

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, April 25, 1994
Volume 30—Number 16
Pages 821–891

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Ameritech employees in Milwaukee, WI—826
Bosnia—824, 825, 849, 881
Democratic Congressional Dinner—862
Earth Day—865
National Infant Immunization Week,
proclamation signing ceremony—853
Radio address—822
Teacher of the Year Award, presentation
ceremony—870

Appointments and Nominations

Education Department, Rehabilitation
Services Administration, Commissioner—
862
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission,
members—853
Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors,
Vice Chairman and member—888
World Bank, U.S. Executive Director and
Alternate U.S. Executive Director—852

Communications to Congress

Cyprus conflict report, letter—834
Embargo on Haiti, letter—861
Peacekeeping operations in the Former
Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, letter—
851
Trade with China, message—873
Trade with South Africa, message—872

Communications to Federal Agencies

Trade with China, memorandum—872

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Milwaukee, WI—833
Newport News, VA—824
Oval Office—855, 880

Interviews With the News Media—Continued

Rose Garden—849
South Lawn—825
Interviews
Journalists on South Africa—874
MTV's "Enough is Enough" Forum—836
News conferences
April 20 (No. 55)—856
April 22 (No. 56) with Prime Minister
Papandreou of Greece—881

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Austria, Chancellor Vranitzky—855
Greece, Prime Minister Papandreou—880,
881

Proclamations

Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and
Tissue Donor Awareness Week—821
National Infant Immunization Week—854
National Volunteer Week—822
National Youth Service Day—852
To Amend the Generalized System of
Preferences—872

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations
Advisory Committee on Human Radiation
Experiments—871
Agreement on elections in South Africa—850
School-to-work opportunities legislation—871
State Criminal Alien Assistance Program—889

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—891
Checklist of White House press releases—891
Digest of other White House
announcements—889
Nominations submitted to the Senate—890

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Week Ending Friday, April 22, 1994

**Proclamation 6672—Nancy Moore
Thurmond National Organ and
Tissue Donor Awareness Week, 1994**
April 15, 1994

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

Perhaps the most precious legacy that one human being can bestow upon another is the gift of life. The unselfish decision to donate one's organs after death is an act of generosity that can mean the beginning of new life for others. Advanced medical knowledge and techniques have allowed bone marrow transplants to bring hope and healing to children with leukemia; the gift of a new heart, lung, or liver has enabled many terminally ill Americans who would otherwise have died, to live longer, fuller lives. A new kidney has provided improved health, and the donation of a cornea has restored the miracle of sight. Unfortunately, however, many people still wait, and many people still die waiting for a suitable organ to become available.

Today there are more than 34,000 patients on the national transplant waiting list, and a new patient is added to the list every 20 minutes. The gap between the number of patients on the waiting list and the number of donors continues to widen, and many more will needlessly die. The United States has the potential to maintain an adequate supply of donor organs. To fulfill that potential we must increase public awareness of the urgent need for donation. All Americans need to know that by completing a donor card and carrying it, and by discussing with their families their wishes to donate, they may give the blessing of life to other Americans in need of organs for transplantation.

One year ago, on April 14, 1993, a tragic auto accident claimed the life of Nancy Moore Thurmond, the beautiful, gifted, and caring young daughter of Senator Strom

Thurmond and his wife, Nancy. Their courageous decision to donate her organs so that others might live was in accordance with Nancy's wishes and, even in death, has enabled the promise of her young life to continue. The Thurmond family, along with others who have made the same magnanimous gesture for their loved ones, can find some measure of comfort in knowing that they have, indeed, bequeathed the gift of life.

The Congress, by Public Law 103-30, has designated the week beginning April 17, 1994, as "Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of April 17 through April 23, 1994, as Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week. I urge all health care professionals, educators, the media, public and private organizations concerned with organ donation and transplantation, and all Americans to join me in promoting greater and more widespread awareness and acceptance of this humanitarian cause.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifteenth 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, 2:06 p.m., April 15, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 19. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 6673—National Volunteer Week, 1994

April 15, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Since the founding of our democracy, the ideal of community service has been an integral part of our national character. As the words of Thomas Jefferson remind us, "A debt of service is due from every man to his country proportioned to the bounties which nature and fortune have measured to him." Throughout our history, Americans have been called upon to meet his challenge a thousandfold. For our Nation is a place of tremendous blessings—a noble purpose, a wealth of resources, a diverse and determined people. We are rich in the gifts of freedom. During this week especially, we realize anew that shared responsibility is freedom's price.

