

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, April 18, 1994
Volume 30—Number 15
Pages 745–820

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- American helicopter tragedy in Iraq—809, 815
- American Society of Newspaper Editors—794
- Bosnia—771
- Law enforcement officers—775
- Legislative agenda—783
- Mayors and law enforcement officials—810
- Minnesota
 - Health care rally in Minneapolis—746
 - Japan and Rwanda—752
 - Town meeting in Minneapolis—754
- Missouri, arrival in Kansas City—745
- Nonprofit organizations—784
- Public housing, telephone conversation—773
- Radio address—769
- Radio and television correspondents dinner—786
- Thomas Jefferson dinner—778
- United States Winter Olympic athletes—804, 806

Appointments and Nominations

- Export-Import Bank, member, Board of Directors—809
- National Science Foundation, Deputy Director—791
- Superior Court of the District of Columbia, Associate Judge—791
- Treasury Department, Under Secretary—814

Appointments and Nominations—Continued

- U.S. Attorneys
 - Alabama—791
 - Delaware—792
 - New Jersey—792

Communications to Congress

- Angola, message—790
- Evacuations from Rwanda and Burundi, letter—792
- Panama Canal Commission, message—791
- Protection of United Nations personnel in Bosnia-Herzegovina, letter—793
- Rhinoceros and tiger trade, letter—781

Executive Orders

- Amending Executive Order No. 12882—813
- Coordinating Geographic Data Acquisition and Access: The National Spatial Data Infrastructure—779

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchanges with reporters
 - Cabinet Room—772, 783
 - Briefing Room—809
 - Minneapolis, MN—752
 - Roosevelt Room—815
 - South Portico—771

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

- Turkey, Prime Minister Ciller—815

(Continued on the inside back cover.)

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Contents—Continued

Proclamations

- Death of Those Aboard American Helicopters
in Iraq—814
- Jewish Heritage Week—768
- National Day of Prayer—794
- National Park Week—813
- National Public Safety Telecommunicators
Week—789
- Pan American Day and Pan American
Week—768
- 251st Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas
Jefferson—807

Statements by the President

- See also* Appointments and Nominations
- Bombing in Hadera, Israel—808

Statements by the President—Continued

- Disaster assistance for California—817
- Nonprofit liaison network—786
- Trade sanctions against Taiwan—783

Statements Other Than Presidential

- See also* Meetings With Foreign Leaders
- President's telephone call to Prime Minister
Rabin of Israel—808
- Resignation of Prime Minister Hosokawa of
Japan—754

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—820
- Checklist of White House press releases—820
- Digest of other White House
announcements—817
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—818

Week Ending Friday, April 15, 1994

**Remarks on Arrival in Kansas City,
Missouri**

April 7, 1994

Thank you very much, Governor Carnahan, Mayor and Mrs. Cleaver, Mr. Holden, Speaker Griffin, and all of you. Thank you for coming out today. I didn't know there would be such a good crowd here. I'd like to stay with you longer, but I'm afraid I'll be late to the meeting if I stay too long.

I do want to say a word or two if I might. First of all, I thank you for your sentiments, and I thank the Mayor and the Governor for what they said. I've had the opportunity to come to Missouri quite a lot since I've been President, mostly because of the terrible ravages of the floods that gripped your State. I'm proud of the work that we were able to do together and proud of the response of my administration to the problems of people during that flood.

Frankly, the one thing that bothers me is that we can't have our National Government function all the time the way it did during that flood. Why does there have to be an emergency before people will stop using all the hot air and rhetoric that seems to grip Washington, put aside the special interests, talk to one another, ask what the problem is, and try to get it solved? I ran for President because that's what I wanted to do.

When I was the Governor of your neighboring State to the south, it never occurred to me that I could get by day-in and day-out just on hot air. It never occurred to me that the purpose of politics was to try to take words and push people to the furthest extreme, to the left or the right. And I ran for President because I got tired of all the rhetoric, people saying Government couldn't do anything or Government could do everything, people saying everybody out there is on their own or people saying that people had no responsibility to improve their own

lot. And I felt that if we could pull this country together and face our problems, we could go into the next century with the American dream alive and well. That's what we're trying to do, and we've made a good beginning on it.

I just want to point out that in the 15 months that I've been President, since we got our economic plan in place, trying to drive down interest rates and drive up investment, our economy has produced 2.5 million jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector, more than were produced in the previous 4-year period. After 12 years of talking about the deficit while the national debt tripled, if the Congress adopts the budget I have given them now, we'll eliminate 100 Federal programs, cut over 200 more; have the first decrease in discretionary domestic spending since 1969; and we'll have 3 years of declining Government deficits for the first time since Harry Truman of Independence, Missouri, was President of the United States of America.

One of the things that bothers me is that sometimes I think that out here in the country, folks are worried that nothing's getting done in Washington because of what they read about in the papers. Let me tell you, we are moving more rapidly to do more things than we did even last year. The Congress is moving forward at a record pace on the budget. The Congress will take up a crime bill as soon as it comes back on Monday, which will put 100,000 police officers on the street, take assault weapons off the street; it will stiffen penalties and reduce parole for seriously dangerous repeat violent offenders; and it will give our children the means to have recreational facilities, alternatives to imprisonment for first offenses, and other things that will give them a chance to avoid the trouble that has come to so many people in the high crime areas of our country. We can do better, and we're going to with that crime bill.

We have an education bill that we just passed that, for the first time in the history of the country, provides world class standards for all of our schools and encourages grass-roots reforms to achieve them. Soon after the Congress comes back we're going to pass the school-to-work bill, which says to all the kids that don't go on to 4-year colleges, "We care about you, too; your education, your training, and your future's important. We want you to be able to get at least 2 years of further training after you leave high school."

These are the kinds of things that we're doing up there. And I came here tonight also to talk about this health care issue. Let me remind you, my fellow Americans, that health care in America costs 40 to 50 percent more of our income than it does in any other country, and yet we're the only advanced country that doesn't provide health insurance to all of our people so that all of our working people have health care security.

Let me remind you that people on welfare get health care paid for by the Government. But if someone leaves welfare and takes a minimum wage job without health insurance, then that person puts his or her family at risk. The kids don't have health insurance, and you start paying taxes for somebody who wouldn't go to work to have health care. That is crazy, and we can do better.

Let me remind you that we have 81 million Americans—81 million of us live in families where somebody's been sick, where there's been a child with diabetes, a father with a heart attack, a mother with cancer. And they have what the insurance companies call pre-existing conditions, which means that under the present system, you either pay higher insurance rates, you can't get insurance at all, or you can never change your job because if you do you lose your health insurance. No other country tolerates that. We live in a country where the average 18-year-old will change jobs eight times in a lifetime; when people in their fifties and sixties are losing their jobs, having to find new ones, and they can't get health insurance now because they're older and their rates are higher than younger people. That is wrong. We can do better. And we can do better without messing up what's good about America's health care system.

So all of my adversaries on this health care thing, I wish everybody would just tone the rhetoric down and talk about the real existence of real problems and how we can solve them. The truth is I don't want the Government to run the health care system. It's a private system; it ought to stay private. What I want is guaranteed private insurance for everybody. I want all of you to be able to choose your doctor or your health care plan, not just once but every year. More and more workers and their families are losing the right to choose their health care plan. I want to guarantee it for all Americans. And I want people to be guaranteed those benefits in the workplace, just like most of us are today. And finally, I want small business people and self-employed people to have access to the same good competitive rates that those of us in Government and big business do today. I think that is fair, reasonable, and just. And if we don't do it, we're going to continue to have serious problems in this country.

I hope you will help us provide health care security for all. We've been fooling with it for 60 years. We haven't done it yet. And what have we got to show for it? Continued problems. We can do better, and this year we're going to, with your help.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:35 p.m. at the Kansas City Downtown Municipal Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri; Mayor Emanuel Cleaver II of Kansas City, MO; Bob Holden, Missouri State treasurer; and Bob Griffin, speaker, Missouri House of Representatives. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Rally for Health Care Reform in Minneapolis, Minnesota *April 8, 1994*

Wow! What a crowd. Thank you for coming this morning. Thank you for supporting health care. I want to thank Mary Ellen for that wonderful speech. She really left nothing for me to say. But she and the nurses of Minnesota have my undying gratitude for this wonderful rally and for their commitment to your health care and to the future of Amer-

ican health care. I want to thank Senator Wellstone and Congressman Sabo, who's done a wonderful job in his new leadership position, helping us to get a budget through that will drive down the deficit and still increase investment in the things that help America to grow and prosper. I thank you, Mayor Sayles, for being here. And I want to thank the others in the audience who are good friends and supporters of mine, especially Congressman Bruce Vento, who is also a strong supporter of health care reform; your secretary of state, Joan Crowe; your State treasurer, Mike McGrath; my good friend Skip Humphrey, your attorney general; and the Mayor of St. Paul, Norm Coleman. Thank you all for being here. I also couldn't come to Minneapolis today without saying a special word of gratitude for the extraordinary service being rendered to the United States of America under what you now know are difficult circumstances by our Ambassador to Japan, Vice President Fritz Mondale.

I am honored to be here today under the sponsorship of the nurses of Minnesota. I thank them for doing this. I also want to say that I'm very grateful for the people from Heightman Properties, who made it possible for us to meet inside instead of outside today. At least for me, it's not springtime yet. The remarks that Mary Ellen made in introducing me speak more eloquently than I ever could to what millions of American nurses know are the facts of life in health care in this country.

I ran for President because I thought that Washington had become a place where there was too much rhetoric and too little reality, where every statement that every person made was automatically pushed to its ultimate extreme: "The Government can do nothing; you're on your own," or "The Government can do everything; there's nothing for you to do." But real people and real life want us to come together as a people and figure out how to deal with our problems and seize our opportunities. And we have done our best there, in other words, to give the care to America's public life that the nurses of Minnesota give to their patients every day.

If you look at what's happened in the last year, there has been a pretty big change in

the way things work in Washington. For a dozen years people talked about the deficit, and the national debt tripled. Well, last year this Congress, working with me, adopted a budget that brought the deficits down, interest rates down, has helped to create 2.5 million new jobs in this economy, more than were created in the previous 4 years. We're on the way.

The Congress is on a record pace to adopt a new budget which, if it is adopted, will eliminate 100 Government programs, cut 200 others but increase spending in education, in Head Start, in defense conversion, in the new technologies for the 21st century, in educating and training our people, and give us the first 3 years of declining Government deficits since Harry S. Truman was the President of the United States of America.

Already this year, the Congress has passed an education bill called Goals 2000 which for the very first time in the history of this country establishes national standards for world-class education and promotes the kind of grassroots reforms that Minnesotans have been experimenting with for a decade to see that we meet those standards everywhere in the country for all of our children.

And when the Congress comes back, they will take up a bill designed to help all the young people who don't go to college to at least get a year or two of further training after high school so they, too, can have good jobs and good skills in the global economy. And they will take up a bill that will completely reorder the unemployment system to make it a reemployment system, because people often don't get the job they lose back anymore; they have to find new jobs. And now, from the first day an American is unemployed, he or she should be eligible from day one for new training and new job search and new opportunities. We're going to change that unemployment system this year.

The Congress will take up a crime bill designed to make us not only tough but smart, for a change, with crime. It puts another 100,000 police officers on the street in community policing in models that have proven—proven—effective at lowering the crime rate. It takes 28 kinds of assault weapons off the streets and out of the hands of gangs. And if we do it the right way instead of the

wrong way, the Congress will pass a bill increasing penalties for violent offenders so that we recognize that a relatively small number of our fellow citizens create a very high percentage of the seriously violent crimes. We have more people behind bars, as a percentage of our population, than any country in the world, and yet we continue to let the wrong people out from time to time. It's time we found alternatives to imprisonment for young people and kept the people behind bars who should stay there. We can do that if we do it intelligently.

Now, why is this happening? It's happening partly because people like Paul Wellstone and Martin Sabo and Bruce Vento last year were willing to risk their political necks to make tough decisions, to stop talking about problems and start doing something about them. But it's happening also because the American people say, "Look, we are tired of gridlock; we are tired of paralysis. We are tired of rhetoric over reality. We want you all in Washington to conduct your business the way we conduct our business at home: identify the problems, identify the opportunities, seize the opportunities, and beat back the problems. Show up for work every day." It's pretty simple what our strategy is: get people together, get things done, move the country forward, give people the chance to live up to their potential.

And now we are being called upon to face one of the greatest challenges of this age. For decades and decades, the American people have been denied something that every other advanced country provides to its citizens: the security of knowing that they have good health care that is always there. Every other country with which we compete with an advanced economy has solved this problem. Only the United States, time after time after time after time, has found it impossible to do. For 60 years, whenever we came to the point when it looked like we could deal with the health care problems, at times when it was much simpler than it is today, when the money at stake was much lower than is at stake today, always, always fear overcame hope, entrenched interest overcame the public interest. Today I can tell you that we are going to make 1994 different. We can pro-

vide health security for all Americans this year, and I believe that we will.

My fellow Americans, in Washington this may look like a partisan issue, but out here on Main Street it isn't. Democrats and Republicans and independents all get sick. They all lose their jobs. They all lose their health insurance. There are 39 million Americans who don't have any health insurance now for a whole year. In any given year there are 58 million Americans at some time during the year, more than one in 5 of us, who will be without health insurance.

There are 81 million of us, more than one in 4, who are in families where we've had someone with what the insurance companies call a preexisting condition, a child with diabetes, a mother with breast cancer, a father who had a premature heart attack, people who have to continue working but who either can't get insurance, pay more than they should, or can never change the job they're in because someone in their family has been sick.

There are 133 million Americans who have lifetime limits on their insurance policies, so if, God forbid, they should give birth to a child with a serious illness they could run out of health care at the very time they need it the most.

There are people who change jobs in an era when—look at all these young people in this audience today—the average 18-year-old will change work seven or eight times in a lifetime. And yet it is usual in America for people to have to wait months and months and months to get health insurance coverage.

The good people of Minnesota know we can do better. You know that if there is a Mayo Clinic which can provide world-class health care at lower cost, than many Americans pay for something which at least you could say is not better and they wish were as good, we can do better. You know that there is no reason in the wide world to permit Americans to be in this condition, to permit most Americans, those who don't work for secure big companies or the Government—I don't care who they are, are just an illness or an economic failure away from losing their health care.

And we now have an economy in which we're desperately trying to preserve life in

rural America, and more and more and more, there are no doctors in rural America. I was in rural North Carolina the other day, and I met a woman physician who told me she had worked for months on end over 100 hours a week. And she was now in her slow season where she was down to 80 hours a week because there are no doctors. We know we can do better than that. We know we can.

So the question is, why haven't we done it? Well, there are a lot of people who don't trust the Government in America to do anything. They think we'd mess up a one-car parade. [Laughter] And frankly, from time to time, I've been in that crowd, and so have you. We do not propose—there's not a single solitary proposal in the Congress that would have the Government take over the health care providers of this country. And don't you believe that. We've got the best doctors, the best nurses, the best health care providers, the best medical research, the best medical technology in the world. What we also have is the absolutely worst financing system for health care in the world. It is the way it is financed that is killing us.

For all the people who tell you that if we reform health care it will make it more bureaucratic, let me just ask you, go talk to one doctor and ask a doctor how much time the people in his or her clinic spend on the telephone to insurance companies talking to employees who don't know a lick about health care, trying to get approval for a procedure which is obvious and clear. Ask a nurse, ask any trained nurse who works in a clinic or a hospital how much time he or she spends filling out paper instead of taking care of patients because of the system we have.

It is conservatively estimated that we spend at least a dime on a dollar more on the administrative cost of health care than any other nation in the world. That is \$90 billion we spend, because we have 1,500 separate companies doing insurance plus the Government doing Medicare for the elderly and Medicaid for the poor, writing thousands and thousands of different policies, insuring zillions of small groups of people, finding out—with all these hundreds of thousands of paperworkers in insurance companies and hospitals and in clinics—who's not qualified,

who's not covered, what you can and can't reimburse for. Nobody else does this.

So we can't figure out how to cover all of our people, how to give people job security through health care security when we know they're going to have to change jobs. But we can figure out how to spend \$90 billion to hire people for the very frustrating work of second-guessing every decision the doctor and nurse makes and pushing paper around all day long. It is wrong, and we can do better.

You heard Senator Wellstone say so eloquently that what we have to do is provide coverage for all Americans. He favors a single-payer system; I favor guaranteed insurance. You can argue it flat around, depending on the experience of the two main models we have, Canada and Germany. But I'll tell you one thing, both of them have lower administrative costs, less paperwork, more freedom to practice medicine, more efficiency, and people have health care.

People should have insurance that they can never lose, not when they change jobs, not when they get sick, not when they're self-employed, and not when they get older. And they should have insurance that provides the right to choose their health care providers. I get tickled when these people attack all of us that are trying to change the health care system. They say, "Oh, they're going to ration health care; oh, they're going to take your choices away." My fellow Americans, more than half the people in America today who are insured in the workplace don't have a choice about their health care plan or their doctor. Ninety percent of the businesses that are providing health insurance who have 25 employees or less have no choice. And to be fair to them and to the insurance companies, they can't afford it under the present system. They're doing the very best they can under the present system. It is not a bunch of evildoers out there trying to keep people sick and insecure, it is a badly broken system. That is what is wrong, and we can do better.

Under our proposal, every American family, every year—every year—would have access to at least three choices. You could have access to an HMO of your choice or a professional provider organization of your choice or the right to choose your own doctor and

continue fee-for-service medicine or the right to have a guaranteed health managed plan and still have the right to opt out when you want it for a specialist of your choice or your own doctor. Everybody would have those choices. And they would all be more affordable for most Americans than what they're stuck with now. We can do that if we had a system that was rational.

Choice is important, but you can't get there unless you change the rules of health care finance. If you want to have a system that works, you can't have people denied coverage or charged more because of preexisting conditions. What difference does it make? I have a stake as an American citizen in seeing you as a successful, effective worker, able to change jobs, able to grow in your job even if, God forbid, your spouse should get cancer or your kid should have a serious illness. That is my interest in your future. We all share that.

Insurance used to be that way. Everybody threw in, everybody paid; the risk was broadly spread. We can't have waiting periods anymore before there's coverage. We shouldn't have lifetime limits. We shouldn't deny coverage to people who need it most. And we shouldn't deny coverage by charging more for older people rather than younger people.

Let me tell you, we live in a world today where people are going to be losing their jobs well into their fifties and sixties and still have to find new jobs. I met a 59-year-old man the other day who worked for over 30 years in the defense industry, and because of the end of the cold war and the reduction of defense spending—which virtually all of us support and thank God for the opportunity to have a more peaceful world—this good man lost his job. He had to find a new job; he needed retraining. He was, thankfully, hired by a hospital for a rewarding job. But there are lots of people like him who will not be hired because the small businesses who could hire them, who know they're reliable workers because they're older, they're settled, they're experienced, also know that they will drive up their health insurance premiums because of their age. We do not need that; we cannot afford that.

We have a bizarre system in this country when, because of certain training and other

problems, a lot of young people are discriminated against in the job market. They're told, "Well, you've got to have experience before we hire you." How do you ever get experience if you don't get a job? And then you have a lot of older people who don't get hired because even though they've got worlds of experience, their insurance is too high. We can overcome both of those things.

Another big problem for insurance is that small businesses and self-employed people pay, on average, 35 percent more than larger businesses and governments do because they have no bargaining power. So we have to reform that, too. We have to go back to what is called community rating, old-fashioned insurance, put people in big pools, spread the risk broadly, let us all share that. And then small businesses and self-employed people have to have the right to band together in buying co-ops so that they can get the same deal that those of us who work for the Federal Government do. I want for you what I've got and what we take for granted in Washington.

Now, there are a lot of people who say it's not fair to require all employers and employees to contribute to their own health care if they don't do it now. They say they can't afford it. But let me just remind you of this: When people in this country get real sick, they do get health care. It's too late; it's too expensive; they show up at the emergency room, then they pass the cost along to all the rest of us and our health care bills go up. What about the small businesses all over this country who are in competition with other small businesses? They cover their employees, and their competitors don't.

Nine of ten Americans who have health insurance that is private get it at work. Eight in ten Americans who don't have any health insurance at all are in working families. I think everybody should do their part, and I know we can do it without hurting small business. Our plan has discounts for small businesses, recognizing that not all can afford to pay as much as others. We know that that happens. Our plan gives 100 percent deductibility for self-employed people. Did you know that if you're self-employed in this country today, you can't deduct the entire cost of your health policy, but if you work

for somebody else you can? That's crazy. We fix that. We are not going to hurt small business, we're going to help small business by controlling the exploding cost of health care and giving people a chance to get affordable health insurance.

And finally, let me say, I saw this up here on the—one of the wonderful signs. Our plan protects and preserves Medicare. But it also provides a prescription drug benefit and long-term care benefits to elderly people. And that is also very important. Let me tell you, folks, the fastest growing group of Americans are people over 80. The fastest growing group of Americans are people over 80. Many of them are bright, active, and vigorous. They don't want to be forced into a nursing home just because they may not be able to get along all on their own. We ought to reward their children who are willing to care for them at home and help them to get some respite care, help them to deal with these crises. We ought to reward the community providers who are willing to help elderly people stay in their communities.

And there is ample evidence that providing help for prescription medicine will save money immediately in the health care system by reducing hospitalization, especially for elderly people but also for the nonelderly, and strong evidence based on population trends that over the long run we are going to have to do something to help people deal with this long-term care crisis within the family and within the community. We cannot afford only to have nursing homes as an option, even though we need them where they are appropriate. We have to think of other things as well.

Now, I have been, in the last week, in North Carolina doing a health care forum in which I talked to people about health care and crime and other issues in Virginia and Tennessee and in Texas. Then yesterday I was down in Kansas City, and we talked to people in Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma. And I'm here tonight to do one of these. Let me tell you what I find. I find that people really would like to know more about all these programs. They'd like to know honestly what the problems are. They know that there are tough decisions to be made. If this were an easy issue, somebody would have done it al-

ready and said, "Hey, vote for me; I solved this problem." This is a hard problem. That's why it's been pushed to the back.

But I think you hired me to deal with the hard problems. So we're trying to deal with them. And what I want to ask you today, all of you here, these fine nurses who have endorsed what we're trying to do and all the rest of you, tell the Members of your congressional delegation to tone down the rhetoric and open their hearts and their eyes and their ears and listen and talk and explain this thing and work through the problems. And don't use this as yet another opportunity to take a proposal and push it to the ideological extremes, forgetting all about the reality of the tens of millions of people's lives that are at stake here. I plead with you.

Your wonderful State has been very good to me, from the time I came here in the primary when I just had a handful of friends, all the way through the general election. You've been wonderful to my wife when she's been out here on her health care crusade. You have been good to us, and I thank you for that.

But I ask you, tell the Members of your congressional delegation, without regard to their party, that you want this dealt with and you want it done now. We know enough; we know as much as we're ever going to know; and the longer we put it off the worse it's going to be. It's going to be like an ingrown toenail. [*Laughter*] It will not get better. This is a part of our growing and maturing as a nation, deal with the problems while we can deal with them, don't just let them get worse and worse and worse.

This is an opportunity for us to come together across regional and racial and income and party lines to do something that is good for America. All of our jobs are at stake, all of our health care at stake, our children are at stake, our parents are at stake. This need not be an issue that divides us.

But we are going to have to have a clear message from the American people that it will not be tolerated to do nothing, to walk away, to be divided, to have hot air, to turn it into a political issue. Tell the American people. Tell the Congress you want us to act and act now.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:25 p.m. in the Crystal Courtyard at the IDS Tower. In his remarks, he referred to Mary Ellen Imdieke, president, Minnesota Nurses Association, and Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton of Minneapolis. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters in Minneapolis

April 8, 1994

Japan and Rwanda

The President. I wanted to mention a couple of things today. First, this morning, pretty early, I had a conversation with Prime Minister Hosokawa in which he told me that he was going to resign and that he hoped it would help the cause of political reform. He said he was very proud of the work that he had done in his term as Prime Minister in trying to promote reform within Japan and in trying to reform Japan's relationships with the United States and that he intended to keep working on that and that he hoped that I would continue to work on the Japanese-U.S. relationship with his successor.

I told him that I was personally very sorry to see him step down, that I thought he had provided amazing leadership to the people of Japan, and that he had made them believe in the possibility of change and that it could help the people. And I thanked him specifically not only for his work in political reform but for opening the Japanese rice market for the first time in history and for engaging us on a lot of other issues and for his support in Korea and in a number of other areas. It was a good conversation, and I'm very grateful to him for that, for what he did.

Let me just mention one other thing, if I might. I called today the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and my National Security Adviser and had extended conversations with all three of them about the situation in Rwanda. And I want to mention it only because there are a sizable number of Americans there, and it is a very tense situation. And I just want to assure the families of those who are there that we are doing ev-

erything we possibly can to be on top of the situation, to take all appropriate steps to try to assure the safety of our citizens there. But it is a difficult situation, and we should all know that.

Japan-U.S. Trade Relations

Q. Mr. President, there are some people, even within the administration, who feel that this really marks a very bad turn for U.S.-Japanese trade talks and economic policy. There's been little progress until now, and now there is even less hope that it can be concluded successfully.

The President. I'm just not sure. We certainly don't intend to change our economic policy or our trade policy. But one of the problems that the Prime Minister had was that the coalition that he heads, as presently constituted, contains a small minority that can, in effect, veto what a majority of the coalition might want on economic reform. So while I think clearly he was as committed to the kinds of changes in the modernization of Japan's economic policy as any person who has ever headed that government, I think what he hopes is that in the end there will be a realization, without him, that there must be a majority coalition for change.

So I think what we're going to have to do, frankly, is to stick with our policy and then see how it shakes out in Japan, how it works itself out. They're going to have to work that out.

Q. But Mr. President, in the past we've been pretty hard on Japan. In the last year or so we've been very rough on them. When the talks broke down, you said you didn't want to paper over differences with rhetoric. Do you think there's a chance maybe we were a little too hard on Japan and it might be a time to kind of step back and let this kind of settle?

The President. Well, I don't—those two things are not inconsistent. I think we should stick with our policy and be firm about it. We also tried to support Japan in many ways. And as I said on my trip there, I think that our policy is in the best interest of the Japanese. A more open Japanese market means that the Japanese citizens won't have to pay almost 40 percent more for their consumer goods than they otherwise would. And I think

it means more jobs and a more prosperous economy in Japan, and I think we should keep pushing for that. But I think plainly the Japanese are going to need a little bit of time to constitute a new government.

The United States-Japanese relationship is a complicated one in the sense that it has many legs. It has a security aspect, a political aspect, an economic aspect. But I do not expect there to be a marked deterioration in our relationships with that country. We're too important to each other and to the rest of the world.

Q. With Prime Minister Hosokawa stepping down, is there a sense in your White House that the administration is going to have to start from scratch with Japan on trade? It's a whole new picture now.

