people in your neighborhood to work with people in the police to stop crime before it happens, that is, to report suspicious things; if you

think there is drug dealing going on or you think there are people with illegal weapons or you think there is something else going on, there's some risk that might be happening, to let people know in advance. And that really counts for a lot. I have seen cities in this country with very tough neighborhoods where the crime rate dropped dramatically because the people in the neighborhood got organized and worked with the police on the front end to stop things from happening.

The third thing you could do that I think is really important is to do everything you can to organize young people to keep each other in school, because most people who show up for school on time, stay in school, learn something when they're in school, and try to work out their problems in a positive way in school don't wind up getting in trouble with the law. Those are the three things that I think you could do that would have the biggest impact on the crime problem.

Family Life

Q. Good morning, Mr. President. Since family life has been breaking down for the last 30 years, what can my generation do to restore family values?

The President. Did you hear what she said? She said, "If family life has been breaking down for 30 years, what can my generation do to restore it?" Good question. First thing you can do is make up your mind you're not going to have a baby until you're old enough to take care of it, until you're married. I mean, that's the most important thing.

You know, I gave—how many of you all saw my speech the other night? Did any of you see it? I guess you knew I was coming, so some of you watched it. Did they tell you to watch it? The principal told you to watch the speech. We spent all this time—now, I'm trying to figure out how to help people get off of welfare, good people who are strapped on welfare, who hate it, who don't want to be on it. And I've got some ideas, and I've learned a lot from people who are on welfare about it.

But one big problem is, people get on it because they start having children when they are children. And that's the first thing. The second thing that you ought to do is something you can't do alone, and that is that we

need to organize, starting about this age, young men to start talking among each other about what their responsibilities are, and that they shouldn't—they should not go out and father these kids when they're not prepared to marry the mothers, they're not prepared to take responsibility for the children, and they're not even able to take responsibility for themselves. This is not a sport. This is a solemn responsibility. Look, it's hard.

Then, once you get married, people have to realize they're going to have to ride through some tough times to keep the family together. There is no such thing as a trouble-free family. There's no such thing as a family where fights never occur, where differences never happen, where some days you think it wouldn't be easier to quit than to go on. There is no such family.

So the third thing we should be doing when young people are young is to say, look, the family is the most wonderful institution in society, but it's a human thing, which means it's full of fault, too. And you need to think about it. And when you make a commitment to it, you need to do everything you can to hang in there with it, all the way, because it makes life much more meaningful. Life is lonely enough as it is. And if you have a family and you have people that are helping you, it makes a huge difference, and it makes life better.

I'm telling you, until we decide this is a—this is a big cultural thing. We've got to make a decision. Every one of you have to make it. Is it right or wrong, if you're a boy, to get some girl pregnant and then forget about it? I think it's wrong. I think it's not only wrong for them, I think it's wrong for you. It's something you pay for the rest of your life. You carry that in the back of your head: Somewhere there's some child out there you didn't take care of that's in terrible shape because of something you didn't do. And if you're a young girl, you've got to think being a mother is still the most important thing in society. It is the most important thing that any person can do. But when you do it, you ought to do it when it's right: when it's right for you, when it's right for the child, and when you can do it right.

And we just have to make a decision. If you really want to rebuild the family, then

people have to decide: I'm not going to have a baby until I'm married. I'm not going to bring a baby into the world I can't take care of. And I'm not going to turn around and walk away when I do it. I'm going to take responsibility for what I do.

I wish there was some highfalutin easy way to say it, but there's not. There isn't any way to turn this thing around except to turn it around.

AIDS

Q. My question was, what type of steps are you going to take to help to slow up AIDS in the community?

The President. AIDS? The AIDS problem?

Q. Yes.

The President. Good, Jesse. He asked what we were going to do to try to slow down AIDS in the community. How many of you know somebody with AIDS? A pretty good number, huh? I'll tell you what we're doing; then let's talk about what's happening.

Even though, if you heard my speech the other night, I talked about how we were reducing Government spending in many areas to bring our debt down, our deficit down, we have increased Government spending a lot in trying to improve research, to try to find a cure or at least a treatment for AIDS that will keep people alive and to try to improve the ability of folks who care with folks with AIDS and continue their useful life as long as possible. In addition to that, we've tried to promote more AIDS education and prevention. But this is kind of like the question you asked me about the family. Right now, the only thing we know that works with regard to AIDS is not to get it. And we know that AIDS is spread primarily in two ways: because of drug users using unsafe needles and because of unsafe sex, primarily homosexual sex but not exclusively.

Now, so what we're trying to do is to be honest, brutally honest about that, talk to young people, tell them that your life is on the line and the only safe way, the only way to avoid dying from AIDS that we know right now is not to get it. And that's the truth.

I think eventually we will, if not find a cure, because it's a virus, but we'll at least find a treatment that will keep people alive.

