

Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, February 28, 1994  
Volume 30—Number 8  
Pages 329–374

## Contents

### Addresses and Remarks

- American Council on Education—335
- Ames spy case—343
- Bosnia—331
- Business Council—353
- Connecticut
  - Arrival in Groton—360
  - Senior citizens in Norwich—362
- Earthquake relief for California—349
- Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans, Executive order signing ceremony—344
- NCAA soccer champion University of Virginia Cavaliers—372
- Radio address—329
- Technology reinvestment awards—349

### Appointments and Nominations

- Air Force Department
  - Assistant Secretary—360
  - Under Secretary—360
- Defense Department, Deputy Secretary—366
- Health and Human Services Department, Administrator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—367
- Justice Department, Deputy Attorney General—360
- State Department, Ambassadors
  - Finland—360
  - Kuwait—367

### Communications to Congress

- Alaska's mineral resources, message transmitting report—348
- Radiation control for health and safety, message transmitting report—348

### Executive Orders

- Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans—346

### Interviews With the News Media

- Exchanges with reporters
  - Christ Episcopal Church—331
  - Colonnade—343
  - Grand Foyer—349
  - Norwich, CT—361
  - Oval Office—329
- News conferences
  - February 21 (No. 48)—333
  - February 25 (No. 49)—367

### Statements by the President

- See also* Appointments and Nominations
- Minority voting opportunity—349
- NATO action on Bosnia—332
- Technology reinvestment awards—360

### Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—374
- Checklist of White House press releases—373
- Digest of other White House announcements—372
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—373

## 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 25, 1994

**The President's Radio Address and  
an Exchange With Reporters**

*February 19, 1994*

My fellow Americans, this morning I want to speak with you about the conflict in Bosnia. My administration has worked for over a year to help ease the suffering and end the conflict in that war-torn land. Now, a prolonged siege of the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo has brought us to an important moment.

In the coming days, American war planes may participate in NATO air strikes on military targets around Sarajevo. We do not yet know whether air strikes will be necessary. But I want to talk with you about what American interests are at stake and what the nature and goals of our military involvement will be if it occurs.

The fighting in Bosnia is part of the broader story of change in Europe. With the end of the cold war, militant nationalism once again spread throughout many countries that lived behind the Iron Curtain and especially in the former Yugoslavia. As nationalism caught fire among its Serbian population, other parts of the country began seeking independence. Several ethnic and religious groups began fighting fiercely. But the Serbs bear a primary responsibility for the aggression and the ethnic cleansing that has killed tens of thousands and displaced millions in Bosnia.

This century teaches us that America cannot afford to ignore conflicts in Europe. And in this crisis, our Nation has distinct interests. We have an interest in helping to prevent this from becoming a broader European conflict, especially one that could threaten our NATO allies or undermine the transition of former Communist states to peaceful democracies.

We have an interest in showing that NATO, the world's greatest military alliance, remains a credible force for peace in the post-cold-war era. We have an interest in

helping to stem the destabilizing flows of refugees this struggle is generating throughout all of Europe. And we clearly have a humanitarian interest in helping to stop the strangulation of Sarajevo and the continuing slaughter of innocents in Bosnia.

I want to be clear: Europe must bear most of the responsibility for solving this problem and, indeed, it has. The United Nations has forces on the ground in Bosnia to protect the humanitarian effort and to limit the carnage. And the vast majority of them are European, from all countries in Europe who have worked along with brave Canadians and soldiers from other countries. I have not sent American ground units into Bosnia. And I will not send American ground forces to impose a settlement that the parties to that conflict do not accept.

But America's interest and the responsibilities of America's leadership demand our active involvement in the search for a solution. That is why my administration has worked to help contain the fighting, relieve suffering, and achieve a fair and workable negotiated end to that conflict.

Over a year ago, I appointed a special American envoy to the negotiations to help find a workable, enforceable solution acceptable to all. And I have said that if such a solution can be reached, our Nation is prepared to participate in efforts to enforce the solution, including the use of our military personnel.

We have participated in the enforcement of economic sanctions against Serbia. We initiated airdrops of food and medicine and participated in the Sarajevo airlift, a massive effort, running longer than the Berlin airlift, which has relieved starvation and suffering for tens of thousands of Bosnians. Together with our NATO allies, we began enforcement of a no-fly zone to stop the parties from spreading the war with aircraft.

We have warned Serbia against increasing its repression of the Albanian ethnic minority in Kosovo. We have contributed 300 American troops to the United Nations force that is helping to ensure that the war does not spread to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which lies between Bosnia and Greece. And we have worked with our allies to ensure that NATO is prepared to help solve this crisis.

In August, at our initiative, NATO declared its willingness to conduct air strikes to prevent the strangulation of Sarajevo and other population centers. NATO reaffirmed that commitment at our summit in Brussels just last month. But the shelling of Sarajevo continued. Two weeks ago, in a murderous attack, a single shell killed 68 people in the city's market. And last week with our NATO allies, we said that those who would continue terrorizing Sarajevo must pay a price.

On that day, NATO announced it was prepared to conduct air strikes against any heavy weapons remaining after 10 days within 20 kilometers of Sarajevo, unless such guns are placed under United Nations control. That 10-day period ends tomorrow night. If the U.N. and NATO authorities find the deadline has not been met, NATO stands ready to carry out its mission. American pilots and planes stand ready to do our part.

I have asked Secretary of Defense Perry and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, to travel to Italy to meet with their counterparts from other participating NATO countries to review our preparations.

Over the past two days, there have been some encouraging signs in Bosnia that our ultimatum may be working. Bosnian Serb leaders now say they will comply with the ultimatum. There is some evidence that heavy weapons are being pulled back from around Sarajevo, but others remain.

Many nations have helped to underscore the seriousness of our common intent. I have conferred on this matter with Russian President Boris Yeltsin. And the Russians, in the last couple of days, have made very important contributions by using their influence with the Serbs and expressing a willingness to use their U.N. forces to help to enforce this order.

If guns are truly being moved or impounded, we welcome the news. If the Serbs and others fully comply with NATO's ultimatum, there will be no need to use force against anyone. But we are determined to make good on NATO's word. And we are prepared to act. Our actions will be determined by one thing: the facts on the ground.

I want to be clear about the risks we face and the objectives we seek if force is needed. American planes likely will account for about half the NATO air strikes if they proceed. General Shalikashvili has told me that our forces are well prepared for this operation. But the fact is, there is no such thing as a mission completely without risks, and losses may occur. I have conferred with my national security advisers and told them to take every precaution to protect our courageous soldiers in uniform.

Our military goal will be straightforward: to exact a heavy price on those who refuse to comply with the ultimatum. Military force alone cannot guarantee that every heavy gun around Sarajevo will be removed or silenced, but military force can make it more likely that Bosnian Serbs will seek a solution through negotiation rather than through Sarajevo's strangulation and that more innocent civilians will continue to live.

For that reason, I have also ordered American negotiators to intensify their efforts to help the parties reach a fair and enforceable settlement. I have consulted with leaders from both parties in the Congress and asked for their support in this effort. I want us all to stand united behind our forces if they need to conduct air strikes and united in our determination to do our part in bringing an end to this dangerous conflict.

During this Olympic season, let us recall that only 10 years ago the winter Olympics were held in Sarajevo. Today, Sarajevo's athletic fields have been transformed into makeshift cemeteries for those killed in that city's siege.

In the week since NATO issued the ultimatum, the big guns around Sarajevo have fallen silent. Now let us work to help make this break in the violence continue so that Sarajevo's future may be marked by images of peace rather than by those of war and carnage.

While the cold war may be over, but the world is still full of dangers and the world still looks to America for leadership. Now, with our interests at stake and with our allies united at our side, let us show the world our leadership once again.

Thank you, and God bless America.

[At this point, the radio address ended, and the President answered reporters' questions.]

### **Russian Position on Bosnia**

**Q.** Mr. President, has President Yeltsin assured you that the Russian role will be entirely constructive and under the NATO leadership and that there is no risk of a renegade Russian force protecting Serb weapons or Serb forces?

**The President.** Last night the United Nations Commander on the ground, General Rose, said that he was confident that all the U.N. forces, including the Russian forces, would carry out the U.N. mandate. And I have no reason to believe otherwise.

**Q.** But has President Yeltsin given you any such assurance? When was your last communication with him?

**The President.** When did I talk to him—the day before yesterday, I think. And we've been in constant communication. Based on my communications with him, I have no reason to believe otherwise.

### **NATO Decision**

**Q.** Mr. President, if there is compliance, is Sarajevo sacrosanct, or will you try to extend and pose the ultimatum in other parts where their slaughter goes on?

**The President.** I think for the next day and a half I'd like to let my statement stand for itself.

**Q.** Mr. President, could you just give us an idea of what you think the likelihood would be of the need for air strikes?

**The President.** I have nothing to add to the statement I made on that. I think my statement's pretty clear.

**Q.** Do you wish you had prevailed a year ago on this, in this action, and could have saved thousands of lives?

**The President.** We didn't have the votes we needed, though. We didn't have the consensus a year ago, we have now.

**Q.** Do you agree with Mr. Churkin that if there are air strikes, it could lead to a wider war—it would in fact produce a wider war?

**The President.** The purpose of the air strikes is made clear in the resolution of NATO and what the U.N. asked us to do. I think it is clear and self-contained and stands for itself. The words are clear.

### **The President's Health**

**Q.** Are your eyes doing better, Mr. President?

**The President.** They are much better. The doctor told me that nothing would heal them but time, and they're getting a little better. I don't look like the monster from the deep as much as I did 2 days ago.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gen. Michael Rose, Commander of the U.N. Forces in Bosnia. Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaliy Churkin is the Russian Special Envoy to the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia.

### **Remarks on Bosnia and an Exchange With Reporters**

*February 20, 1994*

**The President.** I talked this morning with Secretary Perry and General Shali and General Joulwan and Admiral Boorda in Europe. There is a lot of activity on the ground. The Serbs seem to be moving weapons and also bringing the U.N. forces to the weapons that cannot be moved. So that much is encouraging. But we are monitoring this as the day goes on. The deadline will stand, and I expect to get further reports throughout the day and to talk to Manfred Woerner later in the day after we see what happens.

**Q.** There seems to be some flexibility on this deadline. I mean, is it exactly at 7 p.m. our time, even if they found out they couldn't move certain weapons?

**The President.** The deadline only makes the artillery positions subject to attack, and I think that we should keep the deadline and we should keep working at it. There may or may not be some questions about whether all those weapons can be put into U.N. control, depending as much as anything else on

the weather there. And we're just monitoring it.

Right now the report I got just before I came to church here was encouraging, directly from Secretary Perry and the military command we have there. But we're just going to have to wait and see what happens as the day unfolds.

**Q.** Are you hopeful, Mr. President, that you won't have to bomb?

**The President.** Well, I'm hopeful because of what I see happening. But basically, we have the procedures in place now, and as I said yesterday—I want to say again—what happens after 7 p.m. tonight will be determined by the facts on the ground. We have already authorized, I and the other leaders in the NATO coalition, we have already authorized our military commanders, working with the U.N., to draw their own conclusions and take appropriate actions. So the mechanisms are in place. This will be determined, as I said yesterday, entirely by what happens on the ground. We'll just have to see.

**Q.** Does the United Nations still have to authorize the first strike?

**The President.** Yes, the United Nations would have to approve the first strike. And right now, as I said, the activities on the ground seem encouraging. We'll just have to see. But there are still, plainly, weapons that are not yet under U.N. control, and they're not yet beyond the 20-kilometer safe zone. So we'll just have to see.

**Q.** Are you going to talk to Yeltsin before you—

**Q.** Are you going to talk to President Yeltsin?

**The President.** Well, we are in touch, close touch with the Russians, and I may well talk to him before any final determination is made. But that decision has not been made yet, and partly it's a function of the huge time difference, you know, between Washington and Moscow and what time it will be there by the time we know something. But we are keeping in close touch with the Russians, and I may well talk to President Yeltsin within the next 24 hours.

**Q.** What are you going to do all day?

**The President.** I don't know yet. I'm going to go take my family to lunch right

now. It's a nice day, and I'm just going to be—

**Q.** Where are you going?

**The President.** We'll probably go back to the house and eat. But I'm going to be where I can get some reports.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:51 p.m. outside Christ Episcopal Church. During the exchange, the President referred to Secretary of Defense William J. Perry; Gen. John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Gen. George A. Joulwan, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; Adm. J.M. Boorda, commander in chief, U.S. Naval Forces in Europe; and NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

### Statement on Results of NATO Action on Bosnia February 20, 1994

I have just been informed by NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner that NATO and United Nations commanders have concluded that all known heavy weapons of the parties have been withdrawn from the exclusion zone around Sarajevo, are under the control of the United Nations, or soon should be. Therefore, they have concluded that no air strikes in Bosnia by NATO air forces are required at this time.

This week's events clearly have given the residents of Sarajevo a respite from the shelling and a measure of hope. I want to congratulate NATO and each of our NATO allies for the demonstration of resolve that produced these results. I want to commend the high level of cooperation that has been demonstrated between the U.N. and NATO. As I told President Yeltsin in a call earlier today, I want to congratulate the Government of Russia for its contributions to this effort. Finally, all Americans join in praising the courage and skill of our service personnel and those of our NATO allies; they have been the muscle in NATO's ultimatum.

Despite the significant events of the day, we must remain vigilant. All parties should be aware that the ultimatum stands. The deadline has not been extended. Any heavy weapons in the exclusion zone not under

U.N. control are, and will remain, subject to air strikes. NATO's decision also applies to any heavy weapons attacks on Sarajevo from within or beyond the zone. NATO and the United Nations will continue to monitor compliance extremely carefully.

The NATO decision and its results provide new potential for progress toward an end to the tragic conflict in Bosnia. In the coming days, American diplomats will be working with the parties to the conflict and our allies and partners to transform this potential into reality.

### **The President's News Conference**

*February 21, 1994*

#### **Bosnia**

**The President.** Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It is now over 15 hours since NATO's ultimatum regarding Sarajevo went into effect. According to NATO and United Nations commanders, at this point the parties are in effective compliance with the ultimatum. There continues to be no shelling of Sarajevo. Over 250 heavy weapons have been placed under U.N. control. All known heavy weapons have now been removed or brought under U.N. control, except for a couple of sites that should be brought under control within hours as the U.N. operation continues. As a result, air strikes have not yet been necessary.

I spoke this morning with U.N. Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali and expressed my appreciation for his efforts. I again want to congratulate NATO, our NATO allies, and Secretary General Manfred Woerner for their resolve; the United Nations for its efforts and its cooperation with NATO; the Government of Russia for its important contributions to a peaceful resolution; and above all, the American military personnel and those from our NATO allies whose courage and skill provided the muscle that made this policy work. Let me review why we and our NATO allies took this action: to stem the destruction of Sarajevo and to reinvigorate the peace process.

Now that we have brought some breathing space to the people of Sarajevo, we are taking additional steps on both fronts. First, we in-

tend to remain vigilant. The U.N. and NATO will continue to conduct intensive reconnaissance and monitoring of the Sarajevo area. The NATO decision stands. We will continue to enforce the exclusion zone. Any shelling of Sarajevo or the appearance of heavy weapons in the exclusion zone will bring a certain and swift response from the U.N. and NATO. Second, we are working to renew progress toward a negotiated solution among the parties. A workable, enforceable solution acceptable to all parties is the only way to ensure a lasting solution for Sarajevo and for all of Bosnia.

Negotiations among the parties are set to resume in the near future. American negotiators have been and will remain active in helping to bridge the gap among the parties. Ambassador Redman has had a series of intensive conversations in Europe, and this week in Bonn our experts will meet with the representatives from European Union countries, Canada, and Russia to take stock of where we are.

The challenge for all who have been touched by the fighting in Bosnia, the parties to the conflict, our own nation, and the international community, is to build on this week's progress and create a lasting and workable peace for all the people of Bosnia.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

**Q.** Mr. President, are you willing to extend the ultimatum to stop the killing in other parts of Bosnia and to persuade the allies and Russia to go along with the idea of enforcing it throughout the country?

**The President.** Well, that's one of the things that we've been discussing this morning and that our representatives will be discussing in Europe this week.

Let me say, first of all, we have to make sure that we continue to do what we can to protect Sarajevo. Second, we should remember that that option is, in effect, available now wherever there are U.N. forces, because if U.N. forces are brought under shelling, they can ask for close air support from NATO. Thirdly, if we decide to pursue this as a strategy, we think it is important, as we did in Sarajevo, that the United Nations not—excuse me, that NATO not undertake any mission it is not fully capable of performing. And

I think that's very important. So we're reviewing—

**Q.** Well, wouldn't it be an irony, though, to have killing go on in other parts and just protect—

**The President.** Oh, yes. Well, we're very concerned about the prospect that maybe the weapons could be moved out of the Sarajevo area and transferred to another area. We're quite concerned about that. I believe that the United Nations Commander on the ground, General Rose, has been pretty clear and forceful about that, too, as he has been about everything. I think he's making a real difference there.