The President. I don't think so. I don't think so. We started, interestingly enough—it's easy to forget now, but the agreement itself, the framework agreement was negotiated with Mr. Miyazawa before he left office, with the concurrence of at least a sufficient number of the people in his government in the LDP, which would normally be thought of as more resistant to these sorts of changes. And we have kept up, we have had a good relationship, our administration has, with a number of the Japanese political leaders in this coalition. And we'll just have to see what comes out of it.

But I would not assume that the cause of economic and political reform will suffer an irrevocable setback. If you listen to the Prime Minister carefully in his public statement, he made it clear that while there were these personal questions which were raised which he took, I think, to use his words, personal and moral responsibility for, he also talked about the importance of having an effective governing coalition and the need for the reform movement to come to grips with its internal contradictions.

So I wouldn't write the epitaph of change too quickly here. I think Mr. Hosokawa believes that he may be able to continue to push for it and be a force for it, and I think he believes that we may wind up with a Japanese government with a little more capacity to change in some areas than perhaps the

present coalition does. We'll just have to wait and see.

Asia

Q. Might it complicate the situation with North Korea and with China? You've got some big decisions regarding Asia in the next 2 months.

The President. Well, we do. My belief is that any successor government will keep working closely with us on North Korea and keep in close touch with us on China and keep working with us with China on North Korea. I believe that will happen. I would be surprised if that did not happen.

Bosnia

Q. Which way are we going on Bosnia right now?

Q. The Perry way or the Christopher way?

The President. We're going—no. Let me just say, I think that's a great overstatement. I talked to both of them in each of the last few days about a number of other issues. But I don't think that there ever was a real difference between them. And our Government position is clear, and we'll keep trying to work for peace in Bosnia. We'll make our air forces available as part of the NATO strategy, as part of the UNPROFOR strategy to protect the forces that are there.

They were both trying to say in different ways that we might—we certainly wouldn't rule out the use of our efforts around Gorazde but that there is a process that triggers those efforts, which you know well and which has to be followed before we can bring our force into play. So I do not believe there is a difference between the two of them and I—frankly, my instinct, having talked to both of them at some length, is that there never was a difference between the two of them. So we are together. We have the same policy we always had, and we're going to keep trying to make it work.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:36 p.m. at the Marquette Hotel. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the Resignation of Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa of Japan
April 8, 1994

The President spoke with Prime Minister Hosokawa of Japan today at 9:40 a.m. for approximately 12 minutes. The President conveyed his regret at the Prime Minister's decision to resign and commended him for his commitment to political and economic reform in Japan. The President expressed his hope that the process of reform would continue in Japan. The President stated that he is confident that our strong bilateral relations with Japan will continue.

The President told Prime Minister Hosokawa, "I am confident that you will always be viewed as an historic Prime Minister who made great strides in helping Japan in a period of transition. You gave your people the courage to change."

The President intends to work closely with the new Prime Minister to improve the economic relationship with Japan and to implement fully the framework agreement, which remains a high priority and is very much in the interests of both countries.

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

Remarks in a Town Meeting in Minneapolis
April 8, 1994

Angela Astore. Welcome to the Twin Cities and our town hall meeting. And thank you for this unique opportunity to answer questions about your health care program.

The President. Well, thank you for giving me the chance to do it. And I want to thank the people who are joining us from Milwaukee and Detroit and Sioux Falls, too.

Ms. Astore. We'd like you to start off the program perhaps with some opening remarks.

The President. I'll do that.

Randy Meier. We turn it over to you.

The President. Thank you.

First, let me say, I came here to Minneapolis late last night, and I started the day off with a rally for health care sponsored by

the Nurses Association of Minnesota. Over 2 million nurses in the American Nurses Association have endorsed our health care plan. And that's especially important to me because I started out my interest in health care because my mother was a nurse. And then many years ago when I started out in public life, I was an attorney general, and one of my jobs was to try to ensure good care within our nursing home system in my State. Then as a Governor, I had to worry about health care for the poor through the Medicaid program, something Minnesota and every other State has wrestled with.

About 4 years ago, a long time before I even thought I'd be running for President, I agreed to take a look at the health care system for the Nation's Governors to see what we could do about it. And at that time, I talked to literally 900 health care providers, doctors, nurses, hospital administrators, paramedical workers of all kinds, and a lot of business people and health care consumers, people in every kind of medical problem you can imagine. I became convinced then that unless we had a national solution to a lot of our health care problems, we wouldn't be able to solve them; that no State, even the most progressive State, could solve all the problems of the health care system without a national solution.

And let me just briefly say what I think the issues are, and a lot of them will be represented by people who are in our four audiences tonight. First of all, 39 million Americans don't have health insurance at all, ever, during the year. And about another 100,000 a month are losing their health insurance permanently. Secondly, at any given time in this Nation of about 260 million people, 58 million people won't have health insurance at some time during the year. Third—and it gets worse as we go along here—about 81 million of us live in families with so-called preexisting conditions, a child with diabetes, a mother with cancer, a father who had a heart attack early but still had to go back to work. Those families either can't get insurance, pay very high rates, or can never change their jobs because if they change jobs, they won't be able to get insurance in their new jobs. Fourth, small business people and self-employed people who have health insur-

ance pay on the average 35 percent more than those of us who are insured who are Government workers or who work for bigger business. And 133 million of us have health insurance policies with lifetime limits, which means that if someone in our family should get real sick, we could run out of our insurance just at the time we need it the most.

In addition to that, we're spending 40 to 50 percent more of our national income on health care than any other country in the world. The cost of health care to State government and to the Federal Government is exploding at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. All the things I'd like to do for you as President, in terms of investing more in education and training and new technologies for the 21st century, are limited by how much we have to put into health care every year to pay more for the same health care.

There are lots of other problems. We have tens of millions of Americans with disabilities—some of them are here—who could work, who could be self-supporting, who get no help for long-term care in their homes and who can't get health insurance if they go to work. We have older people on Medicare who need help with their medical bills. And if they could get medicine, they could stay out of hospitals and save us money and have a better quality of life, but that's not covered. So the question is, what are we going to do about this? Let me very briefly tell you what I think we should do; then we'll open the floor to questions.

First of all, I'm convinced that we can't solve any of our problems until we deal with the basic one. We can no longer be the only advanced country in the world that doesn't provide health care security to all of our citizens all of the time. If you want to do that, there are only two ways to do it. You either have to have a system where you get rid of insurance all together and have the Government fund it, the way Canada does, or you have to have a system of guaranteed insurance, the way Germany does and several other countries. I advocate—and I'll explain why later—I think we should have a system of guaranteed private insurance with comprehensive benefits, including primary and preventive care which saves a lot of money

in the long run, with no lifetime limits, and insurance that you can't lose.

I believe that our system should maintain something that's very important to Americans, which is the choice of doctors and health care plans. More and more Americans are insured in plans that deprive them of any choice of their doctors, and that can be a serious problem. I believe there are ways to control costs and protect choice. Our plan would guarantee you at least three choices every year.

Third, we have to change insurance practices. We have to make it illegal for people to have their coverage dropped or benefits cut, for rates to be increased just because there's someone in the family with a preexisting condition who's been sick, for lifetime limits to cut off benefits, or for people who are older to be charged more. This is a big deal. The average person's going to change jobs eight times in a lifetime. A lot of people are losing their jobs in their fifties and sixties and have to get new jobs and can't get jobs because no one will give them insurance because their rates are higher.

Fourth, I want to preserve Medicare, which keeps the choice of doctors. But I also want to have Medicare begin to cover prescription drugs, which it doesn't now, and phase in a long-term care program not only for the elderly but for Americans with disabilities.

Finally, I think these health benefits should be guaranteed in private insurance at work. Why? Because it's the simplest way to get to universal coverage from where we are now. Nine out of ten Americans with private health insurance are insured through the workplace. Eight out of ten Americans who don't have any insurance at all are in working families. So the simplest way to cover this is to say the employed uninsured should have their insurance paid for by the employers and the employees. The Government should pay for the unemployed uninsured and should raise a pool of money to provide discounts to small businesses who otherwise couldn't afford health insurance. That's essentially our plan: guarantee private insurance, choice of the doctor, reform insurance procedures, preserve Medicare, have health benefits guaranteed at work.

One last thing—you have to find a way if you want to reform the insurance practices to make it possible for insurance companies to do these things, which means they have to insure all of us in very large pools. And we have to let small business people and self-employed people band together in co-ops so they can bargain for the same good prices that those of us who are insured through big businesses or Government get. That's essentially what we're trying to do in the Congress this year.

Ms. Astore. Mr. President, we're going to start with a couple of questions from our Twin Cities audience.

[Mr. Meier introduced a participant who asked for the philosophical arguments in support of the President's plan.]

The President. Well, compassion is part of my philosophy. But anyway, philosophically, I don't believe the Government can solve all the problems for people, and I don't think you should rob people of their personal responsibilities or their personal choice. That's why I don't have a Government-run plan. It's private insurance. And people who don't have insurance have the responsibility to provide it for themselves.

But I believe philosophically it is wrong for people not to assume responsibilities for themselves and let other people do it. And what's happening today—let me just give you two examples. Self-employed person X decides, "Well, I'm not going to have any insurance." Then they get in a wreck; they show up at the emergency room; they can't pay. They could have had insurance, but they didn't do it. That's fine for them, except they get the care. Nobody lets them die, and nobody thinks they should. And then the rest of us pay for it. And that is irresponsible. Another example: Restaurant X and restaurant Y next together; one covers the employees, the other doesn't. One is fulfilling a responsibility not only to himself and the employees but to the rest of society by not asking us to bear the risk of anybody getting sick; the other isn't. The other has a competitive advantage in business. I don't think that's right.

And the system we have is not an individual responsibility system, it's an irresponsibil-

ity system. I don't plan to take over the health care system. I don't want the Government to run it. I think the Government should help to organize the markets so that small business people and self-employed people can afford to have insurance and so that they are not disadvantaged as compared with big business and Government. And I think it is irresponsible for people not to provide for their own health care and irresponsible for the Government not to make it possible for people to do it no matter what their station in life.

[Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked if the plan was really about control of health care rather than better service.]

The President. Well, let me try to answer 2 or 3 of those questions; you asked me 10 at once so—[laughter]. The only real tax we have in this plan—we have to raise funds to pay for the unemployed uninsured, which we're all paying for anyway, folks. When they get sick, they wait until it's too late, it's too expensive. They show up at the emergency room, and we pay. Under our plan we would raise a fund to pay for them and to pay for the discounts on small business from two sources, one, a tax on cigarettes, and the other, a modest assessment on the biggest American companies that will get the biggest windfall from this. That is, most big companies are paying way too much in insurance now to subsidize the rest of us. They'll get a windfall. We ask for a portion of that back to create a fund for discounts for small business and for the unemployed uninsured.

There will be more choice under our plan. This idea that every American today has a choice of doctors is a myth. More than half the American people who are insured in the workplace today don't have a choice. They get one plan and that's it. Ninety percent of the American people who are insured in small businesses with 25 or fewer employees have no choice. Under our plan there will be more choices. That's one of the reasons why so many medical groups have endorsed this plan, not just the nurses but the family practitioners, the pediatricians. Any number of other medical groups have endorsed our plan because they know it guarantees more choice.

Now, if you have a plan today that is better than the one in our bill, you can keep it. In other words, if you have a plan today where your employer pays 100 percent of your health insurance, not 80 percent, and you continue to do that, that's perfectly alright. We don't change that at all.

Q. [*Inaudible*—individual when you go for universal coverage. If I already have a policy, isn't it true that it will cost people that now pay for insurance more?

The President. No, if you don't pay your premium, if your employer pays all of your insurance now—

Q. They don't pay all of my insurance; I carry family coverage.

The President. Well, the question is whether it will cost you more. It depends on a lot of factors. In all probability, you won't. Not our studies but all the nonpartisan studies that have been done show that more than half the people will get the same or better insurance for the same or lower cost.

By and large, the people who will pay more are people who aren't paying anything now, people who have only very bare-bones coverage now. And young single workers will pay more so that older people can pay less and we can have a large community rating. Otherwise, most other people will pay the same or less.

But if you have a better plan than we require, what this does is put a floor under you. We've got—keep in mind—I don't know where—you know, I understand; I saw those ads putting out all that propaganda, "This is just politics, this is just a power play," and all that. Tell that to these people who are disabled who can't get insurance. Tell that to these old people who choose between medicine and food every month. Tell that to the 100,000 Americans a month who lose their health insurance. Tell that to the farmers and the small business people who insure at 35 and 40 percent higher rates. I mean, this is a bunch of hooley. If people don't agree with me, let them come forward and contest me with their ideas. But I am sick and I think a lot of you must be sick of all this hot air rhetoric and all these pay television ads and all these hit jobs from people who are making a killing from the insurance business that we

have today. It is wrong, and we should change it.

Let me just tell you something, I don't go around—I don't mind doing this; I'll do this all night. But it never gets—one of the things I've learned in 20 years of public life is you don't get very far questioning other people's motives. Most people I've met—contrary to what you read, most of the people I've met in public life are honest, well-meaning. They're not crooks, and they're trying to do the right thing. We have differences of opinion. But this health care debate, in my judgment, has really been retarded, in more ways than one—[*laughter*]—by all this motive throwing around we've had. If I had wanted to take on a tough issue, I could have found something else to do with my time. I believe we have to do this. And if we don't do it, you're going to have more people without insurance, more people that can't afford what they've got, and a terrible situation in this country. And that's why I did it. That doesn't mean I'm right, but let's argue about what should or shouldn't be done and not talk about other people's motives. I've even tried to convince the insurance industry I don't want to attack their motives. I just want us to argue about what we should do.

Mr. Meier. Mr. President, I want to direct you to this side of the floor where you can look at that large monitor. I want to give our live satellite audiences a chance to join in. Let's go first to WDIV-TV in Detroit and Carmen Harlan.

Carmen Harlan. Thank you, Randy. They were living the American dream. The Bertolones had two healthy children, a nice home, and their own business. But in a matter of months, their dream life changed.

[*At this point, a videotape was shown about the family's efforts to obtain their insurance company's approval for treatment for Mrs. Bertolone's breast cancer. Ms. Harlan made comments during the film and then introduced Mr. Bertolone.*]

Q. My wife had advanced breast cancer. She was told by a leading bone marrow transplant unit in the country that they had a 25 percent chance of prolonged life extension if she would receive the transplant. Our insurance company deemed the procedure ex-

perimental and would not cover the expense. Would women in a similar situation be told the same under your health care plan?

The President. It's an issue I'm very familiar with. As you may know, my mother had breast cancer, and so I've learned a lot about this issue. What we would cover under this health care plan—transplants of all kinds as long as the doctors thought it was an appropriate procedure.

Now, there are some people who still believe bone marrow transplants for breast cancer are experimental, although there's a lot of evidence that it can prolong life among younger women, especially women 50 and under. And the truth is that it will depend upon the doctor's belief that it should be the appropriate course of medical care. But what we're trying to do is to give these decisions back to doctors and their patients who believe it's an appropriate course of medical care. And I think that it is clear that we're moving to the point where most physicians believe that there are circumstances under which it is an appropriate thing to do to give women with breast cancer bone marrow transplants.

But I'm not trying to give you an evasive answer, I'm trying to give you the standard that will be used in the insurance policy, is it appropriate medical care? Will the doctor believe that? I think that more and more doctors do believe that, so in most cases I think you can look forward to that kind of procedure being covered.

Thank you.

Ms. Astore. Let's bring the audience in Milwaukee into the discussion now.

[*The Milwaukee, WI, moderator introduced a participant who asked about premium increases and the cost effectiveness of requiring a referral for coverage of a visit to a specialist.*]

The President. Well, first of all, let me say that a lot of that referral business is probably because of requirements that the insurance companies have put on the doctors treating this lady. If you talk to any doctor, they'll tell you that more and more and more, they're having to call insurance companies and get permission to practice medicine in advance of doing what they think has to be

done anyway. Last night I was down in Kansas City, and I had three doctors in our group there, and that's all they talked about was how much time they were spending getting the approval of insurance companies to do what they knew to do anyway.

You talked about how much your insurance had gone up. Let me say, one of the best things about having a national reform is that you can charge people the same price for an individual policy and a higher price for a family policy, but you would pay that price even if you had to use the doctor enough. That's what insurance used to be. I mean, when Blue Cross first got organized, everybody was lumped in a great big pool, everybody paid the same amount. Some people got sick, and the rest of us paid for that as well, as a hedge against ourselves getting sick. Now we have 1,500 separate insurance companies, thousands of different policies, hundreds of thousands of people working in doctors' offices and hospitals and insurance offices figuring out who's not covered for what. So if you're in a little pool—and this lady, you heard what she said, she has an illness—your rates can go way up. If we're all insured in large pools, then your rates would not go up unduly—just more or less at the rate of inflation—just because you had an illness. That's one of the—this woman would be dramatically advantaged if we had national insurance reform—health care reform.

[*Mr. Meier introduced a participant who suggested combining the best parts of the Canadian and German health care systems.*]

The President. Well, that's kind of what we're trying to do. The Canadian system—in Minnesota, for example, where you're close to Canada, or in Michigan or any of the States that are in our program tonight, there are a lot of people who would like to see the single-payer system that the Canadians have.

The problem is twofold. One is, it would be very difficult to get Congress to agree, in effect, to put all the health insurance business in America out of business and substitute it with a tax. And a lot of people like the lady who asked the second question here would wonder what that would do to their

health care plans. Secondly, the Canadian system, in my judgment, has not had quite as much success at controlling costs as the German system has, where all the people pay something, assume some responsibility directly for their health care, and therefore negotiate more vigorously on an ongoing basis to try to hold down the costs of health care.

But let me say from my point of view, sir, to you, there are lots of people in America who are HIV positive who could be working, who could be making a contribution and paying taxes, who have difficulty doing that because they can't get health insurance. But if they were insured in very large pools, they would be able to do so. So I think that one of the most important beneficiaries of this policy will be people who have very serious illnesses that still may permit them to work for long periods of time and be active if they can provide for their own health care needs.

Ms. Astore. Thank you, Milwaukee. We have one more live location to bring into our town hall meeting tonight on health care.

[*The Sioux Falls, SD, moderator introduced a participant who asked about coverage for services by nontraditional medical practitioners.*]

The President. Well, what we do in the health care plan is to require certain kinds of care to be covered. And then that care can be provided in a variety of different ways by anybody who is qualified to provide it. What will happen is that the people who band together in these purchasing alliances will be given any number of choices from which the consumers of health care can choose what kind of health care plan they want. So all consumers will have the option, if they wish, to choose plans that have different kinds of providers, including alternative providers, as you mentioned, to provide various health services. We have to have—everybody by law has a right to have three different kinds of plans, kinds of plans. But what you'll have in most places is the kind of choices that now, for example, Federal employees have. You know, a lot of Federal employees can choose between two dozen different plans. It's amazing. And as a consequence of that you have all different kinds of options, and a lot of providers, in-

cluding chiropractors, have a chance to provide services to people. That's the way ours would be set up.

Let me go right to the heart of the question because I've got a lot of friends who are chiropractors who have asked me this. We do not specify in the bill as it is presently drawn the services of chiropractors, osteopaths, nurse practitioners, or neurosurgeons for that matter. What we do instead is say, here are the kinds of health care services that have to be offered, let people organize themselves and offer them to the consumers of America.

[*Mr. Meier introduced a participant who asked how the plan would address increased costs related to malpractice.*]

The President. Our plan does that in two ways. Let me also mention, since we're talking to South Dakota and you've got a lot of rural population, although we do here in Minnesota, too, and in Michigan, the other States that are represented and in Wisconsin, another big problem that we have in my rural State where I'm from is that more and more general practitioners out in the country are reluctant to do things like deliver babies and set simple fractures because of the malpractice problems.

Our bill does two things. One is it sets a limit on the percentage of a malpractice judgment that can be taken by a lawyer, a percentage of the contingency fee. The second thing it does, which I am convinced will have a far more positive impact on insurance rates, is it sets up a system in which the professional associations set up medical practice guidelines for various kinds of cases. And then if the physicians can demonstrate that they follow the guidelines, there is a presumption that the physician was not negligent.

Now, that presumption can be overcome, but it is much harder. And if that happens, we believe that there will be a substantial reduction in the number of frivolous cases in the malpractice area and therefore malpractice insurance rates will go down.

That's been tried in a rural State, Maine, with some considerable success. And I think that it's the best way to go to guarantee lower malpractice fees and still give people a right

to go into court when they've genuinely got a gripe.

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

Ms. Astore. Welcome back everyone to "Health Care in the Heartland," our town hall meeting in the Twin Cities with the President.

[Mr. Meier introduced a videotape about a person's loss of health insurance. A participant then asked about insurance portability and the effect of economic changes and profitability of companies on the funding of the plan.]

The President. Thank you very much. You know, this is so interesting. Of all these forums that I've done, you're the first person that's asked me that question. And let me try to explain how it would work.

First of all, under our plan, companies would be free to self-insure if they were above a certain size. We now have 5,000 and above. There are some in Congress who think it should be smaller. But what we have is complete portability of benefits so that no family can ever be without benefits. So that if your company goes down and you don't have another job, you just carry your benefits. And for the period in which you're between jobs, this reserve fund that I talked about that we'll set up—the Government basically would provide the reserve to guarantee that your coverage would continue just as if you were still working at the other company. So you would not have been put in the position that you're in now. And it's very important. In addition to people who are in the position that you're in, where your company went broke and you got left with all those bills, there are an awful lot of people who just want to change jobs, but they have to wait for months and months and months, even after they change jobs, before they actually get coverage. So this is a big issue. We need to guarantee—the term of art is portability—complete portability of policies through jobs and through employers. And our system would provide that.

Thank you.

[Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked about health benefits for immigrants.]

The President. Most of those folks, even with very limited English capacity, have jobs. So they would get at the job site a card, a health care card, just like everyone else, which they then would be able to present to their doctor. They would have the opportunity either at work or at a local health clinic to have explained to them what their choices are of the health care plan, and then they would just—they wouldn't have to keep up with a lot of paper or anything, just one card for the family that they could present at the health care clinic when they needed it or at the hospital. So I think that's the way it will work.

Now, in many places where there are a very large number of people whose first language is not English, we will have to expand the outreach activities of the public health clinics for people who are not employed and where there's no one in the family who is employed. And we understand that we're going to have to do that and make some provision for doing that.

Thank you.

Mr. Meier. Mr. President, we're going to join our satellite audience one more time in Detroit and station WDIV.

[The Detroit, MI, moderator introduced a participant who asked about prescription drug coverage outside of Medicare.]

The President. Under our plan, every health policy would have to have a prescription drug component which would have the following characteristics. There would be a \$250 deductible. In other words, you have to spend up to \$250 of your own money on medicine before it would trigger in. And then after that, every prescription would require a 20 percent co-pay. But there would be a ceiling beyond which you could not spend; it's about \$1,000. If your expenditures were over \$1,000 a year, then the insurance policy would cover all the prescription drugs that your doctor would require and that your health would require.

So it's a pretty good policy because—now, if you have a better policy now, you can keep it. Keep in mind, if the coverage is better now, you can keep it. But almost no one has coverage that good today in their health care policy for prescription drugs. And there are

a lot of national studies which show that the adequate provision of prescription medicine can actually save money by reducing hospital stays and emergency room visits.

[Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked if the President knew about the community health center system in Ontario, Canada.]

The President. I think that one of the things that will happen if we pass this bill is that you will have more and more health care provided in that way by community-based clinics or comprehensive health centers that have salaried professionals, including doctors. Interestingly enough, we're here in Minneapolis; that's what you have at the Mayo Clinic, right? Everybody concedes that there is no finer health care in the world. And yet I have many people who have been patients at the Mayo Clinic tell me that it is less expensive than what they paid back home for other kinds of care.

So I think that you will see a lot more of that in this country once the health insurance market is organized so that people know they will always be reimbursed for the services they provide. That then permits people to organize these kinds of associations and know that they'll be able to run them without going broke, because they know they'll always have reimbursement.

[The Milwaukee moderator introduced a doctor and showed a videotape about his clinic. The doctor then asked if the President supported community health centers.]

The President. Yes, I do, not only for the reasons we just saw in the fine practice that you have but because the community health centers are increasingly providing services to large numbers of people who used to not use them at all. For example, in many of the southern States of this country, including mine, over 80 percent of all the children in the States get their immunizations through community health centers, because a lot of regular doctor's offices don't do it anymore because of the malpractice problems that were mentioned earlier. So I think it's very important. And our plan has a special provision for funding community health centers at a higher level to try to make sure that these

kind of comprehensive services can be provided.

And let me emphasize, too, that in the inner city and in rural areas—we've got South Dakota here, remember, on this television program—if it weren't for community health centers there would be no access to health care, so that people might have insurance but they still wouldn't have any place to go with their insurance. So it's very important.

Thank you for practicing there.

[Mr. Meier introduced a participant who questioned the cigarette tax.]

The President. Well, as I said, first of all, let me say if I could figure out how to get enough savings out of this program to pay for it without any tax, that's what I would do. We are going to get dramatic savings out of this program, mostly by having a single form, simpler administration, which will save the taxpayers a lot of money, and those of you who aren't taxpayers who have private insurance, by drastically cutting the amount of administrative overhead in the system.

We cannot, however, provide enough money to do the things that we've been discussing without raising some money. Obviously, I think it is fair to ask the companies that will have the biggest drop in their insurance premiums to give a small portion of that to the fund for small business discounts and for unemployed people.

The reason I think that the cigarette tax is a legitimate place to get funds is that cigarette smoking is the only activity we know of in our society that there is no known safe margin for doing. That is, it's not like alcoholic consumption where, if you're not prone to be an alcoholic, there are safe margins of consumption. We know of no safe measure of smoking. And we also know that several thousand people a year get lung cancer from subsidiary exposure to smoke, when they don't do it themselves. We also know that our society bears a health care burden and cost as a result of the health care consequences of smoking far in excess of the money raised from the cigarette tax. So for all those reasons, I thought since we had to raise some money, that was the fairest way to do it.

[Following a commercial break, the Sioux Falls, SD, moderator presented a videotape on rural health issues and then introduced a farmer who asked about organ transplants.]

The President. Yes, sir. We support transplants, as I said, let me restate—particularly organ transplants. We support transplants when they are the recommended medical procedure, and we try to provide ways to make sure that we facilitate that.

Now, let me also say to you since you were introduced in a slightly different way—as a farmer who's self-employed, who has already had a medical problem, who has folks working for you on the farm—farmers, in my opinion, may be the biggest winner in the proposed reform we have because today, believe it or not, self-employed people who buy health insurance, number one, pay exorbitant rates anyway because they're not in big pools. If they've been sick, they pay lots more. And if you're self-employed, you can only deduct 25 percent of your cost of the premium from your income taxes, whereas a business can deduct 100 percent.