But we're not there yet. So I'm going to spend more money every year I'm President to do more on research and development, to do more on care to try to lengthen the useful lives of people with AIDS. Any of us who've ever had friends with AIDS, some of you probably even have family members, have been gripped by this. It is agonizing, and it is a terrible problem for the United States. And I have friends who have died with AIDS or who have it now, so it's something I care a great deal about. But I have to tell you again—it's kind of like this schooling—that right now, as much as I can do about it, the most important person in determining what happens to you and AIDS is you. And I hope that you will do it.

Charter Schools

Q. Hello. I'm in the eighth grade. I would like to know, what are your thoughts about privatization and private schools?

The President. Private schools and what? Privatization?

Q. Yes.

The President. Privatization of the schools. Well, first of all, you asked about the private schools. This country has always actually done pretty well because we've had private schools and public schools. Most people have gone to public school, but there have been private schools out there for people either who, for religious or other purposes, wanted to use them. And most schools, at least those that are religiously motivated, have always provided some scholarships for people who couldn't afford to pay the tuition. So I think it's provided some competition that on balance, I think, has been good.

There's a whole different thing going on about privatization, which I think is what you want me to talk about. Baltimore, for example, has 9 or 10 schools now where the local school board has contracted with a private company, and they've given them whatever the budget of the school was and let them organize the schools, try to improve the physical facilities, try to operate them well. Then they are responsible for the principal, the teachers, how the thing operates. I think school districts ought to try it if they have real problems in their schools.

Those schools are called charter schools, where the public school system gives a charter to a private group to operate the schools. If the schools aren't working and if the school board decides they can't make them work, then I think they ought to try this. If it works, great, and if it doesn't work, they're no worse off than they were. So I think they ought to have the right to try it. I think they should be encouraged to try it. Our legislation which is moving through Congress encourages this sort of experimentation.

Let me say this in defense of our schools: Public schools and public housing projects—let's put them in there, too—they both worked just fine when you had strong families, strong communities, and the people who lived in them had a job. Public schools and public housing projects didn't really start to break down until the family and the jobs and the community started breaking down. So we have loaded a whole lot onto our public schools. Now, that means we've got to be smart and we've got to be creative because, still, the schools is the best hope that all of you have. But do I think it ought to be tried if a school's not working and the school board wants to try it? You bet I do. I don't see what we have to lose by trying it. If the school board wants to do it, I'm all for them.

National Information Superhighway

Q. Mr. President, how will the national information superhighway impact schools?

The President. Great question. If we do it right, what the national information superhighway will do is to set up a system in which if the schools can get the appropriate computer equipment, which I think will happen in the future, that a school like this one could be connected to schools all over the country, maybe all over the world, to libraries all over the country. You could interconnect with special television stations that were putting out certain information. In other words, you could have access in the school, in the classroom, to worlds of information that now you have to go someplace to find. It would, in effect, bring instantaneously, literally, in theory, billions of pieces of information into the fingertips of students all over America in all schools. And it's very, very important in its implications for American education because

if we do the national information superhighway right and we make sure that we get the kind of communications equipment, the kind of trained personnel we need out in the schools, it could go an enormous way toward vanishing or erasing the difference between wealthy school districts and poor ones, between wealthy schools and poor ones, by giving everybody access to the same information at the same time.

You could also have special courses like interactive video to take courses that otherwise could never be made available in schools, immediately, everywhere. So, if we do it right, it's going to be great for education. It's also going to be a great equalizer for us. I'm really hopeful about it.

Federal Spending

Q. Hello. I would like to know how much money was cut from Government spending?

The President. How much money does the Federal Government spend?

Q. How much money was cut from Government spending?

The President. Oh, how much had been cut. I'm sorry. Well, we spend every year—let me tell you how much we spend so I can explain that. We spend every year about \$1.5 trillion. When I became President we were taking in about \$1.2 trillion, so our deficit was about \$300 billion a year. Last year we cut \$255 billion from last year's budget, and we increased spending in certain areas. We increased spending in education and health and in high technology. And we raised taxes on the wealthiest Americans, and we raised the gas tax some, and we cut the deficit \$300 billion. So last year there were \$255 billion of spending cuts in the budget. This year, the Congress hasn't started work on it. I just sent a budget up there this year, this time. So the Congress hasn't started work on it. But we'll have to have a whole range of other cuts, and I propose that they cut 300-plus different programs and eliminate 100 altogether so that we can continue to increase our investment in the things that matter, like these education programs.

Q. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Good morning.

Technology in the Future

Q. I would like to know, in the year 2000, what level of technology should we have achieved?

The President. That is a great question. Let me say this: I don't think it's possible to answer that, because I don't think we know how fast technology will improve in the world. So I wish I could answer it, but I can't. Let me try to give you an answer, however, by starting with where we are now.

We know that there are seven or eight major areas of technology that will provide most of the high-wage, high-growth jobs of the future, that is, the good jobs, and that if we got a whole bunch of them, they in turn will create other solid jobs. One of those areas is civilian aviation. Another is biotechnology; that goes back to Jesse's AIDS question. Biotechnology—how are you going to solve all these problems of the human body and disease and everything—there's worlds of jobs there. Another will be telecommunications. Another will be computer software.