**Q.** Mr. President, Bosnia's Ambassador to the United Nations has expressed fears that the weapons that are being moved out of Sarajevo are being taken to other battlefronts. Do you see any evidence of that? And if so, is there anything that can be done to prevent it?

**The President.** Well, we're doing what we can to discourage it, obviously, and we believe that others will, including the Russians. And keep in mind, I think General Rose on the ground will take an aggressive attitude about that. And remember, as I just said to Helen, we now have operative right now a resolution to NATO which we supported, which gives the U.N. commanders the option at the present time, if they're under shelling, to call in NATO close air support.

**Q.** Mr. President, given your apparent success in this, how do you answer those who will now say to you and to other NATO leaders who may perhaps have been not as enthusiastic as you have been about such an operation, "Why not sooner?"

**The President.** Well, I would say, first of all, when we got the first approval ever for NATO out-of-area operations last summer, that resulted in immediately a reduction in the shelling of Sarajevo and the casualties, and then they built back up. So we've been working on this for some time. Even before then, we received permission to enforce a no-fly zone. So we've been working on this for some time.

I think that we finally had a consensus among our allies—and I have to compliment them—and which included, as I have said many times, NATO members who had troops

on the ground there, unlike the United States. So I think that the main thing we need to do now is to build on this and figure out how we can use it to make a permanent peace.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News].

**Q.** Mr. President, how can you build on this diplomatically? What can the United States now bring to the peace talks? You've always said that it has to be determined among the parties, but once you have a bottom line from the Bosnian Muslims, is there some new initiative, some way to push it? And might the Russian involvement on the ground lead to more Russian involvement in the diplomacy, as well?

**The President.** Well, I would hope it will. President Yeltsin and I have been discussing this, as you know, intensely, both through our representatives and directly. And I talked to him again yesterday. I hope that they will be intensely involved in this. I think it is important that all of us who are prepared to stick with this and who have made the same commitment, that if there is an agreed-upon peace will help to implement it, really push for that kind of peace. On the other hand, I think it is equally important that we not pretend that we can impose a peace that the parties disagree with, that they do not freely accept. So that's the delicate line we'll be walking, and that's what our people will be discussing this week in Europe.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

**Q.** Mr. President, if the United States now is much more actively engaged in working with the Bosnian Government to achieve some sort of peaceful settlement, won't that bring additional responsibilities to the U.S. Government if the Bosnians do go forward and make major concessions? Specifically, how committed are you to dispatching some 25,000 U.S. military peacekeepers to try to enforce an agreement?

**The President.** Well, I have said since February of 1993, since shortly after becoming President, that if the parties themselves freely and clearly adopted a peace agreement which the United States felt was an enforceable one, that we would do what we could through the United Nations and through NATO to support the implementation of it as long as we had fewer than half of the

troops there and as long as we were convinced that we had a fair chance to implement it. We're not committed to any specific number of troops, but I think we should, and that's been my position all along.

**Q.** You first talked of air strikes some 13 months ago. Do you now feel personally vindicated by the events of the past couple of days and week?

**The President.** To be honest, I haven't given any thought to that. Let me just say generally, in a situation like this, first of all, it's a complicated, heartbreaking situation. I want the United States to play a role in stabilizing that part of the world, so the conflict doesn't spread, and in bringing an end to the humanitarian tragedy.

I believe that the policy that I have advocated is and has been the right one. But I also fully recognize that, unlike our allies that I had to convince to go along with the policy, we did not have troops on the ground there. We did not have people who could be easily outnumbered and killed quickly. So I have to say a strong word of appreciation to our allies in NATO for the work they have done, as well as a strong word of appreciation to General Rose and to, generally, the renewed vigor of the United Nations forces in Bosnia, because they knew they would be at some risk if this policy ultimatum had to be carried out.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 48th news conference began at 12:10 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Charles E. Redman, U.S. Special Envoy to the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, and Muhammed Sacirbey, Bosnian Ambassador to the United Nations.

## Remarks to the American Council on Education

February 22, 1994

Thank you very much, Father Malloy, for that introduction. Now that we're in Washington, DC, I should tell you that the most important thing about him is not that he is the president of Notre Dame but that he was a legendary high school basketball player who played on the same team with the great

John Thompson, here in Washington, DC. This is one of our big struggles in life. Some people would question, is it better to be the president of Notre Dame or be a great high school basketball player? The answer is, it's better to do both, if possible. *[Laughter]*

I'd like to thank you all for inviting me here and to say that I've looked forward to this day. I want to recognize many of you in the audience, but I think if I start I don't know where I'll stop. I am glad to be joined here by the Secretary of Education, and I know that the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Labor also are on this program.

Many leaders in our administration have come from the ranks of higher education. Donna Shalala was the chancellor at the University of Wisconsin. The Director of USIA, Joseph Duffey, who came in with me, was the president of American University and formerly the president of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Dr. David Satcher, the Director of the Center of Disease Control, was formerly the president of Maharry Medical Center in Tennessee. Shirley Chater, the Commissioner of Social Security, was the president of Texas Woman's University. Then there are the people in our administration like the Secretary of Labor Bob Reich, the First Lady, and me, who taught at institutions of higher education and complained about you all the time. *[Laughter]* So we're actually all exhausted after the last year and we're looking for a home to go back to—*[laughter]*—so I sort of came here for a job interview today. *[Laughter]*

For 75 years, the American Council on Education has represented colleges and universities with real distinction. And in large measure because of your common efforts, it is now generally agreed that we have the finest system of higher education anywhere in the world. No other nation gives such a high percentage of its high school graduates the opportunity to go on to college. None other offers such diverse choices among institutions. No other nation conducts as much basic research at its universities or produces as many Nobel laureates. No wonder tens of thousands of students come here from all over the world every year to study.

The shape of American higher education is changing, and with it, the needs and demands. This morning, in preparation for this speech in part, I went jogging with about 12 students from the Northern Virginia Community College. One had just become a citizen, was a native of Iran; another was a native of Sierra Leone; another was a native of Peru; another a native of Scotland. Nobody but me had a southern accent in the whole crowd. [Laughter]

Every great chapter in our history has begun by expanding educational opportunities, from guaranteeing free public education to creating the land grant colleges to enacting the G.I. bill. Education has propelled our economy, strengthened our democracy, and created our great American middle class.

As Governor, I worked to improve our schools because I thought it was the best way to lift people up in a State with a lot of people who worked hard but were not rewarded sufficiently for their work. I ran for President in large measure because I thought too many of our people were working too hard for too little, that the American dream of upward mobility was seriously imperiled, and that our country was coming apart when it needed to come together. As President, I work every day to try to secure and expand opportunities for people to be in that middle class and to see that American dream.

It is now clear that in order to do that, more than ever before, Americans must seek their own opportunities to improve their lives through education and training and that it must happen over the course of a lifetime. We now know that the average American, because of changes in the economy at home and abroad, will change work seven or eight times in a lifetime, even if that person stays with the same employer, although most will change employers frequently throughout a lifetime. If that is true, it is clear that we need an agenda as a people for lifetime learning.

And so today, I want to offer you a seven-point agenda for lifetime learning: first, to help every child begin school healthy and ready to learn; second, to set and achieve world-class standards in public education; third, to open the doors of college opportunity to every young American who is eager

and able to do college work; fourth, to expand opportunities for our young people to serve their communities and their country while earning money for their education; fifth, to provide new learning opportunities for young people who are going from high schools to work; sixth, to change our unemployment system into a reemployment system; and finally, to challenge every sector of our society to accept greater responsibility for achieving an environment of lifelong learning.

I come today to ask for your support, to invite the Congress to continue its cooperation in enacting the lifelong learning agenda, and to call on all Americans to do their part.

Throughout our history, people have had the idea that if they worked hard, played by the rules, and made the most of their opportunities, they would be rewarded by a decent life and greater opportunities for their children. But for the last two decades, that whole idea has been called into question as more and more Americans have lengthened their work week while their wages have remained stagnant or have actually declined relative to inflation.

This happened because of a lot of things. The world is changing rapidly, more rapidly than our policies, perhaps more rapidly than our ability to understand the changes themselves. An economy that was once almost entirely domestic is now global in its competition for markets and for jobs. Once capital and information, management and technologies were limited by national boundaries. Clearly, today, they are not. Once the principal source of wealth was natural resources. Then it was mass production. Today it is clearly the problem-solving capacity of the human mind, making products and tailoring services to the needs of people all across the globe.

In the 19th century, at most, young Americans needed a high school education to make their way. It was good enough if they could read well and understand basic numbers. In the 20th century, as the century progressed, more and more they needed more education, college as well. And in the 21st century, our people will have to keep learning all their lives.

This is clearly evident everywhere. Next month in Detroit, I will host a conference of the world's leading industrial nations to discuss how we can make technology, information, trade, and education create more and better jobs for all our citizens. This now is a problem throughout all advanced countries, the problem we have been experiencing for 20 years. In America we have had more good fortune than the Europeans, for example, in creating new jobs; our problem has been increasing incomes. In Europe hardly any new jobs have been created. Now in Japan they're having great difficulty creating new jobs. So you see, in all the advanced countries there is a combined crisis of jobs and incomes. In the United States, even though we created almost 2 million jobs last year, we are still millions short of where we would be, going back in 1989, if this had been a normal economic recovery. So you now have a global crisis in the advanced nations: How do you create jobs, how do you raise incomes?

If you look at the charts behind me, you will see, however, that even though this is an international problem for all the advanced countries, it is clear that for individuals in our country, education goes a long way toward solving the problem of jobs and incomes.

First, if you look at the unemployment rate in America in March of 1993—these numbers would be all slightly lower now but still more or less the same, the ratios would all be the same—people with no high school diploma had a 12.6 percent unemployment rate. People with 4 years of high school had a 7.2 percent unemployment rate. People with some college education had a 5.7 percent unemployment rate, that is, below the national average. People with 4 years of college had a 3.5 percent unemployment rate, way below the national average. And I would point out that this is after several years of severe defense downsizing which has dramatically increased unemployment among college-educated workers in some sectors of the economy. And these numbers still hold.

Now, if you look at the chart to my right, and now I'm on your right, too—I've turned around—[laughter]—if you see the earnings here, it is clear that what you earn depends

upon what you're able to learn. Again, the mean earnings of full-time workers—this is calendar year 1992—\$19,100 for people with no high school diploma, \$5,000 more for 4 years of high school, \$4,000 more for some college, \$11,000 more for 4 years of college, stepping up.

It is, therefore, clear that if we really want America to grow jobs and increase earnings, we will have to dramatically improve the levels of education of the American people, that we have to start with the preschoolers, but we can't stop with the adults.

Today, these dozen young people that I ran with, I asked them what their ages were. The youngest was 19; the oldest was 32, in this community college. I would say their average age, I didn't run the math, but their average age was probably, oh, 24, 25. The average age of a college student in America today is, I think is 26. And it is likely, given the demographics and the fact that the youngest of the baby boomers are now 29, if my math is right, that the average age will continue to go up for another 10 years or so.

So any hope we have to hook the American economy to the 21st century and to open up opportunity again depends upon making sure that our education system is responsive to and adequate to the demands of the times and able, I might add, to make a strength of that diversity that I spoke about a few moments ago.

In 1993 we tried to clear some of the non-educational obstacles to our growth away by bringing the deficit down, creating incentives to invest in a growing economy, stripping away controls on exports that were outmoded so that we could export more of our high-technology products, opening up trade opportunities in Mexico and throughout the world with the GATT agreement and other initiatives, trying to build a foundation for economic growth.

Last year our economy created almost 2 million jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector, a real change from previous years when more and more job growth had come only from Government. And we have begun clearly to move in the right direction. But over the long run, if you look at these charts behind me, it is clear that the future of our

economy and, therefore, the fabric of our society, is in no small measure in your hands and the hands of others who are committed to educating our people for a lifetime.

We're going to have to make some tough choices because we can't do everything we would like to do. But I believe we can, with discipline, continue to bring the deficit down and make room for investments that improve the skills and the productivity of the American people. In order to do that, we have to take the long view, and we have to avoid gimmicks. I believe—and I think I have some credibility in saying this now since I lived in a State and governed a State for a dozen years with, I think, the toughest budget mechanism in the country and since we now have adopted one tough budget, bringing the deficit down, and if this budget is adopted, our administration will be the first since Harry Truman's to have three consecutive declines in the deficit—I think I can say that I think this balanced budget amendment is not a good idea for the United States. And I'll tell you why.

First of all, if you constitutionalize the budgeting process and no one's sure what it all means, you're going to wind up having courts making decisions about budgets. If any of you have ever had your budgets in court, you know that's not a very good place to do it.

Secondly, if the amendment is carried out, it will lead to, in the near term, until we reform health care, it will lead in the near term either to huge tax increases which could cramp economic growth or to huge cuts in defense or Social Security and Medicare or investments in education and technology or all of the above. And if it is decided to ignore that, then what you will do is basically put the filibuster in the Senate and in the House in the only area where it doesn't exist today, the budget. That is, you will put 40 percent of the Senate and 40 percent of the House plus one vote in total control of the American Government and America's future. Now, that's what this does if it passes the way it is.

The budget that I presented cuts or eliminates outright over 300 Government programs and reduces the deficit according to very tough targets and increases our invest-

ment at the national level in lifelong learning by 23 percent by getting rid of some things and investing in others. If you think that's the way we ought to go, I wouldn't mind it, since you're in town, if it's not even a long-distance call, if you call your Senator or Congressman and tell them that that's the way you feel.

Why do we need to spend this money? Let's look at the various elements that I outlined earlier. First, in lifelong learning: With regard to early childhood, we all know that parents are the first and most important teachers, but sometimes Government can help them to do that. That's why our agenda begins with investing in our youngest children, giving them a healthy start in life, giving them a chance to succeed later as students and ultimately as citizens, giving them a chance to stay out of prison and in the work force and become full-fledged human beings in every way. That's why we're increasing our investment in child nutrition and immunization and investing not just in a bigger Head Start program but in a better one as well. Our budget will serve about 850,000 children this year and provide new opportunities for the very youngest children.

With regard to public schools, I want to talk a little about our Goals 2000 legislation that the Secretary of Education has worked so hard on. Back in 1989, I represented the Governors in negotiating the national education goals with the administration. The goals were designed to recognize the fact that from the day they start kindergarten to the day they graduate from high school, we owe our young people the best education in the world and then the chance to go to a lifetime of learning.

Our States and communities have always taken the lead in public education, and they'll continue to do so. But the National Government can do more to help. With the Goals 2000 legislation, we enshrine the national education goals, establish national standards by which we can determine whether schools are meeting those goals, encourage grass-roots reforms, and give the schools the flexibility and the tools they need to meet the goals. We encourage States and communities to learn from one another, empower individual school districts to experiment with ideas

like public school choice and charter schools, asking always one overriding question of every education official: Are the children learning what they need to learn to compete and win in the global economy? Goals 2000 has been approved by bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress. I look forward to a speedy conference and to signing the bill into law next month.

We also favor dramatic reforms in the education and secondary education act. Our efforts to raise standards and to focus resources have sparked some controversy, so I thought I would mention this, even though it only indirectly affects you. I just think the status quo in this act is not good enough. As the House debates this act this week, we will fight for fundamental changes: first of all, high standards of all students, wherever they are; secondly, significant waiver authority for schools to make experimental decisions.

We've got real problems in this country today, folks. Baltimore, for example, has in effect chartered several of their schools, I think up to nine now, to be operated by private corporations to see if they can at least fix the physical facilities. If you want to know why—I don't know how many of you saw—here, I'll promote Al Gore a little bit here—the Sunday Times magazine has a wonderful article on the Vice President. It also has a stunning picture essay which says this better than I could: "America's Best Building." See, this is a beautiful library, and this is a lousy building. This is a school building; this is a prison library. Why? Because you can take a State into Federal court and make them build buildings like this for prisoners. And the students don't have any such constitutional claims now.

So these school districts are having to try some fairly radical approaches, and they're trying to say, "Well, if we've got some fat in this budget, if we can clean up the physical facilities, if we can make it available, we ought to try some things." We want to give people a chance to try that.

I made a joke about Father Malloy's basketball prowess, but you know, I think it's important for children when they're in school to be able to play basketball and baseball and have music and learn something about art. And a lot of schools in this country where

the kids need it the worst, can't afford it anymore. You know, there are kids in neighborhoods that produce the greatest baseball players in the history of America where there are no gloves and balls and bats and playgrounds anymore. It's a serious problem. I could spend the rest of the time talking about that picture essay, but you ought to get that picture and ask yourself: How did my country come to this? Why, when it's so much cheaper to educate somebody than it is to keep them in prison, can you get a better library in the prison than you can in the school?