Under our plan, you'd be able to buy on an equal basis with others in a much bigger pool, and you would be able to deduct 100 percent of your self-employed premium. Which means in almost every case in the country, farmers would be able to insure their farm hands for the time they work for them and their families for less than they're paying just for family insurance today. And you certainly would, because of your pre-existing condition.

But let me just say this, I will try to get some more information on the specific question you asked me about encouraging and organizing the whole market for transplants. And I will make sure that we get back to you in the next day or two with a more specific answer to your question.

[The Sioux Falls moderator introduced a participant who asked about the development of a small town infrastructure.]

The President. Yes, I'd like to talk about that a little bit. And I'd like to say, first of all, my wife had a wonderful time out there. And I want to thank Senator Daschle for doing such a good job and working on this rural health care issue.

Let me try to explain how this would work, and let me say for the rest of you, a lot of people who live in small towns in rural areas don't even have a doctor in their town anymore. I met in rural North Carolina earlier this week a doctor who told me she was working 110 hours a week and had been for several weeks, but she had just come to her slow season when she could work 80 hours a week. Now, that's a doctor who's going to need a doctor pretty soon, right? *[Laughter]*

Here's what we try to do. Let me briefly run through the things that are in this plan for rural areas: Number one, revive the national health service corps where young doctors can pay for their medical education, which normally leaves them with a big debt, by serving in underserved areas; 7,000 doctors over the next few years doing that. Number two, give doctors and other health care providers who go into underserved areas significant income tax credits as incentives to do it, \$1,000 a month for doctors, \$500 a month for nurses and other medical professionals for up to 5 years; that's a huge incentive. Number three, give doctors faster write-offs, tax write-offs, when they buy modern equipment to put into their clinics in rural areas. And number four, make sure that we've got the technology, the computer technology to connect rural clinics with urban medical centers, so doctors can feel good about the quality of their practice when they're out there and feel like they're giving their patients the kind of care they need. Those are the things that we think will get a lot more doctors and nurses and others into rural America and make a big difference.

[The Sioux Falls moderator introduced a participant who asked about reimbursement for rural providers under Medicare and Medicaid.]

The President. Well, for one thing, Medicare and Medicaid are going up right now at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation, by far more than inflation and population growth, because primarily of the way the Medicaid program is organized. Under our plan, Medicaid recipients would be put into big insurance pools along with small business people, self-employed people, and larger business people. In other words, they'd be put in these

big community pools. And doctors, for the first time, would be reimbursed at the same rate, whether or not they had a Medicaid patient or someone who was privately insured. It would be exactly the same reimbursement. And that would make a huge difference to the physicians. And how would we do that and still save money? Because you'll have competition, you'll have managed competition, which we've seen already in Minnesota with the work that's been done here. You've had dramatic drop-off in the increase in medical costs here as people have organized themselves into larger groups.

Secondly, under Medicare, we leave it the way it is because so many of the people that I have talked to at AARP and the other groups believe Medicare works and want it left alone. But we do add a prescription drug benefit, and we add a long-term care benefit.

How will rural doctors be able to deal with this? They won't have any more uncompensated care. One of the things that makes Medicare and Medicaid a bigger burden in rural areas is there are an awful lot of uncompensated care in rural areas. Now doctors will be paid something by everybody they treat. And I believe that that will make a big difference to the quality and rewards of the practice of medicine in rural areas.

We can save this money, to go back to your question, by the way we organize the health care markets and by making sure that everybody is reimbursed for all the services that are provided. Then we'll be able to lower the rate of inflation.

Keep in mind, we don't propose to cut Medicare and Medicaid, ma'am. Medicare and Medicaid under our proposal would go up at twice the rate of inflation, instead of 3 times the rate of inflation, which it's going to do if we don't pass national health care reform.

[Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked about coverage for mental health care.]

The President. Yes, it is a very important part of health care reform. Under our plan, some mental health benefits would be included from the beginning of national health reform. That is, whenever—all the States would have until the end of '97 to provide universal coverage. Each State would have

that time. From the beginning of the time everybody was covered, there would be significant mental health benefits, much more than most people have under their policies today, both inpatient and outpatient care.

There would not, however, be complete parity. And if you're interested in mental health, you know—parity between the mental health benefits and the physical health benefits until the year 2000. And that's because we don't have accurate cost estimates on how much it will cost, and we have to phase it in. To go back to what some other people had said earlier, we have to know that when we put these things in, that we can pay for them and we're not going to cost the Treasury more than we have.

But there will be quite a significant mental health benefit from the very beginning and much more than most people have today. I think it's very important. I think it's one of the best things about our plan, and I personally believe it will make us a healthier country and will cut down on long-term medical costs if we have proper kind of mental health.

[Mr. Meier introduced a participant who asked about the plan's effect on the present Minnesota Care health plan.]

The President. No, you won't lose money because—and I commend what you've done; I think it's important. But you won't lose money. We estimate that both private insurers and the Government will save money if we go on with national health care reform. And what will happen is if we have the national plan, we'll be able to do some things that at least you're not now doing.

First, everybody will be able to be insured. And secondly, in addition to holding costs down, we'll be able to hold costs down with more choices for health care consumers than you're going to be able to provide unless we have a national plan which reorganizes the insurance markets. So my judgment is you'd be—I would urge you to keep going with your reforms here, to do the best you can and go full out until the Congress acts. But I believe you'd be much better off when the Congress acts.

[Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked about coverage for substance abuse treatment.]

The President. I don't know if I can do a better job of defending it. Some days I don't think I do such a hot job. [Laughter] I did my best when we started tonight, but I'm going to try. Let me say—I think you may know this, but I have a brother who is an addict, who is a recovering addict. I know the treatment works. And we have done two things in our administration. One is to require that drug treatment be a part of the benefits, as a part of a general approach to preventive health care. I believe in preventive health care, folks. We spend a ton of money after the cow's already out of the barn door in our health care system. And I like—I mean, I like the fact that we have the best technology in the world. I like the fact that we can get it. But we can save so much money if we just invest in prevention generally, whether it's mammograms for women or cholesterol tests for people or substance abuse treatment.

In addition to that, although I just presented a budget to the Congress that cuts defense and cuts discretionary domestic spending—that is, not Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security—for the first time since 1969, we increase in our regular budget drug treatment funds by, oh, about 8 or 10 percent, just because I think it is so important. And I will fight very hard for it. I think it would be a big mistake for us to back off of this. There's still an awful lot of people who have alcohol and drug abuse, substance abuse problems in this country. And we can save a bunch of money and a lot of people, more importantly, if we stay with it.

[The Detroit moderator introduced a participant who asked about prescription drug coverage for senior citizens.]

The President. Yes, ma'am. Let me explain this again for the benefit of all of our participants here. Older people who are at or below the poverty line are eligible for coverage under the Medicaid program, the Government's program for poor folks. If you're under Medicaid, then you have a prescription drug benefit. But if you're a senior citizen eligible for Medicare, that is, the regular elderly person's health care program, and you haven't spent yourself in poverty, you don't get any prescription drug benefit. But we know that older people are 4 times as likely

to use medicine as younger people. And we also know that we save money in our health care system if people who need medicine get it and can therefore stay out of hospitals. I mean, you can spend a year's worth of medicine in 3 days in a hospital.

So what our plan does is to add to Medicare a prescription drug benefit which has a \$250 deductible, a 20 percent co-pay, and I think, a \$1,000 ceiling; it has a ceiling, and I think it's \$1,000. That is, after you spend \$1,000 out of pocket, your insurance then will cover all your medicine from then on.

[Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked about maintaining competition in the health insurance market.]

The President. First, let me say, I think there has to be some consolidation of the insurance market. To be fair, I've tried to say this over and over again, and sometimes not so well, but I don't think there are any bad people in this drama. We have the best health care in the world. We have the best doctors, the best nurses, the best medical technology, the best medical research. We have the worst health care financing system in the world. It is the world's most expensive. It's estimated by nearly everybody that studies it that we spend about \$90 billion a year, which is pretty good money, in clerical work, simply because of the way we're organized.

I think there should be and will be, inevitably, some sort of insurance consolidation. How do we guarantee competition? By requiring that in every group of buyers, every consumer in America have access to at least three different kinds of plans, a fee-for-service plan, a health maintenance organization, a professional provider organization.

They may have access to 24 different specific plans—as I said, the way the Federal Government employees often do today—but we will guarantee that every person always has access to at least three different kinds of plans, including fee-for-service medicine in the old-fashioned way. When you do that, you're going to ensure that there will be more competition than there will be. If we do nothing, the move toward competition, in my judgment, will be just exactly what you say, there will be more and more concentra-

ion, more and more managed care but less choice, less quality, and less competition.

[*Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked if choice of physicians would be limited.*]

The President. No. But let me answer your question directly. First of all, one option you will always have, ma'am, is to continue to pay your doctors as you would now, on a fee-for-service basis. Your premiums might be slightly higher, but they probably still would be as low, if not lower, than they are today because of the way the markets are organized.

In addition to that, you can also join a certain plan, like a certain health plan, and maybe all your doctors aren't members of it; let's say three are, but one of your specialists aren't. You can buy a small premium, which would not be very expensive, which would give you the right also to use that doctor, who would then get reimbursed from your plan at the same rate other doctors in the same specialty or the same area would.

So you would be able to keep all your doctors. That would be one of the things you'd have to do. You might have to pay slightly more to do it than you would otherwise pay, but you could keep them all and, in all probability, based on our studies, it would be for the same or less money than you're paying now, if you have a comprehensive plan.

[*Ms. Astore called on the Milwaukee moderator, who introduced a participant who asked about increasing employment opportunity for welfare recipients, listing her education and job skills.*]

The President. My guess is we've already done it. I'll bet you'll have four job offers tomorrow since you've been on television. [*Laughter*] I imagine we probably solved your problem. But let me give you a more general answer. I hope somebody who's watching you will call you and offer a job tomorrow.

First of all, quite apart from welfare, we have to create more jobs in this country. In the last 15 months, our economy has produced 2½ million new jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector, more than in the

previous 4 years. So we're creating more jobs. That's the first thing.

Secondly, with regard to welfare, how do you move people from welfare to work? You have to make work more attractive. We, this year, starting in this calendar year, we are lowering income taxes for 16.6 percent, one-sixth, of American workers who make lower wages, to make sure that work will always be more attractive than welfare by saying if you work for modest wages, you'll get an income tax cut.

The third thing we are trying to do is to reform the welfare system itself by helping to create jobs ultimately for people who have training and are able to go to work, if necessary, with some sort of public funding. But let me say, it doesn't apply to you.

But the biggest problem we've got with welfare for a lot of people is that—remember, if you're poor, on Medicaid and on welfare, your children get health care. If you take a minimum-wage job in a business that doesn't have health insurance, you have to give up your kid's health care to go to work. Then you work for a minimum wage and you pay taxes so people on welfare can have health care. It doesn't make any sense. So, the health care issue is an important part of welfare reform.

The answer to this lady's question is she should be able to get a job in a healthy market economy. So we have to create more jobs. Ultimately, for people on welfare who are willing to go to work, if they can't find jobs within a certain specific time, in my judgment, the Government is going to have to work with the private sector to give extra incentives for people to go to work. It's better to have work than be on welfare even if you have to give extra incentives to create the jobs.

[*The Milwaukee moderator introduced a participant who asked about the plan's effect on the U.S. free enterprise system.*]

The President. I think it will do much more good than harm. There will be some job loss in some areas, and there will be some job gain in some areas. And let me explain how and why I think it's the right thing to do.

First of all, the system is entirely private. We require people to purchase insurance. We keep private insurance. We do not abolish insurance and substitute taxes. Secondly, all the health care providers that are now private will continue to be private. So we leave that alone. But if you go to a comprehensive benefit program where you have a single form that the doctor has to fill out, a single form that a hospital has to fill out, a single form that a patient has to fill out, and everybody is clearly covered by producing a card, then all those people who are busily at work trying to figure out who's not covered under what health insurance policy or why the health insurance policy needs to be cut off or why a small pool can't anymore support a person who's got a sick child, those jobs will go down in number dramatically. But we'll have a big increase in jobs in health care providers, people who work in home health, for example.

Some small businesses will pay more because they don't pay anything now or they have very limited policies now. But on average, it will add one to 2 percent to their cost of doing business, and all their competitors will have to do the same thing. And within a few years they'll all be saving so much more because medical inflation will be less.

The Congressional Budget Office is a non-partisan group that did a study on this. They estimate that on average, within 5 years we'll be creating many jobs in the small business sector because we'll lower medical inflation and all small business people will be on equal competitive terms.

So I think there will be some job loss, more job gain in the short run in health care, and big job gains over the long run by bringing health costs in line with inflation.

[Mr. Meier called on the Sioux Falls moderator, who introduced a participant who asked if businesses would still provide health insurance to retirees under the new plan.]

The President. It would relieve them of some of their responsibilities for paying for the early retirees. And they would be in the retiree pool in our health care program. But I still believe it's good economics because a lot of these companies are paying now 15, 16, 17, 18 percent of their payroll, as com-

pared with the national average of 8 to 8.5 percent of payroll, for health care. And that is undermining their ability to reinvest money and to create more jobs and to make our economy stronger.

Most of those companies that are severely affected by this are companies like automobiles and steel, which had to have huge layoffs through early retirement all during the 1980's to be competitive. In other words, it wasn't a decision they made, it was necessity. And they had contracts which required them to carry these health burdens.

We believe for relatively modest cost we can generate a huge amount of money in these sectors, which are now prospering, to create more jobs and help strengthen the American economy. So we think that it'll be about a wash that we can well afford.

Let me say, sir, that we have had the cost of our plan evaluated by any number of people, including groups that are composed largely of folks that were active in the previous two Republican administrations. And all of them say more or less the same thing, that over the 10-year period our numbers are right. They differ from year to year sometimes, but I think that the cost figures in my plan are good because we've bent over backwards, we've contacted 10 different medical actuarial firms and also had a lot of outsiders look at it. I think the numbers are right.

Ms. Astore. Thank you, Sioux Falls. Mr. President, we have time for one final question here in the Twin Cities. And we'd like you to pick a member of the audience to ask that final question.

The President. Go ahead.

Mr. Meier. Wait, wait, wait, wait. I've got to pull a Donahue here and get up there. [Laughter]

The President. Maybe we'll do two if you can do it real quick.

Mr. Meier. Tell us your name and what your question is.

[A participant asked if the plan would include dental coverage.]

The President. Yes—we're running out of time. I can't give you the whole details. But the short answer is yes. You'll have to pay some of it, and I'll get you the details.

Go ahead, what's your question? Thank you.

Ms. Astore. Hurry, Randy.

The President. We can do it. We can do it.

Mr. Meier. I'm getting there. Here we go. Your name and what your question is.

[A participant asked about coverage for his adult handicapped daughter.]

The President. What's her handicap?

Q. Right now it's a form of scoliosis. She's got a severe curvature; she's had a back spinal fusion amongst other things.

The President. Your daughter would be able to buy insurance as an individual once she becomes an adult, on the same terms as anybody else.

Now, the only way we can do that is if we organize the insurance markets and the buyers so that there are big insurance pools and large numbers of buyers so we can spread the risk of some future illness or problem of hers across a large number of people.

I do want to make full disclosure, because one of the first questions I got was who would pay more under this plan. We would ask young single workers to pay a little more per month than they would otherwise pay so that we'd be able to insure people like your daughter and older workers on affordable terms. I think, again, that's a fair thing because young, single workers want to be older some day, number one, and they're going to be married, they're going to have children, and they might have children that have health problems.

So I think it's a fair thing to do. But that's the way it would work. That's the way, by the way, other countries do it. And your daughter would be able to get insurance.

Ms. Astore. President Clinton, we're coming to the end of our town hall meeting. We'd like to give you this opportunity to offer some closing remarks.

The President. I just want to make two points after I say thank you to all of you. Thank you to those of you who asked questions and those who couldn't get your questions asked. For those of you in the other

sites, if you had a question that didn't get answered, send it to us and we'll answer it. And those of you that are here, I'll just gather them up while I'm here.

I want to make two points if I might. We can differ about the details of this, but the one thing we have to decide on as a people is, are we going to continue to be the only advanced economy in the entire world that can't figure out how to provide health insurance for all of its people, so that we insure people and pay for them if they are on welfare but we punish working people? Or are we going to solve this problem after talking about it for 60 years now?

The second thing I want to say is this, to go back to a point I made at the beginning. This is a complicated issue. I've tried to shoot straight with you and tell you what the problems are with it. I respect people who have differences of opinion with me on exactly how we should do it.

But what I want to ask you to do is to try to communicate to your Members of Congress, without regard to party, that Republicans and independents and Democrats all get sick, all have kids, all have parents, all have hopes, all have fears, and that it's okay for us to disagree about this in terms of the details, but it is not okay to let another year go by and not deal with it.

And what I ask you to do is not so much to say, "Bill Clinton's right about everything," but to say, "This is a serious problem; we have to deal with it. Please act now." We will not know any more about this next year than we do this year. It's just going to be like an ingrown toenail. It will get worse, not better, if we don't move. So that is what I plead with you to do. Ask your Members of Congress to act now and to work in the spirit of humanity, bipartisanship, and common sense, and let's get this done.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The town meeting began at 7 p.m. at the KSTP-TV studio. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 6665—Jewish Heritage Week, 1994

April 8, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

American history is a tapestry woven from the fabric of traditions and beliefs from every corner of the globe and bound together by a common love for life and liberty. Since our Nation's earliest days, Jewish citizens have contributed to our success in virtually every field of human endeavor. The Jewish culture, a vibrant and distinctive strand in our richly textured tapestry, has helped to give our Nation its shape.

After enduring centuries of hardship and bigotry in nations throughout the diaspora, many Jewish people found their ways to America's shores. Some came early in our Nation's history, seeking to make their mark in a newly free society. Others came in the wake of the pogroms or the Holocaust, looking for a government that would protect their rights to worship and live as they chose. By boat, airplane, and any other means that would carry them, Jewish people came to America and infused this great land with a noble heritage based on faith and family, with an enduring commitment to the pursuit of knowledge and the ideal of justice.

Though the customs of daily Jewish life have changed markedly over the millennia, the central tenets of ancient Judaism have remained a constant guide since Moses taught them to his people so long ago. Jewish families continue to hand down these lessons to their children, and the fundamental lessons of the Torah still serve the faithful today, as we seek to renew our land and restore the bonds of community.

Jewish citizens, along with people of hundreds of other beliefs and backgrounds, have found freedom and success in our Nation of immigrants, and they continue to make lasting and meaningful contributions to every area of our society. Recognizing the positive influence of the Jewish people, traditions, and culture within our country, the Congress, by Public Law 103-27, has designated April 10 through April 17, 1994, as "Jewish Herit-

age Week," and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of April 10 through April 17, 1994, as Jewish Heritage Week. I call upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:38 p.m., April 11, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 9, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 13.

Proclamation 6666—Pan American Day and Pan American Week, 1994

April 8, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Within the last few years, we have witnessed remarkable changes around the globe. The defeat of oppression and the ascendancy of democracy and free market systems have brought a new world full of opportunities and challenges. Nowhere has the march toward positive change—political, economic, and social—been more dramatic or more complete than in our own hemisphere.

From North to South, more citizens of the Americas are enjoying the fruits of liberty than ever before. Principles fundamental to democracy, such as acceptance of the rule of law and respect for human rights, continue to gain ground. There is no question that this hemisphere is well on its way to becoming a beacon of liberty and democracy for the whole world.

The interdependence of nations is greater than ever because democracy, human rights, market economics, and good governance are ideas that are rapidly maturing throughout the Americas. They form an enduring foundation for sustainable and mutually beneficial economic growth and development. A renewed partnership between nations of this hemisphere will further these ideas, thus ensuring lasting security for future generations.

The approval of the North American Free Trade Agreement was an historic achievement and one that is crucial in this process. Beginning with Canada and Mexico, it will build a bridge of greater economic and political cooperation. It will serve as the model for our future relationships with the region. It will advance the vision of a community of nations committed to democracy, bound together by open markets and rising standards of living and dedicated to the peaceful resolution of disputes.

Over a century ago, representatives of the nations of this hemisphere met in Washington to establish the International Union of the American Republics. Accepting the tenets of democracy, peace, security, and prosperity, these member nations made a firm commitment to mutual cooperation. The Union's successor, the Organization of American States (OAS), has furthered this commitment. I applaud and encourage the activity of the OAS in this pursuit to ensure that worldwide changes create a hemisphere of peace and prosperity.

We can take great pride in accomplishments already achieved in the Americas. But there is much work to be done. Later this year, I will host a summit of the democratically elected leaders of our hemisphere. The Summit of the Americas will have two broad themes: democracy and good governance; and trade expansion, investment, and sustainable development. The Summit will be an historic opportunity for our nations to recognize explicitly this convergence of democratic and free market values and to chart a course for the future.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim Thursday, April 14, 1994,

as "Pan American Day" and the week of April 10 through April 16, 1994, as "Pan American Week." I urge the Governors of the 50 States, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and officials of other areas under the flag of the United States of America to honor these observances with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:39 p.m., April 11, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 9, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 13.

The President's Radio Address

April 9, 1994

Good morning. This past week, I traveled across our country because I wanted the American people to hear directly from me about the progress we're making on their behalf and what we still have to do. Last month, our Nation gained 456,000 new jobs, the largest jump in 6 years. That brings the total number of private sector jobs created in this economy during our recovery to 2.3 million. That's twice as many new jobs in the past 14 months than we saw in the previous 4 years. I'm determined to keep building on that strength. Our job is to fix the economy and to give our people tools, like world-class education and health care security, so that they can compete and we can strengthen the great American middle class as we move toward the 21st century.

In my travels this week, people made it clear to me they expect us here in Washington to take care of one job immediately: to confront the crime and violence that are tearing our communities apart. None of our efforts to tackle other problems will work if we fail to address the overwhelming force of crime. It is reducing the sense of freedom the American people have.

If we can't stop people from hurting one another, we can never reduce the burden on our health care system and the fact that we have too much crime, too much violence, and too many people showing up in our emergency rooms. If we can't make our classrooms safe, we can't teach our children. If we don't replace drug money with good jobs and a steady paycheck, our people will never lose their fear and gain hope.

I'm convinced the American people want a crime policy that works without gimmicks and they want our leaders to make it possible for them to take back their streets, their homes, their schools, and their lives. That's why this week I ordered Attorney General Janet Reno and the Housing and Urban Development Secretary, Henry Cisneros, to promptly develop a policy allowing police to sweep public housing so that criminals cannot find shelter in the places they terrorize.

I took this action just hours after a Federal district judge in Chicago declared the Chicago Housing Authority's search policy a violation of the fourth amendment to the Constitution. We have to take some action to permit appropriate law enforcement work to go on in these projects. I have been in the Chicago housing projects, and I know the difference between those that have been swept free of illegal weapons and criminals and those which have not. Just last weekend, 13 people died violently in Chicago, 3 of them in the Robert Taylor Public Housing Project.

All Americans, rich and poor alike, deserve leaders they can rely on to protect their safety. Congress will have a chance to provide that kind of leadership when it comes back into session this Tuesday. The crime bill will be item number one on its agenda. Next week, police officers, mayors, and other community leaders all across our America will come here to Washington to and join me at the White House to urge Congress to pass the crime bill. For 6 long years, we've waited for a comprehensive crime law. We shouldn't have to wait any longer.

The crime bill I have proposed to the Congress is both tough and smart. Right now, a small number of dangerous criminals commit a large proportion of the violent crimes because our system doesn't put them away. The crime bill sends a simple message:

"Three strikes and you're out." Commit three violent crimes, and you go to prison for life. The crime bill will help States build 33,000 more prison cells, along with boot camps for first-time offenders. It will help us to lock the revolving door that swings too freely on serious criminals and give young people a chance to avoid a life of crime.

The bill also will help us put another 100,000 police officers on our streets. More police in community policing settings means not only that more criminals will be caught, it means that there will be less crime. When police walk the streets, know their neighbors, win the respect of local young people, focus on high crime areas, and work with parents and business people, they can actually reduce crime. I have seen it in city after city after city.

Preventing violence from occurring in the first place is also an important part of our crime bill. It encourages young people to stay off the streets, offering employment opportunities, afterschool activities, and good role models who teach strong values. These boot camps and other similar operations will give us a chance to send first-time offenders to a disciplinary setting who might otherwise go free. But they'll also give these young people a second chance to avoid a lifetime of trouble, a chance to learn new discipline and how to behave responsibly.

We're doing more to make the schools safe and to get hard-core drug users into the treatment they need. But telling our kids to say no to drugs is only half the battle. If we want children to grow up to become law-abiding members of society, we have to help them find a place in tomorrow's economy to give them something to say yes to.

You and I both know Government can't do this job alone, nor should it. The most law-abiding societies are not those with the most jails. They're the ones with good jobs, strong families, and strong communities, where the rights of the community are respected, with strong values about helping, not hurting, one's neighbors. Let's face it: In a lot of places in this country, crime, drugs, and violence now fill the spaces where work and family and community used to be. So the job of all Americans is urgent. That's why I'm calling on everyone in Washington to put

their partisanship aside. The American people don't want politics or gimmicks, they want us to do something that will work. Well, this crime bill will work. Next week, it's time for Congress to be tough and smart by passing the crime bill when it comes back into session. I hope you'll do your part by asking your Congressmen and Senators to see that the crime bill becomes law.

Finally, let me say just a brief word about a very tragic situation in the African nation of Rwanda. I'm deeply concerned about the continuing violence following the assassination of the President, the Prime Minister, and other officials as well as some of our United Nations peacekeepers. There are about 250 Americans there. I'm very concerned about their safety, and I want you to know that we're doing all we can to ensure their safety. I ask you to join together this morning in praying for their safety and for a return to peace in Rwanda.

Thanks for your help, and thanks for listening.

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

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters

April 10, 1993

Bosnia

The President. Today, while negotiations were being held on a cease-fire in Bosnia, the Serbs launched a new attack on Gorazde. These attacks have resulted in heavy casualties and have put United Nations personnel there at risk.

UNPROFOR Commander General Rose requested and received authorization from U.N. civilian authorities to receive NATO close air support. Under existing authority and policy, NATO forces promptly responded. U.S. F-16 aircraft under NATO command attacked at least one target identified by UNPROFOR. French aircraft under NATO are now conducting a damage assessment.

We have said we would act if we were requested to do so. We have now done so and we will do so again if we are requested. The Serbs should cease their attacks on Gorazde

and should pull back. The talks on cessation of hostilities in Bosnia should resume. We were at quite an important point in these discussions when these attacks interrupted the progress of the discussions. And I very much hope that now the attacks will cease, that the Serbs will pull back, that the talks will resume on cessation of hostilities. I have a great deal of confidence in General Rose's determination. We strongly supported his decision, and I applaud the rapid response of the U.N. civilian authorities.