The answer to your question is, what we have to do is to educate our people well enough and to put enough money aside for research so that we achieve whatever level of technology anybody else in the world achieves. Otherwise, they will leave us behind. But technology is changing so fast—I can't say—I can tell you this: We know now that in order to have the assurance of having a job with a growing income right now in America, everybody that wants to have some assurance of a decent job with a growing income needs at least a high school education and 2 more years of training, every 18-year old looking forward, at least.

NAFTA

Q. Good morning, Mr. President. I want to know how will NAFTA affect our job market in future generations?

The President. How will NAFTA affect our job market in future generations? NAFTA will create—and of course, you know I'm for it, so I have my view; there are people who are against it who would give you something else. I believe NAFTA will create a lot more jobs for Americans because Mexico has almost 100 million people and

is growing very rapidly. And most of the products the Mexican people buy that are made in other countries are products made in America. In order for us to create more jobs for the American people, we have to have more customers for our products and services, obviously. You look at the unemployment rate today, you can see that we're capable of producing everything Americans want to buy and still not using up all the labor we've got. In other words, we can produce everything that Americans want to buy, and there will still be Americans unemployed. So if we want every American who wants to work to have a job, we've got to have more customers. NAFTA gives us more customers, and it will create more jobs.

It will also—I don't want to gloss it over—there will also be some things that the Mexicans sell to Americans that used to be made by Americans. So there will be some job loss. But I'm convinced there will be a lot more jobs gained than lost. And if I weren't, I wouldn't have supported it in the first place.

Drugs

Q. Good morning. I would like to know, how can we keep the drugs off the street?

The President. Well, I think there are two or three things we have to focus on. How can we keep the drugs off the street? Your ideas are maybe better than mine. Maybe you ought to tell me how you think we can keep the drugs off the street. I've got two or three ideas I want to mention, though.

One is, most cities do not have enough police officers to give the neighborhoods the kind of coverage they need. Thirty years ago, there were three police officers in this country for every violent crime reported. Today, there are three crimes, violent crimes, for every police officer. So most cities simply don't have the people they need to work in the neighborhoods, stay there, and help keep the places safe and drug-free—first thing.

Second thing is that schools should become drug-free areas. You ought to be able to get the drugs out of the schools, and then kids should be taught from a very early age about the hazards of drugs, that they can kill you, they can take your life away.

The third thing is, we've got to bring another economy to the areas where people are

doing drugs, because it's a business. People have to have other ways of making a living. We have to create an alternative future.

So I think there's law enforcement. I think there's drug education and treatment, which I know works, because my own brother has had a drug problem, so I know that works. But I think you also have to create another future. We have to tell people—keep in mind, the drugs got real bad in the places where the family and the community and the jobs were all disappearing. So I think we have to again create an alternative reality. One of the things we're trying to do in our administration is to create some conditions in which people will go in and invest money and hire people in these areas where people have been making money off drugs instead of off honest jobs. But you all might have better ideas than that. If you've got any ideas for me about what to do about drugs, stand up and give me one of your ideas. I'd like to have—go ahead.

Goals for National Renewal

Q. I'm in the eighth grade. Mr. President, how will the renewal reform reach out for the betterment of our children?

The President. I understand now. I'm sorry. You have to forgive me, I'm a little hard of hearing. It comes with age for some people. Well, it will be better in several ways. First of all, obviously if we can keep creating more jobs, that provides more hope. Jobs and incomes help families to stay together; they help people to succeed as parents. Let me say one more thing about—I got asked some questions earlier about what can be done to strengthen the family. For people who already have children, you've got to do the best you can, and you can succeed. I mean, I was raised by a mother who was a single parent when I was born. So a lot of people do a good job. But the first thing we've got to do is to provide more jobs and keep doing it until we can put our people to work.

The second thing we have to do is to give people a sense that they can take their streets back, that through this crime bill and through these other initiatives, people that are willing to obey the law can at least live in a safe environment and children can go to a safe school.

The third thing that we have to do, in my opinion, is to try to give people a leg up in life. That's what the education programs and the welfare reform programs are all about, giving people a chance to see that they can always do better than they're doing if they're willing to work at it.

The fourth thing we have to do, and this is why I want the health care program to pass so much, is to give people the security of knowing that they can succeed in all these different ways: that you can succeed as a student, you can succeed as a worker, you can succeed as a parent, and that if you work hard and play by the rules and you try to make something of your life, you will have a certain level of personal security. And that's what we're trying to do.

In other words, I think America should be seen as sort of an extended family, a big community. And I think we should look at all of our people, without regard to where they live or what their race is, as an enormous resource, as something precious, where everybody is equally important. And I don't think we can make it as a country unless we do that. I don't think we can make it as a country—in my old age, when I want to be retired and taken care of by somebody else—unless all of you do well. And we are going to have to reinvigorate our education system, our job system, our criminal justice system, and our health care system, at least, if you all are going to do that. And that's what I work for all the time, so that you'll have the freedom to make whatever you want of your life.