Which leads me to the next point. The other thing we try to do in this is to make sure that the limited money we do have goes to the school districts that need it the most. Why? Because they don't have access to the Federal courts to order people to build them those kind of buildings. So we have to spend the money that we have where it is needed the most.

And finally, we try to promote more parental involvement in the schools, knowing it will make a difference. If it makes a difference in Head Start, it will make a difference in elementary school, too.

We have a safe and drug-free schools initiative. First of all, we know that more than 160,000 kids every day stay home because they are afraid to go to school. Tens of thousands go to school carrying not just their lunches but knives or guns. In that kind of environment it's hard for teachers to teach and for students to learn, people are scared and people are armed. Our safe schools act helps to reduce violence by adding security, removing weapons, and maybe most importantly, helping schools to get the resources to teach young people to resolve their problems peacefully. And our national drug strategy provides more education to help them stay away from drugs and guns and gangs.

Let me just mention one thing. I know you're going to think I'm obsessed with this, but I heard about a program the other day in a school that is immensely successful: teaching children ways other than violence to resolve their difficulties. It was wildly popular among the students. There was a drop in violence in the school in question. A business had given this school \$3,000 to pay for somebody to come in and teach the program,

but because it was dependent upon largesse, the grant wasn't forthcoming the next year and so the \$3,000 was gone. If \$3,000 kept one person out of the penitentiary, it saved \$30,000 a year. We have got to get our priorities back in order on this investment issue.

The next thing I want to talk about with regard to education is student loans, something you know a lot about. Last June I addressed a commencement at Northeastern University in Boston, and I met the young student who spoke there named Doug Luffborough, who delivered an incredibly moving address. He talked about how his mother had worked hard at very low wages all her life, and he tried to tell her that he wanted to give up college so he could help her support his two younger brothers and their sister. But his mother insisted that he go on to college no matter how difficult her circumstances. His message was, "Never say I could have, I should have, I would have; just say, I can, I will." Well, that's great that he did that. But you and I know that there are too many young people who go to college and drop out or defer going to college because they think they can't afford it. And last year I proposed and the Congress adopted initiatives to change the student loan program to help people like Doug Luffborough, and I thank all of you for helping it pass.

The new direct lending program reduces fees, interest rates, and monthly payments for millions of borrowers. It gives every student the choice of repaying loans as a small percentage of income over time, which is a big deal for young people who know they want to do things that are personally rewarding but don't pay very much. It will decrease the debt burden that crushes too many of those people and discourages them from spending a few years in lower paying jobs. And it will save the taxpayers over \$4 billion in just the first 5 years.

We have also strengthened the Pell grant program. When I became President, the Pell grant program was \$2 billion in arrears. That's one of those pleasant things you don't know about until you show up one day and they drop that on your desk. I am pleased to report that if Congress accepts the proposal that the Secretary of Education has developed, the shortfall will be eliminated by the end of the next fiscal year, the number

of student recipients will increase to 4.1 million, the most ever, average awards will increase, and for the first time in 4 years, the maximum benefit will increase.

Congress has also given us the tools to root out fraud and to decrease default, and we're beginning to use them. We want to listen attentively to your suggestions for reducing Federal intrusion and redtape. But we have to faithfully implement and vigorously enforce this law. That was the compact I made with students all over America in 1992: If I became President, I would try to open the doors of education to all young Americans, never make the cost a deterrent, but you've got to pay your loan back.

We also need to do more to open the doors of equal opportunity. Last fall, I signed an Executive order strengthening the partnership between the Federal Government and historically black colleges and universities. Last week, the Department of Education issued guidelines that lifted the cloud hanging over scholarships for minorities. [*Applause*]

You know, it's interesting to me, the more people know about this issue, the more likely they are to be on our side. Did you notice that?

Later today, I will sign another Executive order to advance educational excellence for Hispanic-Americans. I believe we now live in a Nation with way over 150 ethnic and racial groups. In a global economy with shrinking distances, instantaneous communication, and blurred borders, this can give us an advantage in the 21st century unlike that enjoyed by any other nation, but only if we have a genuinely deep commitment to universal education and the development of the capacities of all Americans.

Now, let me say one word about my favorite project, national service. Last year we provided new opportunities for tens of thousands of our young people who wanted to contribute something to their communities and earn money for education. The national service program which Congress adopted, AmeriCorps, will this year send 20,000 young people out across our country, helping police to stop crime and violence, tutoring the young, keeping company with the old, helping the illiterate to learn to read, organizing

neighborhood cleanups, conserving national parks. Within 3 years, we'll have 100,000 young people a year doing that.

There was a program in Texas last summer where the young people helped to immunize over 100,000 people, and a respected evaluator just looked at the program and said that for every one dollar in tax money spent in that program of immunization, \$5.50 in tax money would be saved with a healthier population. National service is more than a program, it carries the spirit of what America is going to have to be like if we're going to solve our problems and grow closer as a people.

I want to thank the colleges and universities that are participating. Smith College makes community service a requirement for graduation. Spellman is forming real partnerships with communities throughout the Atlanta area. Hampshire College matches assistance with the national service program and provides for young people who join AmeriCorps. For every American who needs to find a first job, national service is a good place to begin.

Let me also now talk very briefly about this school-to-work issue, something that the community colleges have been particularly involved in. We have the best system of higher education in the world, but we are the only advanced country that basically has no system for helping all of our young people who don't go to the 4-year colleges at least have a smooth transition from school to work where they've got a chance to have a good job with a growing income.

For the half of the young people who don't go to college and the nearly three-quarters who don't get a 4-year college degree, we propose a better system to move from school to work, a new kind of education and training connecting the classroom and the workplace, removing the artificial distinction between the academic and the practical. Students will learn practical problem-solving in the classroom and at job sites. And for at least a year after graduating we want young people to get more training in workplaces and community colleges.

We have to have rigorous academics and practical learning. We have to tie the workplace to the learning environment in high

school for young people who know they are not going on to 4-year colleges in a way that makes them respect learning and gives them the option, therefore, to go on to a 4-year college later and to work and succeed if they do not.

We know now, from a lot of studies that have been done of people's personal learning capacities, that a lot of very bright people actually learn more in a practical setting than in a more abstract setting. We also know that a lot of practical tasks now require very sophisticated levels of knowledge. Therefore, we have an opportunity to do something that Americans have resisted for too long, which is to merge instead of keep divided our notion of vocational education and academic education. And that is what the school-to-work program is all about.

Part of Goals 2000 is voluntary national skills standards that will enable every young person who goes through this program to get a nationally recognized credential, good for young men and women, good for employers who need skilled workers but don't always know how to recognize them. A B.A. degree should not and must not be the only ticket to a good job and a good livelihood, but you shouldn't be foreclosed from going on to get one by what you do in the school-to-work program. Our approach would solve both problems.

Finally, let me say, just as we need to train our young people, we have to retrain millions of workers who are losing their jobs, people who have been displaced by technological change, international trade, corporate restructuring, reduced defense spending, and ordinary cycles in the business economy aggravated by changes in the global economy.

The unemployment system into which employers all over America pay taxes was designed for a time when there would be cyclical changes in the economy which would require them to lay their workers off so that humanity demanded that they give their workers some, even though a reduced level, of compensation. And then they would be brought back to work when the economy cycled upward again. The truth is that that doesn't describe what happens to most unemployed people anymore. And yet, the

structure of unemployment is still designed for that economy.

What we need to do is sort of erase the whole concept of unemployment and develop one of reemployment. What would that mean? It would mean that at least on the day that someone loses a job, and before if they have any advance notice, people would be planning to use the unemployment time as a retraining time, not just waiting around until the unemployment benefits run out to have to look around for a new job or a new skill but to use the time on unemployment to learn and to grow and to develop new job skills and new awareness of what kinds of jobs are offered. We want to create one-stop job centers where unemployed workers can get counseling and assistance and learn about new job opportunities, the skills they require, and where they can best get the training.

Last month, just to give you one example, I attended a Labor Department conference on training and retraining, and I met some interesting people. I met a woman named Deb Woodbury from Bangor, Maine, who lost a factory job, had a bunch of kids, didn't know what in the world to do, learned new skills to be a marketing representative. I met a woman named Cynthia Scott from San Antonio, who went from welfare to a training program in nursing and a good job in a hospital. I met a man named John Hahn from Niagara County, New York, who was laid off from a job he had for 28 years because of defense cuts and, being an older worker, was still given the opportunity to learn new skills for a new career as a biomedical technician. And I might say, he was lucky enough to find an employer who was smart enough not to discriminate against people because they weren't young, which has got to be a big part of this. We're going to move people through a mobile learning environment, we have to get over the notion that since you're not going to keep somebody for 30 years anyway, or at least not in job X for 30 years, people are going to have to be willing to hire people who are not young as well as people who are young.

Ironically, we've got two big blocks here in the labor mobility. One is a lot of young people can't get hired coming out of college because they haven't had any experience, and

so they keep running around like a dog chasing their tail. How do you ever get it if nobody hires you? The other is people who have worlds of experience, but because they're so old, people say, well, they don't want to hire them. Well, they look younger to me every day. *[Laughter]*

So I think that employer attitudes are some things we're also going to have to work on. But if we can set up this kind of system, this reemployment system, it will become normal. Then losing a job may not be so traumatic because with income supports and retraining, people will be able to see it as an opportunity to move to a new and exciting and different career, so that job security won't be tied to a particular job so much as it will be to the ability to work and the ability to find a job. We'll have to redefine that security, but if we do, it will be deeper because it will be real, real meaning tied to the realities of this economy, not the economy of a generation ago. And I know all of you can identify with that, and many of you have worked hard on it.

Finally let me say, in order for any of this to work, there has to be a whole ethic that grips the American imagination. Parents and schools and teachers have to believe that this is important and have to support it, all of them. This is not something that professional educators alone can do.

I just—to give you an example of that, the kind of a flip side of a very troubling story today—I don't know how many of you saw the cover story in USA Today today, but it's about teen pregnancy and what a terrible problem it is and how births to teen mothers are going up again and now most of them are out-of-wedlock births. A couple of years ago, the Children's Defense Fund did a study on teen mothers. And they surveyed two groups of them, one who had a second child out of wedlock, another group that did not have another child out of wedlock. And the single most significant determinant for the ones who never had another child out of wedlock was the acquisition of a good education, which gave them an appreciation for what they could become and a devotion for the future and an understanding about what it took to raise children successfully. So this is something that has to grip the American

imagination. Government programs alone can't do it. Educational professionals alone can't do it. There is something for all of us to do. But it begins with us here in Washington passing our agenda.

So again, I would say, if you believe we should prepare children for school better, if you believe we should set higher standards for our public schools, if you believe we should expand college opportunity and encourage national service and provide a transition from school to work and create a system of reemployment to replace unemployment, and if you believe we have to challenge every American to be a part of this ethic, then I ask for your support. I ask for your support in the Congress. I ask for your support in your institutions. I ask for your support in the country.

Education has always been important for democracy. Democracy is always a gamble, at every election, in every crisis, at every turn in the road, because it requires that a majority of the people have enough information in the proper context with a high enough level of security to make the right decision, sometimes under the most arduous circumstances. We are now being called upon to make a lot of those right decisions. And one of those right decisions is the simple question of how we can guarantee the success of this democracy into the 21st century. It begins with the program that I have discussed today. And I ask for your support, and I thank you for what you're doing to make the American dream real for so many millions of Americans.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:33 a.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to John Thompson, Georgetown University basketball coach.

### **Remarks on the Ames Spy Case and an Exchange With Reporters** *February 22, 1994*

**The President.** Ladies and gentlemen, I know that all of you have been informed about the arrest of the CIA employee and his wife for espionage. I just want to make a couple of brief comments.

First of all, I have been kept informed of this investigation for some time now. It is a very serious case. I congratulate the FBI and the CIA for the work they did in cracking it. We will be immediately lodging a protest to the Russian Government. And because of the nature of the case, there's really nothing more I can say at this time. Thank you.

**Q.** Mr. President, is this the worst case?

**The President.** I don't want to characterize it, but the FBI and the CIA did a very good job on this. They worked on it for a long time, and I can tell you that it is very serious.

**Q.** Mr. President, what does this say about the state of Soviet-American—or Russian-American relations? Is the cold war over or not?

**The President.** I don't want to comment on that. We'll be dealing with that over the next few days.

**Q.** Were any Americans harmed?

**The President.** What did you say?

**Q.** Were any Americans harmed?

**The President.** I can't comment on the case any more. Thank you.

### **Interest Rates**

**Q.** Mr. President, could you comment on Mr. Greenspan's remarks about interest rates, interest rates going to continue to go up?

**The President.** I don't think so. I was encouraged by what he said. Alan Greenspan said that he thought that we had the best conditions for fundamental economic growth in two decades or more—I think that's quite encouraging—and that there was no reason to believe we had any problem with inflation. And if that's true, if we're going to have steady growth and no inflation, then we ought to keep relatively low interest rates.

**Q.** Did he miscalculate in bumping up short-term rates?

**The President.** I don't want to comment any more on that. I think the people setting the long-term rates should know what he said, there will be no—there's no reason to believe there's an inflation problem.

And let me also say that there's still a pretty good gap between the short- and the long-term rates. Historically, they have been, if you go back over 20, 30 years, they've been

closer together. So the fact that the short-term rates went up a little bit, still the long-term rates could be lower than they are, considerably lower than they are. And the difference between short- and long-term rates would not be out of whack with 20, 30, 40-year historical average.

So I think the main good news for Americans is that Mr. Greenspan said that conditions for long-term growth are good; conditions for low inflation are good. And that's what we believe, and we're going to keep working on it.

**Q.** But he did say that long-term rates would go up, did he not?

**The President.** No, he said they had gone up, didn't he? I mean, he thought they—if we had explosive growth, they'll go up because we'll have more people wanting money.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:39 p.m. in the Colonnade at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to the arrest of Aldrich Hazen Ames and Maria del Rosario Casas Ames.

### **Remarks on Signing the Executive Order on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans**

*February 22, 1994*

Thank you very much, Secretary Peña, Secretary Cisneros, all the people here from the Department of Education, along with Secretary Riley, including Norma Cantu and Gene Garcia, who have been recognized. When I was listening to my longtime friend Dick Riley up here speaking, I was thinking that this group could have forgiven me perhaps for putting someone in my Cabinet who spoke English with such a heavy accent. [*Laughter*] You know, sometimes people from South Carolina are hard for even the rest of us southerners to understand. I remember once when Senator Fritz Hollings from South Carolina was running for President and he was in a roast, and Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts spoke at the roast. And he said that he was glad to be there in honor of the first non-English-speaking American ever to seek the Presidency. He'll probably resign this afternoon—[*laughter*].

We've had a wonderful day today, Dick Riley and I have, the kind of day we always wanted to have, fighting for better education in America. We were the Governors of our respective States together for a long time in the seventies and the eighties. We saw what education could do and what the lack of it could mean. And I want to thank him personally from the bottom of my heart for the extraordinary work that he has done as Secretary of Education.

This morning I started off the day by going jogging with about a dozen students from the Northern Virginia Community College, and it was interesting. Their average age, I'd say, was probably 26. One was a native of Peru; one a native of Iran, just became an American citizen; one a native of Sierra Leone; one a native of Scotland. And as a matter of fact, I think only 7 of the 12 were native-born to the United States.

Then I spoke to the American Council on Education and was on the platform with Juliet Garcia from the University of Texas at Brownsville and others today, and we had a terrific time. I want to thank her and all the rest of you who are here representing various organizations, including the Hispanic Education Coalition. I think I have you all down here: Laudelina Martinez, the president of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities; those here from the National Council of La Raza; the National Puerto Rican Coalition; Aspira; also MALDEF; the Cuban American National Council; the National Association for Bilingual Education; the Association of Hispanic Federal Executives.

I'd also like to acknowledge the members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus who are here, including the chair, Congressman José Serrano; Congressman Bill Richardson from New Mexico—and we thank you, sir, for your extraordinary Burmese mission dealing with Aung San Suu Kyi; all America's proud of you for what you've done—Congressman Ed Pastor; Congressman Robert Menendez; Congressman Carlos Romero-Barceló; Congressman Lincoln Diaz-Balart; Congresswoman Lucille Roybal; Congressman Robert Underwood; Congressman—is Solomon Ortiz here? I don't think so. I think that is everyone.

Those of you in this room, including many that I have not introduced, have been at the forefront in pressing for educational opportunity for Hispanic-Americans. It must have seemed sometimes a lonely cause. It is, today, an even more urgent cause than ever before. You are here today, in part, for me to say to you, you are not alone.

Our administration has embraced your cause and seeks to support it. We know that doors can be shut. We know that only about half of Hispanic-Americans complete high school; that between 1980 and 1991, Hispanic enrollment at institutions of higher education grew 84 percent but still lagged far behind the national average of enrollments. The percentage of Hispanics going to college is just about half of that from college students in other minority groups.