Q. What about Serb retaliation, sir?

The President. Well, I have no reason to believe there will be any. We were retaliating. We—the United Nations made it absolutely clear that there were U.N. personnel in Gorazde, that an attack on the town would be interpreted as a clear violation of the rules. And it happened anyway. General Rose asked for the air support, and civilian authorities approved it in a prompt fashion, and then we supported it.

Q. After the bombing raid, we had reports that there were antiaircraft missiles fired into the suburbs. Do you know—

The President. I can't—excuse me?

Q. —at the houses.

The President. I can't confirm that at this time.

Q. Mr. President, did you know about the bombing raid before it took place?

The President. We knew that General Rose had asked for it before it took place, yes. With only—it all happened in fairly rapid succession. There was not a long time delay now between when he asked for the support from the civilian authorities and when they gave it. But we've been keeping on top of this, you know. I—on 2 successive days, Thursday and Friday, I talked with the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and National Security Adviser about this. I was kept informed yesterday, and then we talked again this morning. It became clear to me that General Rose would probably ask. And when he asked I was told, and we were told as soon as Mr. Akashi approved it.

Bosnia and Rwanda

Q. So what do you think is going to happen next, sir? Do you think this is the end of

it, or are you fearful that NATO will have to strike again?

The President. I don't know. I think we have to be firm. We have seen in the past that when we have been firm in support of the United Nations mission, that it has tended to further negotiations. That's all we're trying to do, is to further negotiations.

Let me make one other comment, if I might. As you all know, we've been very concerned about the safety of Americans in Rwanda. As far as we know now, the last of the convoys containing all Americans who wish to leave has either passed into Burundi or is about to pass into Burundi.

And I just want to say a special word of thanks and gratitude on behalf of our entire Nation to our Ambassador, Ambassador Rawson, for the remarkable way in which he has handled himself and in which he went about guaranteeing the security and safety of American citizens during this very difficult situation. There may be more to say about that tomorrow. But for now, I just think we all ought to be grateful to him for the role he played in getting our people out to safety.

Q. Do you think this is a one time only attack in Bosnia? Do you think we'll have to use our air power again there?

The President. I think we have to be prepared to do it. But I don't have any reason to believe one way or the other. I'm not hopeful; I'm not skeptical. I just think that—you know, sometimes the command and control is not very tight there, the communications aren't all that tight. This may have been something that happened that was not authorized by any central authority on the part of the Bosnian Serbs. So I just think this is a clear expression of the will of NATO and the will of the United Nations and the UNPROFOR operation there. And it's a clear call to the Serbs to pull back from Gorazde and resume the negotiations.

Thank you very much.

Legalization of Drugs

Q. Do you have a response to the minister who wants to legalize drugs, Mr. President?

The President. I disagree.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:55 p.m. in the South Portico at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to U.N. Special Envoy Yasushi Akashi.

Exchange With Reporters on Bosnia

April 11, 1994

Q. What can you tell us about the latest air strikes in Bosnia?

The President. That the latest strikes were a direct response to General Rose's request for close air support, that the continued Serb shelling of Gorazde put the U.N. personnel there in danger, and that the air strikes were conducted in strict accordance of existing U.N. policy.

Q. Can you tell us how many aircraft, what type, and what kinds of targets they hit?

The President. They did hit some targets, and you'll be briefed about the details.

Q. Is the U.N. going to defend the people of Gorazde—however you pronounce?

The President. The United Nations is carrying out its mission there, and when they—they're attempting to reassert Gorazde as a safe area, which it has agreed to do. They're encouraging the Serbs to withdraw from the safe area and to resume negotiations and to stop the shelling. And if they are put at risk in the course of doing that mission, they can ask for NATO close air support. That's what they have done, and we have done our best to provide it.

Q. Only the U.N. personnel is our concern?

The President. The U.N. resolution gives NATO the authority to act. We are acting solely under the existing U.N. resolution which has been approved by the Security Council.

Q. Would it be—setting up an exclusion zone around Gorazde like—in Sarajevo?

The President. Well, what the United Nations wants is for the Serbs to stop the shelling and to withdraw and to resume the negotiations. I don't want to compare it exactly to Sarajevo; there are some tactical and factual differences. But that's what they want, and NATO simply responded to the request for air support in carrying out the U.N. mission.

Q. Did you talk to Mr. Yeltsin about this latest—

The President. No, I talked to him last evening, and he was going to be out of pocket today. So we had quite a long talk last night. And I told him that—I explained that this

was different from what happened at Sarajevo. There was a clearly existing U.N. policy, the same policy under which we acted when the planes were shot down, you remember, a few weeks ago, but that I thought we ought to have close coordination with the Russians. After all, the Russians are a part of the UNPROFOR delegation there. They have soldiers on the ground in Bosnia. And we had a good talk. And I think there have been further communications today between the Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister and between the Secretary of Defense and the Defense Minister. So we are trying to work very closely with the Russians. They have a critical role to play if we are going to get these peace talks going again. And I hope we can.

Q. [Inaudible]

The President. We had quite a good talk, I thought. I explained to him what happened. I think in the beginning he was concerned that he didn't know about it in advance. I explained clearly what happened, that the United Nations asked for this, that Boutros-Ghali the day before had put out a press release supporting this action if the shelling didn't stop, that General Rose had received the appropriate approval from the civilian authority in Bosnia, and that it was an action taken under existing authority, and that indeed I thought that the U.N. had notified all the UNPROFOR members that it would be taken, but that it was not any kind of new or different thing. And when these things occur, there is often not a lot of time. There was just, you know, somewhere between 30 minutes and an hour and a half, I think, the decisionmaking time. I don't know the exact time, but we responded in an entirely appropriate way, I think, under the circumstances.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 9:19 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House, prior to a foreign policy meeting. In his remarks, the President referred to U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks in a Telephone Conversation on Public Housing April 11, 1994

Secretary Henry Cisneros. Mr. President, this is Henry Cisneros in Chicago.

The President. Hello, Henry, how are you?

Secretary Cisneros. Good, sir. I'm here with Senator Carol Moseley-Braun and Congressman Bobby Rush and Vince Lane of the housing authority, who's a good friend of yours, and about 200 folks at Progressive Community Church. And we are gathered together to talk about how to deal with the violence that's plagued the Chicago Housing Authority, Robert Taylor, Stateway, and other developments, over the last couple of days.

We're sitting at a table with about 20 guns that were picked up last night in police actions, a very violent weekend that resulted in about 15 shootings and 5 deaths. One 16-year-old was killed last night at Washington Park Homes, here in the area. We're looking at about 20 or so rifles, pistols, automatic weapons that were picked up in police action last night. So this is a very serious circumstance, and the group is very appreciative for your call, sir.

The President. Well, I'm very concerned that—all the efforts that have been made there over the last several years, and I'm glad Senator Moseley-Braun's there; I'm glad Bobby Rush is there; I know you're in his district. And I know Vince Lane remembers the trip that we took into Robert Taylor Homes back in 1991, before I even started running for President. And I'm so worried that all the progress that's been made will be undermined by the court decision. I wonder if some of this violence has not been almost aggravated by the decision. And I'm hoping that you'll be able to find a constitutional solution to this working with the Attorney General.

I know that this bike team effort last night did net a significant amount of guns and other things, and I'm encouraged by what you say. I want to encourage all the citizens who are there that we're going to do every-

thing we can to support them and enable them to have control over their lives and not allow criminals to find shelter in the very public housing communities that they're terrorizing. I think it's very important. I just want to say, you tell me what you think we have to do, and I'll do it. I've seen what can be done there when people can take control of their own destinies. And I think we owe it to them to do everything we can to give them their homes back.

Secretary Cisneros. Mr. President, we're looking at a strategy that is essentially four elements. And I'll prepare a report for you with the Attorney General and have something on your desk, hopefully, by tomorrow or the next day. But obviously the first piece is to focus on the sweeps and the legality of what can be done to get the sweeps constitutional; secondly, to focus on other security measures, other measures we can take, such as Operation Safe Home and other things we can do; thirdly, to focus on such things as recreational programs this summer, recreational activity, midnight basketball, ballparks, antigang things, youth mentorship, critically important, and the community recognizes that so; and then finally to focus on the long-term vision remake of public housing in Chicago. And we've got some ideas about that. And I'll get it all to you in writing. But I just wanted to give you kind of the strategy.

I'm going to ask Senator Moseley-Braun to say a word, if I may, Mr. President.

Senator Carol Moseley-Braun. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Good morning, Senator.

[*Senator Moseley-Braun suggested that the public housing problem could be solved by investing money in securing buildings, providing security forces, and creating jobs and opportunity.*]

The President. Thank you. You know, there's some money in the—some significant money, especially in the House version of the crime bill, that would provide for some jobs for young people in high crime areas.

Senator Moseley-Braun. Right.

The President. And that's one of the things that we tried to do in rewriting it over on the House side, was to get some money

in there so that we could determine the impact on the crime rate of providing jobs for people. I think—of course, I know you agree with me, what we're going to find is if we can go into some of these neighborhoods and put people to work, the crime rate will go way down.

[*Senator Moseley-Braun voiced support for the legislation and reiterated the need for initiatives to reverse the history of neglect.*]

The President. Thank you.

Senator Moseley-Braun. Thank you again, sir.

The President. Thank you so much.

Representative Bobby Rush. Mr. President?

The President. Yes.

Representative Bobby Rush. Bobby Rush, how are you doing?

The President. Hi, Bobby, nice to hear your voice, Congressman.

[*Representative Rush thanked the President for calling and called on Congress to assist in finding resources to improve public housing. He then introduced a community leader who listed problems facing residents of public housing and encouraged the President to take a stand.*]

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you for what you said.

Secretary Cisneros. Mr. President, thank you very much.

The President. I want to thank the gentleman for his remarks. As I said, I once came to Chicago and visited the projects with Vince Lane shortly before I declared for President. And I would like to come again. And I do care a lot about what's going on there. And I'm encouraged by this meeting. And I want to thank Secretary Cisneros for so promptly responding to my request and going over there and spending the night and getting in closer touch with the situation. I feel better about it. And I hope we can do some things to help. I believe we can.

Secretary Cisneros. Mr. President, thank you for calling. I'm going to sign off with Vince Lane saying a couple of words to you, and we'll close out. We appreciate your time very much. We know there's things swirling

in the world and you've got a busy schedule, so we deeply appreciate your call.

The President. Thanks.

Mr. Vince Lane. Mr. President?

The President. Yes. Hi, Vince.

Mr. Lane. How are you?

The President. Great.

[Mr. Lane thanked the President for his leadership in sending Secretary Cisneros and involving Attorney General Reno with addressing the problems in public housing in Chicago.]

The President. Well, thank you Vince, and thanks for blazing away for us and making people believe that we could actually do something to improve life in public housing. You showed me that it could be done years ago, and I'm convinced that maybe we can use this court decision as a spur to even do a better job, a more comprehensive job. We're going to do everything we possibly can.

Mr. Lane. God bless you.

The President. Thanks. It's nice to hear your voice.

Goodbye, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you.

NOTE: The telephone conversation began at 10:27 a.m. The President spoke from the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Vince Lane, chairman, Chicago Housing Authority.

Remarks to Law Enforcement Officers

April 11, 1994

Thank you very much, Officer Williams, if you just keep doing your work, and I'll be glad to carry your notebook anytime. There are a lot of days when you do more than we do up here anyway. [Laughter] I want to thank you, and thank you, Earline Williams, for your commitment and your remarkable statement and the work you and your husband are doing. Thank you, Eddie, for reminding us that we have an obligation to fight for your future. Thanks for bringing your friends, and thank you, officers, for giving him something to look up to and believe in. I want to welcome the new officers from

Albany, Georgia, and thank them for their commitment to law enforcement and thank all the other people in law enforcement who are here at the local and State and Federal level.

In the last congressional recess, like the Attorney General, I got out around the country and listened to people, talked to them about a lot of issues. And I found that all over the country in every region, among people from all walks of life, all races and income groups and political parties, there is a deep concern about the tide of crime and violence in this country and about the underlying strains on our fabric as a common people that these have imposed.

We have simply got to do everything we can to move forward in helping the American people to reduce crime, to say no to those things which they ought to say no to, and to give our young people some more things to say yes to.

I came here today to emphasize how terribly important it is that the House of Representatives consider the crime bill immediately on its return. The Speaker has agreed to do that. I then want the Senate and the House to get together and resolve their differences and send me the crime bill as soon as possible. The American people have waited long enough. We don't need to waste their time with frivolous or political amendments and delay. We don't need to take months on a task that can be done in a couple of weeks. If the bill is on my desk in weeks, I will only take a minute to sign it, and then the American people will begin to have the tools they need to solve so many of their problems.

This has been a good year for us in this country. Our deficit is going down, and our economy is going up. Twice as many private sector jobs have come into this economy in the last 14 months than in the previous 4 years. After 7 years of gridlock, the Brady bill became the Brady law and is already working to stop felons and fugitives from purchasing handguns. And I'm proud that it was passed with the help of America's law enforcement officers.

But everything that we are trying to do to move this country forward and to bring this country together will be undermined unless we can give the American people a great-

er sense that they are secure in their homes, on their streets, and in their schools. The number of murders has tripled since 1960; so has the number of crimes per uniformed police officer. Death by gunfire will soon surpass death by car accidents. Almost a third of all of our families have had someone victimized by crime. Today, one in 20 American children carry a weapon to school, and over 150,000 stay home every day because they're afraid of what might happen to them in school.

We know the crime bill cannot solve all these problems. We know many of them will have to be solved by those people who are here today in uniform and people like them and the friends and neighbors they have, like Mrs. Williams. We know that. We know that unless there are young people like Eddie and his friends who are willing to work and be role models themselves and make something of their own lives, that everything we do here in Washington will be limited. But we know, too, that we have to take the lead, we have to take the initiative, and that we can give people like these people the tools they need to seize control of their lives and make their communities safer and better places to learn, to work, and to grow.

The crime bill provides funding for another 100,000 police officers over 5 years for community policing because it works. It will make a difference. You already heard what Officer Williams said about 12 officers in Albany, Georgia. The mayor of Houston put 655 more police officers on the beat. In 15 months, crime dropped 22 percent; murders went down 27 percent.

This can be done everywhere. This bill with community policing will help the police officers of our country not only to catch more criminals and put them behind bars but to reduce crime and to connect with more young people before it's too late. I was very moved by what Eddie said about his attitude about the police, because of the work of these two fine police officers. We know that crime can be reduced and that lives can be enhanced. So as the Attorney General said, policing is a big part of this crime bill.

If Congress passes the bill soon to give the American people more police officers, I'll make this commitment to you: I'll cut

through the bureaucracy and the redtape in Washington so that within a year, 20,000 of these new officers will actually be hired and trained and working to make our streets safer. If they'll send me the bill, we'll cut the redtape. No more politics in Congress; no more redtape in the bureaucracy. Let's give the police to the American people, and let's do it this year.

The second thing this bill is about is punishment. And I want to emphasize, if I might, three things. There's been a great deal of debate and much honest disagreement about whether we ought to have some sort of "Three strikes and you're out" bill. I would like to make two points about that, as someone who started my public career as a State attorney general almost two decades ago now. First of all, an overwhelming percentage of the really serious violent crimes are committed by a relatively few people. Even a small percentage of the criminals in our country commit an overwhelming percentage of the really serious violent crimes. Secondly, this law is designed to be directed, if it's properly drawn, against a narrow class of people, those who do not commit crimes for which it's already "One strike and you're out." Keep in mind, many of our crimes today can get you a life sentence or a very long sentence just by doing it one time. But there are people that are clearly and demonstrably highly likely to take life or to commit serious, horrible crimes—we know them by their profiles—who do things which clearly indicate this, and still they can wind up being paroled after relatively modest sentences.

This bill is designed, if properly drawn—and the Attorney General has done a fine job of working on the bill that is coming through the House—to be directed against that narrow class of people. I do think those folks, you can say, "If you do this three times, we do not think you should be paroled." And I believe it will enable us, for those who think this is too harsh, to create more enlightened attitudes about other people who may be put in prison for too long a period of time or who may need alternative rehabilitation strategies. But these police officers are out there putting their lives on the line, oftentimes in the face of people who are back on the street

that they know are highly likely to do something that is life-threatening.

So respectfully, I dispute those who believe that we can't have a "Three strikes and you're out" law that is good, that is properly drawn, and that makes a difference. We shouldn't let a small percentage of even the criminal population terrorize the country if we can find a way to stop it. And this is our best effort.

The second point I want to make is that this bill does some other things about punishment, too. This bill encourages States and localities to find alternative punishments for first-time, nonviolent offenders, for young people, boot camps or other kinds of community-based programs which may reconnect people to their communities before it is too late and which will give them a chance not only to be punished but to learn something while they're doing their respective sentences. So this is a smart punishment bill.

The third thing this bill is about is prevention. We know these programs work, too, especially for young people. And I want to say a special word of thanks here to the Attorney General. When I appointed her, I wanted someone who had actual experience on the front lines fighting crime and who understood that you have to be both tough and smart. And her relentless, constant, compassionate but tough-minded advocacy for a sensible prevention strategy is critical to the fact that we now have about a billion dollars in this plan for jobs for young people in high crime neighborhoods and recreation programs and summer programs and opportunities for young people to bond with caring, concerned adults who care about their future. I thank her for that. And that's a very important part of this bill. It will make a huge difference to young people of America.

A big part of that is making the schools safe and drug-free and free of violence again. If our children can't be safe in school and going to and from school, they're going to have a very hard time. After all, a lot of the young people most at risk of being victims of crime, as well as at risk of becoming criminals at a young age, live in communities very different from those that most of us grew up in, communities where the family structure has been weakened, communities where

other organizations are weaker than they once were, and communities in which there is almost no work for people to do. When you take work and community and family out of a neighborhood, you create an awful vacuum in which only bad things, only bad things, can occur unless someone moves in to fill the vacuum.

Our schools are trying. But we are asking them to do in many of our communities today, we are asking them to do things that no one ever thought the schools could do alone. And we have got to continue to support them through these safe school initiatives and the other prevention plans. So that's what we're trying to do in this crime bill: more police, more punishment, more prevention.

In this time of budgetary constraints, the very idea that we're about to pass a program that will involve over \$20 billion in new money is an astonishing thing. It's a lot more money for State and local initiatives, but we have to do it. And I am proud of the fact that it is going to be paid for, not with a tax increase but with the phase-down of the Federal Government. We are reducing over a 5-year period the size of the Federal bureaucracy by about 250,000 people. And all the savings are going to go on into a trust fund to pay for this crime bill, so that at the end of 5 years we will have a Federal Government that is small as it was when President Kennedy was in office. And the money saved from that downsizing will be giving our communities a chance to give our kids a future and our people a chance to be safe on the streets. I think that's a pretty good switch, and I appreciate the initiative in doing it.

Let me say again in closing, there is not a moment to lose. People are trying everywhere to do something about this, and everywhere they are being frustrated. The case of the Chicago Housing Authority has been in the news because just a few days ago, a Federal district court declared that the housing authority's own policy of sweeping their units for guns, for ineligible people living there, and for drugs was unconstitutional. As soon as I heard about that, I asked the Attorney General and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros, to develop another policy that is constitutional and

effective, because I have been to the Chicago housing projects. And I have been in the places where the sweeps occurred and where the housing units were cleaned up and where the people who were living in the housing units were hired to work with the police to ride up in the elevator and walk down the stairs and keep the places clean. And I saw children pouring out of housing units, pouring out, to run up to the head of the Chicago Housing Authority, Vince Lane, as if he were their savior because he simply gave them a safe place to live.

So does this administration want to follow the Constitution of the United States? You bet we do. But I can't believe that we can't find a way to have a constitutional search of places that we know are full of victims of crime because they harbor criminals. We are going to find a way to solve this problem.

Thirteen people died in Chicago violently last weekend, three of them in the Robert Taylor Homes Project. Last night, Secretary Cisneros spent the night in that project, and he called me today from there and we had a conversation about this. He and the Attorney General are working on it. But I say this just to make this point: Those folks living out there in that housing project, most of them are not criminals, most of them are good people. They obey the law; they're doing the best they can to raise their children. They deserve our best and our quickest efforts.

So I say to you again in closing, I thank you for coming here, but we know we're all preaching to the saved today. Tomorrow when the Congress comes back, there are many other things that will claim their attention. I will ask them to think about many other things. You must say, "Pass the crime bill now."

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:36 p.m. at the Department of Justice. In his remarks, he referred to Ernest Williams, veteran police lieutenant, Albany, GA; Earline Williams, longtime volunteer for Trenton, NJ, police department; and Eddie Cutanda, 15-year-old beneficiary of Boston, MA, community policing programs.

Remarks at the Thomas Jefferson Dinner

April 11, 1994

Ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention, please? We thought of how we might best honor Mr. Jefferson on this evening. And I did a little research and discovered that in addition to this being the end of our observation of the 250th anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth, it is also the 200th anniversary of the birth of Edward Everett, who, like Thomas Jefferson and Warren Christopher, served as Secretary of State and whom you will all remember was supposed to be the person who delivered the real Gettysburg Address, at least according to Garry Wills. *[Laughter]* And so I thought I could follow Edward Everett's lead and speak for 2 hours tonight. *[Laughter]* And then I decided I wouldn't do that, that tonight should belong to Thomas Jefferson.

Let me say that any person who is fortunate enough to be Secretary of State or Ambassador to France or Vice President or President feels immediately, in many ways, a great debt to Thomas Jefferson. But in a larger sense, every citizen who ever benefited from the powerful ideas of the Declaration of Independence, the devotion to education embodied in the founding of the University of Virginia, the belief in the first amendment enshrined in the statutes of religious liberty, all of us are in his debt.

Tonight, I ask you to think of only one or two things as we begin this fine evening. Jefferson had the right tensions and balances in his life, and that is why he seems so new to us today. He believed that life had to be driven by fixed principles: life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, but that we all had to be willing to be constantly changing. Life belongs to the living.

He believed that we all had a right to a radical amount of freedom, in return for which we had to assume a dramatic amount of responsibility. He always was trying to accomplish very big things, but the richness and texture of his life, and the reason it seems so relevant to us today, is that he took such great joy in all the little things of daily life. And it was those things that enabled him to

be not just a philosopher and a politician and a lawyer but also an architect and a scientist, a person who enjoyed the large and the small, who believed that life should be driven by eternal principles in constant change, who would gladly have given his life for freedom and who exercised that freedom so responsibly. Oh, if only we could do as well.

On this 200th anniversary of his beginning, at the end of a wonderful year which included, for me and Hillary and our administration, the fact that we got to start our Inaugural at Monticello, let us raise our glasses in a toast not to the memory of Thomas Jefferson but to the vitality of his spirit and his ideas in our own lives and those of our country men and women for all time to come.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:20 p.m. in the Benjamin Franklin Room at the Department of State. In his remarks, he referred to Garry Wills, adjunct professor, Northwestern University.

**Executive Order 12906—
Coordinating Geographic Data
Acquisition and Access: The National
Spatial Data Infrastructure
April 11, 1994**

Geographic information is critical to promote economic development, improve our stewardship of natural resources, and protect the environment. Modern technology now permits improved acquisition, distribution, and utilization of geographic (or geospatial) data and mapping. The National Performance Review has recommended that the executive branch develop, in cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments, and the private sector, a coordinated National Spatial Data Infrastructure to support public and private sector applications of geospatial data in such areas as transportation, community development, agriculture, emergency response, environmental management, and information technology.

Now, Therefore, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America; and to implement the recommendations of the National Performance Review; to advance the goals of the National Information Infrastructure; and to avoid wasteful duplication

of effort and promote effective and economical management of resources by Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. Definitions. (a) “National Spatial Data Infrastructure” (“NSDI”) means the technology, policies, standards, and human resources necessary to acquire, process, store, distribute, and improve utilization of geospatial data.

(b) “Geospatial data” means information that identifies the geographic location and characteristics of natural or constructed features and boundaries on the earth. This information may be derived from, among other things, remote sensing, mapping, and surveying technologies. Statistical data may be included in this definition at the discretion of the collecting agency.

(c) The “National Geospatial Data Clearinghouse” means a distributed network of geospatial data producers, managers, and users linked electronically.

Sec. 2. Executive Branch Leadership for Development of the Coordinated National Spatial Data Infrastructure. (a) The Federal Geographic Data Committee (“FGDC”), established by the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) Circular No. A-16 (“Coordination of Surveying, Mapping, and Related Spatial Data Activities”) and chaired by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior (“Secretary”) or the Secretary’s designee, shall coordinate the Federal Government’s development of the NSDI.

(b) Each member agency shall ensure that its representative on the FGDC holds a policy-level position.

(c) Executive branch departments and agencies (“agencies”) that have an interest in the development of the NSDI are encouraged to join the FGDC.

(d) This Executive order is intended to strengthen and enhance the general policies described in OMB Circular No. A-16. Each agency shall meet its respective responsibilities under OMB Circular No. A-16.

(e) The FGDC shall seek to involve State, local, and tribal governments in the development and implementation of the initiatives contained in this order. The FGDC shall utilize the expertise of academia, the private sector, professional societies, and others as

necessary to aid in the development and implementation of the objectives of this order.

Sec. 3. Development of a National Geospatial Data Clearinghouse. (a) *Establishing a National Geospatial Data Clearinghouse.* The Secretary, through the FGDC, and in consultation with, as appropriate, State, local, and tribal governments and other affected parties, shall take steps within 6 months of the date of this order, to establish an electronic National Geospatial Data Clearinghouse ("Clearinghouse") for the NSDI. The Clearinghouse shall be compatible with the National Information Infrastructure to enable integration with that effort.

(b) *Standardized Documentation of Data.* Beginning 9 months from the date of this order, each agency shall document all new geospatial data it collects or produces, either directly or indirectly, using the standard under development by the FGDC, and make that standardized documentation electronically accessible to the Clearinghouse network. Within 1 year of the date of this order, agencies shall adopt a schedule, developed in consultation with the FGDC, for documenting, to the extent practicable, geospatial data previously collected or produced, either directly or indirectly, and making that data documentation electronically accessible to the Clearinghouse network.

(c) *Public Access to Geospatial Data.* Within 1 year of the date of this order, each agency shall adopt a plan, in consultation with the FGDC, establishing procedures to make geospatial data available to the public, to the extent permitted by law, current policies, and relevant OMB circulars, including OMB Circular No. A-130 ("Management of Federal Information Resources") and any implementing bulletins.

(d) *Agency Utilization of the Clearinghouse.* Within 1 year of the date of this order, each agency shall adopt internal procedures to ensure that the agency accesses the Clearinghouse before it expends Federal funds to collect or produce new geospatial data, to determine whether the information has already been collected by others, or whether cooperative efforts to obtain the data are possible.

(e) *Funding.* The Department of the Interior shall provide funding for the Clearing-

house to cover the initial prototype testing, standards development, and monitoring of the performance of the Clearinghouse. Agencies shall continue to fund their respective programs that collect and produce geospatial data; such data is then to be made part of the Clearinghouse for wider accessibility.