I mean, I don't like the fact that a lot of young people like you wake up every day and look in the mirror and don't believe that they could do whatever they want to do. The best thing that could ever happen to us is if tomorrow you and everybody like you got up and got ready for school and looked in the mirror and said, "You know, whatever I really want to do, I can go as far as my God-given abilities will take me. I'm not going to be burdened by violence. I am not going to be interfered with by drugs. I'm not going to be interfered with by bigotry. I'm not going to do anything stupid to mess myself up. I'm going to hold on and make my life something. And it's never too late to get a second chance."

No matter what's happened before, I can do better." That would be the best thing that ever happened to this country, if all of you believe that and acted on it. And I'm just trying to create an environment where it's true enough so that all of you can believe it.

Are we done?

Principal Poles. Thank you, Mr. President. This concludes our question-and-answer series.

The President. Thank you. You guys have been great. Good luck. God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the auditorium. In his remarks, he referred to Carlotta Harper, president, student government association.

Remarks Announcing the End of the Trade Embargo on Vietnam and an Exchange With Reporters

February 3, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. I want to especially thank all of you who have come here on such short notice. From the beginning of my administration, I have said that any decisions about our relationships with Vietnam should be guided by one factor and one factor only: gaining the fullest possible accounting for our prisoners of war and our missing in action. We owe that to all who served in Vietnam and to the families of those whose fate remains unknown.

Today I am lifting the trade embargo against Vietnam because I am absolutely convinced it offers the best way to resolve the fate of those who remain missing and about whom we are not sure. We've worked hard over the last year to achieve progress. On Memorial Day, I pledged to declassify and make available virtually all Government documents related to our POW's and MIA. On Veterans Day, I announced that we had fulfilled that pledge. Last April, and again in July, I sent two Presidential delegations to Vietnam to expand our search for remains and documents. We intensified our diplomatic efforts. We have devoted more resources to this effort than any previous administration. Today, more than 500 dedi-

cated military and civilian personnel are involved in this effort under the leadership of General Shalikashvili, Secretary Aspin, and our Commander in the Pacific, Admiral Larson. Many work daily in the fields, the jungles, the mountains of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, often braving very dangerous conditions, trying to find the truth about those about whom we are not sure.

Last July, I said any improvement in our relations with Vietnam would depend on tangible progress in four specific areas: first, the recovery and return of remains of our POW's and MIA; second, the continued resolution of discrepancy cases, cases in which there is reason to believe individuals could have survived the incident in which they were lost; third, further assistance from Vietnam and Laos on investigations along their common border, an area where many U.S. servicemen were lost and pilots downed; and fourth, accelerated efforts to provide all relevant POW/MIA-related documents.

Today, I can report that significant, tangible progress has been made in all these four areas. Let me describe it. First, on remains: Since the beginning of this administration, we have recovered the remains of 67 American servicemen. In the 7 months since July, we've recovered 39 sets of remains, more than during all of 1992. Second, on the discrepancy cases: Since the beginning of the administration, we've reduced the number of these cases from 135 to 73. Since last July, we've confirmed the deaths of 19 servicemen who were on the list. A special United States team in Vietnam continues to investigate the remaining cases. Third, on cooperation with Laos: As a direct result of the conditions set out in July, the Governments of Vietnam and Laos agreed to work with us to investigate their common border. The first such investigation took place in December and located new remains as well as crash sites that will soon be excavated. Fourth, on the documents: Since July, we have received important wartime documents from Vietnam's military archives that provide leads on unresolved POW/MIA cases. The progress achieved on unresolved questions is encouraging, but it must not end here. I remain personally committed to continuing the

search for the answers and the peace of mind that families of the missing deserve.

There's been a substantial increase in Vietnamese cooperation on these matters over the past year. Everyone involved in the issue has affirmed that. I have carefully considered the question of how best to sustain that cooperation in securing the fullest possible accounting. I've consulted with my national security and veterans affairs advisers, with several outside experts, such as General John Vessey, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who has been an emissary to Vietnam for three Presidents now. It was their view that the key to continued progress lies in expanding our contacts with Vietnam.

This was also the view of many distinguished Vietnam veterans and former POW's who now serve in the Congress, such as Senator Bob Kerrey and Congressman Pete Peterson, who are here. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Senator John Kerry—is he here? There he is. He just came in—and Senator John McCain, who had to go home on a family matter and could not be here. But I thank the two of you so much for your leadership and your steadfastness and all the rest of you, Senator Robb and so many others, especially those who served in Vietnam, for being counted on this issue and for taking all the care you have for such a long time.

I have made the judgment that the best way to ensure cooperation from Vietnam and to continue getting the information Americans want on POW's and MIA's is to end the trade embargo. I've also decided to establish a liaison office in Vietnam to provide services for Americans there and help us to pursue a human rights dialog with the Vietnamese Government.

I want to be clear: These actions do not constitute a normalization of our relationships. Before that happens, we must have more progress, more cooperation, and more answers. Toward that end, this spring I will send another high-level U.S. delegation to Vietnam to continue the search for remains and for documents.

Earlier today, I met with the leaders of our Nation's veterans organizations. I deeply respect their views. Many of the families they represent have endured enormous suffering

and uncertainty. And their opinions also deserve special consideration. I talked with them about my decision. I explained the reasons for that decision. Some of them, in all candor, do not agree with the action I am taking today. But I believe we all agree on the ultimate goal: to secure the fullest possible accounting of those who remain missing. And I was pleased that they committed to continue working with us toward that goal.