This is a complex problem. And finding solutions, therefore, can be deferred, as they often are with complex problems, or we can say, because the problems are difficult and complex, we should take even more aggressive action. I am determined that we must do the latter because we have to succeed. After all, in the next century, Hispanics will make up the largest minority group in our Nation. From this pool, we will draw many of our leaders, our educators, our work force, our future.

To ignore the barriers to educational opportunity only hampers our own future, as well as the future of Hispanic-Americans as individuals. If we fail the youngest and fastest growing segment of our population, we'll all fail. Therefore, we must do everything in our power to allow every American child to reach his or her full potential.

I believe and everyone in this administration believes that every child can learn and can achieve. We have set world-class goals in education, and we want to give our schools and communities the tools to achieve them. That is at the heart of our general initiatives on education, the Goals 2000 program, the school-to-work initiative, the reformation of the college loan program to lower the interest rates and string out the repayments so that all Americans can borrow money and then do work that they're proud to do, knowing that they will never be unduly burdened in paying back their loans. It's at the heart of

the national service program. It's at the heart of the reemployment program, what we want to do in replacing the old unemployment system where people drew unemployment and waited for their old jobs to come back, when we know those jobs are not coming back. We now want a reemployment system so that the moment someone is unemployed, that man or woman can begin immediately, while drawing the unemployment, to engage in retraining to plan for a new and better job.

These are the things we want for all Americans. But we know we must do more if we are to achieve those goals for Hispanic-Americans. And therefore, these goals are at the heart of the Executive order that I sign today.

I know that all of you here have heard of the President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans and the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans; both previously existed. But we also know, from months of working closely with Hispanic groups including many of you here, that this administration needed to do more. Together with Hispanic leaders in education, civil rights, and business, we put our hearts and minds into finding the means to address the problems affecting the education of young Hispanic Americans. This Executive order is far-reaching. It is a commitment to education for all Americans.

First, the order establishes a commission that will be made up from leaders of the Hispanic American community. Using the national education goals, this commission will track how Hispanics are doing and recommend ways to improve performance. The commission will also look for ways to better involve Government and the private sector in helping Hispanic students to achieve these goals.

The order will also marshal together the resources of the Federal Government by using an interagency working group. This is important because the problems in the education of young Latinos are tied to other areas, to poverty, to unemployment, to crime, to language barriers, to the breakdown of family, to name only a few. We need to address these problems in their entirety because that is the only way to make progress

long-lasting. Agencies will set goals, and they will not get lost in a bureaucracy. Each executive department in every agency taking part will appoint a senior official to oversee their part of this program.

We will also move to increase Hispanic American participation in all Federal education programs. And every step of the way, we will continue to consult with the people and the organizations who have long been studying the education of Hispanics, and that includes many of you here today.

This Executive order expands on steps we have already taken for education. We propose an increase of \$700 million for the Title I provision and to increase the access to Title I funds for Hispanic children by removing a major obstacle, the requirement that a child have limited proficiency in English. We propose a 12 percent increase in funding for bilingual education. We proposed, as I said, direct student loans to lower the interest rates and the costs and ease the repayment of student loans. We have proposed a national service program, that has already passed, that this year will provide the opportunity for 20,000 and 3 years from now 100,000 young Americans to earn money against their higher education by performing service in their communities.

But we all know that with these best efforts Government can only provide part of the solution. We can only succeed if all of us take personal responsibility for our families, our communities, our educational institutions, and our countries. The ties of family have been a great strength in Hispanic America. These ties fortified by opportunity can nurture and keep a child on a straight and strong path going forward and upward through the generations. We have to continue to support that as well.

And now, I would like to sign this Executive order and ask Representative Serrano, representing the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, to come up. I see Representative Luis Gutierrez, from Illinois, here also. Did I miss anyone else in the caucus? I think I saw everyone else. You shouldn't hide your light under a bushel back there. *[Laughter]* I'd like to ask Norma Cantu, Juliet Garcia, Laudelina Martinez to join me, along with Raul Yzaguirre of La Raza, Luis Nunez from the National Puerto Rican Coalition, Mario

Mareno from MALDEF, Gilbert Chavez from the Association of Hispanic Federal Employees, and Hilda Crespo from Aspira to come up; and we will sign the Executive order. Please come up.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:31 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Norma Cantu, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, and Eugene Garcia, Director of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Department of Education.

### **Executive Order 12900— Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans**

*February 22, 1994*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to advance the development of human potential, to strengthen the Nation's capacity to provide high-quality education, and to increase opportunities for Hispanic Americans to participate in and benefit from Federal education programs, it is hereby ordered as follows:

**Section 1.** There shall be established in the Department of Education the President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans (Commission). The Commission shall consist of not more than 25 members, who shall be appointed by the President and shall report to the Secretary of Education (Secretary). The Commission shall comprise representatives who: (a) have a history of involvement with the Hispanic community; (b) are from the education, civil rights, and business communities; or (c) are from civic associations representing the diversity within the Hispanic community. In addition, the President may appoint other representatives as he deems appropriate.

**Sec. 2.** The Commission shall provide advice to the President and the Secretary on: (a) the progress of Hispanic Americans toward achievement of the National Education Goals and other standards of educational accomplishment; (b) the development, monitoring, and coordination of Federal efforts

to promote high-quality education for Hispanic Americans; (c) ways to increase State, private sector, and community involvement in improving education; and (d) ways to expand and complement Federal education initiatives. The Commission shall provide advice to the President through the Secretary.

**Sec. 3.** There shall be established in the Department of Education the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans (Initiative). The Initiative shall be an interagency working group coordinated by the Department of Education and shall be headed by a Director, who shall be a senior level Federal official. It shall provide the staff, resources, and assistance for the Commission and shall serve the Secretary in carrying out his or her responsibilities under this order. The Initiative is authorized to utilize the services, personnel, information, and facilities of other Federal, State, and local agencies with their consent, and with or without reimbursement, consistent with applicable law. To the extent permitted by law and regulations, each Federal agency shall cooperate in providing resources, including personnel detailed to the Initiative, to meet the objectives of this order. The Initiative shall include both career civil service and appointed staff with expertise in the area of education, and shall provide advice to the Secretary on the implementation and coordination of education and related programs across Executive agencies.

**Sec. 4.** Each Executive department and each agency designated by the Secretary shall appoint a senior official, who is a full-time officer of the Federal Government and responsible for management or program administration, to report directly to the agency head on activity under this Executive order and to serve as liaison to the Commission and the Initiative. To the extent permitted by law and to the extent practicable, each Executive department and designated agency shall provide any appropriate information requested by the Commission or the staff of the Initiative, including data relating to the eligibility for and participation by Hispanic Americans in Federal education programs and the progress of Hispanic Americans in relation to the National Education Goals. Where adequate data is not available, the

Commission shall suggest the means of collecting the data.

**Sec. 5.** The Secretary, in consultation with the Commission, shall submit to the President an Annual Federal Plan to Promote Hispanic American Educational Excellence (Annual Federal Plan, or Plan). All actions described in the Plan shall be designed to help Hispanic Americans attain the educational improvement targets set forth in the National Education Goals and any standards established by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council. The Plan shall include data on eligibility for, and participation by, Hispanic Americans in Federal education programs, and such other aspects of the educational status of Hispanic Americans as the Secretary considers appropriate. This Plan also shall include, as an appendix, the text of the agency plans described in section 6 of this order. The Secretary, in consultation with the Commission and with the assistance of the Initiative staff, shall ensure that superintendents of Hispanic-serving school districts, presidents of Hispanic-serving institutions of higher education, directors of educational programs for Hispanic Americans, and other appropriate individuals are given the opportunity to comment on the proposed Annual Federal Plan. For purposes of this order, a "Hispanic-serving" school district or institution of higher education is any local education agency or institution of higher education, respectively, whose student population is more than 25 percent Hispanic.

**Sec. 6.** As part of the development of the Annual Federal Plan, each Executive department and each designated agency (hereinafter in this section referred to collectively as "agency") shall prepare a plan for, and shall document, both that agency's effort to increase Hispanic American participation in Federal education programs where Hispanic Americans currently are underserved, and that agency's effort to improve educational outcomes for Hispanic Americans participating in Federal education programs. This plan shall address, among other relevant issues: (a) the elimination of unintended regulatory barriers to Hispanic American participation in Federal education programs; (b) the adequacy of announcements of program opportunities of interest to Hispanic-serving school

districts, institutions of higher education, and agencies; and (c) ways of eliminating educational inequalities and disadvantages faced by Hispanic Americans. It also shall emphasize the facilitation of technical, planning, and development advice to Hispanic-serving school districts and institutions of higher education. Each agency's plan shall provide appropriate measurable objectives for proposed actions aimed at increasing Hispanic American participation in Federal education programs where Hispanic Americans currently are underserved. After the first year, each agency's plan also shall assess that agency's performance on the goals set in the previous year's annual plan. These plans shall be submitted by a date and time to be established by the Secretary.

**Sec. 7.** The Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Secretary and the Secretary of Labor, to the extent permitted by law, shall develop a program to promote recruitment of Hispanic students for part-time, summer, and permanent positions in the Federal Government.

**Sec. 8.** I have determined that the Commission shall be established in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 2). Notwithstanding any other Executive order, the responsibilities of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, shall be performed by the Secretary, in accordance with the guidelines and procedures established by the Administrator of General Services.

**Sec. 9. Administration.** (a) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons serving intermittently in the Government service (5 U.S.C. 5701-5707).

(b) The Commission and the Initiative shall obtain funding for their activities from the Department of Education.

(c) The Department of Education shall provide such administrative services for the Commission as may be required.

**Sec. 10.** Executive Order No. 12729 is revoked.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
February 22, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:35 a.m., February 23, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on February 24.

**Message to the Congress  
Transmitting the Report on Alaska's  
Mineral Resources**

*February 22, 1994*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the 1993 Annual Report on Alaska's Mineral Resources, as required by section 1011 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487; 16 U.S.C. 3151). This report contains pertinent public information relating to minerals in Alaska gathered by the U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and other Federal agencies.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
February 22, 1994.

**Message to the Congress  
Transmitting the Report on  
Radiation Control for Health and  
Safety**

*February 22, 1994*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with section 540 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360qq) (previously section 360D of the Public Health Service Act), I am submitting the report of the Department of Health and Human Services regarding the administration of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 during calendar year 1992.

The report recommends the repeal of section 540 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cos-

metic Act that requires the completion of this annual report. All the information found in this report is available to the Congress on a more immediate basis through the Center for Devices and Radiological Health technical reports, the Radiological Health Bulletin and other publicly available sources. This annual report serves little useful purpose and diverts Agency resources from more productive activities.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
February 22, 1994.

**Statement on Action To Defend  
Minority Voting Opportunities**  
*February 22, 1994*

I have been advised that the Department of Justice has announced that the United States will participate in voting rights litigation in three States to defend minority voting opportunities. The legal action taken today in cases in North Carolina, Georgia, and Texas reaffirms my administration's strong commitment to defend the historic gains made under the Voting Rights Act.

The Voting Rights Act ensures that all Americans may fully participate in the democratic process. In recent years, our Nation has enjoyed a tremendous increase in minority voter access to our electoral system. These hard-won victories must not be abandoned. I applaud the forceful actions of Attorney General Reno and the Justice Department to ensure that voting rights are vigorously protected.

**Remarks on the Technology  
Reinvestment Awards and  
Earthquake Relief and an Exchange  
With Reporters**  
*February 23, 1994*

**The President.** Thank you. I have to bear so much bad news, I must say that's the only time I've ever been introduced as the bearer of good news. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, and thank you all for being here, the members of the administration, the Members of the Congress, and our distinguished

guests from California. We're glad to see all of you here.

We are here to announce some new help for California as you work to come out of the consequences of the earthquake. But first I want to talk about the announcement made just this morning at the Pentagon to which the Vice President referred.

This morning we announced the latest round of awards in our Technology Reinvestment Project, which helps companies and workers in defense industries to develop technologies to meet our Nation's commercial and military needs. This is the fourth round of TRP awards we've announced since October. So far, \$605 million in competitive Federal grants awarded on merit have gone to firms and communities through this innovative program. It's a cornerstone of our reinvestment and conversion initiative, recognizing that those who worked so hard to win the cold war should not be unduly burdened by cutbacks in military expenditures and that all the work they have done, the expertise they've developed, the barriers that they have broken, should be turned to the advantage of America as we move into the 21st century.

The TRP is of special interest to the people of California because California has been on the leading edge of military technology. And converting this know-how for dual use and commercial applications will help our country move into the next century as the economic leader of the world, using things that relate from biomedical and environmental technologies to advanced transportation and communications systems, all rooted originally in our investments in national defense.

The projects which have been funded are exciting; they're futuristic; they're farsighted; they have potentially enormous beneficial impact to all the American people. I can't tell you about all of them—we awarded 50 just today—but let me just mention a couple.

One involves the Bay Area Rapid Transit System and Hughes Aircraft. Together they'll develop an advanced automated train control system that will identify the precise location of every train, even those in tunnels. That will allow trains to operate at closer distances to each other, and that means the existing infrastructure can double its rider capacity.

Another project will establish a technology center in Cerritos, California, to transfer leading-edge composites manufacturing technology to 16,000 small defense and commercial firms just in the Los Angeles area. The University of California at San Diego will work with Alcoa Electronic Packaging and Hewlett Packard to offer displaced defense engineers a 2-year master's program in world-class manufacturing engineering. This will emphasize foreign language training and include an internship in international manufacturing companies. The aim, of course, is to help these folks build on their old skills with new learning to keep them vital and employed and to keep our country competitive in the global marketplace, to provide economic opportunity and shore up military strength, and to ensure that the people who won the cold war won't be left out in the cold. That's what this TRP, the Technology Reinvestment Project, is all about. And that's why I'm proud it's proving to be such a success.

I will say that on the last round of grants, I think California won—again, I will say, on a purely competitive basis—almost 40 percent of the total dollars. And when you consider the fact that when we started this, the State of California, with 12 percent of the country's population, had over 21 percent of the Nation's military expenditures and has had almost 40 percent of the base closings, the last two rounds of base closings, and over 40 percent of the last round of base closings, it is heartening that in the race for the technologies of the future and, therefore, the jobs of the future, that the whole conversion effort is obviously beginning to work in the way that it ought to work.

Let me now say a few words about our continuing efforts to deal with the consequences of the earthquake. In the 5 weeks since the Northridge earthquake, our administration has worked closely with State and local officials, as all of you know, to try to help families, businesses, and communities. We are working to get the whole region back on its feet again. All of you know what the Vice President has already said, that the FEMA Director, James Lee Witt, Secretary Cisneros, Secretary Peña, Mr. Panetta, and many, many others have worked tirelessly to

try to deal with the problems that were generated by the earthquake.

Immediately after the earthquake, I extended the period for which Federal Government's paid the entire cost of FEMA disaster assistance and increased from 75 to 90 percent the share paid by the Federal Government for FEMA public assistance programs. Now, today we are announcing some loan guarantees which will help to meet the remaining share owed by the State of California.

Congress has appropriated new funds for FEMA, for the Small Business Administration, for the Departments of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, Education, and Veterans Affairs to rebuild these homes and businesses, to house the homeless, to repair the highways and bridges, to restore the damaged schools and other facilities.

I do want to say a word of thanks to Secretary Peña for trying to accelerate the construction process. We stood on one of those totally broken sections of highway, and they said it was going to take a year to fix. I can only imagine how mad the drivers would be. I know how mad the drivers get at me when we stop traffic at one intersection for 2 minutes here. I multiplied 2 minutes times whatever the number is to get to one year, and it seemed to me that we ought to try to make the contracts go faster. I thank you for that.

Recently, your Governor, Speaker Brown, the Senate president pro tem Bill Lockyer, Mayor Riordan, and other officials have asked if there was any way we could lend California the money they believe is needed to pay the State and local share of the FEMA assistance costs.

Today I am asking Secretary Cisneros to offer loan guarantees totaling more than \$500 million to jurisdictions affected by the earthquake, including the cities of Los Angeles and Santa Monica, Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, and other towns and communities which suffered damages. This loan guarantee authority we are extending to local governments will enable them to obtain loans from private lenders at below-market rates that will take some of the bite out of the cost of recovery. The assistance will be provided under HUD's Community Develop-

ment Block Grant Section 108 loan guarantee program. I've asked Secretary Cisneros to work with the local governments to work out repayment terms that meet the needs of local communities. The Secretary is also committed to providing technical assistance in preparing the applications and to expedite the review process. This will ensure that the flow of assistance to those in need in southern California will continue without interruption.

I've asked the Federal agencies whenever possible to use their discretionary authorities to waive rules and regulations to expedite the delivery of further assistance.

This step today builds on these efforts. It reflects a commitment that our administration has made to the people of California, a commitment to do all that we can to help your people work their way out of this disaster, day-in and day-out, until all the work is done.