That our vibrant spirit of community has made our country strong reflects our understanding of this enduring truth. Every day, countless volunteers across America work to address the fundamental necessities of our people—educating our youth, protecting our environment, caring for those in need. From children who help older Americans after school to volunteer firemen who guard our neighborhoods while we sleep, these dedicated individuals bring a sense of hope and security to everyone whose lives they touch. Their service makes us stronger as a Nation, setting a powerful example of leadership and compassion to which we all can aspire.

This past year has marked the beginning of a new era for America, an era in which those of us who have benefited from this great land are acting on our instincts to help others in return. Though government has an important role to play in meeting the many challenges that remain before us, we are coming to understand that no organization, including government, will fully succeed without the active participation of each of us. Working family by family, block by block, the efforts of America's volunteers are vital to enabling this country to live up to the true promise of its heritage.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim the week of April 17 through April 23, 1994, as "National Volunteer Week." I call upon all Americans to observe this week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities as an expression of their gratitude.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifteenth 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, 11:03 a.m., April 18, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 16, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 19.

The President's Radio Address

April 16, 1994

Good morning. This week we joined in sorrow for those who lost their lives in the downing of two of our helicopters over Iraq. I want to begin by expressing, again, my condolences to the loved ones of those who died. They gave their lives in a high cause, providing comfort to Kurdish victims of Saddam Hussein's brutal regime, and we honor the sacrifice of those brave individuals.

Today I want to talk about one of the greatest threats we face right here at home: the threat of crime in our communities. In 1991, I visited the Rockwell Gardens in the ABLA housing projects in Chicago where I saw firsthand what happens to our children who live too long in the shadow of fear. Dozens of children rushed out to greet me, eager to have someone to tell their stories to. They talked of gunshots and drug dealers, of late-night knocks at their doors and hallways where they dared not stray. Many of their stories had a common theme: their childhoods were being stolen from them.

Vince Lane, the head of the Chicago Housing Authority, is a genuine hero to these

children. He's trying to show the children that someone cares. To help, he put into effect a search-and-sweep policy to clean out Chicago's public housing communities, to find weapons, to get people out of those housing projects who didn't belong, to find drugs. But just over a week ago a Federal district judge declared Vince Lane's search-and-sweep policy unconstitutional.

Every law-abiding American, rich or poor, has the right to raise children without the fear of criminals terrorizing where they live. That's why, as soon as I heard about the court's decision, I instructed Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry Cisneros and Attorney General Janet Reno to devise a constitutional, effective way to protect the residents of America's public housing communities. Secretary Cisneros and Attorney General Reno moved quickly. Today I am announcing a new policy to help public housing residents take back their homes.

First, at my direction, Secretary Cisneros is in Chicago to provide emergency funds for enforcement and prevention in gang-infested public housing. We'll put more police in public housing, crack down on illegal gun trafficking, and fill vacant apartments where criminals hide out. And we'll provide more programs like midnight basketball leagues to help our young people say no to gangs and guns and drugs. Second, we will empower residents to build safe neighborhoods, and we'll help to organize tenant patrols to ride the elevators and look after the public spaces in these high-rise public housing units. Finally, we're going to work with residents in high-crime areas to permit the full range of searches that the Constitution does allow in common areas, in vacant apartments, and in circumstances where residents are in immediate danger. We'll encourage more weapons frisks of suspicious persons, and we'll ask tenant associations to put clauses in their leases allowing searches when crime conditions make it necessary.

This new policy honors the principles of personal and community responsibility at the very heart of this administration's efforts. It also shows all Americans that their Government can move swiftly and effectively on their behalf.