Whatever the Vietnam war may have done in dividing our country in the past, today our Nation is one in honoring those who served and pressing for answers about all those who did not return. This decision today, I believe, renews that commitment and our constant, constant effort never to forget those until our job is done. Those who have sacrificed deserve a full and final accounting. I am absolutely convinced, as are so many in the Congress who served there and so many Americans who have studied this issue, that this decision today will help to ensure that fullest possible accounting.

Thank you very much.

POW's/MIA's

Q. Mr. President, aren't you giving up some leverage, though? Could we ask about that? And what do you anticipate in terms of American trade? What's the size of the market? What do you think the opportunities are?

The President. I have no idea. I wanted to make sure that the trade questions did not enter into this decision. I never had a briefing on it, and we never had a discussion about it. I thought it was very important that that not be a part of this decision.

I don't think we're giving up anything. It was the consensus of all those who had been there, who had worked there that we had gotten so much more cooperation that we needed to keep moving the process forward and that we would lose leverage if there were no forward movement. Have we given up anything? I don't think so. Nothing we are doing today is irreversible if the cooperation ceases. So I am convinced we are moving in the right direction for the right reasons.

Vietnam Veterans

Q. Mr. President, you mentioned people who had been to Vietnam, had served; you did not. Did this have any role in your decision, and did it make it more difficult for you to reach this decision?

The President. No. I do think, however, everybody my age, whether they were in Vietnam or not, knew someone who died there, knew someone who was wounded there. And I think people in our generation are perhaps more insistent on trying to get a full accounting, more obsessed with it than perhaps people who are younger and people who are older, except those who had children there. I think that was the only thing.

I have spent an enormous amount of time on this issue. I got a personal briefing when I was in Hawaii last summer. I have talked to some of the young people who were there digging in the jungles for the remains. I have really thought about this, and I have tried to listen hard to—when Senator Kerry and Senator McCain and their delegation came back, we had a long meeting here about it. I think the people, all the people my age just want to know we've done everything we can. And I think this is consistent with doing that.

Immigration

Q. Mr. President, on another subject, what do you hope to achieve with the immigration crackdown that was announced today? And do you have any concerns that people's rights will be violated?

The President. Well, we're going to do our best not to violate anybody's rights. What we hope to achieve is a continued environment in which America will be open for legal immigration. We are a nation of immigrants—which we can do our best to protect our borders.

Health Care Plan

Q. You've had, sir, two influential business groups say that they prefer other plans than yours to health care. Does that hurt you?

The President. One was the Chamber of Commerce.

Q. Does their stand, saying that other directions are the way to go, particularly the Business Roundtable, does that hurt you in negotiations as you move forward?

The President. I don't want to make too much of it, because the people who came in here to see me said it was a negotiating strategy. And I said, well, if all of you are providing health care coverage to your employees, I don't think you want to come out for a position against providing guaranteed health insurance to all American workers. So I don't know what to make of it, but I wouldn't read too much into it. This is the beginning of what will be a protracted legislative discussion.

Former President Ronald Reagan

Q. Tonight, sir, Ronald Reagan is apparently going to take issue with some of your criticisms of him. Do you feel that you have been unfairly savaging his record in the 1980's?

The President. Gee, I don't think I've been very critical of him at all. You know, I disagreed with the economic policy, I said so. I think if you go back over the rhetoric of this last year, it's been fairly free of obsession with the past, I'm not much into that. I'm looking toward tomorrow.

Q. You hired Gergen, after all. [Laughter]

The President. What greater compliment could I pay President Reagan?

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:06 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Executive Order 12896—Amending the Civil Service Rules Concerning Political Activity

February 3, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including sections 3301 and 3302 of title 5, United States Code, and as a result of the enactment of Public Law 103-94, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Civil Service Rule IV (5 CFR Part 4) is amended by revoking section 4.1.

Sec. 2. This order is effective on February 3, 1994.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 3, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:40 p.m., February 3, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on February 7.

**Executive Order 12897—
Garnishment of Federal Employees’
Pay**

February 3, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 5520a(j)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 9 of Public Law 103–94, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Attorney General, is designated to promulgate regulations for the implementation of section 5520a of title 5, United States Code, with respect to civilian employees and agencies in the executive branch, except as provided in section 2 of this order.

Sec. 2. The Postmaster General is designated to promulgate regulations for the implementation of section 5520a of title 5, United States Code, with respect to employees of the United States Postal Service.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 3, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:41 p.m., February 3, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on February 7.

**Proclamation 6648—American Heart
Month, 1994**

February 3, 1994

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

The heart is one of nature’s most efficient and durable machines. During an average lifetime, the heart contracts an amazing 2.5 billion times. Although we now realize that

it functions as a life-giving pump, the human heart was thought of by ancient man as the very soul of one’s being. Certain words, such as “courage” and “cordial,” are derived from the Latin word for heart, symbolizing its prominence and significance.