In recent years, the citizens of southern California, in particular, have endured multiple disasters, from riots to fires and mudslides and now the earthquake. That's what people around here call a character-building experience. I just want you to know that I am committed to ensuring that our Government continues to meet those obligations that we have to give you the opportunity to make a full comeback in the face of this latest setback.

Let me just say one other thing, if I might. Even though this is a time of renewal and reconstruction for the people of Los Angeles and California, it's also a day of sadness for many people in that area and for many of the rest of us who believe in the rule of law and appreciate those who enforce it. Yesterday, as all of you know, a rookie policewoman named Cristy Lynne Hamilton was shot and killed in the line of duty less than one week after she became a commissioned police officer. A teenager with a semi-automatic weapon hardly gave her a chance to emerge from her patrol car before she was shot down. She received her diploma, as I said, just 5 days ago. At the academy, she was honored by her classmates as being the most inspirational officer candidate. And now her city has lost a policewoman who could have made a difference to people on her beat. Her force has

lost its ninth officer this year. Her children have lost a mother. There have been too many funerals and too many folded flags presented to too many grieving survivors.

Our duty is clear: We have pending before the Congress an opportunity to pass crime legislation that is both tough and smart, that would put another 100,000 police officers on the street, a proposal of real value for the cities of California, and at the same time, ban the kinds of semi-automatic weapons that are used for killing people like Cristy Hamilton and which have no justification for sporting or hunting purposes.

I hope that we can make this legislation law and that we can do it soon. Many of you in this room have worked for a long time on these issues. Senator Feinstein, in particular, got the semi-automatic weapons ban into the Senate crime bill, and we all thank you for that.

All I can tell you is that we are here primarily to celebrate our coming together to overcome the destructive impacts of an act of God. It is time that we here in Washington muster the courage and the fortitude to do something to help you also overcome the acts of people that have no basis in law or honor, not only to honor the memory of Cristy Lynne Hamilton and all those others like her we have lost but to defend the honor of the American people to live together as human beings in a common community.

Thank you very much.

**The Vice President.** Before the President takes questions, let me say we inadvertently forgot to acknowledge Secretary Ron Brown who's played a special and leading role in organizing the administration's response to a whole range of economic problems, in particular in the State of California. And we wanted to remedy that oversight.

**The President.** Thank you.

#### **Ames Spy Case**

**Q.** Mr. President, are you satisfied so far with the Russian response to the espionage arrest? And what do you think of Senator DeConcini's proposal today that there be a 60-day freeze on Russian aid until we get answers from the Russians?

**The President.** First of all, this morning I met with my national security team for

some length of time before the Secretary of State went up to the Hill. And we decided then what we had already decided, that I should emphasize to you that—to you, the American people through the press—that I have known about this particular case for some time.

I have continued to pursue our policies toward Russia because Russia, like other countries, is not a monolith. It is not a single force. It is many forces and many developments occurring at once. I still believe it is in the interest of the United States to support democracy, to support the movement toward economic reform, to support the absence of weapons proliferation, to support the denuclearization of Russia. And therefore, I think we should be careful before we make specific determinations about aid flows. A lot of our aid flows, for example, are directly to individuals who are trying to privatize their businesses, having nothing to do with government or government policies. Most of our government aid is in the form of aid to take down the nuclear weapons. And I don't think anyone thinks we should slow that up.

This is a serious case. It is an unusually serious one because of factors I cannot discuss. But I also believe that, given all the facts as I understand them—and I know, I think, quite a bit about it—that we are pursuing the proper policy. And at this time, I think we have lodged the formal protest and a strong one. I think we should wait and see what the full response of the Russians is before we make any other determinations.

**Q.** Have you had any response yet? And what do you expect them to do? I mean, what gesture are you waiting for?

**The President.** Let's give them a chance to make an adequate response, and we'll see what happens.

**Q.** Have you instructed Director Woolsey to begin a damage assessment? And have you been given any preliminary briefing as to the scope of damage?

**The President.** The answer to the first question is, yes, the damage assessment is ongoing. The answer to the second question is, I have gotten a preliminary assessment. They are working on it. I had a good discussion with Mr. Woolsey today. I am satisfied, by the way, that the CIA worked with the

FBI very well over a considerable period of months. Keep in mind they have been working against the worst consequences for some considerable period of time now while they've been attempting to complete the investigation and wrap up the case.

**Q.** Sir, do you intend to discuss this with Mr. Yeltsin? You've had a lot of personal discussions with him. Is it going to put this on a personal level?

**The President.** We may well discuss it, but I can't make a decision on that at this time until we see what the official reaction of the Russians is and until I have a little bit more time to reflect on what our options are, sir. I don't think I'm in a position to make that decision right now.

**Q.** So far the reaction has been, what are we making such a fuss about, since we spy and they spy and we both know each others spies. Is it hypocritical of the United States to make this fuss?

**The President.** First of all, we're making a fuss about this man. This man was not just a spy, this is a person who is a 31-year veteran of the CIA. So quite apart from the Russians, this was a very serious offense against the United States of America by one of its citizens. So this is a very serious matter. Also, it is a serious matter because of issues which I am not at this moment at liberty to discuss. What I said yesterday is this was a serious case going back several years. I do not think the facts of this case at this time undermine in any way, shape, or form the policy we have followed for the last year toward President Yeltsin and his Government and the forces of change in Russia; I do not believe that. But this is a very serious case, and it has to be pursued aggressively, and we will do that.

**Q.** Don't you think there was a real lapse in finding these people?

**The President.** Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:30 p.m. in the Grand Foyer at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Pete Wilson of California; Speaker Willie Brown of the California Assembly; and Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan.

## Remarks to the Business Council

February 23, 1994

Thank you very much, Bob, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I was glad to walk in here and see the Attorney General. I just saw Lloyd Bentsen, the Treasury Secretary. He said, "I've heard this speech before. I think I'll leave." [Laughter] Mr. Panetta, how are you? Is anybody working in the Federal Government?

I am delighted to be here, and I thank you for the invitation to come by. I have seen many people in this audience on various occasions to talk about different issues over the last several months. And I'm glad to see so very many people in the administration here tonight to have the opportunity to speak with you. We have tried to maintain close ties to the American business community and to work in partnership on as many issues as we possibly could.

As all of you know, the Business Council was formed in 1933, a pretty tough year for this country, to help President Roosevelt pull America out of the Depression and move it forward. This group provided guidance on a number of profoundly important issues then, and I believe has a very important role to play today.

Most of you know that with the help of Bob Rubin, the National Economic Adviser, and Alexis Herman, who is here, my special liaison to the business community and to other public groups in the country, I have worked in a very disciplined way over the last 14 months to try to seek out the opinions of people in the business community of different political parties, different views, both support and sometimes opposition, because I think it is so important to have a dialog and for you to believe that there is a genuine listening ear in the White House and a real interest in trying to work on these problems together.

I'm glad to see Senator Riegle and Senator Packwood here. We have a lot of important work to do today in this coming session of Congress. But let me just say, when I took office it really was the end of one era and the beginning of another. The election conveniently dovetailed, missing by only about 3 years the formal end of the cold war and

the beginning of the post-cold-war era with a whole new awareness in our country of the extent to which all our affairs were shaped by a global economy which we can no longer totally control or even largely dominate, and that we had profound questions to face on the eve of not only a new century but a new millennium, which would determine whether or not we would go into that new millennium stronger, better, and more well positioned to make sure that it wouldn't be only the 20th century that would be known as the American century in the history books.

I have always believed that the purpose of politics in our country is to get people together and to get things done. Therefore, I have always sought and often achieved partnerships sometimes with allies that were unusual in the cause that was plainly good for the public. I want to thank those of you who were part of those partnerships last year, part of our efforts to reduce the deficit or to pass NAFTA or to get the GATT agreement done, or to reduce export controls or to start a genuine defense conversion initiative or to help prove that we could pursue an environmental policy that would be good for the environment and also good for the economy. I also want to challenge you to keep talking with us as we face the problems that lie ahead this year and in the years ahead.

I have tried to address the issues that the business community talked to me about in the campaign of 1992, the issues that are uppermost in the minds of most of you who just want a good environment in which to operate. We've worked on the budget deficit and the investment deficit in America. We've tried to get the growth rate up and to produce jobs in the private sector, after years in which most new job growth net was in the public sector. We've tried to address the fact that for more than a decade, health costs have outpaced the growth of the economy by a factor of two or three, and that we have not been as aggressive as we ought to be as a nation in opening the world to our products and services and, at the same time, making sure our markets were open as well.

In short, I have tried to fashion a role for the Government and this time, fit it to this time—one that recognizes that the private sector is the engine of economic growth, but

that our Government has a role to play as a partner in setting the framework and dealing with the basic fundamental questions that every government must face in dealing with the particular challenge of this age and time—trying to prepare our country to compete and win in the global economy.

The economic plan which the Congress adopted last year by such a stunning margin reduced the deficit by \$500 billion, cut spending by \$255 billion, allocated every new tax dollar to deficit reduction, cut over 300 Government programs, including \$80 billion in entitlement savings over the budget which was in place when I took office, much more than was thought possible when we began.

This year's budget, which I have submitted to the Congress, cuts 379 program lines out of a total of 636 in the Federal budget, eliminates 115 programs altogether. And the Wall Street Journal said, and I quote—I'm sure the editors will make sure nothing like this appears again—but they said, and I quote, "For the next year, discretionary spending will actually fall by \$7.7 billion without adjusting for inflation. That has not happened since 1969." This budget reduces Federal employment by 118,000, more than the 100,000 this year recommended by the Vice President's reinventing Government commission.

If we stay on the path we are now on, by 1998, the National Government will be smaller than it has been in 30 years, the deficit will be \$200 billion a year less than it was projected to be when I took office and before our plan passed, and for the first time since Harry Truman was President, there will be 3 years of declining deficits in a row. The deficit as a percentage of national income is now as low as it was in 1979, before the deficits started to explode. In other words, we have restored fiscal discipline to this budget and to this Government without gimmicks or without fooling with the Constitution.

I hope that the budget I have presented and the record established by the Congress last year will be sufficient to persuade at least most of you that we should not pass the balanced budget amendment because it would mandate one of two things: either significant tax increases which could imperil the economic recovery along with cuts, significant

cuts in defense, in Social Security or Medicare and Medicaid and in areas where all of you believe we should be investing more; or it will be ignored. And if it is ignored, it will put the Government's future in the hands of 40 percent plus one of both Houses, basically giving minority control over the future of the country to whoever wants to blackball any kind of budget proposal made. This is a gimmick. We don't need it. We are bringing the deficit down.

And I'll talk a little more about today, a little more about what we have to do to bring it down further. Do I think it should be structurally in balance? Yes, I do. But it's also important to note that the Federal Government doesn't handle its accounts the way most of you do. We don't have a capital budget. We don't amortize capital expenses. We don't separate long-term investments with high return from current expenditures that amount to basically consuming the same programs we've had in years past. So I hope that you will support budget discipline but oppose the balanced budget amendment.

The second point I'd like to make is this administration tried to prove once again that open trade is a bipartisan American commitment, that we have never done very well when we tried to close our borders or be protectionist, but that if we are going to open our borders and push for open trade in a world economy where we are 22 percent of the world's GDP as opposed to 40 percent, which we were at the close of the Second World War, we have to demand equal access to our goods and services.

We worked on NAFTA. We worked on GATT. We worked on a national export strategy, supported strongly by the Secretary of Commerce, who is here, and also the Secretary of State, who came in. And I want to say, for the first time in a long time, we've got the State Department and our Embassies all around the world genuinely working on promoting American economic interests, that the commercial desks mean something there now, and we are really trying to do this in a disciplined, comprehensive way that I believe is very, very important.

The Saudi purchase of the Boeing and McDonnell Douglas aircraft I hope—it may be the biggest—but I hope it's only the first

in a long line of examples of partnership involving, in this case, three Cabinet members, the President's Chief of Staff, and many others working to see that we got a contract that American business earned on the merits, the kind of contract we have too often lost in the past for reasons having nothing to do with the merits. And I'm very proud that that happened.

We lifted export controls on \$37 billion of high-technology equipment in the telecommunications area and the computer area that had no relevance to the post-cold-war era. And it will be a very significant and important contribution to economic growth.

I have approved for announcement tomorrow a new export administration act which will be significantly better than the present law. I want to be candid with you: A lot of you won't like it all because we do provide for the continuation of the capacity of the President and the Government to restrict exports for reasons that appear to be good and sufficient. I urge you to look at what we will recommend, evaluate it. If you think it is wrong, tell us and work with us.

But remember this: One of America's continuing responsibilities is to try to do whatever we can to deal with some of the problems that will replace the terror of the nuclear age, in all probability, in the 21st century. One of those big problems is the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, not just nuclear weapons but biological weapons and chemical weapons and the vast proliferation of conventional but high-tech weapons that can do a lot of damage in a short amount of time.

So we will, for the foreseeable future, as a nation have certain responsibilities that I believe require us to maintain the ability to do some things in the area of export control that may be difficult for everyone from time to time. So I urge you to look at the act, evaluate it. If you think we're wrong be as specific as you can and tell us why, because we want an honest dialog on this. I think you know that I am for more trade. And I think you know I want to listen if you think we're wrong on this. So I think we're on the same wavelength, but we do believe that this administration and its successors for the foreseeable future, in a world in which there will

be a lot of chaotic events that can be made much worse by irresponsible conduct by others, we need some leverage in this area. And I hope we can reach agreement on what the proper balance is.

I am very proud of where we are to date. If you look at the last year, we've had a very good year. I appreciate what Chairman Greenspan said about it in his congressional testimony yesterday. Business investment was up 18 percent in 1993. There was a record number of public offerings for high-tech companies. Durable equipment expenditures were at their fastest pace in 20 years. The private sector provided for over 90 percent of the nearly 2 million jobs created by the American economy in 1993, which, as I said, is a reversal of the trend of recent years when many of the new jobs were coming from Government.

These are things that I think are very, very important. Yesterday Mr. Greenspan said—I've got his quote. I wouldn't have quoted him if I had known he was going to be here; I would just ask him to stand up and speak and I'd sit down. [Laughter] But he said, and I quote, "The deficit reduction package apparently had a salutary effect on long-term inflation expectations. The outlook for the economy as a result of subdued inflation and still low long-term rates is the best we've seen in decades." That is the environment we want to preserve. It is the basis which will permit you to create success for the American economy.

The question then is, what is our role, and what are our responsibilities? What things do we need to do, and what things do you need to help us do well? First, I think it is clear to everyone here—and I might mention I'm glad to see my friend, David Kearns, because he's done so much work on education—that we're still a long way from where we need to be in the education and training of the American work force. We are supporting some bills which have enjoyed significant bipartisan support and business support in the Congress that will enable us to enshrine in law the national education goals and promote local experimentation, everything from charter schools to public school choice, in the Goals 2000 bill.

We are supporting opening the doors of college opportunity to everyone with a student loan program now that has lower interest rates and better repayment and will allow up to 100,000 people in 3 years to be part of a national service program to earn some money against their college costs by working in their local communities.

We are supporting a school-to-work program which will build on the apprenticeships which now exist in some States and some industries but which are not uniform throughout the country. Most Americans will not get and do not need to have 4-year college degrees to have good jobs. But the economic data is clear, 100 percent of the American people coming out of high school now need at least 2 years of some kind of further training, whether in the work force, in a community college, in the service, in a blend of all. But if you look at the income differentials, it is shocking.

The unemployment rate for people who drop out of high school is 5 percent higher than it is for high school graduates. That unemployment rate, in turn, is 2 percent higher than it is for people that have 2 years of college. That unemployment rate, in turn, is another 2 percent higher than it is for 4-year college graduates. Average income is \$4,000 lower for high school dropouts than for high school graduates, which is—their incomes are \$4,000 lower than for people who have had 2 years of college, and their incomes are about \$8,000 lower than people who graduated from college. So it's clear that this country has a national interest in at least getting people through high school and with 2 years of further education and training.

And finally, I hope, as major employers, you will help us when the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education come forward at the end of the year or later in the year with this reemployment system. The unemployment system on which payroll taxes are paid today is based on an economy that no longer exists. People are not normally called back to the job they are laid off from. But that is the premise of this unemployment system. That's the whole basis of the feud attacks. And it doesn't work anymore.

We believe we can cut down on costs over the long run and dramatically increase labor

mobility if, instead of waiting for people passively to run out of their unemployment and then start looking for a job which, because they haven't acquired a new skill, will probably not pay what their old job did, if we start immediately, as soon as people are unemployed, retraining them for a job that is relevant to the future.

I think this is a profoundly important structural change that we have got to make if we want labor market mobility, if you want a pool of trained workers. And we don't want a lot of alienated, hard-working Americans who think that they went all over the country looking for decent jobs, they have played by the rule, and they can't find a place in life. So I hope you will help us this year to pass the reemployment system.