Sec. 4. Data Standards Activities. (a) *General FGDC Responsibility.* The FGDC shall develop standards for implementing the NSDI, in consultation and cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments, the private and academic sectors, and, to the extent feasible, the international community, consistent with OMB Circular No. A-119 ("Federal Participation in the Development and Use of Voluntary Standards"), and other applicable law and policies.

(b) *Standards for Which Agencies Have Specific Responsibilities.* Agencies assigned responsibilities for data categories by OMB Circular No. A-16 shall develop, through the FGDC, standards for those data categories, so as to ensure that the data produced by all agencies are compatible.

(c) *Other Standards.* The FGDC may from time to time identify and develop, through its member agencies, and to the extent permitted by law, other standards necessary to achieve the objectives of this order. The FGDC will promote the use of such standards and, as appropriate, such standards shall be submitted to the Department of Commerce for consideration as Federal Information Processing Standards. Those standards shall apply to geospatial data as defined in section 1 of this order.

(d) *Agency Adherence to Standards.* Federal agencies collecting or producing geospatial data, either directly or indirectly (e.g. through grants, partnerships, or contracts with other entities), shall ensure, prior to obligating funds for such activities, that data will be collected in a manner that meets all relevant standards adopted through the FGDC process.

Sec. 5. National Digital Geospatial Data Framework. In consultation with State, local, and tribal governments and within 9 months of the date of this order, the FGDC shall submit a plan and schedule to OMB for completing the initial implementation of a national digital geospatial data framework

("framework") by January 2000 and for establishing a process of ongoing data maintenance. The framework shall include geospatial data that are significant, in the determination of the FGDC, to a broad variety of users within any geographic area or nationwide. At a minimum, the plan shall address how the initial transportation, hydrology, and boundary elements of the framework might be completed by January 1998 in order to support the decennial census of 2000.

Sec. 6. Partnerships for Data Acquisition. The Secretary, under the auspices of the FGDC, and within 9 months of the date of this order, shall develop, to the extent permitted by law, strategies for maximizing cooperative participatory efforts with State, local, and tribal governments, the private sector, and other nonfederal organizations to share costs and improve efficiencies of acquiring geospatial data consistent with this order.

Sec. 7. Scope. (a) For the purposes of this order, the term "agency" shall have the same meaning as the term "Executive agency" in 5 U.S.C. 105, and shall include the military departments and components of the Department of Defense.

(b) The following activities are exempt from compliance with this order:

- (i) national security-related activities of the Department of Defense as determined by the Secretary of Defense;
- (ii) national defense-related activities of the Department of Energy as determined by the Secretary of Energy; and
- (iii) intelligence activities as determined by the Director of Central Intelligence.

(c) The NSDI may involve the mapping, charting, and geodesy activities of the Department of Defense relating to foreign areas, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(d) This order does not impose any requirements on tribal governments.

(e) Nothing in the order shall be construed to contravene the development of Federal Information Processing Standards and Guidelines adopted and promulgated under the provisions of section 111(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services

Act of 1949, as amended by the Computer Security Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-235), or any other United States law, regulation, or international agreement.

Sec. 8. Judicial Review. This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and is not intended to, and does not, create any right to administrative or judicial review, or any other right or benefit or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 11, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:32 a.m., April 12, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on April 13.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Rhinoceros and Tiger Trade by China and Taiwan

April 11, 1994

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

On November 8, 1993, I reported pursuant to section 8(b) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (Pelly Amendment) (22 U.S.C. 1978(b)), on the issue of ongoing illegal trade by the People's Republic of China (PRC) and Taiwan in rhinoceros and tiger parts and products. My report followed the certification by the Secretary of the Interior on September 7, 1993, that this trade was diminishing the effectiveness of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Five rhinoceros species and the tiger are listed in Appendix I of CITES, which means that the species are threatened with extinction and no trade for commercial purposes is allowed. The report suggested actions that the PRC and Taiwan could take that would demonstrate their commitment to the elimination of the trade, and stated that the United States is prepared, through close dialogue and technical aid, to assist them in their efforts. However, the report concluded

that, if measurable, verifiable, and substantial progress were not made by March 1994, import prohibitions will be necessary, as recommended by the CITES Standing Committee. This letter provides an update of the situation since November 1993.

The world's tiger and rhinoceros populations remain gravely endangered and will likely be extinct in the next 2–5 years if the trade in their parts and products, fueled by market demand in consuming countries, is not eliminated. The suggested actions in my November 8 report, based on criteria established by CITES for adequate legislative measures and enforcement in the PRC and Taiwan that effectively eliminates the trade, were further amplified in letters dated December 21, 1993, from the Secretary of the Interior, and by three CITES and U.S. delegation visits to the PRC and Taiwan from November 1993 to March 1994. However, at its most recent meeting last week, the CITES Standing Committee did not revoke its earlier recommendation that parties consider stricter domestic measures up to and including prohibition in trade in wildlife species now against the PRC and Taiwan. The Committee also noted "with satisfaction the progress demonstrated by China" but "that further actions are still needed," and expressed "concern that the actions agreed by the authorities in Taiwan . . . towards meeting the minimum requirements have not yet been implemented." Taking these factors into account, I have made the following assessment and decision for action by the United States.

The PRC has consolidated much of its stocks of rhinoceros and tiger parts and products. The PRC has used radio, television, newspaper, and poster announcements—as well as burnings of rhino horn and tiger bone—to educate its population on new laws and the need to protect wildlife. In addition, large enforcement efforts were made, netting many prosecutions and seizures.

However, more still needs to be done. Both the CITES and U.S. delegations that visited the PRC since November concluded that an investigative unit in addition to existing Ministry of Forestry Police and Public Security Forces would be unnecessary, but that better training in enforcement and

forensics are crucial to effectively eliminate the trade in endangered species in the PRC. In addition, further efforts are needed to develop cooperation on a regional basis. Accordingly I have instructed the Department of the Interior, in coordination with the Departments of State, Justice, and the Treasury (Customs Service), to further explore with the PRC possibilities for U.S. technical and law enforcement assistance.

As a result of the PRC's progress in the key areas identified in my November 8 report, I have decided that import prohibitions are not warranted at this time. At the same time, since progress has not been sufficient to warrant the lifting of the Pelly Amendment certification, the Secretaries of State and the Interior, in consultation with the Departments of Justice and the Treasury (Customs Service), will continue discussions with PRC officials and jointly seek to identify next steps to assure continued progress and opportunities for international cooperation that will help eliminate the trade. I have also directed the Interagency Rhino/Tiger Task Force to continue to monitor progress in the PRC so that a review of the situation and an appropriate response can be made in December 1994.

Because Taiwan's constitutional provisions are understood to prevent the consolidation of stocks of tiger and rhinoceros parts and products, Taiwan made an effort to identify, register, and mark these stocks on a voluntary basis. However, this effort has only located one-third of the stocks voluntarily registered in a 1990 initiative. Draft amendments to Taiwan's Wildlife Conservation Law making registration of stocks mandatory and enforceable—including limited penalties for non-compliance—were transmitted to Taiwan's legislative body, but have not yet been enacted. An investigative unit was recently funded and equipped, and training sessions have been held for the relevant officers on part-time assignment. These units have made some arrests of people caught selling rhinoceros and tiger parts. However, prosecutions resulting from enforcement actions have been limited by concerns regarding the use of undercover investigations.

The most pressing outstanding action is final enactment of adequate amendments to

Taiwan's Wildlife Conservation Law. It is not yet clear whether the current proposed amendments will satisfactorily address the illegal trade in wildlife specimens and products. Furthermore while enacting amendments is necessary, such enactments alone are not sufficient. Enforcement efforts must effectively accomplish major reductions in the illegal trade in endangered species. Accordingly I instructed the Department of the Interior, in coordination with the Departments of State, Justice, and the Treasury (Customs Service) and the American Institute in Taiwan, to continue to explore with Taiwan possible U.S. technical and law enforcement assistance. I have also directed the Interagency Rhino/Tiger Task Force to continue to monitor progress in Taiwan so that a review of the situation and an appropriate response can be made in December 1994.

As a result of Taiwan's lack of progress in the key areas identified in my November 8 report, I have decided to follow the recommendation of the CITES Standing Committee and direct that imports of wildlife specimens and products from Taiwan be prohibited, in accordance with appropriate public notice and comment procedures. While the Pelly Amendment provides the authority to impose a greater level of import prohibitions, I believe that this level is appropriate at this time. Depending on future progress, these import prohibitions could be adjusted as appropriate. The enactment of adequate legislation coupled with enforcement actions that result in reductions in the illegal trade in rhinoceros and tiger parts would be grounds for an immediate reconsideration of the decision.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

Statement on Trade Sanctions Against Taiwan *April 11, 1994*

This is the first time any country has acted on the international call for trade sanctions to protect endangered species, but if the ille-

gal trade in rhinos and tigers is not eliminated, these species could be extinct in 5 years. This administration recognizes that threats to endangered species are of critical importance. The world must know that the United States will take strong actions to protect the Earth's natural heritage.

NOTE: The President's statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary on the sanctions.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to Meeting With Congressional Leaders

April 12, 1994

Legislative Agenda

The President. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the press. This is our first bipartisan leadership meeting on the resumption of the Congress, and we have a lot of things to discuss today.

I want to begin with a discussion of the crime bill and the importance of proceeding deliberately and quickly to pass it; to reiterate my commitment yesterday that we will do whatever we can to get the first 20,000 police officers on the streets this year if the crime bill is passed in an expeditious fashion. Then we'll move on to some other issues where I hope we can have a good bipartisan discussion in support of domestic issues like the budget and health care, and also we'll talk a little about Bosnia today and some other foreign policy issues.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, do you have some concern—there's more shelling today. I mean, there's some suspicion that the Muslims may be trying to provoke the Serbs. Have we started something with air strikes that will make matters worse rather than better?

The President. We certainly haven't started anything. We have done exactly what we said we would do under the U.N. policy, that if the U.N. forces there were put at risk, as they were in the shelling of Gorazde, we would offer close air support if the General asked and the civilian authorities agreed. We went through all the procedural require-

ments, and we did exactly what I think we should have done.

Q. Well, the Serbian—

Q. What about—

The President. We have talked—let me answer Andrea's [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News] question—we have cautioned the Bosnian Government forces not to try to take advantage of this in violation of the understandings themselves. And General Rose has been very firm on that this morning.

Q. Are you considering expanding this to other safe havens if the Serbs persist and don't get the message?

The President. Well, I wouldn't rule anything out. We're working very closely with General Rose, and he's got a very aggressive view of his role there, which I think is good.

Q. The Serbian leader has threatened against the U.N. forces. They've kidnaped some. They're holding some in house arrest. They've escalated the military action.

The President. Well, every time we have been firm, though, in the end it's been a winner for the peace process. And I think it will be here. And I'm very encouraged by the position taken by the Russians, that they want the Serbs to withdraw from the safe area in Gorazde, and they want to return to the negotiating table.

Before this last incident, I thought we were getting pretty close to—not just to a cease-fire but to an absolute cessation of hostilities and a real serious bargaining position so we could get back there in a hurry, and I wish the Russians well in working with the Serbs. I've assured President Yeltsin that we have no interest in using NATO's air power to affect the outcome of the war. But we do want to protect the U.N. mandate. And we do want a negotiation, and I think we're going to get one.

Q. Have you seen or heard anything from the Serbs that would indicate a response to the air strike, sir?

The President. I don't know how to answer that, Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio]. The Russians—Mr. Churkin is over there now, and we're working on trying to get this thing back on track, and I hope we can do it. But we have to be firm in our reaction to the plain violations of the United

Nations resolutions and in what we set our policy to do.

The good thing that we've seen since the terrible incident in Sarajevo in the market is that both the U.N. and NATO have been able to follow what they said their policy would be all along, and I think that's what we have to do. We have to be firm in pursuing the policy that we say we have. It's our only chance of success.

Supreme Court Nomination

Q. Will it be more difficult to—[inaudible]—your domestic agenda with George Mitchell nominated to the—will it be harder, once he's nominated?

Q. Do you have the name of a Supreme Court Justice on your left?

The President. You think the next Supreme Court Justice should be to my left, Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]? [Laughter]

Q. I said is he.

Q. Unless you're considering Mr. Foley.

The President. He'd be a good one.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Reception for Representatives of Nonprofit Organizations

April 12, 1994

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, Secretary Shalala, Secretary Cisneros, and the many other people in our administration who are here who have long supported the nonprofit sector of this country and worked in it.

I suppose no one qualifies in that regard more than the First Lady. Since I first met her, I've seen Hillary serve on children's advocacy boards, legal services boards, hospital boards, foundation boards. I was counting outside; I haven't checked with her, but I know that she's helped to form three nonprofit organizations and been associated with at least a dozen others. I appreciate the fact that she found a little time for me over the years. [Laughter]

I say that because I have learned, not only as a Governor and a public official and now as President but also in my own family, the incredible importance of the work that all of you do and those whom you represent.

When I ran for President, I said as clearly as I could that I thought the National Government had a responsibility to do many things that we were not then doing but that there were many things we could not do and that in the absence of a partnership with people in community organizations all across this country, we would surely never become the Nation we ought to be.

I'd like to make a few remarks about that, but I think it is appropriate, since we're talking about citizenship in its best form, that I also make a couple of comments at the outset about a subject very much in the press today.

Since Justice Blackmun announced his retirement last week, I have been working to find an able replacement. Last night, Senator George Mitchell, who was my leading candidate for the Court, came to see me and asked me what I wanted him to do. And I said, "Well, I want to talk to you about it. I'd like to appoint you to the Supreme Court if you think we can do our work here for the country this year in pursuing health care reform and the other things we have to do."

And he looked at me and said, "You know, I've always wanted to be on the Supreme Court, and no one can predict what it would be like if I were nominated and then confirmed, while sitting in the Senate and leading this fight, what the impact would be. I have thought of all the ways we could do it and all the various scenarios, and I'm only sure of one thing: I cannot imagine that the impact would be good in terms of our ability to pass health care, welfare reform, or any of the other things we want to do." But his special concern was with regard to health care reform. And so he said, "I believe I should stay in the Senate and serve my term out and try to lead this country to health care reform. That's after all, the job I was given, and it's my job until next January, and I'm sorry that the timing is not good, but I think it's the right thing to do."

I said, "Well, why don't we sleep on it and see if we can think of a way to do it?" This

morning early I called him on the phone, and he said, "I still see it the same way." And I said, "Well, I haven't had any thunderbolts of insight about how your analysis is wrong." So he said, "I still think I ought to do not what I want to do, but what I should do." And he seemed as comfortable with that decision as any one that I've ever seen him make. I say that because this country needs more people who devote themselves not only to what they would like to do but what they think the country needs. He has dedicated himself to doing something that, if successful, this health care reform, would be the work of a generation in America. His leadership role is crucial; I value it and I'm grateful for it.

And so, I would like to begin by thanking him on behalf of his country for his willingness to forego a great personal opportunity in anticipation of an enormous struggle with an uncertain result for a goal that is worth the careers of many of us. I thank him very much.

The interesting thing as I look out at this crowd, and I see so many of you whom I've known for so many years, I think of all the struggles that you have been in with an uncertain result, determined to make life better for people in any number of ways.

In 1840, Alexis de Tocqueville said, "If Americans want to proclaim a truth or propagate some feeling by the encouragement of an example, they form an association." Well, today, at the dawn of a new century, we're full of associations. Every now and then I hear from one I don't like all that much. [Laughter] Sometimes I hear from those I like very much things that I wish I didn't have to hear. That is a part of what makes America a special place.

Every item, as I said earlier, of the national agenda I have sought to pursue so vigorously, ultimately depends upon people in their private capacities doing things differently. Much of what I try to do here is designed to empower people to live up to the fullest of their own capacities and to face their problems in their own ways most effectively.

Whether that's true in health care reform or education reform or crime prevention or using national service through the sterling work that Eli Segal has done to permit peo-

ple to solve their problems at the grassroots level, you can see it in every initiative. The whole notion that the Government has to empower people to take control of their own lives depends upon the ability of people to organize effectively, to lobby their Government, to influence our policies, and also to tell us what they know is the truth.

Just today we received what I have seen year after year is one of the best examples of that kind of action with the release of yet another report from the Carnegie Corporation, and this one I think is one of the best that I have ever read on how we can better meet the needs of our youngest children. This report is nearly 3 years in the making, and I think now, it's fair to say, is the most comprehensive analysis of the condition of American children aged 0 to 3. It awakens us to the fact that millions of our infants and toddlers are living in shameful conditions, but also and even more importantly, offers a coherent set of solutions about what we ought to do about it.

In an attempt to be a better partner with all of you in what you are doing, we are establishing today a non-profit liaison network of 26 different liaisons in every important Government Department and agency to work with all of you to emphasize in an organized way how much we value your good work, your input into our policies, your advocacies of things that still need to be done.

One of the most important things in this complicated age of zillions of problems is that I identify what it is as President I can do and what it is I need someone else's help to do; of all the things that we can spend our time on here in the White House and in this Government, which things are most important and which things will spark the largest release of energy in a positive and constructive way around the country. You have to help us make that decision for, in truth, that's a decision that we make anew here constantly as we deal with the difficulties as well as the opportunities that come to this place.

I hope this is the beginning of an even better partnership. I thank you very, very much for what you do, and I want to say again, I cannot succeed as President unless you succeed and unless you succeed in mobi-

lizing millions of our countrymen and women for the important tasks that face us. I honestly believe that we may be at the dawn of a new American renaissance—a period when we are able to face, with greater energy and greater hope and a greater sense of community and common purpose, the challenges before us than has been the case in a generation.

If we do it, we will make the beginning of the 21st century the most exciting time in American history to be young, to grow, to come to maturity, and to make a life. If we don't, we will have squandered a great legacy. The only way we can do it is if somehow there is a role for all of us, not just those of us in high office. You provide that role for all of us, and I will do my best to help you play it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:56 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Statement on the Nonprofit Liaison Network

April 12, 1994

I have long advocated the role of the nonprofit sector. Throughout our history, the nonprofit community has helped our Nation adapt to a changing world by strengthening the core values that shape American life. Today, that role has never been more important. The nonprofit liaison network will create better collaboration between the administration and advocacy and service groups in a mutual effort to solve the problems of crime, housing, health care, and other pressing national needs.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House press release announcing the nonprofit liaison network.

Remarks at the Radio and Television Correspondents Dinner

April 12, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Lockman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. I cannot tell you how happy I am to be here tonight on the 50th anniversary

of the TV dinner. I was a little disappointed that the entree wasn't Salisbury steak or chicken pot pie. [Laughter] But I really am delighted to be here. If you believe that, I've got some land in northwest Arkansas I'd like to show you. [Laughter]

I want to congratulate you on 50 years of TV and radio coverage of our national politics, 50 dinners, all the way back to 1945. I thank you for letting us know that Helen Thomas was at the first one. [Laughter] I don't know if she thanks you for letting us know that. But tonight I want to play the journalist. I'd like to ask you, Helen: After 50 of these dinners, why? Why? [Laughter] I love Helen Thomas. How would you like to start every morning jogging with Helen in your ear? The other day, after we had the incident in Bosnia, she said to me as I was running, trying to wake up, fighting off the allergies of the springtime, "Yeltsin's mad at you." [Laughter]

Well, anyway, I'm delighted to be here with you, Brian, and I appreciate your inviting Garrison Keillor to join us this evening, because, as he described in the fabled Lake Wobegon, we also like to think that all the kids who work at the White House are slightly above average. [Laughter]

I'm really glad to see, also, that in spite of the dominance of C-SPAN, that Cokie Roberts is sitting with us tonight at the head table. At least it looks like the head table. Actually, I know it's the head table; Rick Kaplan told me it was. [Laughter]

You know, since this is your 50th dinner, we should acknowledge that over these last 50 years, radio and television has witnessed some of the greatest moments in American political history. And if you believe that, I've got some land in northwest Arkansas I'd like to sell you. [Laughter] But just think of the highlights you've seen.

Remember this: Your impact actually goes back before your 50 dinners, going back to radio, in 1922, when President Warren Harding utters the first words ever spoken by a President on the radio, "Gergen, come here. I need you." [Laughter] And your association's first year, 1944, Franklin Roosevelt delivers more of his fireside chats over the radio. It's not much different today, except

today you insist that the President sit directly on the logs. [Laughter]

Following a reliable source, just hours after the polls closed in 1948, network news airs the very first televised interview with President-elect Thomas Dewey. In 1952, Eisenhower says he will go to Korea, and the first question from the press is about the seating arrangements on the plane. [Laughter] In 1960, researchers discover that people who watched the Kennedy-Nixon debate on television thought Kennedy won. People who listened to the debate on radio thought, "When in the hell am I going to get a television?" [Laughter]

In 1972, Democratic Presidential candidate George McGovern concedes a 49-State, 23-point landslide election. The press demands to see records of his losses. [Laughter] In 1974, two crusading young journalists take on a President for abuse of office. And to this very day, Evans and Novak still have not forgiven Richard Nixon for price controls. [Laughter]

In 1981, Dan Rather replaces Walter Cronkite. Soon after, an impressionable Jim Leach purchases his first sweater. [Laughter] In 1982, the introduction of the first Saturday morning political cartoon, "The McLaughlin Group." [Laughter] In 1988, a well-meaning network news producer whispers in the ear of a Dukakis advance person, "Why use a Jeep when you can put him in a tank?" [Laughter]

In 1994, Senator George Mitchell goes live on CNN to withdraw his name from consideration for the United States Supreme Court, fueling speculation that he would rather argue with George Steinbrenner than Justice Scalia. [Laughter]

I can only imagine how wonderful your future will be when there are 500 channels to fill all the airwaves. [Laughter] Anyway, you do have a proud history.

Now, my history with you is another matter altogether. [Laughter] Some say my relations with the press have been marked by self-pity. I like to think of it as the outer limits of my empathy. I feel my pain. [Laughter] People say to me, "Remember Harry Truman, 'If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.'" It's the only room in the house I never want to leave. [Laughter] In fact, I've

been trying to get Kathleen Sullivan interested in Whitewater.

I think history, actually, in spite what all of you think, I think history will show I had a very good relationship with the press. And if it doesn't, I'll complain like hell to the historians.

I do want to say something about my strong views on the question of privacy: They're none of your business. *[Laughter]*

I do think you're entitled some inside information tonight, however. After the dinner—we had this wonderful dinner—Hillary consulted with Speaker Foley about the spawning prospects in Washington, and she has recommended that all of you purchase salmon futures tomorrow. *[Laughter]*

I do want to remind you of one thing. It's 3 days before April 15th, and most of you have spent a lot more time on my taxes than your own. *[Laughter]* Many happy returns. *[Laughter]*

I do want to complain that, amid all this disgusting media frenzy, the many terribly important accomplishments of this administration have gone unnoticed or grossly underreported. For example, just since I have been your President, the United States Government has raised \$21 million in back taxes from people with nannies. *[Laughter]* And we're not even through with audits in the West Wing yet. *[Laughter]* Consider this, millions of Americans now feel better about how they look in jogging shorts. *[Laughter]* And there is a hugely increased awareness of the information superhighway. Today, 72 percent of all Americans are in favor of it, provided the rest stops are clean. *[Laughter]* Not only does our administration look more like America, it changes jobs at the same rate other Americans do. *[Laughter]* We have the first administration to have the same senior adviser make the cover of both Time magazine and Teen Beat. *[Laughter]* We've got the first smoke-free back room in American political history. And my Vice President has made enormous strides in his first and most daunting assignment, reinventing Al Gore. *[Laughter]*

We've created 2.3 million new jobs, almost 50 percent of them in the health insurance lobby. *[Laughter]* You can see more things like this in the years to come. This adminis-

tration doesn't know the meaning of the word "surrender." We don't know the meaning of the word "timidity." And with such limited vocabulary and self-awareness, I think we've done right well. *[Laughter]*

I was asked tonight before I left for this august dinner, "Why do you keep going to these things? They still keep beating your brains out." And I said, "Because I still believe in a place called 'Help.'" *[Laughter]* I also came because I love radio and TV. I've been called the first President to grow up in the television age. I guess that's true. We got our first TV when I was 9 or 10. Before that, I listened to the radio, doing my homework to baseball games. Then I saw the radio news. I got our television in time to watch the '56 Democratic and Republican Conventions from gavel to gavel. I've watched the debates, the election returns, all the news since then. The fact is, the electronic media has changed my life and changed how we all see the world and how the world sees us.

The media's changed, too. You have more information and more programs and more channels, more competition and more time to fill than ever before. Last night, we celebrated the last day of the year celebrating the 250th birthday of Thomas Jefferson, the man whom all of you know said if he had to choose between a Government without a press or the press without Government, he would unhesitatingly choose the latter. I might point out that he said that before he became President of the United States. *[Laughter]*

But if you think about what Jefferson and the other Founders did, they had this uncanny sense of what it would take to preserve a republic, a democracy: To permit government enough power so that its exercise could keep us together and moving forward, but to limit its abuse and to keep it accountable to the people. The power was limited by the Bill of Rights and divided—executive, legislative, and judicial; national, State, and local—in a brilliant way.

And if you think about the fabric of our national life, there are only two places where power is arguably unaccountable: one, in the Supreme Court and its lower courts, where people have lifetime appointments, where they have a limited unaccountable power be-

cause there are some great questions on which someone must have the final say in order to permit us to go on with our lives; and the second, in the area of the press, because there is no practical way to limit the free expression of ideas and opinions, painful though those of us in authority might find them from time to time.

Mr. Jefferson understood so long ago these things that carry us through to the present day. But I must say tonight as we come here, Hillary and I, to pay tribute to you in this business, your business is more difficult, more challenging, more daunting than ever before. And the burden of carrying the responsibility that goes with that sort of unlimited freedom is greater than ever before. I appreciate it, and I'm glad, at least on occasion, we all have the chance to laugh together about our common efforts to advance the common good.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:30 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Brian Lockman, Radio and Television Correspondents Association; correspondents Helen Thomas, United Press International, and Cokie Roberts, ABC News; humorist Garrison Keillor; Rick Kaplan, executive producer, "ABC World News Tonight"; and journalist Kathleen Sullivan.

Proclamation 6667—National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week, 1994

April 12, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In an emergency, most Americans depend on 9-1-1. Each day, more than half a million public safety communicators answer desperate calls for help, responding with services that save the lives and property of American citizens in need of assistance.

These dedicated men and women are more than anonymous voices on the telephone line. They are local police, fire, and medical professionals who use public safety

telecommunications to quickly respond to emergency calls. They are also Federal public safety officials who use telecommunications for everything from drug interdiction to protecting forests to promoting conservation. We rely on their knowledge and professionalism as they make critical decisions, obtain information, and quickly dispatch needed aid.