Heart disease was not recognized until about 1500 A.D., for the heart was considered so delicate and sensitive that death was believed to be inevitable if the heart were injured in any way. Although most causes of heart disease observed early in the 20th century are still present today, the treatment and cures of the disease are now dramatically altered.

Today, heart disease is one health threat that Americans can conquer. Extraordinary scientific advances, together with increased public awareness, have forged one of this century’s greatest medical achievements, saving untold lives through improved prevention and treatment. However, as long as cardiovascular diseases and stroke threaten the lives of Americans, we must continue in our diligent efforts to fight these diseases.

Today, many Americans are joining in this fight by taking steps to reduce their chances of developing a cardiovascular disease. They have learned to avoid the major risk factors by controlling blood pressure and blood cholesterol, by avoiding tobacco products, and by becoming more physically active.

At the same time, scientists are developing better ways to detect and treat cardiovascular diseases and stroke. Revolutionary advances are reducing the physical suffering exacted by heart disease and are making diagnosis and treatment more successful.

The Federal Government has contributed to these achievements by supporting research and public education through its National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. The American Heart Association, through its research and education programs and its vital network of dedicated volunteers, has played a crucial role in bringing about these remarkable accomplishments.

The results of the many scientific and public education achievements are dramatic. From 1972 through 1990, the death rate from heart disease dropped 39 percent and the death rate from strokes fell 57.4 percent.

However, these advances have not yet eradicated the devastating consequences of heart disease, which remains the leading cause of death in the United States today. American men and women still suffer about 1.25 million heart attacks each year. About 50 million Americans still have high blood pressure—and uncontrolled high blood pressure is a major cause of stroke. Virtually every American has grieved for a relative or friend debilitated or killed by a cardiovascular disease or stroke.

In recognition of the need for all of us to become involved in the ongoing fight against cardiovascular diseases, the Congress, by Joint Resolution approved December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 843; 36 U.S.C. 169b), has requested that the President issue an annual proclamation designating February as “American Heart Month.”

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of February 1994 as American Heart Month. I invite the Governors of the States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, officials of other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and the American people to join me in reaffirming our commitment to combating cardiovascular diseases and stroke.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this third day of February, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-four, 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, 11:44 a.m., February 4, 1994]

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

Proclamation 6649—National Women and Girls in Sports Day, 1994

February 3, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The inspiring story of Wilma Rudolph is among our most outstanding examples of the courage of women in sports. Wilma Rudolph literally sprinted onto the world stage during the 1960 Olympics, becoming the first American woman to win three gold medals in track and field competition. What had transpired in her life before her great victory in Rome was perhaps even more astounding. The twentieth of twenty-two children, Wilma was born near Clarksville, Tennessee, weighing only 4-½ pounds. At the age of four, she was stricken with pneumonia, chicken pox, and polio, which left her crippled and with little hope of ever walking again. Through sheer determination and the love and support of family and coaches, Rudolph became an athlete of enormous talent and skill. However, hers was not only a personal victory. She was one of the first major role models for both Black and female athletes, and her unprecedented success caused gender barriers to be broken in previously all-male track and field events, like the Penn Relays.

As we celebrate the ability and commitment of women and girls in sports, we recognize that the life of Wilma Rudolph carries an important lesson for all of us. This stunning athletic sprinter, who raced like the wind, reminds us that women have long delighted in the thrill of athletic competition. They have demonstrated their versatility and have tested the limits of physical mastery and endurance.

With the adoption of the Education Amendments of 1972, American law offered women in colleges and universities the hope of enjoying the same governmental support that men’s sports had always enjoyed. Title IX of that Act requires that those institutions

receiving government funding provide equitable athletic programs for women. But even as we remember the passage of this historic legislation, we realize that true equality in the world of sports has not yet come. By applying the same virtues that make a successful athlete—commitment, spirit, and teamwork—all of us can play a role in providing women and girls the opportunities they deserve.

Wilma Rudolph has spent her lifetime trying to share what it has meant to be a woman in the world of sports, so that other young women have a chance to reach their dreams. On this day, let us emulate this goal—to encourage all women and girls to fulfill their true potential in any sport they choose. Let us hope that they, too, will enjoy the incomparable feeling of the wind at their backs.

The Congress, by Public Law 102-557, has designated February 3, 1994, as “National Women and Girls in Sports Day” and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim February 3, 1994, as National Women and Girls in Sports Day. I urge all Americans to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this third day of February, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-four, 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, 11:45 a.m., February 4, 1994]

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

**Letter to Congressional Leaders
Transmitting a Report on
Implementation of the Privacy Act
February 3, 1994**

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

I am pleased to forward the enclosed report on the Federal agencies’ implementa-

tion of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (5 U.S.C. 552a). The report covers calendar years 1990 and 1991.

In addition to the data required to be reported by the statute, the report also describes agencies’ efforts in training their employees to carry out the provisions of the Privacy Act responsibly and reliably.