The next thing I hope you'll do is to help the Attorney General to pass a good crime bill. We had a bunch of people in from California today to talk about earthquake relief, and I couldn't help noting that yesterday in California—you may have seen it on the news—a 45-year-old mother of two who had been a policewoman for 4 days was gunned down by a teenager who just murdered his father with a semiautomatic weapon—one week, less than one week after she had become a police officer.

This crime issue is a complicated one. It is easy to demagog and difficult to do much about. But there are things we can do. We know there are things that work. We know that if we had the same ratio of police to violent crimes today we had 35 years ago, and the police were walking the streets, working with the neighbors and the kids in the neighborhood, that the crime rate would go down, not just because of more arrests but because there would be fewer crimes. We know that.

If you look at the experience of Houston, where, in the last 15 months, there was a 22 percent drop in crime and a 27 percent drop in the murder rate—and coincidentally, the mayor got reelected with 91 percent of the vote; I think there was some connection there—if you look at what they did, it was the deployment of more police officers in a better, smarter way, more relevant to the existence of the people in the communities. I see Mr. Lay nodding his head there. That

is what happened. I've seen this happen place after place after place.

This crime bill also provides not only stiffer penalties for serious offenses but also provides more money for drug treatment for people, facilities, and alternatives to incarceration, opportunities like boot camps for first-time nonviolent offenders. We can have a smart, as well as a tough, crime bill.

I hope you will help us to pass a sensible welfare reform bill this year which recognizes that welfare should be a second chance, not a way of life, that cracks down on child support enforcement and provides education and training and child support and moves people into the workplace.

I hope you will support the administration's antidrug strategy. I know that Lee Brown was here. And I see Jim Burke over here. I should let him come and give a speech for it. But we have a significant increase in funds to help us deal with drug problem areas in this country. And it's an important time to take a stand on this because of the disturbing evidence that there is now an increase again in drug use among young people because they think it may be more acceptable. And it's no more acceptable or no less dangerous than it was last year, the year before, or the year before. This is a cultural thing we have to change. And we're trying to make a beginning on that.

Finally, let me say a couple of words about health care. We spend 14.5 percent of our income on health care. No other country except Canada spends over nine. They are at about 10. Erskine Bowles, who has done such a great job as head of the Small Business Administration, probably because he's qualified—it wasn't a political appointment in that sense; he spent 20 years helping people start businesses—says that we're servicing less than all of our people with 14 percent of our revenues and other countries are servicing all of theirs within the range of nine. That doesn't make any sense. And no company could survive like that in a competitive environment. I think that is one of the problems.

We know that every month about another 100,000 Americans lose their health insurance permanently. We know we have significant problems where people who retired early from companies that aren't solvent are

losing their health care before they are old enough to get on Medicare. And a lot of other companies that are critical to our economic future are bearing massive burdens because of that. We have some American companies now spending almost 19 percent of payroll on health care.

We know that there is massive cost-shifting in our system because of totally uncompensated care and because Medicare and Medicaid, especially Medicaid, often don't reimburse our physicians and hospitals for the full cost of their care. We know small businesses pay 35 to 40 percent more in premiums for the same health care coverage that big business and government pay.

We know that if something doesn't happen and present trends continue, that we'll be spending over 18 percent of our gross domestic product on health care by the end of the decade. And if present trends continue, none of our competitors will be over 12, which means we'll be at a 50-percent disadvantage.

We know that some of this is unavoidable because of factors, good and bad. The good factors are that the United States invests more in medical research and medical technologies, in academic health centers. A lot of you in this room are probably on the board of various academic health centers. And that is an important part of our economy, an important part of our quality and way of life, and we wouldn't give it up for the world. And we shouldn't. And we pay a premium for that in our health care system.

We also know that this country is more violent than other countries. We have higher rates of AIDS than a lot of countries. We have bigger, therefore, bills at the emergency room, more people cut up and shot and getting expensive care than other countries. That's something we would gladly trade in, and we're trying to find out how to trade it in. But until we trade it in, we'll pay a premium in our health care system for that. And it's wrong for us to pretend that health care reform on its own terms can close the gap between where we are and where our competitors are.

Nonetheless, we also know that this is the most bureaucratic, the most expensive to administer system in the world, even though a lot of big companies have found ways to

have access to managed competition and to squeeze the inflation out of their costs. But the system is causing us great grief.

The other thing I want you to understand—going back to the budget, because so many of you supported the deficit reduction plan—is that every single scenario for every single budget—and you can ask the Budget Director to attest to this—shows the deficit going down for about 3 more years and then shows it going right back up when we have flattened all discretionary spending, when we have continued to decrease defense, only because of exploding health care costs overtaking everything else in the budget.

So that if we do not reform the health care system, if we don't do something to get costs under control and to provide coverage to everybody to stop the cost shifting, then you will see an exploding Federal deficit as we move toward the end of the century. And you may want us to spend more money on—what will the world look like by then—on job retraining, on export promotion, on defense conversions, on the development of dual-use technologies, on whatever, and we won't have it because all of our new money will be going to health care—everything—and not more money for new health care, but more money for the same health care.

You may say, "Well, inflation is down in health care costs." Inflation has gone down in health care costs every time there has been a serious attempt to reform the system. It went down in the Nixon administration when President Nixon proposed almost the same plan that I've proposed. And then it started right up again. So I would say to you, we have to find a way to deal with this.

The Congressional Budget Office, in evaluating our program, confirmed our analysis that our plan would pay for itself and contribute to deficit reduction, and it would reduce health care spending—listen to this—\$400 billion between the years 2000 and 2004. In the short run, we had differences with the CBO; they said that our program would cost a little more of Government money and save a little more in private sector money, by the way, than we had estimated. But we've had these kinds of differences before, but we worked them out.

I want to be clear on a couple things. Number one, any health care bill that I sign will pay for itself and contribute to long-term deficit reduction. It won't be some pig-in-a-poke that will explode the Government budget in the years ahead.

Number two, I do not want to pay for people who do not have health care now who are in the work force with new broadbased taxes. I don't think it's right to tax people who are already paying too much for their own health care to pay for somebody else's.

Number three, a lot of the doctors who have read this program actually like it. We consulted with hundreds and hundreds of doctors, and I had a doctor in my office a couple of weeks ago that put together an organization with several thousand other doctors who worked for him. He said, you know, if people understand what's really happening to medicine, they would like this. It gives doctors more protection than the present, the status quo will, unless we do something to change it.

The fourth thing I want to say is, the nub of this is something I would hope you would agree with me on. The nub of this is, you cannot solve this problem of cost-shifting and of inflation until you do one thing: find a way for everybody to have access to health care and to pay for it, so that somebody else doesn't have to pay for it. Then if you want to control costs, there has to be some competitive pressure. That is, the consumer has to know what the health care bill is, which is why in our plan employees have to contribute as well as employers. And there has to be some competitive pressure, which is why we proposed the most controversial part of this from the point of view of most large employers, which is the whole alliance structure.

And I will just say this about the whole issue of alliances. I do not want to create a new Government bureaucracy. I want to find some way to recreate the same economic reality that the farmers' co-ops did when they were organized. In other words, if you want to have community rating, which I think is very important to this, so you don't have real rating discrimination, especially for small businesses, if you want to have real community rating, you have to have a way to aggregate at least the smaller purchasers into big

enough units so they can buy on the same terms that most of you can. And if you don't do it, you can legislate community rating all you want, and it won't happen. The State of New York has legislated community rating. But it doesn't necessarily happen.

So if you don't like this, then tell me how you would do it. Somebody says, "Well, make these alliances voluntary." Washington State made them voluntary. Look at the Washington State plan. Anybody that wants that instead of mine, step forward. The alliances are voluntary in Washington State because there is one plan and one fixed price. If you fix the price, you've got community rating. So Washington State can make the alliances voluntary because the small businesses want to get in so somebody else will handle all their paperwork for them. It's a heck of a deal. And the price is already set. The Congress won't do what Washington State did, I predict. We want to see competition and market forces, not price fixing. But that is a possible option. I don't think it's going to happen.

The point I want to make is this: This is a complicated thing. There are no easy answers. My bottom line is I can no longer justify why America spends more and does less than anybody else with a system that threatens to bankrupt the Government, paralyze our ability to invest in the future and to grow and to be a good partner with the private sector, and that promises to charge you more and more every year in cost-shifting once you have squeezed all you can squeeze out of your ability to compete by your size and your disciplined organization, which is what most of you have been able to do the last 2 or 3 years.

So what I'm asking you for on behalf of myself and the Congress, including Members in the other party like Senator Packwood, who really want to see something done on this, is to be our partner in this. You know based on your experience that everybody is going to have to be covered. And there is only—in my opinion, there are only three ways to do it. You can have a tax and do it the way the Canadians do. You can require employers to cover it, the way most people are covered here. You can have a mixture the way the Germans do, where employers cover their employees but if you're a high-

income person, you have to get your own. You can have an individual mandate on everybody, but the problem is, look at the problems States have right now in enforcing the automobile liability requirement.

So there is no easy way to do this. If this were easy, it would have been done 60 years ago when Roosevelt tried to do it or 20 years ago when President Nixon tried to do it or in the Carter administration. This is not an easy thing. But we have reached a point—if you look at the trends in the Federal budget, if you look at how we're spending our money in our economy, if you look at how every last red cent you spend needs to be evaluated in a globally competitive context, we have reached the point where, on sheer grounds of humanitarianism for the working people of this country—and most people without insurance work, and they pay their taxes to give health care to people who don't work today—so on the grounds of humanitarianism and self-interest, we need to do this.

If we care about what the Federal budget is going to look like 5 or 10 years from now, and you don't want to see Leon Panetta either gray or bald within 2 years, we have got to face this question. We have tackled it and danced around with it and struggled with it and piecemealed it, literally, for six decades now. And I believe the time has come to act.

If you can help us get wired together on the basic principles of coverage for everybody, an end to cost-shifting, responsibility for individuals as well as employers in sharing some of the cost, we can work out the rest. And we need less rhetoric and more commitment to try and to solve what is a huge problem for all Americans.

We've got a lot on our plate this year. But I didn't run for this job just to come to nice dinners. I thought you hired me to get things done. I can't do it unless you help. But helping means not only being critical but being a critical part of the solution.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:12 p.m. in the ballroom at the Park Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to David T. Kearns, former chairman of Xerox and former Deputy Secretary of Education; Kenneth L. Lay, chairman and chief executive officer, Enron Corp., Houston, TX; and James

R. Burke, former chairman and chief executive officer, Johnson & Johnson, Inc., and chairman, Partnership for a Drug-Free America.

**Statement Announcing the Designation of Jamie Gorelick as Deputy Attorney General**

*February 23, 1994*

I applaud Attorney General Reno's choice of Jamie Gorelick to be the next Deputy Attorney General for the Department of Justice.

She has ably served my administration with great distinction as General Counsel of the Department of Defense, and I am confident Jamie will continue to bring her sharp legal mind, penetrating analysis, and tremendous management capabilities to her newest assignment.

I look forward to working closely with Attorney General Reno and Jamie Gorelick in fighting for passage of a tough, smart crime bill and to give the American people a Justice Department that is innovative in its approaches and solutions for crime reduction and law enforcement.

**Statement on Technology Reinvestment Awards**

*February 23, 1994*

This marks another major step in our effort to protect our national security and promote our economic security in the post-cold-war world. We are investing in projects that will create the jobs of the future by exploring ideas, developing technologies, creating products, and strengthening skills that will keep America strong, militarily and economically.

NOTE: This statement was part of a White House press release announcing the fourth round of technology reinvestment awards.

**Nomination for Ambassador to Finland**

*February 23, 1994*

The President today announced his intention to nominate Derek Shearer, director of the International and Public Affairs Center

at Occidental College in California, as Ambassador to Finland.

"Derek Shearer has a keen intellect and a broad range of foreign policy experience, particularly in international economics," the President said. "I am pleased that he has accepted this assignment, and I have full confidence that he will represent our country effectively and with honor."

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

**Nominations for Under Secretary and an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force**

*February 23, 1994*

The President today announced his intention to nominate Rudy de Leon Under Secretary of the Air Force, the number two civilian position in that branch, and Jeffrey K. Harris Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Space.

"These two individuals have each given almost two decades of substantial service to their country," the President said. "I am confident their experience and commitment will serve them well in their important new roles."

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

**Remarks on Arrival in Groton, Connecticut**

*February 24, 1994*

**The President.** Well, this is hardly the time and place for a speech, but I am delighted to be here with Senator Dodd and Senator Lieberman, Congresswoman Kennelly, and your Congressman, Mr. Gejdenson.

We're here to talk about health care today and to talk about the future of the people of Connecticut and the future of our country. I also want to say, since I am fairly near Groton, that I think most of you probably know, but yesterday Electric Boat was awarded one of the administration's Technology Reinvestment Projects for defense conversion, to help

to use the defense technologies that were developed in the 1980's to build the high-tech jobs here at home of the 1990's. And that will be a help in the future.

**Audience member.** Sea Wolf!

**The President.** Well, we hung in there with the Sea Wolf—we did the Sea Wolf. I did that. We reversed that decision. That's right.

I also want to just say a special word of thanks to all of you for braving this weather and for coming out and for bringing your messages as well as your support. My family and I are very grateful for the friendship that we've been given all across this country, especially in the last month as I've dealt with the loss of my mother, and we've tried to deal with a lot of the challenges facing our country. And when you come out here and stand in this rain after the tough snow you had last night, it's very moving to me personally. I thank you for that.

I want you to know one other thing. We've got a lot of tough challenges still ahead facing our country. We've got a lot of hard work to do in the Congress. We are facing the health care issue, the welfare reform issue. We're going to try to redo the unemployment system of the country. We have got a lot of big challenges facing this country, but we're going to meet them with your help and your support. And I just want you to tell these folks standing behind me that you do support them when they take the chances and show the courage to change the country and move it toward the 21st century.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:47 a.m. at the Groton/New London Airport.

## **Exchange With Reporters in Norwich, Connecticut**

*February 24, 1994*

### **Health Care Reform**

**Q.** Are you troubled at all, sir, by word coming off the Hill from the likes of Chairman Pete Stark that the employer mandates and the alliances are in trouble, that he sees little if any chance of them getting through?

**The President.** No. Mr. Stark has his own plan, and it's sort of a modified single-payer plan. So you wouldn't need the alliances if you did what he wanted, you know, if the Government paid for it all and fixed the price, if you had—just expanded for Medicare. But we see no evidence that beyond that subcommittee that that plan could pass.

But on the other hand, he does want universal coverage, and he wants comprehensive benefits. And so I consider him an ally because he wants that. He's been in this area a long time, and he has a fixed view about how he thinks it should be done. And so anything that's sent to his subcommittee obviously he's going to try to—he's going to see that it reflects his view. We'll just see what happens.

I think—but keep in mind, you've got that committee that a bill would have to come out of, and you've got two other House committees, then you've got two Senate committees. So you've got subcommittees in all the committees, five of them, and then the ultimate committees, and then the battle on the Floor. And this is just beginning.

So I'm not concerned about it because I think what everybody's going to have to do is to ask and answer the questions that at least he's asked and answered: Are you for universal coverage? Do you want reasonable benefits? And all these people here who have written me these letters make the best case for having a simple, clear comprehensive system that covers everybody and that involves things like prescription medicine. And I know you've been briefed on the letters they wrote me and how the system's affected them. But I consider, therefore, even though Pete Stark has a totally different view about how it ought to be done than I do, what he wants to do is what I want to do.

So I'm not troubled by that. We'll just have to see what comes out of that subcommittee, what comes out of the Ways and Means Committee as a whole, and where we go. I just think that the main issue now is going to be getting all the Members of Congress to sit down and ask and answer in a very calm and clearheaded way these hard questions that relate to making sure everybody has guaranteed private insurance, having the benefits be comprehensive to include pre-

ventive and primary care and things like this prescription-drug benefit that we're here to talk about. If that happens, than I think we're on the way to victory. We'll work out everything else, but I'm going to have a lot of very good conversations with people in both parties who are interested in this to deal with those big questions. If you can get there, I'm convinced we'll work out the details. I'm not worried.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2 p.m. in Slater Hall at the Norwich Free Academy. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

### **Remarks to Senior Citizens in Norwich**

*February 24, 1994*

Thank you very much. I think John Kiszkiel did a great job of introducing me and talking about the problem. Sam, when you get done, maybe we ought to run him for office around here. [*Laughter*] He did a great job, didn't he? I thank him for opening his pharmacy this morning and for introducing me to some of his customers. I'll mention them in a moment.

I also want to thank Charles West, who, if you notice, when I heard Charles West up here talking, I thought, he's the only guy up here that doesn't have an accent. He's from Arkansas. [*Laughter*] He's like me. So I loved hearing him talk. But I want to thank Charles and Ron Ziegler for coming here and expressing the support of the pharmacists of America and the people who run our drug-stores all over the country for the administration's health care initiative. I am very grateful to them. And their support will be pivotal as we go into this critical session of Congress and try to pass the health care bill.