America's public safety telecommunicators serve our citizens daily in countless ways. The work of these "unseen first responders" is invaluable in emergency situations, and each of these dedicated men and women deserves our heartfelt appreciation. Americans place their trust in these individuals, not just this week, but every day of the year. This week is a time for a grateful Nation to show its appreciation and to recognize that our health, safety, and well-being are often dependent on the commitment and steadfast devotion of public safety telecommunicators.

The Congress, by Public Law 103-221, has designated the week beginning April 11, 1994, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of April 11, 1994, as National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week. I urge all Americans to observe this week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, activities, and appreciation for these outstanding individuals.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:05 a.m., April 13, 1994]

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

Message to the Congress on Angola
April 12, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since September 26, 1993, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order No. 12865 of that date. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to Angola, invoking the authority, *inter alia*, of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibits the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibits such sale or supply to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"). United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance, of the stated prohibitions. The order authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against UNITA.

A copy of the Regulations is attached for reference.

The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft relating to transportation to Angola or to UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has initially designated the following points of entry as points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: Airports: Luanda, and Katumbela, Benguela Province; Ports: Luanda, Lobito, Benguela Province, and Namibe, Namibe Province; and Entry Points: Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

2. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from September 26, 1993, through March 25, 1994, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to UNITA are reported at about \$85,000, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the FAC, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel) and

the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs and the Office of the Legal Adviser).

I shall continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 12, 1994.

Message to Congress on the Panama Canal Commission

April 12, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 3522 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 22 U.S.C. 3611 note), I transmit herewith the recommendations for changes to the Panama Canal Commission. I have determined that the adoption of these recommendations would facilitate and encourage the operation of the Canal through an autonomous entity under the Government of Panama after the transfer of the waterway on December 31, 1999, pursuant to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements.

In accordance with the law cited above, an extensive study of the governance and financial management structure of the Panama Canal Commission was conducted. The study and its recommendations were then considered and discussed among representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Treasury, Commerce, Transportation, and Justice, as well as the Panama Canal Commission. The study, and the process that followed it, formed the basis for my recommendations, which are contained in the attached document.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 12, 1994.

Nomination for Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation

April 12, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Dr. Anne C. Petersen as

Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation. She will be the first woman to serve in one of the two top management posts at the Foundation in its 44-year history.

"I am pleased today to name a leading scientist and administrator to our experienced team of science and technology leaders," the President said. "Anne Petersen has impeccable scientific standing as a social scientist with strong research capabilities in mathematics and statistics. She also is an outstanding administrator with a significant track record as a dean at two major universities, Penn State and the University of Minnesota."

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

Nomination for an Associate Judge on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia

April 12, 1994

The President has nominated Rhonda Reid Winston to serve on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

"Rhonda Winston's solid legal background and dedication to justice will be a great asset to the DC Superior Court and the Nation's Capital," the President said.

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

Nomination for U.S. Attorney for Alabama

April 12, 1994

The President today nominated Redding Pitt, a veteran of the Alabama attorney general's office, to be U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of Alabama.

"Redding Pitt's extensive experience in the field of law and his knowledge of Alabama will make an inestimable contribution to the State and to the country's judicial system," the President said.

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

Nomination for U.S. Attorney for Delaware

April 12, 1994

The President today nominated Gregory Moneta Sleet as the U.S. Attorney for the District of Delaware.

"Gregory Moneta Sleet's extensive legal background and experience in the State of Delaware make him an excellent choice for this most important judicial position," the President said.

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

Nomination for U.S. Attorney for New Jersey

April 12, 1994

The President today nominated Faith S. Hochberg as the U.S. Attorney for the District of New Jersey.

"Faith Hochberg's legal skills and dedication to law enforcement make her an excellent candidate for this position and will serve the State of New Jersey well," the President said.

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

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Evacuations From Rwanda and Burundi

April 12, 1994

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

On April 6, 1994, the private plane of Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana crashed under suspicious circumstances on approach to Rwanda's capital, Kigali, killing the President and others, including the President of neighboring Burundi. Following the crash, some members of the Rwandan military began killing opposition leaders and civilians. General fighting broke out, including fighting between government forces and forces of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RFP), encamped in Kigali under a peace agreement. As violence in the capital escalated, the State Department ordered the departure

of U.S. Government employees and dependents. Combat-equipped U.S. military forces began deploying to Burundi to be in a position to conduct possible noncombatant evacuation operations of U.S. citizens and designated third-country nationals.

During April 9-10, 275 Marines were airlifted via C-130 aircraft to Bujumbura, Burundi. (A total of 328 U.S. Armed Forces personnel deployed to Burundi, including aircrews.) Their mission was to be in position to link up with American citizens moving from Rwanda to Burundi via overland convoy and to be prepared to proceed to the Rwandan capital of Kigali to assist with their departure, if necessary. On April 9-10, American citizens proceeded to leave Rwanda by several overland convoys to Bujumbura and by other routes. Approximately 240 U.S. citizens were evacuated from Rwanda. Most were then flown by U.S. C-141 aircraft to Nairobi, Kenya. Approximately 21 citizens chose to remain in Rwanda for various reasons. It did not become necessary for U.S. forces to enter Rwanda. (United States C-5 aircraft also airlifted Belgian military forces and equipment into Nairobi to assist Belgian efforts in support of their citizens.)

I am pleased to report that these operations were successful, that no hostilities were encountered, and that no casualties were suffered by U.S. forces in this operation.

I took these actions pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations and as Commander in Chief. I am providing this information as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. I appreciate the support of the Congress for these actions to protect American citizens.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 13.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders on
Protection of United Nations
Personnel in Bosnia-Herzegovina**
April 12, 1994

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

One year ago, I provided you with my initial report on the deployment of U.S. combat-equipped aircraft to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) enforcement of the no-fly zone in Bosnia-Herzegovina. I provided you with follow-on reports on October 13, 1993, February 17, 1994, and March 1, 1994. I am reporting today on the use of U.S. combat-equipped aircraft on April 10-11 to provide protection for U.N. personnel who came under attack in Gorazde, Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Since the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 713 on September 25, 1991, the United Nations has actively sought solutions to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Under Security Council Resolution 824 (May 6, 1993), certain parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina have been established as "safe areas." Gorazde is specifically included as a location that should be treated as a safe area "by all the parties concerned and should be free from armed attacks and from any other hostile acts." In addition, Security Council Resolutions 836 and 844 (June 4 and 18, 1993) authorize Member States, acting nationally or through regional organizations, to use air power in the safe areas to help protect the United Nations Protection Forces (UNPROFOR).

Recent heavy weapons (tank and artillery) fire in the Gorazde area has resulted in a serious threat to the citizens remaining in Gorazde and to UNPROFOR and U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) personnel operating there. On April 10, the city was subjected to sustained Bosnian-Serb tank and artillery fire. The UNPROFOR and UNHCR personnel in Gorazde were placed in great danger. Based on the threat to UNPROFOR, as reported by U.N. observers in the city, the UNPROFOR commander requested the U.N. Special Representative for Bosnia-Herzegovina to authorize close air support (CAS) strikes on the Bosnian-Serb firing positions. The U.N. Special Representative approved the request. Consistent with

approved procedures and rules of engagement, two U.S. aircraft from NATO Allied Force Southern Europe (AFSOUTH) engaged Bosnian-Serb targets after receiving targeting orders from the Commander in Chief, AFSOUTH.

On April 11, 1994, U.N. personnel in Gorazde requested NATO air support after again coming under attack by Bosnian-Serb gunners. United States F/A-18 aircraft from AFSOUTH were successful in neutralizing Bosnian-Serb targets that had been firing on the city.

There were no NATO or U.N. casualties as a result of the operations on April 10 and 11, 1994.

It is my hope that the clear resolve of the United Nations and NATO as shown by these actions will encourage the parties to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia to respect the decisions of the Security Council concerning the protection of U.N. personnel and of the declared safe areas. United States forces will continue to serve as part of this important NATO enforcement effort and will remain prepared to respond to U.N. and NATO requests for further action against those who violate these decisions.

These actions are being taken in Bosnia-Herzegovina in conjunction with our allies to implement the decision of the Security Council and the North Atlantic Council and to assist the parties to reach a negotiated settlement to the conflict. It is not now possible to determine the duration of this operation. I have directed the participation of U.S. Armed Forces in this effort pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

I am providing this report as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. I remain grateful for the continuing support the Congress has provided and I look forward to continued cooperation with you in this endeavor. I shall communicate with you further regarding our efforts for peace and stability in the former Yugoslavia.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives,

and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 13.

Proclamation 6668—National Day of Prayer, 1994

April 12, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In a country built by people from hundreds of nations and with as many beliefs, we rely upon our religious liberty in order to preserve the individuality and great diversity that give our Nation its unique richness and strength of character. America's founders saw the urgent need to protect religious freedom and opened debate on the important subject when the Continental Congress gathered in Philadelphia to chart a course for our nascent country. After hearing Massachusetts delegate Samuel Adams' plea, the Congress voted to begin its session with a prayer. When the framers of the Bill of Rights set down our fundamental rights, the free exercise of religion rightfully took its place at the head of our enumerated liberties.

As our Nation has grown and flourished, our Government has welcomed divine guidance in its work, while respecting the rich and varied faiths of all of its citizens. Many of our greatest leaders have asked God's favor in public and private prayer. From patriots and presidents to advocates for justice, our history reflects the strong presence of prayer in American life. Presidents, above all, need the power of prayer, their own and that of all Americans.

We need not shrink as Americans from asking for divine assistance in our continuing efforts to relieve human suffering at home and abroad, to reduce hatred, violence, and abuse, and to restore families across our land. By following our own beliefs while respecting the convictions of others, we can strengthen our people and rebuild our Nation. As Micah reminds us, we must strive "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly" before God.

The Congress, by joint resolution approved April 17, 1952, having recognized the

role of faith and prayer in the lives of the American people throughout our history, has set aside a day each year as a "National Day of Prayer." Since that time, each President has proclaimed an annual National Day of Prayer, resuming the tradition begun by our leaders in the Nation's earliest days. Pursuant to Public Law 100-307 of May 5, 1988, the first Thursday of each May has been set aside as a National Day of Prayer.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim May 5, 1994, as a National Day of Prayer. I encourage the citizens of this great Nation to gather, each in his or her own manner, to recognize our blessings, acknowledge our wrongs, to remember the needy, to seek guidance for our challenging future, and to give thanks for the abundance we have enjoyed throughout our history.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 9:32 a.m., April 14, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 13, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 15.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the American Society of Newspaper Editors

April 13, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Bill, for the introduction. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the invitation to come by again.

I can't help noting some satisfaction that the president of this organization is not only the editor of the *Oregonian*, which endorsed my candidacy in 1992, the first time it ever endorsed a Democrat for President—I hope they haven't had second thoughts—[laughter]—he also spent the first 8 years of his

life in Arkansas, which didn't seem to do him too much harm.

I am delighted to be here. I want to make a few remarks and then open the floor to questions. We probably have some things in common. Both of us battle from time to time with reporters. [Laughter] And I recently did some light editing on my mother's autobiography, so I appreciate the difficulty of editing things. It was a little easier for me; my mother, when she got very ill, I said, "What are we going to do if you don't finish your book?" She said, "You finish it, don't touch anything I said about you." [Laughter] "Check the facts. Don't let me be too hard on the living." So it was easier for me than it was for you.

But let me say I've been thinking about it a lot lately because it gave me a chance to relive a period in American history that spanned my mother's life as well as my own, starting in the Depression. In many ways, like everybody's family, her life was unique. But it was in many ways like that of so many people who grew up in the Depression and World War II and exemplified and made possible the rise of the American middle class. Most of those people were obsessed with working hard and taking care of their families and building a better future for their children, and they never doubted they could do it. There's a reason, I think, we ought to think about that today, and that is that there are a lot of people who doubt that we can continue to do it. Our mission at this moment in history, I believe, is to ensure the American dream for the next generation, to bring the American people together, to move our country forward, to make sure the middle class grows and survives well into the 21st century.

My mother's generation knew what we are learning, and that is that the preservation of these kinds of dreams is not as simple as just talking about it. She had to leave home after she was widowed to further her education so she could make a good living. And my earliest memory as a child is of my grandmother taking me to see my mother in New Orleans when she was in school and then seeing her cry when I left the train station as a little child.

But our generation is full of parental stories about the sacrifices that were made for

us so that we could do better. And all of us in this room have been exceedingly fortunate in that regard. The generation that our parents were a part of built the houses, the schools, educated the children that built the explosion of American energy and industry after the Second World War.

Underneath the magnificent material mileposts, which left us with only 6 percent of the world's population then and 40 percent of the world's economic output, was a set of values. They believed we had to work hard, that we had a duty to do right by our community and our neighbors, that we were obliged to take responsibility for ourselves and our families. Without those values, the successes would not have occurred, and nothing else passed on to us would amount to much for we would quickly squander whatever material benefits we had.

Most of my mother's generation, at least that I knew, would never have put it this way, but they lived by a creed that I was taught by a professor of Western civilization at Georgetown, who told me that the great secret of Western civilization in general and the United States of America specifically was that always, at every moment in time, a majority of us had believed that the future could be better than the present and that each of us had a personal, moral responsibility to make it so. In pursuit of that dream, the Americans in this century have made a solemn bargain with their Government: Government should work to help those who help themselves.

Forty-nine years ago today, Harry Truman spent his first full day as President of the United States. No one ever did more to honor that solemn bargain. After World War II, our country chose the course of confidence, not cynicism, building a stable world economy in which we could flourish with the Marshall Plan and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which we have just concluded of the Uruguay round.

We lifted a majority of our people into the middle class not by giving them something for nothing but by giving them the opportunity to work hard and succeed. In just 2 months, we'll celebrate the 50th anniversary of the G.I. bill of rights, which helped more than 20 million American veterans to get an

education and millions more to build businesses and homes.

These great achievements did not belong to any particular party. They were American decisions. They were not the reflection of a country pulled to the right or to the left but a country always pushing forward. They reflected the vision and the values of leaders of both parties. After Truman, Eisenhower continued the tradition by building the Interstate Highway System and by investing in the space program and science and technology and in education. The tradition continued in the next administrations, all working toward greater prosperity but rooted in certain values that enabled us to go forward.

But the seeds of our new difficulties, that we face in such stark reality today, were sown beginning three decades ago in changes in our social fabric and two decades ago in changes in our general economic condition. We have seen the weakening slowly of the institutions and the values which built the middle class and the economic underpinnings which made it possible, in theory at least, for all Americans to achieve it.

Three decades ago, in 1960, births outside of marriage were 5.3 percent of total children born. In 1980, the rate had risen to 18.4 percent; in 1990, to 28 percent. There are many of those who say, "Well, Mr. President, you're overstating the case because the birth rate among married couples has dropped so much." It may be. All I know is that those kids are our future, and the trends are inescapable and disturbing. And the rates for teen mothers in poverty and for all mothers without a high school education of out-of-wedlock birth rates are far, far higher than the 28 percent that I just said.

The fear of violent crime has made neighbors seem like strangers. And as Senator Pat Moynihan of New York has said, Americans have begun to "define deviancy down." We're simply getting used to things that we never would have considered acceptable just a few years ago.

In the post-war economy, a high school diploma meant security. By the time of the 1990 census, it was clear that a high school diploma meant you'd probably be in a job where your income would not even keep up

with inflation. Most middle class families have to work longer hours to stay even. The average working family in 1992 was spending more hours on the job than it did in 1969. And in too many neighborhoods, the vacuum that has been created by the absence of work and community and family has been filled by crime and violence and drugs.

In the 1980's, the world continued to change dramatically economically. And I would argue that, in general, our collective response to it was wrong, even though many of our best companies made dramatic productivity gains which are benefiting us today. We reduced taxes for some Americans, mostly the wealthy Americans, and we increased the deficit. But increases in Social Security taxes and State and local taxes put further strains on middle class incomes. From 1981 to 1993, our Nation's debt quadrupled, while job creation and the general living standard of the wage-earning middle class stagnated or declined.

So we have these problems that, let's face it, brought me to the Presidency in 1992, the abject conditions that Americans were groping to come to grips with. You can be proud that so many newspapers have done so much to not only call attention to these problems to make them really real in the lives of people and to cry out for new thinking.

In its remarkable series, "America: What Went Wrong?", the Philadelphia Inquirer showed how the National Government's policies had undermined the middle class already under stress by a global economy. Of all the facts cited by Donald Bartlett and James Steele, one stood out to me. In 1952 it took the average worker a day of work to pay the closing costs on a home in the Philadelphia suburbs. In the 1990's, it took 18 weeks.

The Chicago Tribune on its front page underscored the epidemic of violence killing so many of our children and robbing so many others of their childhood. The Los Angeles Times explored the loss of a sense of community that prompted the riots there 2 years ago. Recently when I was in Detroit for the jobs conference, the papers there talked about the changing job market and the State that was the automobile capital of the world, the good and the bad dislocations that have occurred and what was working.

Recently, in the Pulitzer Prizes, which were awarded yesterday, I noted that Bill Raspberry got a well-deserved Pulitzer for his commentaries on social and political subjects. And Isabel Wilkerson's report on children growing up in the inner city in New York—the New York Times won.

Our administration owes a special debt to Eileen Welsome's series in the Albuquerque Tribune exposing secret governmental radiation experiments conducted decades ago which have consequences today. And I'm proud of the openness that the Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary, has brought to the Energy Department in dealing with this.

There are lots of other things I could mention: The Akron Beacon Journal's examination of race relations there; the Minneapolis Star Tribune's editorial board hosted me the other day, and I had one of the most searching and rewarding discussions of the health care conditions in our country that I have had in a long time.

Every day, you are challenging us to think and to care through your newspapers. My job is to act. As I travel the country, I see that that is basically what people want us to do. Oh, they want us to be careful. They know we live in a cynical age, and they're skeptical that the Government would even mess up a one-car parade. But they want us to act.

The future of our American leadership depends upon what we do at home, but also what we do abroad. Last year among the most important developments were the trade agreements, the NAFTA agreement, the GATT agreement, the historic meeting we had with the leaders of the Asian-Pacific communities. But we have a lot of problems, too. By attempting to come to grips with them in a world increasingly disorderly, we hope to preserve an environment in which America can grow and Americans can flourish, whether it is in addressing North Korea's nuclear program, which protects not only our troops on the Peninsula but ultimately the interests of all Americans, or supporting reforms in the Soviet Union, which helps to destroy missiles once aimed at us and to create new market opportunities for the future, or by harnessing NATO's power and the service of diplomacy in troubled Bosnia, which will help to prevent a wider war and contain

a flood of refugees. Our efforts to stop the shelling of Sarajevo and the attacks on Gorazde, to bring the Serbs back to the negotiating table, to build on the agreement made by the Croats and the Bosnian Muslims, enhanced both Europe's security and our own.

Here at home, for the past 15 months, we have focused on starting the engines of upward mobility to try to make sure we can remember the values of the so-called forgotten middle class with an economic plan that is fair, with cuts that are real, investments that are smart, a declining deficit, and growing jobs.

Last year, our budget cut 340 programs, including most major entitlements. This year, the budget calls for cutting 379 programs, including the outright elimination of a hundred of them. As we cut unneeded programs, we're investing more in education, in medical research, in the technologies of tomorrow that create jobs now, whether in defense conversion or in environmental sciences. We're fighting for a revitalized Clean Water Act, a safe drinking water act, a reformed Superfund program. All of them will clean the environment, but they will also create the jobs of tomorrow, everybody from engineers to pipefitters.

As April 15th approaches, people will see that I did tell the truth last year about our economic program: 1.2 percent of Americans will pay more in income taxes, including me and some others in this room. All that money will go to reduce the deficit. One-sixth of America's workers will get an income tax cut this year because they are working hard and raising children but hovering around the poverty line. And we are attempting to reward work over welfare and to prove that people even in this tough, competitive environment can be successful workers and successful parents. That's why the earned-income tax credit was expanded so much. I believe it was the right thing to do.

The economic plan creates new opportunities to send people to college by lowering the interest rates and broadening the eligibility for college loans and then changing the terms of repayment so that young people can pay them back as a percentage of their earnings regardless of how much they borrow.

There is in this economic plan a new business capital gains tax, rewarding investments for the long term. People who make new investments for 5 years or more will get a 50-percent tax cut in the tax rate and a 70-percent increase in the small business expensing provision—something that's been almost entirely overlooked—which makes 90 percent of the small businesses in the United States of America, those with taxable incomes of under \$100,000, eligible for an income tax cut.

The economy has generated a 20-percent increase in auto sales and 2.5 million new jobs; 90 percent of these new jobs are in the private sector. That's a far higher percentage than the new jobs of the eighties.

The combination of declining deficits, which will amount to 3 years in a row—if this budget is adopted, we'll have 3 years of declining deficits in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States. And it has produced steady growth and low inflation, leading many of our most respected economists, from the Fed Chairman, Alan Greenspan, to Allen Sinai, to say that our economy and its fundamentals has the best prospects it's had in two to three decades. Inflation is projected to be lower this year than last year.

We've come a long way, but there's a long way to go. There's still too many people out of work, too many people working for low wages, too many people who know that they can work harder and harder and harder and they still won't have the opportunity of doing better. And there are too many people who are left out altogether, living in environments that are, at worst, downright dangerous.

Our country is more than an economy; it is a community of shared values, values which have to be strengthened. This year, we are working on things that will both strengthen the economy and strengthen our community. We're working on a welfare system which will continue to reward work and family and encourage people and, in some cases, require people to move from welfare to work through welfare reform.

We are working on lobbying and campaign reforms which, if the Congress will pass them, and I believe they will, will help us to change the culture of Washington in a very

positive way. The national service program this year will have 20,000 young people earning money for their college educations by solving the problems of this country in a grassroots fashion in their communities or in others all across America. And the year after next we'll have 100,000 young people doing that.

The Vice President's reinventing Government program has been a dramatic example of giving us a Government that will work better for less by slashing paperwork and regulations and again, if this budget is adopted—thanks to the work already done by the Congress—will lead us in a 5-year period to a reduction of the Federal Government by 252,000 workers, in a 6-year period by 272,000 workers; so that in the end of 5 years, we will have the smallest Federal Government since the 1960's, the early sixties. I'll tell you what we're going to do with the money in a minute.

But we are moving in the right direction. The health care reform debate is a big part of that. I know there's a lot of good in our health care system. We don't want to mess with it. We want to fix what's wrong. But nobody who has seriously analyzed it can doubt that we have the worst and the most inefficient system of financing health care of any of the advanced countries. No other country spends more than 10 percent of its economy on health care. We spend 14.5 percent of our income. Part of that's because we're more violent; part of it's because we have high rates of AIDS; part of it's for good reasons: We spend more on medical research and technology, and we wish to continue to do that. No one would give up that premium. It's an important part of our world leadership and our global economy. Indeed, we need to find ways to do more in some of these areas, in biotechnology, for example.

But a part of it stems from the fact that we have a system which is plainly inefficient and which, in paperwork burdens alone, may cost as much as a dime on the dollar more than any other system in the world. We are also the only advanced country in the world that has not figured out how to provide health care to all its citizens. Everybody else has figured out how to do it. The result of that is that almost all of you work for compa-

nies that pay too much for your health care, because when people who don't have health insurance get real sick, they tend to get health care when it's too late, too expensive, at the emergency room, and they pass the cost on to the rest of you in higher premiums. If you live in rural areas where the costs can't be passed along, the cost is passed along in another way, in lower quality of health care when the hospital closes or the clinic closes or the last doctor moves away.

Eighty-one million Americans live in families with someone with a preexisting condition, who's been sick before, so that they pay too much for insurance, can't get it, or can never change jobs. This is an important part of rebuilding a faith in the middle class. It's no accident that the First Lady and I have received a million letters that people—telling us their personal stories. They aren't pikers. They're people who have paid their dues, who work hard, who want to make something of themselves in this country. And because of the way we finance health care, they haven't been able to do it.

The education initiatives of our administration are important in this regard. The Goals 2000 bill I just signed for the first time in American history sets national standards of world class excellence in education and encourages schools to use grass roots reforms to achieve them. The student loan reforms will open college education to more young people than ever before.

And finally this year we're going to try to change the unemployment system into a re-employment system. All of you as employers pay unemployment taxes into a system that is fundamentally broken. The average person when laid off was called back after a period to his or her old job when the unemployment system was created. And the unemployment system was just sort of a fair way for the employer to contribute to the maintenance of that person at a lower wage level while on unemployment. But today, most people don't get called back to their old jobs. Instead they have to find new ones. And we should no longer ask people to pay for a system that leaves people idle for a period of months after which they're out of work with no training, no skill, and not a good prospect for the future. So we believe from the day a person

is unemployed, he or she should be involved in a retraining and a new job placement program immediately. It will cut the period of unemployment. It will increase the national income, and it will certainly honor the values of the American middle class if we change this system.

For all of this, there are still a lot of things, maybe the most important things about America, that Government can't do. Nothing has reminded me more of that than the headlines in today's Washington Post. I'm sure you saw the story. Two 10-year-old boys were taken into custody yesterday in an elementary school not far from here, just across the line in Maryland. They were charged with planning to sell crack cocaine found in one of their school bags. Even in this jaded age most everybody, including the school officials at the school, were shocked.

We can do a lot of things to put this country back where it belongs. We can and must pass the crime bill to deal with a lot of these problems. It's a good crime bill: 100,000 more police officers; a ban on 28 kinds of assault weapons; the most innovative prevention programs we have ever supported at the national level to try to keep young kids out of trouble and give them something to say yes to as well as things to say no to; tougher punishment in what I think are sensible ways. And how are we going to pay for it, \$22 billion over 5 years? With a 250,000 reduction in the Federal work force, not with a tax increase.

But even if you do that, we cannot live the lives of children for them. So every one of us, every parent, every teacher, every person, has to somehow find a way to reach these kids before it's too late. Somehow the young people who make it know that they're important. They understand that their lives matter. They understand that there can be a future. They think about the future in terms of what happens 5 or 10 years or 20 years from now instead of what happens 5 or 10 minutes from now. They understand that they have to fight to find ways other than violence to solve their problems or deal with their frustrations. They have to come to understand that children having children is just wrong and can't lead to anything good for them, that drugs will ruin their lives. We've

got a lot of kids now who are beginning to creep back into drug use just because they think it's hopeless out there. We have to change that, and we have to help them change that. And a Government program, alone, cannot do it. We have to do it with the kinds of things you do with these special reportings in your newspaper and galvanizing and organizing people all over this country, community by community.

Finally, let me just say this. A couple of nights ago, we marked the end of the year honoring the 250th birthday of Thomas Jefferson. For you as journalists, of course, his commitment to freedom of expression was his greatest gift to us. I don't know how many journalists I've had quote Jefferson's famous line that if he had to choose a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, he would unhesitatingly choose the latter. My response is always, he said that before he became President. *[Laughter]*

But there's a line, or a lesson, that we often overlook. Jefferson was also a slaveholder, even though he wrote three or four times in various places attempts to limit slavery or do away with it. If you go to the Jefferson Memorial, you find that wonderful quote when he says, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just and his justice cannot sleep forever." He knew it was wrong, but he couldn't change it.