While agencies continue to meet their responsibilities under the Act, they are becoming increasingly concerned about how the Act’s provisions will work in a computerized environment. A challenge for the years ahead will be to harmonize the provisions of the Privacy Act with the technologies that are now coming into play.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Great Egg Harbor
Study**

February 3, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I take pleasure in transmitting the enclosed report on the Great Egg Harbor River in the State of New Jersey. The report is in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90-542, as amended. The Great Egg Harbor Study was authorized by Public Law 99-590, approved on October 30, 1986.

The study of the Great Egg Harbor River was conducted by a task force made up of representatives of affected municipalities, State and Federal agencies, organizations with river-related interests, and local residents under the leadership of the National Park Service. The National Park Service, together with the task force, identified the outstandingly remarkable resources within the study area, analyzed existing levels of protection for these values, investigated major issues and public concerns, assessed the attitude of riparian landowners, reviewed and analyzed the impact of existing and potential

development, and developed alternative plans and management strategies.

The National Park Service determined that 129 miles of the Great Egg Harbor River and its tributaries are eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This is based upon their free-flowing condition and fish, wildlife, botanic, and recreational values.

Eleven of the 12 affected local governing bodies endorsed designation of the eligible river segments. The lone exception, Upper Township on the Tuckahoe River tributary, did not take a position nor did the State of New Jersey.

Perhaps due to this overwhelming support, the 102d Congress proceeded to designation without waiting for submittal of the required report and Presidential recommendation. While a Presidential recommendation is now moot, I am submitting the report to fulfill the requirements of sections 4(a) and 5(a)(93) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 3, 1994.

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Maurice and
Manumuskin River and Menantico
Creek Study**

February 3, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I take pleasure in transmitting the enclosed report on the Maurice and Manumuskin River and Menantico Creek in the State of New Jersey. The report and my recommendations are in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90-542, as amended. The study of the Maurice River and these two tributaries was authorized by Public Law 100-33, approved on May 7, 1987.

The study of the Maurice River and tributaries was conducted by a task force composed of representatives of affected municipalities, State and Federal agencies, organizations with river-related interests, and local residents under the leadership of the National Park Service (NPS). The NPS, together with the task force, identified the out-

standingly remarkable resources within the study area, analyzed existing levels of protection for these values, investigated major issues and public concerns, assessed the attitude of riparian landowners, reviewed and analyzed the impact of existing and potential development, and developed alternative plans and management strategies.

The NPS determined that 42.4 miles of the Maurice River and its tributaries are eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This is based upon their free-flowing condition and fish, wildlife, and vegetative values. There are also important cultural values and surface water quality of the Manumuskin and Menantico is very good.

In accordance with the wishes of local government, the NPS did not consider Federal land acquisition or management as an alternative for protecting river resources. Instead, the study focused on assisting the political subdivisions in developing and adopting local measures for providing resource protection where existing protection had been inadequate.

Due to strong local and congressional support, the 103d Congress proceeded to designation without waiting for submittal of the required report and Presidential recommendation. While a Presidential recommendation is now moot, I am submitting the report to fulfill the requirements of section 4(a) and sections 5(a)(96) through 5(a)(98) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 3, 1994.

**Nomination for a Member of the
National Labor Relations Board**

February 3, 1994

The President announced his intention today to nominate Charles I. Cohen to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

“Charles Cohen is a respected attorney with years of experience on the NLRB staff. I believe he will be an effective member of the Board,” said the President.

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

Memorandum on Trade With Vietnam

February 3, 1994

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce

Subject: Lifting of the Embargo Against Vietnam

I hereby direct the Secretary of the Treasury to take all appropriate actions to authorize prospectively all trade and financial dealings with Vietnam, and the Secretary of Commerce to exempt Vietnam from existing controls implementing the embargo. Vietnamese assets in the United States or within the possession or control of persons subject to U.S. jurisdiction and that are now blocked should remain blocked until further notice.

In discharging these responsibilities, you are directed to consult with the heads of other Executive departments and agencies as may be appropriate.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 4.

Nomination for Inspector General and an Assistant Attorney General at the Justice Department

February 4, 1994

The President announced today that he intends to nominate Michael R. Bromwich to be the Inspector General of the Justice Department and Lois Jane Schiffer to be the Assistant Attorney General for Environment and Natural Resources.

"Michael Bromwich and Lois Jane Schiffer are respected attorneys with long records of achievement," said the President. "They will be strong additions to the Department of Justice."

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

Digest of Other White House Announcements

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

January 29

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton attended the Alfalfa Club dinner at the Capital Hilton. Following the dinner, they went to the Second Annual Blue Jean Bash at the National Building Museum.

January 30

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton hosted a dinner for the National Governors' Association on the State Floor at the White House. Later in the evening, the President had a telephone conversation with the Super Bowl Champion Dallas Cowboys and then returned to the dinner. Following the dinner, the President had a telephone conversation with Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa of Japan.

January 31

In the afternoon, the President and Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany had a working lunch at Filomena Ristorante of Georgetown.

In the evening, the President attended the Democratic Governors Association dinner at the Omni Shoreham Hotel.