I thank your Members of Congress for being here, especially our host, Sam Gejdenson, who has done a great deal of work in Congress on a number of issues that are important. On health care and defense conversion and job training and exports, if there is an issue that requires us to be on the cutting edge of change, you can bet that Sam Gejdenson will be on the cutting edge of the issue. And I really appreciate that.

I thank my friend Barbara Kennelly for coming here and for her support and outstanding work in Congress. My longtime friend Senator Lieberman, you heard him talking about that, I actually worked in his first campaign for the State senate when we were both in our twenties, and that was a day or two ago. [*Laughter*] And my friend of many years Senator Chris Dodd, who talked about his connections to this wonderful community and who is really working hard on this health care issue as he has on all human resource issues over the years, I thank him for that. There are many others in the audience that I can't mention, State and local officials, including my old classmate, your attorney general, Richard Blumenthal. I'm glad to see him here, and a recent father.

I want to thank our host, the Norwich Free Academy—this is a fascinating school with a great history—the administration, the teachers, and all others, especially Mary Lou Bargnesi and everybody that's made me feel so welcome here today.

And I'd also like to say just a special word about how nice it is for me to be back in Connecticut. Connecticut has been awfully good to me, since long before I ever thought I'd be up here running for the President. I went to law school here. The most important thing that ever happened to me happened here: I met my wife. When I kissed my wife and daughter goodbye this morning, they were sort of jealous that I was coming here even after we'd seen all the snow on television last night. [*Laughter*]

This State and this congressional district were good to me in the last campaign for President, and I'm doing my best to keep faith with the commitments I made. I also have to say I've been immensely impressed, as a fanatic basketball fan, with your basketball team this year. I think they've got a good chance to get to Charlotte, but I can't promise to cheer for them if they play Arkansas. It's amazing, you know, when I come in late at night, sometimes they show these basketball games fairly late at night; it's one thing that I still get to do. Most of my interests and hobbies are restricted to some extent by my job, but at least late at night I can channel

surf like the rest of you do, and sometimes I pick up the basketball team.

I also want to say, because one of the congressional Members mentioned this, that I frankly quite appreciate the fact that most of your big insurance companies here who write health insurance, Aetna, Travelers, ITT Hartford, Signet, have not participated in financing the misleading campaign against the administration's health plan.

I am not trying—there are people who believe we should just eliminate insurance companies altogether from this health plan. What I have proposed is that we guarantee private health insurance to everybody and then give small business people and self-employed people and others the same market power that big business and government have so that everybody can get lower rates. So that the companies that operate here will actually do quite well if our plan passes as long as they're willing to give people competitive prices and as long as we're willing to have a comprehensive, simple plan so that there is no incentive to spend time figuring out how not to pay for people's health care, and instead, we figure out how to provide it at high quality and reasonable costs. So, I appreciate that.

This is a people issue to me. You know, so many of these issues in Washington—you must be bewildered some nights when you turn on the evening news, and you hear some big issue being debated in Washington and they're using 10-dollar words that don't mean anything to you. There's a whole different language that surrounds this health care debate. And when we started working on this, sometimes I'd have to stop our own people in the middle of a sentence and say, "No, no, no. Speak English. Explain to me what you're really talking about. Don't use all this gobbledy-gook language. Let's talk about how this affects real Americans in their daily lives."

This is a big deal, folks. It's a big deal because—[*applause*]*—it's a big deal, first, because there are an awful lot of very good things about American health care, an awful lot of very good things about it: the doctors, the nurses, the health facilities; the fact that most of our people have at least access to some health care is better than if they didn't*

have anything; Medicare works well. It's efficiently administered with a low overhead, and for those things which it covers, it works well. And it shouldn't be messed with or changed where it works. But there are a lot of problems, as you know.

My wife received almost a million letters, when we started this health care effort, from Americans who described what was wrong with the health care system as it affected them. I met with four of those folks here today, and I want to ask them to stand up in a minute. Then I met with three others in the Greenville Drug Store, as you heard Mr. Kiszkiel say.

Bob Hug from Milford, where—is he back here behind me? Stand up, Bob. I lived in Milford my first year in law school on the beach in a house that I bet hasn't survived the condo craze of the eighties, but anyway I liked it. He's written three letters to us. He lives on a fixed income, is paying more as many do in fees and premiums without getting better benefits. He pays \$2,000 a year for medicine not covered by Medicare under the present system. In June, he wrote—and I hope this won't embarrass him, but I'm telling you this because I want to illustrate what this fight is all about—"My wife and I sometimes don't take our medication, as we need the money for food. Other seniors do, too. Why can't we include prescription drugs in Medicare?" Well, under our proposal, we will.

Marian Darling, from Madison—is Marian up on the stage?—who had the same story for herself and her husband except their annual bill was \$5,000. Arthur Poppe of Simsbury—he's here, I think—who had some services for his wife which were covered when she was in the home, but when she had to be put in a nursing home, then they weren't covered anymore. So the Government program sometimes operates just like insurance policies do. You've got to read the fine print to figure out what's covered and not, and then you still can't control it if it happens to you. And Edith Longe of Oakdale—is Edith here? Let's give her—[*applause*].

At Greenville Drug Store I was joined by Louise Jaczynski—Louise, where are you? Are you here? She still works part-time. She

works as a crossing guard for schoolchildren. Give her a hand. [Applause] But she's on maintenance therapy for a substantial health condition which requires expensive medication. You have a State assistance program here which has done a lot of good; most States don't have it. But there are strict income limits and because of the way Medicare benefits are now being calculated, the income limits, she's now 80 bucks over the income limit. So what should she do? Quit her job and lose thousands of dollars plus the right to keep helping young people, plus the probability that she's lengthening her own life and lowering her own health care bills by staying active? Or keep the job and pay thousands and thousands of dollars for medical bills? What should she do?

Joe Riley—Joe are you here? Joe Riley was a foreman at King-Seeley Thermos before it shut down. He was laid off a year before his retirement, so he lost all his benefits with Medicare, and now he has cancer. Now, listen to this, every time he gets out of the hospital, his benefits are covered for the next few months for up to 500 bucks for medicine. So as long as he keeps going back to the hospital before the benefits run out, he can get the drugs. Now, what we hope is that he'll get better, and he won't have to go back to the hospital, but he'll still need the medicine. So, what should he do? Go back to the hospital? If you do, what does that do to the cost of the health care system? If you need to do it, it ought to be there. But no one should be sitting here thinking, I'm going to lose drug coverage that I have to have unless I go back to the hospital.

Finally, Arlene Sullivan is here. Arlene, she made my day; she gave me a kiss when I showed up to the drugstore. [Laughter] Then Louise did, too. Arlene is a widow, a retired secretary. She has some pretty serious health problems, and she gets some of her drugs at a discount through the AARP program; others she purchases directly from Greenville Drug Store. But there are a lot of these, and sometimes she has trouble, which drugs treat which illnesses, and the coverage is not clear. Why should there be any difference in what is covered and what isn't if the doctor prescribes them and you have to have them just by what's covered?

Now, Americans are now engaged in a very serious debate about this issue. This is a complicated issue. Almost 15 percent of our income goes to health care in America. No other nation spends more than 10. Canada spends 10 percent of their income. Germany and Japan spend about 9. Now, in spite of that, all three of those countries provide health care to everybody. We don't cover everybody. And from those people who have coverage—as you've seen, all these people had coverage, but they often don't have what they need covered, especially prescription drugs. And for people who aren't old enough to be on Medicare, almost all of them can lose their health insurance at some time or another.

You know, you've had some big companies in Connecticut who have been forced by the pressures of the global economy to have some lay offs. Now, under the present law, they can keep the health insurance they've got from their old company for 18 months as long as they can afford to pay for it. What about those that can't afford to pay for it 9 months later if they don't have a job? What about those that, after 18 months, lose their health insurance because they had to get a job at a small business that doesn't provide health care?

So, there are some serious problems here. The question is: How do we keep what's good about our health care system and fix what's wrong? How can we give health care security that really means something to all our people? Other countries do it. And they do it, and don't spend as much money as we do.

For many elderly Americans, the neighborhood pharmacist is the symbol of good health care. For many older Americans, the local pharmacist does a whole lot more than just fill the prescription and ring up the register. He's a problem-solver. He's a friend. One of the people in John's pharmacy today told me, "He spends a lot of time with me. He explains how these things work." I saw one bill rung up in the pharmacy today and with every new prescription, you get a little printout from this pharmacy which says, here's what the drug is; here's what it's supposed to do; here's the proper usage, explaining how to manage this.

The pharmacist is often the one person who can really be counted on to answer questions and calm fears and to catch a problem sometimes before it becomes a crisis. They can call different doctors and let them know the effects of combining the drugs that have been prescribed. They sometimes tell you actually what you are taking and why you should take it and how often you should and why. They are really problem-solvers. If a medication isn't helping or is causing harmful side effects, often it's the pharmacist who gets the first call.

That's why I am especially grateful for the support of the leaders here today, for Charles West and Ron Ziegler and for the grassroots Americans they represent, more than 100,000 community pharmacies, retail druggists, and the 1 million employees who work for them. They understand that we can fix what's wrong with the American health care system without messing up what's right.

I heard a lot of you clap when one of the members, one of the people who spoke before me, mentioned preserving choice of pharmacies and doctors. It's a good thing to do. But millions of Americans are losing their choices of doctors, of plans, of coverage. Under our approach, we preserve choices. And we will actually increase the number of choices available to a lot of folks still covered in the workplace.

Under our proposal, you can keep your Medicare. You can keep your doctor. Your children and grandchildren will have much greater access to primary care and preventive care. Under our proposals, older Americans in need of long-term care will have new choices, new choices, the choice of getting that care in the home or in a community setting.

What we're trying to do is to give health care security to people over 65 and people under 65. We're trying to preserve Medicare and to improve it by adding the prescription drug and the long-term care benefits. And that's why the pharmacist and the druggist here support this proposal. In addition, this proposal provides, as a basic benefit, coverage of prescription drugs and pharmacy services for all Americans for the very first time—for the very first time—and provides

for prescription drugs for people on Medicare for the very first time.

Listen to this: Pharmacists have studied this question and determined that each year they write 17 million prescriptions that are not filled because customers cannot afford them. That's 17 million. Hillary often recounts to me her conversations with the hospital pharmacist she met during her father's illness. He told her of the many patients he sees leaving the hospital with prescriptions he knows they will never fill, because they can't afford it.

Now, medicine can't work miracles unless it is used. There's overwhelming evidence that without the regular treatment of adequate medicine, many people actually get sicker or hospitalized or require nursing home care and, therefore, impose far, far greater costs on the health care system, on the taxpayers, then would be the case if there were a prescription medicine benefit. Without medicine, care often comes too late and costs too much. Pharmacists know this. They see this in Americans every day. They see it in human terms. You heard it talked about today. They are here because they want to solve the problem.

Until we do, as many as 8 million Americans—8 million Americans—each month will continue to make choices between drugs and other essentials, including literally the food on their table, just like this letter said. I've had people tell me this in State after State all over America.

Under our proposal, anyone receiving Medicare will continue to choose the doctor and the druggist they want, but they will have the drugs covered under Medicare and under the basic benefit for people who are not old enough to be on Medicare.

Now, I want to make it clear that this is not just some pie-in-the-sky offer that is not paid for and not thought through. Yesterday, two independent studies concluded that if we cover medicine under Medicare, we could save about \$30 billion between 1996 and the year 2000, mostly by involving community pharmacists in preventing related hospitalizations and nursing home stays. One study was done by the Center for Health Policy Studies, the other by the respected, nonpartisan consulting firm, Lewin-VHI. The Lewin firm

also determined that this benefit would improve the lives of Medicare beneficiaries.

Forty-six years ago, Harry Truman passed through this community campaigning for guaranteed private health insurance for every American. He was right then. When Richard Nixon said 20 years ago, as Ron Ziegler said, that “employers and employees ought to contribute and ought to provide health insurance for everybody; we ought to cover everybody,” he was right then, and we’re right now.

The real question is whether Senator Dodd is right: Are we in one of those cycles of history where we’re going to do something about it? The early part of the century, free public education; in the thirties, Social Security; in the sixties, civil rights. Are we going to fulfill the responsibilities of this generation to finally, after 60 years of talking about it, solve this problem? Are we going to continue to make excuses, walk away because everybody’s got a different idea, or are we going to solve the problem? That is the great question facing the United States Congress and the American people.

I full well realize that when you have a system that involves 1,500 separate insurance companies writing thousands of different policies with a blizzard of different rules and regulations, compounded by the Government’s Medicare and Medicaid programs that have a lot of good features but a lot of dizzying complexities and things that aren’t covered, when we are spending 10 percent more on paperwork than any other country in the world but that employs a lot of people and generates a lot of earnings, that there are a lot of interests at stake. I know that. But fundamentally, this is a simple, direct, profound issue. How can we justify spending almost 50 percent more of our income than any other country on Earth and still have to put up with stories like the stories of the people I introduced here who stood up? I say to you, my fellow Americans, this is the responsibility of our generation, and we must fulfill it.

The strange thing is that this is just another one of those deals, as my mother used to tell me, when doing the right thing turns out to have the right consequences in all kinds of other ways. If we do this, we will also help to reduce the Government’s deficit; we will also help to improve the quality of life; we

will also actually lower the cost of the health care system.

If we adopt our program, we will improve individual responsibility because we ask everybody to share some of this. But most importantly, we will not have to listen to these stories anymore and all the other stories that are in those million letters that Hillary got.

I once heard a distinguished New Englander, former Senator and Secretary of State, candidate for Vice President, Ed Muskie from Maine, say that when he was the Governor of Maine, one of the ways that he really thought that you could gauge success was by whether the problems came around twice. And if the same problem came around a second time, somebody hadn’t done their job. This problem, my fellow Americans, has been coming around to us and getting worse and worse for six decades.

I say to you, it is time for all of us to do our job. The Congress cannot do it alone. They have got to know that you will stick with them. They have got to know that you expect them to work their way through all these complicated claims and counterclaims by the interest groups with the vision, the stark, clear vision, of the human beings that are being affected by this and our responsibility for the future.

In spite of the difficulties we face, I think we are going to do it, thanks to you.

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:43 p.m. in the Slater Hall Auditorium at the Norwich Free Academy. In his remarks, he referred to John Kiszkiel, owner, Greenville Drug Store; Charles West, president, National Association of Retail Drug-gists; Ron Ziegler, president, National Association of Chain Drugstores, and former Press Secretary to President Richard Nixon; and Mary Lou Bargnesi, principal, Norwich Free Academy.

## **Nomination for Deputy Secretary of Defense**

*February 24, 1994*

The President today announced his intention to nominate John M. Deutch, a highly respected expert on military technology and current Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, to serve as Deputy

Secretary of Defense under Secretary William Perry.

“John Deutch is a sound and sophisticated adviser whose expertise on military technology and policy has served the Department of Defense well in his tenure as Under Secretary of Defense,” the President said. “Secretary Perry and I will rely heavily on his knowledge, imagination, and judgment as we work to maintain the strongest military in the world at a time of budgetary constraints.”

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

### **Nomination for Ambassador to Kuwait**

*February 24, 1994*

The President today announced his intention to nominate Ryan Clark Crocker, a career member of the Foreign Service and formerly Director of the Iraq-Kuwait Task Force, to be Ambassador to Kuwait.

“Ryan Clark Crocker has led a distinguished career in the foreign service and has a keen understanding of the issues facing Kuwait and the rest of the Middle East,” the President said. “He is well-qualified to serve as our country’s Ambassador to Kuwait, and I am pleased he has agreed to accept this new assignment.”

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

### **Nomination for Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration**

*February 24, 1994*

The President today announced his intention to nominate Nelba R. Chavez, of San Francisco, as Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services.

“Dr. Chavez’ broad range of experiences in the areas of mental health and substance abuse will provide valuable perspective in addressing these problems,” the President said. “Her dedication to these issues will be a great benefit in her new position.”

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

### **The President’s News Conference**

*February 25, 1994*

#### **Hebron Massacre**

**The President.** Good morning. I want to speak briefly about events in the Middle East and in Russia.

Early this morning, Palestinian Muslim worshipers at prayer in the Mosque of Abraham in Hebron were brutally gunned down by a lone Israeli settler. It can be no coincidence that the murderer struck during the holy month of Ramadan and chose a site sacred to Muslims and to Jews. His likely purpose was to ruin the historic reconciliation now underway between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

On behalf of the American people I condemn this crime in the strongest possible terms. I am outraged and saddened that such a gross act of murder could be perpetrated. And I extend my deepest sympathies to the families of those who have been killed and wounded.

I also call on all the parties to exercise maximum restraint in what we all understand is a terribly emotional situation. Extremists on both sides are determined to drag Arabs and Israelis back into the darkness of unending conflict and bloodshed. We must prevent them from extinguishing the hopes and the visions and the aspirations of ordinary people for a life of peaceful existence.