But Jefferson's great legacy, in some ways, was the advocacy of relentless change. He said that we'd have to change our whole way of doing things once every generation or so. He said the Earth belongs to the living. In other words, the great power of the idea that change and progress is possible if rooted in fixed principles is really the idea we need to bring to American life today.

We all share the responsibility in achieving that kind of change and progress. I think we have got to get together. We've got to go on with the work before us. We cannot afford to be diverted or divided in this town. We cannot afford to ignore the urgent tasks at hand. And we cannot afford to ignore the possibility that we can really make a difference, that we can ensure for the next generation of children the values and the life that were given to us by the generation which

preceded us. And that, I submit to you, is the job of the President and the job of the American people in 1994.

Thank you very much.

[At this point, the emcee announced that the President would take questions. The first participant asked if delinquency and crime among children were not symptoms of the disease of adult delinquency.]

The President. Well, in some ways I think it is a symptom. I think it is the outgrowth—if you think about what makes all societies work, basically what makes societies work, what makes them function, what guarantees a healthy environment, it is basically a devotion to the family unit, a devotion to the idea that everybody ought to have some useful work to perform, and an understanding that while the rights of individuals are important, the interests of the community at large are important, too, and that all of us find most personal fulfillment when we live in a community that itself is succeeding. So we have obligations to a larger community. If you go to the places that are in the worst trouble in America today, all three of those things are in deep distress, not very much sense of community, not very much work, and families in ruins.

And what I'm trying to do, sir, is to try to create an environment in which we support family, work, and community, both with incentives for people to do the right thing, like giving a tax break to working people so they won't feel that they'd be better off on welfare—they're hovering at the poverty line—to dealing with the kinds of things that Secretary Cisneros dealt with when he spent the night in the Robert Taylor Homes Project of Chicago the other night, trying to find ways for the people who live in public housing to be secure, to build their own communities, take control of their own destiny, and to be safe from that.

But I agree with you, I think a lot of these problems we identify are the consequences of the fundamental stress on those three things: work, family, and community.

[A participant cited the watchdog role of the press and asked what could be done to open up Government to the people, make Government more accessible to the press in terms

of technology and access to electronic information via the Freedom of Information Act, grant greater access to Presidential materials, and effect changes in Pentagon policy in instances when the press covers military action overseas.]

The President. Well, first of all, I think I mentioned one example in my opening remarks. And that is, I think that the Energy Department is doing quite a good job in dealing with the whole radiation issue. We also have under the review all the sort of, the secrecy rules of Government, and we expect to change them and make available a lot more records than have been available in the past.

You made a specific comment about technology, and whether technology can be used to facilitate this. And we do have a couple of people at the White House—and unfortunately, I'm not one of them—who know a whole lot about this. And we've tried to use things like E-mail more and things like that. But that's one of the things that I've asked our people to study, is how we can use this so-called information superhighway to hook the news media of the country into the Government more for things that are plainly available anyway and whether that could be facilitated. Just the technological transfers, I think, would make a big difference.

On the fourth question, I can't give you a satisfactory answer because I haven't made up my own mind yet, and I don't think I know enough to make a decision, and that is, the relationship of the press to our military operations in time of combat. I'm not rebuffing you, I'm just telling you I have not thought it through, and I don't know what my options are.

But on the other three things, I think we're in accord, and I will try to do a little more work on the whole issue of technology transfer and interconnection. And I think we are moving forward to open more records.

[A participant indicated that the President had advocated Presidential intervention in the strike involving Caterpillar, Inc., and asked if he still believed such action was still appropriate.]

The President. Well, we have worked hard through the executive branch to resolve

other labor disputes, as you know, including the one involving the airlines recently. So I am not averse to that. But if you'll remember, at the time I said that there was an actual strike in place that was of significant duration for a company, Caterpillar, that is very important to this whole country. A lot of you may not know this: Caterpillar has as much as 80 percent of the Japanese market for some of its products. It's a very, very important company.

And so, I guess what I have to tell you is if the strike occurs and if it is of significant duration and if there is something that I think we can do about it, I would be glad to look into that. But what I have tried to do on all labor disputes is not to prematurely intervene—there is no strike at this moment—not to prematurely intervene and to take it on a case by case basis depending on what the national interest is and whether or not there is a positive role we could play. In the case of the airlines, there was; and one or two other cases—a railroad issue, and several others—there has been something we could do. And if it happens, you can be sure that I will look into very closely.

[A participant asked the President to grade the performance of columnists and editorial writers in covering his administration and Whitewater.]

The President. Well, let me first of all say, the grade that they gave me is not as important to me as the grade, sort of objective criteria, that many of the journals here went through: just how much did we get done last year as compared with previous first-year Presidencies. And all the objective analysis concluded that we had the best first year in a generation, in 30 years or more, just in terms of the volume and significance and the difficulty of legislative achievements and advances. So I felt quite good about that, and that's how I measured my own.

Secondly, if I could grade the press, I wouldn't, especially not now. *[Laughter]* But let me just say—let me make three points very quickly about it, either in general or on Whitewater. If you have any doubts about it, then that's good because you ought to be having doubts about things like this. But I want to make three points. One is, you can't

generalize about the press today. You probably never could generalize about the press. But believe me, it is far harder to generalize about it than ever before. There is no way you can do that.

Secondly, I think it is—the press, at least in this town, is very different from most of the press outside this town in terms of how they work and what's important and all of that. But they are under more competitive and other pressures today than ever before. I said last night at the radio and TV correspondents dinner that the Founding Fathers had two points of untrammelled freedom in our set-up. One was given to the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts; that is, they had lifetime jobs. And they got that because somebody had to make a final decision. They have limited power but ultimate freedom. So they have to be careful not to abuse their freedom. The other was the press, because nobody could think of any practical way to limit the press. And in fact, the limits have become less, not more, with the weakening of the libel laws over time.

And I just think that always, any kind of unrestricted freedom imposes great responsibility on people. And what happens here is, when you've got, for example, you've got all these different new outlets; you've got all these channels; you've got all this time to fill; you have all this competition now from the tabloids; you have the highly politically motivated outlets posing as news media, but not really, trying to affect what the news media do. It is more difficult to be responsible now than ever before. It is a bigger challenge than ever before.

The third thing I would say is, while I am in no position to comment on this, you ought to read what Garrison Keillor said last night at the radio and television correspondents dinner. It was a stunning speech. I have never heard anyone speak that way to a group of media people. He obviously was from the heart, and he said some very thoughtful things. And if you really care about the issue, I would urge you to read what he said. I could not add anything to what he said last night.

Q. That's an A-plus answer.

The President. Thanks.

[A participant asked the President to respond to a veteran who had stated that the way the Veterans Administration runs its hospitals is an example of why the Government should not run the health care system.]

The President. That's why we don't recommend a Government run the health care system. I have two responses to that. First of all, our plan does not provide for Government-run health care. In fact, that's very rare in the world. The British system is the only one where the government actually delivers the health care, just about. There are some other systems, like the Canadian system, where the government finances it all. We have Government-financed health care through the Medicare program. Most people think it's pretty good who are on it. But it's all—you know, if you are on Medicare, you get to choose your own doctor; it's all private care, all private.

The veterans hospital system worked quite well, sir, for a while, but it doesn't work now because the Government can't run it without its being able to compete. I mean, what basically happened is, there are fewer and fewer veterans who choose to use the veterans hospital network. They have other options for pay—they're eligible for Medicare; they have private insurance or whatever. The veterans hospital can't take that kind of pay, so it becomes more underfunded while the population it's treating goes down; and those difficulties feed on itself.

I think we've got a—basically, we have proposed to give the veterans hospital network the chance to compete and do well, but when those veterans hospitals are in trouble, that's why they're in trouble. What I proposed to do instead is to have guaranteed private insurance, and all I want the Government to do is to require guaranteed private insurance for the employed uninsured, give organized approval to give discounts to small businesses so they won't go broke providing the insurance, and then organized buyers co-ops, so small business, farmers, and self-employed people can buy insurance on the same terms that big business employees and Government employees can. And I don't want the Federal Government to do that, I just want it set up so that can be done at the State level.

But I certainly don't think we ought to have a Government-run health care system. I think the Government could create an environment in which everybody can get health insurance; we can bring cost in line with inflation—the right economic incentives for managed care are there—and the little folks have the same chance as the big folks to get affordable care. That's all I want to do.

[A participant asked how he should respond to his daughter's statement, "He sounds just like me when I'm trying to explain why I don't have my homework," after she heard the President's explanation of events that happened 15 years ago.]

The President. Well, let me tell you, let me give you an example. I'll just say one thing. Garrison Keillor said last night, he said, "You know, all I know about Whitewater is what I read in the papers, so I don't understand it." [Laughter] He made two statements; I'm just repeating what he said. He said, "I really wasn't going to talk about Whitewater tonight, but I was afraid if I didn't say anything, you'd think I know something about it." [Laughter] Then he said, "I suppose I ought to tell you that I've never been to Arkansas." But, he said, "I'm reluctant to tell you that, because then you will attack me for not telling you that 30 days ago." [Laughter]

All I can tell you, sir, is I have done my best to answer the questions asked of me. Maybe you have total and complete recollection of every question that might be—not is—might be asked of you at any moment of things that happened to you 12, 13, 14 years ago. Maybe you could give your tax records up for 17 years and, at the moment, answer any question. Or maybe, instead, you want to go back to the homework question: You think I should have shut the whole Federal Government down and done nothing but study these things for the last 2 months?

I would remind you that I was asked early on by the press and the Republicans to have a special counsel look into this on the grounds that then everyone could forget about it, and let the special counsel do his job, and I could go on and be President. I could give all the records up, and then when he had a question in his document search,

he could ask me, we could work it out, and the issue could be resolved. So I said, "Sure," even though the criteria for appointing a special counsel weren't met. No one had accused me of any wrongdoing, certainly nothing connected with my Presidency or my campaign for the Presidency. I said, "Let's do it so I can go back to work." And that is what I have tried to do.

Since then, the same people who asked for the special counsel so that these issues could be resolved in an appropriate and disciplined way and I could go back to work, have decided they were kidding. And they wanted to continue for us to deal with this. Well, I'm sorry, I'm doing the best I can while I do the job I was hired by the American people to do.

I have been as candid and as forthright as possible. Sam Dash, the Watergate special prosecutor, said, "This is a very different administration than previous ones. These people have resisted no subpoenas. They have claimed no executive privilege. They have cooperated. They have turned all the documents over." I have done everything I know to do.

But can I answer every question that anybody might ever ask me about something that happened 10, 15, 17 years ago on the spur of the moment and have total recall of all of that while trying to be President? No, sir, I cannot. But the special counsel has a process for dealing with that which would permit us to focus on the truly relevant questions and deal with it. And I have cooperated very well. I will continue to do that.

I will also do my best to give information to the press. But I would just like to point out that the people who asked for the special counsel asked for it and said, the President ought to do this so we can clear the air and he can go on and be President. Now the suggestion is, the implication of your remark, sir, is that instead of that, I should stop being President and do my homework on this issue.

Q. All I was asking is what I should tell my daughter for her response, and I think the response was wonderful. And I thank you very much for it.

The President. Thank you.

Q. We have time for one more question right here.

Q. Mr. President, I'm Tom Dearmore, retired from the San Francisco Examiner and a native of your home State——

The President. Mountain Home, Arkansas.

Q. ——who used to long ago stir up lots of trouble in Arkansas.

The President. You're still legendary down there, Mr. Dearmore. [*Laughter*]

Q. My father helped run your campaign for Congress 20 years ago——

The President. He sure did. And I'm grateful to him.

[The participant then asked if the President favored the unrestricted use of U.S. money that goes abroad for population control or if he favored any limitation at all on the use of American taxpayers' money for abortion.]

The President. Yes, I do. I do, and let me say first of all, I have asked—I did about 2 days ago—I saw a story on this, and I received a couple of letters about it. And I have asked to see the language that we are advocating and the language that is in the present draft so that I can personally review it.

My position on this, I think, is pretty clear. I think at a minimum that we should not fund abortions when the child is capable of living outside the mother's womb. That's what we permit to be criminalized in America today under Roe against Wade. And secondly, we should not, in any way, shape, or form fund abortions if they are enforced on citizens by the government, if they're against people's will.

There may be other restrictions I would favor, but I can just tell you that on the front end, I think that those are the two places where I would not support our funding going in. And so I think that we ought to be very careful in how we do this.

On the other hand, I don't necessarily think that we ought to write the Hyde Amendment into international law, because there are a lot of countries who have a very different view of this and whose religious traditions threaten it differently.

So I think that there is some room between the original draft and where—it appears, from the news reports, some folks in the State Department may be going to write a

policy that most Americans could support. But I'm glad you brought it up.

I, myself, did not know about this until just a few days ago. And I have asked for a report, and I've asked to see the documents myself so I can get involved in it and at least try to have some influence on what happens. Of course, it's an international conference. We don't know exactly how it will come out in the end, and there will be countries and cultures that have widely clashing views on this.

But, anyway, I've answered you what I think.

Q. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, thank you very much. We're looking forward to a more informal gathering with you Friday night.

The President. I'm looking forward to it, too. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:31 p.m. at the J.W. Marriott Hotel.

Remarks Honoring the United States Winter Olympic Athletes

April 13, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, the First Lady, thank you for coming out here, in this case not warming up but trying to cool down the crowd—[*laughter*]—while I was trying to get out of the Oval Office; to all of our distinguished guests, and especially to the Olympians.

Let me say, first of all, that the Olympics for me, like most Americans, is primarily a personal experience, not something I experience as President but something—I'm just another American cheering for our teams. I'm proud of the fact that we brought home more medals than any U.S. Winter Olympic team in history. I'm proud of the astonishing achievements of this Paralympic team and the fact that at least two of the athletes won four gold medals.

I was elated and a little resentful, frankly, when my wife and daughter were able to go to Lillehammer, and I couldn't. But you can bet your last nickel that all of us will be in Atlanta—[*applause*]—to our friends from Georgia there.

There's not much I can add to what the First Lady and the Vice President have said, except to first say how terribly impressed I was at the reports I got from Hillary and Chelsea about their contacts with the Olympians from the United States, about what kind of young people we sent over there and what kind of courage they had and the efforts that they made. It made an incredible impression on me.

And second, to tell you what I said when I started, I experience the Olympics primarily as a citizen. As a matter of fact, I may have endangered the national security, because I stayed up every night until you went off the air. [*Laughter*] I saw every last event. I saw every last interview. I heard "The Star-Spangled Banner" played every time it was played. I did it first when I was alone, and then when Hillary and Chelsea came back, we did it together. And I want to say something very personal about it.

What you did there, just by getting there, I hope with all my heart was communicated to the children that you visited when you went to the schools. And I thank you for that. And if I could ask you just for one thing, it would be to try to take some of your time—and I saw from the television portraits of some of you that a lot of you have done this already—but to try to take some of your time for as long as you can just to find some way to expose yourselves to the young people of this country. Because so many of them have so many troubles, they have so many difficulties; they have no one to cheer them on or spur them on or get them up at 4 o'clock in the morning the way some of you had to to become what you wanted to be. And yet, by seeing you they can imagine themselves in the light of your life.

And I can tell you that I work hard up here every day, all of us do, trying to find ways to pull this country together and push this country forward and give our people the opportunities to live up to their God-given capacities. But in the end, this country is great because of what happens inside people's spirits and in families and in communities. And there are many of those young people whom you could reach better than

I ever could. And because of what you have done, they will see that there are things that they could do; because of what you became, there are things that they can become.

I thank my friends, Florence Griffith Joyner and Tom McMillen, for their leadership of our Council on Athletics and Physical Fitness and all the others who have never forgotten the power of example in a positive way. Just never forget that. All of us as Americans are elated at just the very thought that we could send people to the Olympic games and what you had to do. You will probably never know and most of you will probably never see the results of the people you may have influenced just by visiting these schools in the last day. But I plead with you to keep doing it, because there are a lot of young people out there that we need for America's future. There are a lot of young people out there who will be making decisions about their lives in the next couple of years who literally may be profoundly affected just by seeing you standing in their classrooms or walking their halls or having a simple conversation with them.

You are the embodiment of what the rest of us try to create every day. I hope you'll never forget it and always give a little of it back to the next generation of young Americans.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

[*At this point, the President was presented with a team jacket and a luge.*]

The President. I don't know if I have the courage to get on this. [*Laughter*]

When I got this jacket, the Vice President, never one to pass up an opportunity to keep me humble, said, "They also have a luge suit for you." [*Laughter*] Nothing he says ever has one meaning. The other meaning was, "Think how much thinner you would look in it." [*Laughter*]

This is wonderful. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:34 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

**Remarks at a Dinner Honoring the
United States Winter Olympic
Athletes**

April 13, 1994

Thank you so much. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President and Dr. Walker and—what am I supposed to call Hillary in public?—[laughter]—Madam First Lady.

You know, one of the things these Olympians learn is a whole lot of discipline and, along with that, sort of good conduct and good manners. But I think we're about to test it. They've already heard all of us give one set of speeches today, and now they're having to sit through a second or stand through a second, as the case may be. It was wonderful for us to have all of them at the White House today. And I want to thank them for coming, for giving all of us who work in the White House a big thrill at having the opportunity to meet them and congratulate them and express our great pride in their achievements.

One potentially unfortunate thing occurred at the White House today. Several of them invited me to jog in the morning. [Laughter] So there's a whole bunch of them coming, and now that I've announced it, doubtless more will come as well. And so I'm going to have to go home early and get some extra sleep tonight. The Vice President would come, too—and he's a better runner than I am—but he's on his way to Marrakesh tonight. He's really taking a marathon—going to the meeting which will finalize the understanding among all of our nations for a new worldwide trade agreement and reminding the other countries that they promised that the next time we make a worldwide trade agreement, it will be a green round, one devoted to protecting the global environment and proving that that, too, can be good for our common economic destiny. So I thank him for that.

A few moments before he ran and won the 100-meter final and captured the gold medal in an Olympics a long time ago, one of the heroes of my youth, Jesse Owens, said, "A lifetime of training for just 10 seconds." Dr. Walker and I were talking out here before we came out to visit one more time and stand with the Olympians, and we were spec-

ulating about what the longest Winter Olympic event is, maybe the cross-country skiing, maybe the biathlon. But even the longest one is just the flash of an eye compared to all the training. Think of how many of these young athletes have worked their lifetimes to compete for a minute, sometimes slightly less, sometimes slightly more; a long event, an exhausting event in some of these encounters is 2 or 3 or 4 minutes. But really, it isn't a lifetime of effort for 10 seconds or 2 minutes or 2 hours. It's a lifetime of effort for a lifetime of reward. The reward of knowing that you have done your best with your God-given abilities, the reward of knowing you have lived a good life and stand out as a good model.

I asked all these young people today to continue to visit schools and see the children of America, as they did today. So many of our children today don't have parents or coaches or teachers who can get them up early in the morning, encourage them to great heights, provide the opportunities that so many of the rest of us take for granted. And yet I think these young Olympians, simply by talking to disadvantaged kids who may have no hope, who may have no opportunity in their own mind, who may not even be able to imagine what it is like to make a commitment for a year, much less 5 or 10 years or 20 years, the incredible impact that they can have on the young people of America is something that we must never underestimate and something that I hope and pray they will never underestimate.

I'd also like to say, to echo what the Vice President said, that we are doing our best through the President's Council on Sports and Physical Fitness to try to spread opportunities for participating in athletics to all of our people. And I have to tell you that one of the real tragedies of the economic hardships our country endured in the 1980's is that many of our schools and many of our cities cut back on recreational facilities. Here in the Nation's Capital, I am told that there are only three functioning ballparks that are open to kids who want to start teams. We have kids growing up on streets in America today who get all the way through their teen years without ever holding a baseball bat in their hand or having a mitt on their hand.

We have whole cities where there are no Olympic-size swimming pools for children to swim in.

And so the second thing I ask of you all is to try to remind the city fathers and the State officials and the Federal officials, too, that body and mind go hand in hand, and we've got to bring recreational opportunities back to kids. We have to give them the spirit of teamwork and possibility even those who can never be Olympic athletes.

And finally, let me remind you that when the Olympics started, I mean, really started a long time ago, it gave all the warring Greek city states an excuse to quit fighting with one another and find a way to compete in peace and harmony and to forge bonds of understanding among people who literally were at war one with the other. We saw that in a gripping way in these Winter Olympics when the courageous Olympians from Bosnia somehow made their way to Lillehammer.

And so I ask all of you who have had the experience of the Olympics always to be emissary for a decent and humane set of relations among the people of the world. Most of what people are fighting for in this old world today, with the end of the cold war, is based on ancient hatreds, not present rational divisions, not principled arguments over differences in a way of life but old-fashioned bigotry that somehow they can't quite overcome. The spirit of the Olympics can help that, and all of you can embody that for the rest of your lives.

Somehow I think that all of these words that we've just said may not be quite registering on all the athletes because they've been through so much this year. Robert Frost once said about the present, "It is too much for the senses, too crowded, too confusing, too present to imagine." But soon the present will be past, and all the athletes will fully comprehend, with the benefit of time, the magnitude of their achievement in making our Olympic team and what they mean in their own lives and to the lives of their friends and families and what they can mean to the lives of so many millions of others in America. The Olympic moment may be over, but their lifetime of training will bring a lifetime of benefits to themselves and to all the rest of us as well.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:10 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Leroy Walker, president, U.S. Olympic Committee.

**Proclamation 6669—251st
Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas
Jefferson**

April 13, 1994

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

"I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions," Thomas Jefferson once wrote, "But . . . laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change . . . institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

These words have challenged and inspired the countless millions who have come to America's capital and have seen them inscribed on the marble wall of the Jefferson Memorial. Jefferson's statue presides nobly over America's capital city, a steadfast and enduring reminder of the democratic government that he helped to found. Yet unlike his unchanging visage, our democracy's institutions have proved to be remarkably agile in governing, maturing as society has progressed, evolving as human knowledge and technology have advanced—far beyond Jefferson's imagining. Of all the truths Jefferson knew to be self-evident, of all the freedoms he held dear, this understanding of the need for political and social innovation is perhaps his most lasting gift. He helped to endow us with the freedom to embrace change.

As we complete the year celebrating the 250th anniversary of his birth, it is entirely fitting that we again pause to reflect upon both the contradictions of Jefferson's life and the meaning of his legacy. Far from the sculpted perfection of his statue, Jefferson acknowledged, even anguished about, his failings as a leader. In expressing his fervent

hope that we would one day purge the evil of slavery from our land, he wrote, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that his justice cannot sleep forever." Despite his flaws, Jefferson imbued us with his powerful faith that justice would ultimately transcend our seeming inability to do what we know is right. And I believe he would rejoice to know how far America has come toward winning equal justice under law.

In the United States, we must constantly relearn his teaching that change is both an inevitable and essential part of safeguarding our precious freedoms. We recognize, as he did in his day, that our democracy must continue to develop, that we must shape our politics and policies to meet the rapidly shifting needs of our people and to embrace the better angels of our nature. On this day, we remember that our Nation is an ongoing experiment, a new and fragile spirit, requiring our eternal care and vigilance if it is to continue to grow and prosper and shine.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, April 13, 1994, as the 251st Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson. I encourage all Americans to reflect upon his words and deeds and to rededicate themselves to making our Nation one of which he would be proud. Additionally, I call upon the people of the United States to observe this occasion with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:11 a.m., April 14, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 15.

Statement on the Bombing in Hadera, Israel

April 13, 1994

The United States strongly condemns this terrorist act. On behalf of the American people, I want to express my condolences to the families of the innocent victims killed on Israel's day of remembrance for those who fell in war. This action, like those before it, is a further attempt by extremists to derail the peace process. They must not be allowed to succeed.

We strongly support Prime Minister Rabin's pledge that he will continue the peace negotiations regardless of such terrorist acts. We also welcome Chairman Arafat's rejection of attacks on innocent Israeli civilians intended to strike at the peace process. We believe the best response to the enemies of peace is to demonstrate that negotiations can change realities on the ground and give hope to Israelis and Palestinians for a peaceful future.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Telephone Call to Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel

April 13, 1994

The President called Prime Minister Rabin of Israel this afternoon to express his condolences over the killings of Israeli civilians in Hadera and to express his sense of urgency regarding concluding the agreement on implementation of the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles. Prime Minister Rabin agreed with the President that it was important to accelerate the negotiations and reach prompt agreement. Both leaders underscored the need to ensure that the enemies of peace do not succeed. The President made it clear that the United States was ready to do its part to ensure that the negotiations reached a successful conclusion as rapidly as possible.

Nomination for the Export-Import Bank Board of Directors

April 13, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Julie Belaga as a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

"Julie Belaga's impressive range of public and private sector experience, particularly in the area of the environment, will be a valuable addition to the Export-Import Bank Board," said the President.

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

Remarks on the American Helicopter Tragedy in Iraq and an Exchange With Reporters

April 14, 1994

The President. On behalf of the American people, I want to begin by expressing my deep sorrow at the tragedy this morning in Iraq and to extend my personal condolences to the families and the loved ones of all those who lost their lives.

Three years ago, our Armed Forces joined in a multinational mission to provide humanitarian relief to the oppressed Kurdish minority civilians in northern Iraq. Those who died today were a part of that mission of mercy. They served with courage and professionalism, and they lost their lives while trying to save the lives of others. The important work they were doing must, and will, continue.

According to initial reports, two American helicopters were mistakenly identified as Iraqi helicopters and shot down by United States aircraft. I have met with Secretary Perry this morning; I have talked with him and with General Shalikashvili, and I have instructed him to lead a full inquiry into the circumstances of this terrible incident. We will get the facts. And when we get the facts, we will make them available to the American people and to the people of Britain, France, and Turkey, our partners in Operation Provide Comfort.

Later today, Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili will be providing further briefings to you as we know more and more facts.

The facts are still coming in, and we will give them to you just as soon as we have verified exactly what occurred.

At this moment, let me close by saying that we should join together in terrible sorrow and also in honoring the high purpose for which these individuals served and in which they lost their lives. The Nation and the world should remember them in gratitude.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, what's your preliminary assessment, though? What are you being told of how this could have happened? And is there any suggestion that the troops there are on too fine of a hair trigger?

The President. Well, all that will have to be, obviously, evaluated in light of the real facts here. There are at least three points of inquiry involving, first, the actions of the American jets; second, the AWACS and their actions; and third, the actions of the helicopters themselves. And again, I will tell you we will give you as much information as we can. I just am very reluctant to say anything until we're absolutely sure. I want you to have good information, and we will be doing continuous briefings and updates all day long as we know more.