The President announced that he intends to nominate Maria Elena Torano to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy; Willie Grace Campbell and Marion M. Dawson to be members of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation and that he intends to designate Ms. Campbell as the Foundation's Vice Chair; and Alice Chamberlin to be a member of the International Joint Commission, U.S. and Canada.

February 1

The White House announced the President appointed the following persons as members of the U.S. delegation to the 1994 winter Olympic games in Lillehammer, Norway:

- First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, delegation Chair;
 - Ambassador Thomas Loftus, U.S. Ambassador to Norway;
 - Florence Griffith Joyner, Cochair, President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports;
 - Tom McMillen, Cochair, President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports;
 - Kathy Karpan, secretary of state of Wyoming;
 - David Matthews, partner in the Arkansas law firm of Matthews, Campbell and Rhoads;
 - Irby Clifford Simpkins, Jr., publisher of the Nashville Banner; and
 - Dawn Steel, head of Steel Pictures, Inc.
- The White House announced the President sent a letter to the Congress increasing the amount of loans and grants proposed in emergency supplemental legislation to aid families, businesses, and communities that have suffered earthquake damage in southern California.

February 2

The President announced that he intends to nominate Robert S. Willard to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

February 3

The President appointed Christopher A. Hart as the Deputy Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

February 4

The President announced that he intends to nominate Robert C. Larson to be a member of the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board.

The President announced that he intends to appoint Carol Jones Carmody to be the Representative of the United States on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization and to nominate her for the rank of Minister during her tenure.

The White House announced the President designated Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary to represent the United States at the funeral of President Felix Houphouët-Boigny of the Cote d'Ivoire on February 7.

The White House announced the President will meet at the White House with

Prime Minister Andreas Papandreu of Greece on April 22.

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 January 31

Josiah Horton Beeman, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Western Samoa.

Donald M. Blinken, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Hungary.

March Fong Eu, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federated States of Micronesia.

Richard Dale Kauzlarich, of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Azerbaijan.

Submitted February 1

Strobe Talbott, of Ohio, to be Deputy Secretary of State, vice Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., resigned.

Submitted February 2

Michael Kane Kirk, of Florida, to be Deputy Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, vice Douglas B. Comer, resigned.

Rodney A. McCowan, of Oklahoma, to be Assistant Secretary for Human Resources and Administration, Department of Education, vice Donald A. Laidlaw, resigned.

Linda Joan Morgan, of Maryland, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission for a term expiring December 31, 1998, vice Edward J. Philbin, term expired.

Barry S. Newman, of Virginia, to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years, vice Quincy Mellon Krosby, resigned.

Deval L. Patrick, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice John R. Dunne, resigned.

William Alan Reinsch, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration, vice Dennis Edward Kloske, resigned.

Robert S. Willard, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for the remainder of the term expiring July 19, 1994, vice James E. Lyons, resigned.

Robert S. Willard, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 1999 (re-appointment).

Submitted February 3

Michael R. Bromwich, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, Department of Justice, vice Richard J. Hankinson, resigned.

Lois Jane Schiffer, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Richard Burleson Stewart, resigned.

Submitted February 4

Frank James Anderson, of Indiana, to be U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of Indiana for the term of 4 years, vice Ralph D. Morgan.

Jack O. Dean, of Texas, to be U.S. Marshal for the Western District of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice William J. Jonas, Jr.

Laurent F. Gilbert, of Maine, to be U.S. Marshal for the District of Maine for the term of 4 years, vice Emery R. Jordan.

Kay Collett Goss, of Arkansas, to be an Associate Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, vice Grant C. Peterson, resigned.

Nanette Holly Hegerty, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. Marshal for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years, vice Robert J. Keating.

James W. Lockley, of Florida, to be U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of Florida for the term of 4 years, vice Wallace L. McLendon.

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 January 28¹

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Marshals for the Middle District of Georgia and the Eastern District of Tennessee

Released January 30

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on Attorney General Reno's issuance of a limited visa to Gerry Adams

¹ This release was not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.

Released January 31

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on Elizabeth McCaughey's article in the New Republic on the administration's health care proposal

Released February 1

Biography of Deval L. Patrick

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the Vice President's meeting with Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd of the United Kingdom

Announcement of the President's plans to discuss health care in remarks to the American Hospital Association and the National Governors' Association

Released February 2

Transcript of a press briefing by press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Labor Secretary Robert Reich on the Department of Labor Conference on Reemployment

Released February 3

Transcript of a press briefing by Education Secretary Richard Riley and Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy William Galston on Goals 2000

Released February 4

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, Council of Eco-

nomics Advisers Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson, and Labor Secretary Robert Reich on the national economy

Transcript of a press briefing by Vice President Albert Gore, Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, Attorney General Janet Reno, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Henry Cisneros, and Director of National Drug Policy Lee Brown on Operation Safe Home

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on action by the Supreme Rada of Ukraine on the January 14 Trilateral Statement, the START I Treaty, and the Lisbon Protocol

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on a comprehensive interagency review of encryption technology

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing the President's designation of a representative to the funeral of President Felix Houphouet-Boigny of the Cote d'Ivoire

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing the working visit of Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou

**Acts Approved
by the President**

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