The answer now is to redouble our efforts to conclude the talks between Israel and the PLO and begin the implementation of the agreement they have made as rapidly as possible. Accordingly, this morning I asked the Secretary of State to contact Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat and to invite them to send all their negotiators involved in the Israel-PLO talks to Washington as soon as possible and to stay here in continuous session until their work is completed. They have both agreed to do that.

Our purpose is to accelerate the negotiations on the Declaration of Principles and to try to bring them to a successful conclusion in the shortest possible time. Those negotiations have already made considerable

progress as marked by the Cairo agreement. It is my hope that the parties can turn today's tragic event into a catalyst for further progress and reconciliation.

### **Ames Spy Case**

I'd also like to say a word about the Ames espionage case and our broader interests regarding Russia. Three days ago, an employee of the CIA, Aldrich Ames, and his wife were arrested for spying, first for the Soviet Union and then for Russia, over a period dating back to the mid-1980's. If the charges are true, the Ames couple caused significant damage to our national security and betrayed their country.

This is a serious case, and we've made that crystal clear to the Russian Government. The CIA is working to assess the damage to our intelligence operation. The Justice Department is vigorously pursuing the court case. The FBI is continuing to pursue its investigations. It is important that we not say anything at this point that could jeopardize the prosecution. We need to be firm as we pursue both this case and our national interest in democratic reform in Russia.

Support of the United States for reform in Russia does not flow from a sense of charity or blind faith. Our policy is based on our clear American interests clearly pursued. It is in our national interest to continue working with Russia to lower the nuclear threshold, to support the development of Russia as a peaceful democracy, stable and at peace with its neighbors, to be a constructive partner with the United States in international diplomacy and to develop a flourishing market economy that can benefit both their people and ours. It is, therefore, in our interest to make every effort to help the long-term struggle for reform in Russia succeed.

That's why I've worked with members of both parties in Congress to secure assistance for reform in Russia, Ukraine, Armenia, and other new states, why I went to Moscow in January, to urge the Russian people to stay the course of reform, to join us in building a more positive partnership, and to advance the process of democracy and market reform.

Earlier today, I met with Members of Congress from both parties to discuss these issues, to stress the need for continuing our

long-term and bipartisan approach to dealing with Russia. And I urged them to resist calls to reduce or suspend our assistance for reform in Russia and the other new states of the former Soviet Union. After all, a great portion of our aid is to facilitate the dismantlement of nuclear weapons that were aimed at the United States for over four decades. It is in our interest, plainly, to continue this policy.

The majority of our economic assistance is flowing not to government but to reformers outside Moscow, mostly in the non-governmental sector, to help them start business and privatize existing businesses, to help private farmers, and to help support exchange programs.

Throughout the cold war, our Nation acted with a steadiness of purpose in overcoming the challenge of Soviet communism. Today, whether it is in our policies toward Russia or toward the Middle East, we need that same steadiness of purpose. Our policies must be designed for the long term and for the American national interests.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

**Q.** Mr. President, Russia seems to be taking the view that the spy case is no big deal. Are you satisfied with Russia's response and cooperation to this? And if they don't withdraw individuals from their Embassy here, will you expel them?

**The President.** Well, let me try to clarify, first of all, what we have sought and why we have sought it. We have not sought Russian cooperation in any damage assessment. That was simply, I think, an erroneous report. We have sought Russian cooperation, if you will, in terms of taking what we believe is appropriate action in this case, and we think it's important that appropriate action be taken.

We have expressed our views in what we hoped the Russians would do. If they do not do that, then we will take action, and we will take it quickly, and then it will be apparent what we have done.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

**Q.** Mr. President, has there been any formal response? Out of Moscow today they said they think they can have a dignified resolution. Has anything been offered? And also,

are you looking for a second possible double agent in the CIA?

**The President.** We are—we have made our position clear. We have been in contact with the Russians. We think appropriate action will be taken one way or the other very soon.

David [David Lauter, Los Angeles Times].

### **Hebron Massacre**

**Q.** Mr. President, you referred to the perpetrator of the massacre today as a lone settler, and the evidence so far suggests that he did act alone. But there have been repeated reports over the years of Americans providing aid, both fundraising and other sorts of aid, to extremist groups on both sides. And I wonder whether, in light of today's massacre, whether there is more that needs to be done here to try to prevent Americans from providing aid and other forms of support to Jewish extremist groups that may be involved in these sorts of actions.

**The President.** Well, let me say, based on what we now know, we have no reason to believe that this killer was involved with any group. If we find out differently, we will assess our position at that time.

I can say this, that Prime Minister Rabin, himself, has recognized the need to strengthen the security provided by Israeli forces against extremists, including Israeli extremists. But as far as we know, this was the action of one individual.

Gwen [Gwen Ifill, New York Times].

**Q.** Mr. President, what is it about this massacre as opposed to other setbacks that have occurred in the Middle East that has brought you to this podium today, that makes you feel it's necessary to make a strong statement?

**The President.** First of all, its scope and setting is horrible from a purely human point of view. Secondly, it comes at a time when it appears to be clearly designed to affect the lives of hundreds of thousands of others by derailing the peace process. And I am hoping that the statesmanship of the leaders in the region and the attention that this will bring to the terrible problem will not only diffuse what could become a much worse round of killings and counterattacks, but will actually be used to thwart the purpose of the murder and to reinvigorate the peace process.

Yes, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

**Q.** Mr. President, just to follow up on the earlier question, there have been reports from the scene that the Israeli army stood by and allowed this massacre to go on. What kind of recommendation would you make to Israel to try to do an investigation to see what happened and change the perception maybe of that?

**The President.** Well, we have no reason—we do not know that to be true. I can say that at this time. And we have—the Secretary of State has talked with Prime Minister Rabin. I was not able to talk with him myself yet because of the other meetings I had this morning. I believe the Israelis are committed to increasing security where they can do so. And I don't want to comment on that without some evidence or reason to believe its true.

### **G-7 Meeting**

**Q.** Mr. President, there's a G-7 meeting on Saturday in Frankfurt. It's supposed to focus on Russian aid. Do we go to that meeting with any particular proposition on the speed of aid or the conditionality of aid to Russia? And also, at that meeting, Bentsen will be meeting with Japanese Finance Minister Fujii regarding the failed trade talks, framework talks. Do you see the Gephardt and Rockefeller open markets still being helpful to your mission to open markets in Japan? Do you support that?

**The President.** Well, we've taken no position on any particular legislation. I think that it shows the determination of the American people to improve our trade and open the markets, especially the involvement of Senator Rockefeller, who's actually lived in Japan and I think is thought of genuinely as a friend of Japan but someone who understands what is at stake here.

With regard to the other question, I think we're where we always have been. The kind of aid and the amount of aid which will flow to Russia and the sources from which it flows I think will be a function of the policies and conduct of the Russians.

Yes, Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

### **Russia**

**Q.** Are you concerned now, sir, apart from the Ames case, about other developments in

Russia that might make your policy there appear almost to be in denial, based on what you and others wish were happening or hope will happen, rather than what really is happening there?

**The President.** No, I mean my policy has nothing to do with what I wish or hope will happen. Our response will be dictated by their behavior. But I think the—what I think is naive in this whole element is the suggestion that we should have ever believed for a moment that every event in Russia and every speech made by every Russian politician in every election of every member of Parliament would somehow be in a constant straight line toward a goal that we wanted to predetermine. They have to make their own future. That's what I said there over and over again.

This is not black and white; this is gray. There will be developments over the course of our relationship with Russia which—as there are over the course of our relationship with every other country—where we won't like everything that happens. We should do things based on a clear-headed appreciation of what is in our national interest.

No one has made a compelling case to me, publicly or privately, that it is not in our national interests to continue to work with the President of Russia and the Government of Russia on denuclearization, on cooperation and respect for neighbors, and on economic reform where we can support it. That is, the privatization movement, for example, I would just remind you, is still going on in Russia and has basically occurred more rapidly there than in other former Soviet countries.

So I don't believe the fact that a few speeches are made that we don't agree with or that policies are pursued based on an election they had for a Parliament that we don't agree with should force us to abandon what is in our national interest. When it is no longer in our national interest to do these things, then we should stop it. But we cannot be deluded into thinking that our national interest can be defined by every election and every speech in Russia. That can't be.

Yes, Tom [Thomas L. Friedman, *New York Times*].

### **Middle East Peace Process**

**Q.** Mr. President, in inviting the parties to come here to Washington, do you also anticipate that you or the Secretary of State will adopt a different posture toward these negotiations? Up to now, we've kind of let them handle it and keep a hands-off approach, wisely. But do you see, in fact, now that they're going to be here and given the urgency you've assigned to it, do you see yourself or the Secretary taking a different posture toward the talks?

**The President.** I think, first of all, the very act of inviting them here indicates some sense of urgency on our part. What we have done to date, as you know, is largely to try to give both sides the security they needed to proceed and the assurances that we would support it, but that they would have to freely make the agreement. We still believe they will have to freely agree.

We believe they are close to agreement. We want to do things that will prevent this last terrible incident from derailing that and to try to send a signal to the peoples in the region to not overreact to this horrible act, that the path of peace is still the right path. Whether that will require us to do more in particular meetings, I can't say, because we have discussed this with Chairman Arafat, with Prime Minister Rabin because we wanted to move quickly, and they did, too. And we'll just have to wait for that to unfold.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, *NBC News*].

### **Ames Spy Case**

**Q.** Mr. President, Senator Nunn has just said that we should not be asking Russia to voluntarily bring back their diplomats, that we should have simply expelled them the way we would have during the cold war and after the cold war, that this is too serious a case. Why didn't we just expel the diplomats still working here?

**The President.** I think that the judgment of the security services and the national security team was that the Russians ought to be at least told what we know—not negotiated with, there was no negotiation—told what we know and given an opportunity to take whatever action they wanted to take. And if they don't, then we will do what we should do.

And we will take appropriate action. We will do that soon.

**Q.** Mr. President, does that also mean, as Senator Leahy and Senator Mitchell and others are suggesting following your meeting this morning, that you, the United States Government, will also expose Russian diplomats who are, in effect, who are really intelligence officers who are not declared to the U.S. Government as intelligence officers? Will you take that step, and if you do, don't you invite retaliation, counterexpulsions, counterdeclarations, exposures on the part of the Russian Government against U.S. officials in Moscow?

**The President.** We intend to take the action that we think is appropriate, and you won't have to wait long to find out what that is.

**Representative Dan Rostenkowski**

**Q.** Mr. President, are you in any way interfering with the judicial process in appearing with Congressman Rostenkowski in Illinois on Monday? There have been suggestions—

**The President** Absolutely not.

**Q.** —that Attorney General Reno had concerns that you would be appearing with someone under investigation?

**The President.** First of all—let me make a couple of comments about that. First of all, I have had no conversations to that effect with anyone in the Justice Department. Secondly, there is no way in the world we would do anything like that. Thirdly, this investigation has been going on for months. I have been in Chicago before with Congressman Rostenkowski. I am going there and will be with other Members of Congress, at least one other I know and perhaps more, to talk about issues that directly relate to this administration's work that he is a critical part of, health care and crime. And finally, there is still a presumption of innocence in this country. He has not yet been charged with anything.

But I can tell you, there has been absolutely no contact of any nature about this case with the Justice Department and the White House that anyone could draw any inference of impropriety on. And I have received nothing back the other way that I shouldn't go

to Chicago. I am going there to fight for things I believe in that he has played a critical role in. I am going to be with at least one other, perhaps more Members of Congress—I don't know yet—and I'm going to be doing something that I have already done while this investigation has been going on. No one ever said anything about it before.

Yes, Gene [Gene Gibbons, Reuters].

**Ames Spy Case**

**Q.** You said that the Ames case had caused significant damage to the national security. Can you be more specific, sir? And secondly, you've said the FBI investigation is ongoing. Are you satisfied that we know the full extent of the penetration of the CIA at this point?

**The President.** Well, I can say very little about that except to assure you: I talked with Director Freeh this morning myself; I am confident that the FBI, working with the CIA, is doing everything that is humanly possible to fully investigate this case. I do not want to raise red herrings or other possibilities, only to say this, that it is not unusual, as the FBI Director said this morning. Sometimes it happens that when you're in a criminal investigation and you're on to something, the investigation turns up information that could not have been anticipated in the beginning. I am not trying to say that has occurred. I'm not trying to raise any false hopes. All I'm telling you is, I have directed the FBI and the CIA and everybody else to do everything they can to get to the full bottom of this. And I have nothing else to say about it.

And again, I'm not trying to raise some tantalizing inference, I'm just saying that we have to keep going and try to root it out. After all, this is fundamentally a problem within America, about whether people here who are Americans are spying, and that's our responsibility to try to find it out.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 49th news conference began at 11:55 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

**Remarks Honoring the NCAA Soccer  
Champion University of Virginia  
Cavaliers**

*February 25, 1994*

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Senator Robb, Mrs. Reid, and to the captains and all the members of this wonderful team, and your coach, and your athletic director, and your parents and friends.

We're very honored to have you here today. I was thinking about this a little bit. The Vice President is right, he and I are from the South, and when we were boys nobody played soccer down there, and we had to learn about it really through our children. And one of my most prized pictures is a picture of my daughter trying to do what they did. It hangs on my wall in the White House now, with Chelsea kicking her soccer ball. I have followed this game closely since she was about 5 and entered a league which had both boys and girls in it. And I watched the little girls grow up in this league, fighting with the boys on the soccer field. It was a great experience for me. And I'm really proud that the United States is going to hold the World Cup here. I think it will do a lot for soccer in the United States and a lot for our image as a soccer-playing country throughout the world.

But I think that today I'd like to focus on what this fine team has done for the sport in the United States and to thank you for that. I also noticed that, Coach, my researchers tell me that your record is 252-54 and 29 ties. And if that is true, we would like to invite you to become a congressional liaison. [*Laughter*] We would like margins like that on our major bills. I don't know how you did that.

I also was thinking we might recruit your goaltender. Jeff Causey, where are you? That's what being President is like; people take shots at you all the time, day in and day out. [*Laughter*] And we decided that you could help us be in the right sort of frame of mind to come to work every day.

We're delighted to have you here. We're proud of you. We're proud of what you represent and proud of the teamwork that you represent. And that's the last point I'd like to make.

One of the things I really like about soccer is that even though people are given the chance to star, to excel, to score, it really is fundamentally a team sport. It's a sport where people really have to think about what's best for the team and how they can do well together. And that's a lesson we're trying to get across to America now. There are a lot of economic and educational and social problems that we can only face if we start to think of each other again as well as ourselves and start to play on a team again. And so you've set a good example not only for soccer but for the way we might do better in our own lives. We thank you for that and wish you well. Congratulations.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:30 p.m. in the Indian Treaty Room at the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Landra Reid, mother of Cavaliers soccer player Key Reid and wife of Senator Harry Reid of Nevada; Cavaliers coach Bruce Arena; and Jim Copeland, director of athletics, University of Virginia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

---

**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.

---

**February 19**

The White House announced the President and Prime Minister John Major of Great Britain will travel to Pittsburgh, PA, on February 28. Following a working dinner, they will return to the White House where the Prime Minister will remain overnight as the President's guest.

**February 22**

In the evening, the President hosted a dinner for congressional leaders to discuss health care.

**February 24**

In the morning, the President traveled to Norwich, CT, where he toured the pharmacy

of the Greenville Drug Store and discussed health care with patrons. He returned to Washington, DC, in the evening.

The White House announced that President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine will make an official visit to the United States from March 3 to 5 and will meet with the President at the White House on March 4.

**February 25**

In the morning, the President met with senior military advisers in the Cabinet Room.

In the afternoon, the President had lunch with Cabinet members at Blair House.

The White House announced the President has invited Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze of Georgia to make an official visit to the United States March 6 to 8. They will meet at the White House March 7.

---

**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 February 22**

Charles H. Dolan, Jr., of Virginia, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 1997 (re-appointment).

**Submitted February 23**

Derek Shearer, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Finland.

Ricardo Martinez, of Louisiana, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, vice Marion Clifton Blakey, resigned.

Helen Thomas McCoy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Douglas Alan Brook, resigned.

**Submitted February 24**

Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, 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 State of Kuwait.

Arvonne S. Fraser, of Minnesota, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as the Representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Edward S. Walker, Jr., of Maryland, 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 Arab Republic of Egypt.

Marca Bristo, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 1995, vice Sandra Swift Parrino, term expired.

---

**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 February 20**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

**Released February 22**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Secretary of Education Richard Riley and Secretary of Labor Robert Reich on education and job training programs

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's dinner with congressional leaders to discuss health care

Announcement on the Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans Executive order signing ceremony

***Released February 23***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

***Released February 25***

Transcript of a press briefing by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement

Ron Noble on the implementation of the Brady act

---

**Acts Approved  
by the President**

---

***Approved February 22***

S.J. Res. 119 / Public Law 103-217  
To designate the month of March 1994 as  
"Irish-American Heritage Month"