Q. Do you know anything, Mr. President, about the numbers of people that might be involved and whether they were all American?

The President. We know that there were probably more than 20 people involved and that they were not all American. We do not believe they were all American; we believe there were some other people on the helicopters.

Q. And just to follow, you seem to be indicating—

The President. We do not have—let me say, as of the moment I walked out here, we do not have an absolute roster of the people on the helicopters. I would tell you if I knew. But we think there were approximately 12 total crewmembers, and we know there were some other people on the helicopters. And we know there were some other member countries in the operations. We do not know any more than that. When we know who was on there, we will tell you. As you know, we've dispatched an American team to the site to get all the facts.

Q. Do you know, sir, how high up the chain of command the decision had to be made to go ahead and take these helicopters out, what the process was, and whether it was followed?

The President. I have been briefed on that, but I believe, to make absolutely sure that no error is made in answering that question, that is a question you should direct to Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili, because they will be briefing shortly.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, in the wake of the decision by the U.N. and NATO to bomb in Bosnia, you're now confronted with a developing hostage crisis, it appears, there where French troops are the latest to be encircled by Serbs. What is your message to the Bosnian Serbs as this appears to be moving toward crisis proportions?

The President. Well, of course, this was a concern in the beginning of all our allies who had troops on the ground there. But I would remind the Serbs that we have taken no action, none, through NATO and with the support of the U.N. to try to win a military victory for their adversaries. What we have done is taken military action in Bosnia through NATO, with the approval of the United Nations, to get them to honor the U.N. rules and to encourage them to do what they say they wish to do, which is to engage in negotiations.

There was a hopeful report in this morning's press about the ongoing efforts of the Russians through Mr. Churkin to get the Serbs to stop the aggression and to return to the negotiations. We are in touch with all the events in Bosnia today; there are lots of things going on there. I think the Serbs would be making a mistake to start treating the United Nations and NATO forces as adverse combatants. That is not what we are doing; we are trying to get them to honor their word. And they would be making a mistake to do that.

Q. Sir, if I could follow, how would you get them to make the distinction that you're making? They don't seem to be picking up on that.

The President. I think they know quite well what went on. I think they're just trying to leverage their position.

Caning in Singapore

Q. Mr. President, Singapore seems intent on caning this American teenager who was convicted of vandalism. Do you think American companies that operate in Singapore should exercise their economic clout to try and stop this? And also, former President Bush is in Singapore today. Should he—would you like to see him intercede on behalf of the young man?

The President. I've not thought through your first question; I don't know the answer to that. We have generally quite good relations with Singapore. They have a different culture, a different view, a different set of laws.

As you know, I have not objected to the young man's being punished. I have not even objected to the young man's being incarcerated. I have objected to this caning. I think many Americans who have expressed sympathy with it do not understand exactly what it involves, how it is going to be administered, and that he is going to bleed considerably and may have permanent scars. And I think it is a mistake.

President Bush will have to decide for himself what he wishes to say, but I would—if he decides to say something supportive of the absence of caning, I would certainly be grateful for that. But that—it will be a decision for him to decide what he wants to say.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 a.m. in the Press Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Vitaly Churkin, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister.

Remarks to Mayors and Law Enforcement Officials

April 14, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you. Please be seated. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, as some of you may know, early this morning two American helicopters, flying in northern Iraq as part of Op-

eration Provide Comfort to provide humanitarian relief to the Kurdish population there, were mistakenly shot down in a tragic accident by two United States jet fighters who thought they were Iraqi helicopters illegally in the area.

This is a terrible tragedy for the families involved and for the people in the Armed Forces who have courageously tried to protect the Kurds for many years now. And I would like to ask that, since so many of you put your lives on the line every day, we open this ceremony with a moment of silent prayer for those who lost their lives, their families, and their loved ones.

[At this point, Mayor Abramson, Sgt. Lawson, Mayor James, Mayor Daley, and Mayor Riordan made brief remarks.]

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mayor Riordan, Mayor Abramson, Mayor James, Mayor Daley. Sergeant Lawson, you gave a great talk today, and you represented people in law enforcement very well, and we thank you especially for being here. To Attorney General Reno and the other Federal officials who are here, all the distinguished mayors, the leaders of our law enforcement organizations, and all of you in law enforcement, I thank those of you on the front lines of fighting the crime problem for coming here to Washington today to urge Congress to pass the crime bill now and without delay.

Behind me stand people who represent, not only by their own courageous deeds but by the uniforms they wear, the heroes of law enforcement who stand behind all the rest of us every day, people who wake up every morning, put on a uniform, and put their lives on the line to protect our safety. There are nearly 100 of them from every State in America. They do good work. They can not only catch criminals, they can prevent crime. And that's why we want to put another 100,000 like them on our streets over the next 5 years.

Last week, I was in communities all across America like those represented here today. The Attorney General was, too. And everywhere people wanted to talk about the crime problem, about the violence, about the tear-

ing away of the future of so many children's lives.

When you go to Capitol Hill today, tell Congress that the people you and I work for have waited long enough. The people don't care about amendments that could slow the process down. They don't want partisan bickering. They want the bill certainly to be reviewed carefully and to be honestly debated, but this is not a problem, as Mayor Riordan so eloquently said, that the American people see in terms of partisan advantages.

Nearly one-third of all American families—Democrats, Republicans, and independents, whites, blacks, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, you name it—all of us, we share a common curse: In the most wonderful country in the world, we have the highest violent crime rate, the largest percentage of our people behind bars, cities where young people in gangs are often better armed than the police forces who are supposed to protect the rest of the citizens. We can do better than this, and this crime bill is a very good start. Ask Congress simply to give you the tools you need to do your job.

The 100,000 new police officers is a 5-year goal. But I have made it clear to Congress that if they will go ahead and pass this bill now, even though it's mid-April, I will cut through the bureaucracy and the redtape to make sure that 20,000 of those new officers are hired, trained, and ready to go to work within the first year of this bill.

More police officers on the street, in the neighborhoods, relating to the people who live there, properly trained and properly deployed, will lower the crime rate. In Los Angeles—he was too modest to mention this, but after the earthquake, Mayor Riordan and Chief Williams responded to a potentially explosive situation by increasing police presence on the street, increasing contact with the community. And there was instead of an increase in the crime rate, which was perfectly predictable, a dramatic decrease in the crime rate. The Los Angeles Times said it helped keep criminals off the street in record numbers. The people of L.A. rose to the occasion because they saw the police in their communities, they knew they were not alone, and they knew it was a problem that, together, they could deal with.

No matter how many more police we put into our communities, we also know that we have to do something about the relatively small percentage of our criminal population who commit the dangerous, violent crimes repeatedly. This crime bill does tell them, "Three strikes and you're out." As I have said several times and I said with the Attorney General over at the Justice Department a couple of days ago, this is a controversial provision of the bill. But let us not forget that for many violent criminals today, if the consequences of their crime are serious enough, they could get a life sentence: "One strike and you're out."

But State rules are different from State to State on parole eligibility. And there are many people that we now know are highly likely to continue to repeat certain kinds of very serious crimes. There ought to be a provision in our criminal law that identifies them and that protects the rest of the population and the law enforcement population and permits us to say to other criminals who are not in that category, "You have a chance to start your life again." So, is it right to have a "Three strikes and you're out" law? I believe it is. And I think that we're doing the right thing to pass it in this bill today.

We also make available funding for 30,000 more prison cells so that we don't treat this as some sort of mandate on the States. We are trying to help the States to enact their own kinds of sensible punishment laws and bear some of the costs along with them. We also provide funding for smarter and less costly punishment for nonviolent criminals—boot camps for juvenile offenders—and significant, even dramatic, increases in drug treatment so that people who are going to be paroled have a good chance to make it once they go back on the street. I thank you, Sergeant Lawson, for mentioning Lee Brown, the Director of our drug policy. Now he worries not only about community policing but about how we can make sure, when we do parole people, they're likely to be law-abiding. And I can tell you, it does not make sense, when you look at the percentage of people who commit crimes who have a drug or an alcohol abuse problem, it does not make any sense to put them back on the street without adequate drug treatment. Fi-

nally, this bill does something about that. And the Congress should be urged to pass it for that reason alone, along with the other good things in the bill.

Let me say finally, this bill has a healthy dose of prevention. And we know that works. And I was glad to see Sergeant Lawson speak up for prevention. It's funny, you know, you hear sometimes the debates in the Congress and people who want to be tough on crime say, "Well, this prevention stuff, it's a little squishy, and maybe we shouldn't spend the money on it." But if you talk to any veteran police officer, they tell you, "Spend the money on prevention. Give me the tools to do alcohol and drug abuse education. Give me the tools to give these kids something to do before school and after school and at night. Give me the tools to give these young people something to say yes to, instead of just having us tell them to say no to something wrong." That's what the law enforcement community tells us. So I would ask you as you go to the Hill today, if you believe that, as every law enforcement official I've ever spoken with does, tell the Congress that prevention is an important part of this.

On Monday at the Justice Department, a young man from Boston named Eddie Cutanda stood up and said he used to hate the police. Pretty brave kid. There were about 500 police officers there when he said it. [Laughter] And he said he used to hate the police, because he used to run the streets with his friends. But he got away from gangs and drugs, thanks to a community policing program and the kind of afterschool activity that the officers were able to bring to the young people of Boston, a prevention program that worked, that made this young man and his friends go from hating the police to loving the police and had him standing up in the Justice Department with the Attorney General and the President of the United States, saying, "We are not part of a lost generation; we want to have a life and a better future." There are all kinds of prevention strategies in this bill including the opportunity for some of our communities to offer large numbers of jobs to teenagers who are today out of work, just to test to see whether that will lower the crime rate dramatically. We will be able to experiment with a lot of

different things, as well as building on what works in community after community.

You know, I ran for this job and moved to Washington because I wanted to help empower people back home all over America to solve their own problems. That's what this crime bill does. And another thing I am proud of is we do it without new taxes, even though, as Mayor James said, it is by far the biggest Federal investment, and Mayor Abramson emphasized, by far the biggest Federal investment in anticrime activities in the history of this country.

We do it by taking a major portion of the Vice President's reinventing Government plan, a plan to reduce the Federal bureaucracy by 250,000 employees over the next 5 years and put all the savings into a trust fund directed to fund the crime bill. That's a pretty good swap: reduce the Federal Government by 250,000 by attrition, by early retirement, with discipline over the next 5 years, and give all the money from the savings back to local communities to make our streets, our homes, and our schools safer.

Again, let me thank you all for coming here. Let me remind you that this is not a partisan issue or a sectional issue or a racial issue or an income issue. If anything should unite our country, if anything should truly make us a United States of America in 1994, it should be the passionate desire to restore real freedom to our streets, to give our families back their security, to give our children back their future.

I thank all of you for what you have done to secure it. I look forward now to honoring these fine police men and women behind me, and I urge you: take this opportunity to make it abundantly clear to the United States Congress that America should not wait another day, another week, for a crime bill that will achieve these objectives. We need it, and you can deliver it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:35 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Richard Riordan of Los Angeles, CA; Mayor Jerry Abramson of Louisville, KY; Mayor Sharpe James of Newark, NJ; Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago, IL; and Sgt. Marc Lawson of the Atlanta Police Department.

Executive Order 12907—Amending Executive Order No. 12882

April 14, 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 add three members to the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology, it is hereby ordered that the number "16" in the second sentence of section 1 of Executive Order No. 12882 is deleted and the number "19" is inserted in lieu thereof, and that the number "15" in the second sentence of section 1 of Executive Order No. 12882 is deleted and the number "18" is inserted in lieu thereof.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 14, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:03 p.m., April 14, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on April 18.

Proclamation 6670—National Park Week, 1994

April 14, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Theodore Roosevelt once said that nothing short of defending this country in wartime "compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land an even better land for our descendants than it is for us . . ." In the movement to acquire and preserve areas of outstanding scenic or historical significance, Roosevelt blended science and morality in a highly effective and nonpartisan way.

The idea of creating national parks first attracted attention in the second half of the nineteenth century, when America's receding wilderness left our natural resources vulnerable to misuse and exploitation. The Yellowstone National Park Act of 1872 set aside the world's first national park and led the

way for Federal protection of exceptional lands for public use.

As the number of early parks increased, many recognized the need for their collective management. The National Park Service was created by an act of Congress signed by President Woodrow Wilson on August 25, 1916. Today, almost 78 years later, the National Park Service oversees 367 national parks, including historic sites, monuments, parks, lakeshores, seashores, rivers, and scenic trails. The growth of the park system is a result of the American public's desire to protect the best and most significant treasures of our Nation.

National parks across the country, from Denali National Park in Alaska to Acadia National Park in Maine, allow us to learn more about our environment; they teach us to respect our lands and to care about endangered plant and animal species. Their spectacular scenic beauty and wide variety of wildlife link man and nature intrinsically and universally. The cultural and historic parks connect us with the spirit of our past and form a national family tree, celebrating our triumphs and remembering our tragedies.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim the week of May 23 through May 29, 1994, as "National Park Week." I encourage all Americans to join me in making National Park Week a truly American celebration of our heritage. We are challenged to protect and preserve our parks, to cherish them first, then to teach our children to do the same, so that they, too, can give this gift to their children.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 9:11 a.m., April 15, 1994]

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

Proclamation 6671—Death of Those Aboard American Helicopters In Iraq

April 14, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As a mark of respect for those who died as a result of the tragic incident in northern Iraq, which occurred on April 14, 1994, I hereby order, by the authority vested in me as President of the United States of America by section 175 of title 36 of the United States Code, that the flag of the United States shall be flown at half-staff upon all public buildings and grounds, at all military posts and naval stations, and on all naval vessels of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions until sunset, Monday, April 18, 1994. I also direct that the flag shall be flown at half-staff for the same length of time at all United States embassies, legations, consular offices, and other facilities abroad, including all military facilities and naval vessels and stations.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:47 a.m., April 15, 1994]

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

Nomination for an Under Secretary at the Department of the Treasury

April 14, 1994

The President today announced the nomination of Assistant Treasury Secretary Ronald K. Noble as Treasury Under Secretary for Enforcement.

"I am pleased to nominate Ron to this newly created and critically important position," the President said. "I am confident

that his proven leadership and skilled service in the area of law enforcement will continue to contribute greatly to our fight against crime.”

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

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Meeting With Prime Minister Tansu Ciller of Turkey
April 14, 1994

President Clinton offered his condolences to the Turkish Prime Minister and to the families and loved ones of those Turkish citizens who lost their lives today in the accident in northern Iraq. Prime Minister Ciller expressed her own sorrow at the loss of life.

The President and Prime Minister Ciller discussed her economic reform package. He urged her to move forward quickly with her reform program and to work closely with the International Monetary Fund. The two leaders also discussed the situation in Cyprus. President Clinton and Prime Minister Ciller agreed to continue to do what they can to make progress soon in the talks on the confidence building measures package.

Remarks on the American Helicopter Tragedy in Iraq and an Exchange With Reporters
April 15, 1994

The President. Hello. The people here from Louisiana and Texas are here primarily for health care, and I apologize for the delay. But I met for an hour and a half this morning with my national security team about a variety of issues, but I wanted to say in particular a word of update about the terrible tragedy in Iraq yesterday.

After I met yesterday with my national security advisers, I spoke with Prime Minister Major and with President Mitterrand, expressed my condolences for the losses of French and British citizens, and assured them of what I can now reassure you about, which is that we've put together an investigative team which is now on the site and is working. We will move as quickly as possible

to do a thorough and complete investigation and then to put out all the facts.

In a couple of hours, an hour or so, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be having a briefing at the Pentagon to discuss this further and to answer further questions. But we are going to stay on top of this, work through it, and make a full report to the American people.

If there are any other questions—perhaps we could take some questions on foreign policy or any other national issues for a while, and then we'll come back to the health care questioning.

Iraq

Q. Sir, in light of that shooting down, should the peacekeeping mission in Iraq continue?

The President. Oh, I think so. I very definitely think so. Keep in mind these people—the tragedy of this is that both sets of planes, the two helicopters and the two planes were there trying to save the lives of the Kurds. And I think it has performed a very valuable function, not only in saving the lives of the Kurds but in permitting them to continue to live in northern Iraq and relieving Turkey of a very serious potential refugee problem.

There is no question in my mind that it has been a very successful and a very important mission. The Secretary of Defense implied yesterday and said again today that we would obviously, in the course of this investigation, be reviewing all the tactical issues involved. But our policy is sound, and I believe it should continue.

Bosnia

Q. In Bosnia, sir, there's another issue of peacekeeping. You have recent events by the Bosnian Serbs' actions that have been taken against U.N. peacekeepers and military observers. You yesterday made a statement you've been sending a message to them. But apparently, that message has not been getting across. Why is that, would you say? And is there a chance that there could be a stalemate emerging?

The President. Well, I think that some friction was predictable when the policy began. But let me remind you that since the

United Nations has taken a more vigorous approach and asked NATO to be available, in fact, to provide close air support and created a safe zone around Sarajevo, substantial progress has been made. After a long time when virtually no progress was made, we've had relative peace in the Sarajevo area; we've had the agreement between the Croats and the Muslims which is holding.

We had some friction as a result of the last round of very modest air strikes as a result of the shelling of Gorazde which put United Nations personnel at risk. I think that what I have to do, again, is to clarify if there is any real doubt that the United States has no interest in having NATO become involved in this war and trying to gain some advantage for one side over the other.

But I think we must maintain an absolutely firm support of the U.N. policy. We can't have our U.N. personnel there vulnerable to shelling and to attack with no one there to defend them. The United Nations does not wish to become involved in changing the military balance.

Finally, I would say the most important thing is for the parties to get back to the negotiations. And I, again, want to say that Mr. Churkin from Russia is working hard on this. Our Ambassador, Mr. Redman, is there working. The United Nations is working. So I'd say our position is to be firm but not provocative and not trying to change the military balance. We need to get the negotiations back on track.

But remember, this policy has produced a lot of progress, after a prolonged period in which there was a lot of bloodshed and no progress. And I think if the Serbs will consider what the reality is, they will see that they have a lot more to gain from negotiations than from provocation. We should just be firm and work through this.

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, you say the investigation is continuing in Iraq. Do you have, however, any preliminary estimates of what caused this incident?

The President. No, sir, I don't, really. Like every other interested American—I think almost all our people are interested in this, I suppose—I have asked a lot of ques-

tions, and I've been able to ask a lot of those questions. But I think it would be a real disservice to the process for us to jump the gun. I don't want to mislead the American people. I don't want to say something that might later be proved wrong. We will conduct a thorough and vigorous investigation, and we will do our best to get all of the evidence out to you. But I don't want to make a preliminary judgment.

Peacekeeping Operations

Q. Mr. President, right now on your desk, you have the Presidential directive dealing with peacekeeping. We understand that it's very close to completion, if not virtually completed. And it raises a lot of the things that have been happening this week—are touching on the issue of peacekeeping. Our understanding is, there are going to be tougher criteria for getting involved in peacekeeping activities. Is that the case? And could that mean that there would be fewer peacekeeping ventures?

The President. Well, keep in the mind, the United Nations decides which peacekeeping ventures it will get involved in. And then we have to decide which ones in which we will become involved.

There are several issues here. And if I might, let me just outline some of them. Some of them relate to the management of the peacekeeping operations rather than particular decisions. The United States has long favored tighter financial controls and oversight. And we have urged the appointment of an inspector general at the United Nations publicly. We have also felt that our overall contribution to the peacekeeping cost was higher than it should have been and considerably higher than our world's share of annual income. So we have asked for some—we will seek some change of that. We also want to be very clear about the standards for our involvement in peacekeeping operations.

Now, having said that, I met with a bipartisan committee of congressional leaders yesterday morning and urged them to support our peacekeeping budget this year because we have a sensible way of avoiding dropping behind again in our obligations dividing the responsibilities between the Defense and State Department. And I asked Congress to

help me pay the arrears that we owe to the United Nations in peacekeeping. Even our own forces who went to Somalia can't be fully reimbursed in large measure because the United States owes more debt to the peacekeeping fund than any other country.

So I believe being involved with other nations in peacekeeping is a good way of burden sharing. After all, we only have—I think fewer than one percent of the forces involved in peacekeeping in the world now are American forces. We have about 5 percent of the world's population. We have less than one percent of the world's forces involved in peacekeeping.

So while we pay a little more than I think we should, our commitment in terms of manpower is less than our population would appear to warrant and certainly than our military capacity would. So we have been advantaged by multinational peacekeeping, and I will support it. I do think we need to have higher standards, and that will be in my directive when it comes out.

Q. Sir, when do you sign the——

The President. I'm not sure. We're working—we're very close. We've been working on it for a long time as you noted.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:51 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Charles Redman, U.S. Special Envoy for the Former Yugoslavia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Disaster Assistance for California

April 15, 1994

Our administration is doing everything we can to respond to the continuing needs of individuals, families, businesses, and communities arising from the January earthquake. California's economic future depends in part on a strong recovery from the earthquake, and the loans and other assistance included in this package will help considerably. Our departments and agencies will continue to monitor events in California and take whatever actions are needed to meet Federal responsibilities there.

NOTE: This statement was part of a White House press release on disaster assistance for California.

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.

April 11

The President declared a major disaster exists in Virginia following severe winter storms that struck the State on March 1 to 5, and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts.

April 13

The President announced his intention to appoint Evelyne Villines, Gary Krump, Leonard Vincent, and Donald Wedewer as members to the Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped.

April 14

The President declared a major disaster exists in Tennessee and ordered Federal funds to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the areas struck by rainfall and flash flooding on March 25 through April 3.

The President announced his intention to nominate Philip Edward Coyle, III, to be the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation at the Department of Defense.

The President announced his intention to nominate Manuel Trinidad Pacheco as a member of the National Security Education Board.

The President also announced his intention to appoint the following individuals as members of the American Battle Monuments Commission:

- Hugh Carey;
- Evelyn Pat Foote;
- Gabriel Guerra-Mondragon;
- Rolland Kidder;
- Douglas Kinnard;
- Alfred Los Banos;
- Tom Lyons;

—Brenda Moore; and
—Gary Reals.

April 15

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton hosted a reception for the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

The President announced his intention to nominate Patricia Fry Godley as Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy at the Department of Energy.

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 April 11

Carol Jones Carmody,
of Louisiana, for the rank of Minister during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Peter R. Chaveas,
of Pennsylvania, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malawi.

Myles Robert Rene Frechette,
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 Republic of Colombia.

Donna Jean Hrinak,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Joseph Edward Lake,
of Texas, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to

Administration of William J. Clinton, 1994

be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Albania.

Johnny Young,
of Pennsylvania, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Togo.

Bonnie O'Day,
of Massachusetts, to be a member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 1995, vice George H. Oberle, Jr., term expired.

Leo J. O'Donovan,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 1998, vice David N. Baker, term expired.

Judith O. Rubin,
of New York, to be a member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 1998, vice Sally Brayley Bliss, term expired.

Rhonda Reid Winston,
of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for a term of 15 years, vice Peter Henry Wolf, term expired.

Submitted April 12

Irvin Hicks,
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 Ethiopia.

Timothy A. Chorba,
of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Singapore.

Maria Otero,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for a term expiring September 20, 1994, vice Victor Blanco, resigned.

Maria Otero,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member
of the Board of Directors of the Inter-Amer-
ican Foundation for a term expiring Septem-
ber 20, 2000 (reappointment).

A. J. Eggenberger,
of Montana, to be a member of the Defense
Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term
expiring October 18, 1998 (reappointment).

Herbert Kouts,
of New York, to be a member of the Defense
Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term
expiring October 18, 1997 (reappointment).

Jan M. Chaiken,
of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Bu-
reau of Justice Statistics, vice Steven D.
Dillingham, resigned.

Gregory Moneta Sleet,
of Delaware, to be U.S. Attorney for the Dis-
trict of Delaware for the term of 4 years,
vice William C. Carpenter, Jr., resigned.

Redding Pitt,
of Alabama, to be U.S. Attorney for the Mid-
dle District of Alabama for the term of 4
years, vice James E. Wilson.

Faith S. Hochberg,
of New Jersey, to be U.S. Attorney for the
District of New Jersey for the term of 4 years,
vice Michael Chertoff.

Valerie Lau,
of California, to be Inspector General, De-
partment of the Treasury, vice Donald E.
Kirkendall, resigned.

Patricia Ann Brown,
of New York, to be a member of the National
Council on the Arts for a term expiring Sep-
tember 3, 1996, vice James Nowell Wood,
term expired.

Ira Ronald Feldman,
of New York, to be a member of the National
Council on the Arts for a term expiring Sep-
tember 3, 1998, vice Harvey Lichtenstein,
term expired.

Barbara Wallace Grossman,
of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Na-
tional Council on the Arts for a term expiring

September 3, 1998, vice Arthur Mitchell,
term expired.

Submitted April 13

Robert Krueger,
of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary
and Plenipotentiary of the United States of
America to the Republic of Burundi.

Steven Mark Hart Wallman,
of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities
and Exchange Commission for the term ex-
piring June 5, 1997, vice Edward H.
Fleischman, resigned.

Submitted April 14

Rachelle B. Chong,
of California, to be a member of the Federal
Communications Commission for a term of
5 years from July 1, 1992, vice Sherrie Patrice
Marshall, resigned.

Susan Ness,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal
Communications Commission for the re-
mainder of the term expiring June 30, 1994,
vice Ervin S. Duggan, resigned.

Susan Ness,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal
Communications Commission for a term of
5 years from July 1, 1994 (reappointment).

Cynthia A. Metzler,
of the District of Columbia, to be an Assist-
ant Secretary of Labor (new position).

Ronald K. Noble,
of New York, to be Under Secretary of the
Treasury for Enforcement (new position).

Raymond G. Romero,
of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of
Transportation, vice Jeffrey Neil Shane, re-
signed.

Alan Sagner,
of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board
of Directors of the Corporation for Public
Broadcasting for the remainder of the term
expiring January 31, 1998, vice David P.
Prosperi.

Dharmendra K. Sharma, of California, to be Administrator of the Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation (new position).

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 April 9

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the Chinese Government's recent record on human rights

Released April 11

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by White House Staff Secretary John Podesta on Hillary Clinton's commodities transactions

Released April 12

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen on taxes and the President's deficit reduction plan

Released April 13

Transcript of a press briefing by Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen and Small Business

Administration of William J. Clinton, 1994

Administrator Erskine Bowles on health care reform

Released April 15

Statement by Director of Communications Mark Gearan on the President and Mrs. Clinton's Federal income tax

Statement by Director of Communications Mark Gearan on Chelsea Clinton's Federal income tax

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Council of Economic Advisers Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson on taxes

Acts Approved by the President

Approved April 11

S. 476 / Public Law 103-232
To reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act, and for other purposes

S. 1299 / Public Law 103-233
Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994

Approved April 14

S. 1206 / Public Law 103-234
To redesignate the Federal building located at 380 Trapelo Road in Waltham, Massachusetts, as the "Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center"