Now we must move swiftly on the crime bill before Congress. The bill provides the right balance of protection, punishment, and prevention. It will put 100,000 more police officers on the streets for community policing efforts that work. It will make "Three strikes and you're out" the law of the land and provide money for new prisons. And it will pay for a wide variety of prevention programs to give our young people a future they can say yes to.

This is a crucial moment in the crime bill debate. It's time to tell Congress you've waited long enough for comprehensive national crime legislation, that you don't want political posturing or frivolous amendments, and instead, you need help to take back your communities.

This crime bill is for all our people, but nobody needs it more than the people like the mother of three who lives right here in Washington. A week ago, this 33-year-old mother came home after celebrating her 10-year-old daughter's birthday to find a gang of gunmen ransacking her apartment. The mother had one plea for the intruders: "If you believe in God, please don't shoot my children. Shoot me." The reply was cold and terrifying. "I don't believe in God," said one of the gunmen. Then he shot her daughter dead. Before the gunfire ceased, another child and the mother were both shot, and her 3-year-old son witnessed the whole thing. The sad fact is, the police now believe the shootings were carried out by youths who hang out in the very apartment complex where that mother was trying to raise her children.

There are many rights that our laws and our Constitution guarantee to every citizen, but that mother and her children have certain rights we are letting slip away. They include the right to go out to the playground and the right to sit by an open window, the right to walk to the corner without fear of gunfire, the right to go to school safely in the morning, and the right to celebrate your tenth birthday without coming home to bloodshed and terror. The crime bill will help us take back those rights for all of our people, so will our new policy to protect public housing residents.

We must decide we will not tolerate more tragedies like that mother's. When we do that, together, we can replace our children's fear with hope.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:20 p.m. on April 15 in the Cabinet Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 16.

Remarks on Bosnia and an Exchange With Reporters in Newport News, Virginia

April 17, 1994

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I've received a number of reports today on the situation in Bosnia. I've also been in touch today with President Yeltsin.

We don't have any definitive reports on the status of Gorazde, but I can tell you that there has been some progress in the negotiations between the United Nations and the Serbs. Mr. Akashi has been working on it, Ambassador Redman and Mr. Churkin, and they may have something to announce shortly.

I also—I don't know that this has been made public or not, but the Serbs released 16 Canadian soldiers, and we're working on the release of the other UNPROFOR forces today. So the situation is still tense around Gorazde. There is still some degree of uncertainty there, but there has been, as of my latest report, which was just about 10 minutes ago, some progress in the negotiations between the U.N. and the Serbs on getting back to the negotiations and reducing the tensions.

Q. What's the U.S. role been?

The President. Well, essentially, we've been—Ambassador Redman has been there. He's been working very hard, especially for the last 7 hours, trying to hammer out an agreement that everybody could live with, along with the U.N. and Mr. Churkin.

Secondly, we've worked very closely with the Russians trying to think about what the end game might be, how we can work this out to a successful conclusion over the long run. And of course, we're still a very important part of the NATO alliance, and we're committed to doing whatever we're asked to

do by General Rose. But keep in mind, except for the safe area around Sarajevo, our role in NATO has been to provide close air support, or, if necessary, to protect the UNPROFOR troops, the U.N. troops, and where it's possible to do that. So we have the role, but we also have this diplomatic role, and we're doing our best to fulfill it.

Q. Have there been any violations of the new truce since the 3-mile zone was agreed to?

The President. I don't want to comment on anything definitively with regard to Gorazde, because we have been getting reports over the last 4 and 5 hours, kind of mixed reports. But on balance, the last report I got was encouraging in terms of an agreement impending between the U.N. and the Serbs.

Q. Were the next reports reports of tank incursions into that zone?

The President. There's one, I think. I think there was a news report that there was at least one tank sighted. But I want to say that we have no reports at the moment that the status of Gorazde has changed.

Thank you.

Q. Is military action still possible?

The President. It depends on NATO. It depends on what the U.N. commander on the ground, General Rose wants. But their conclusions were twofold. One is that with regard to Gorazde itself, it wouldn't necessarily be possible now for close air support to have the desired military effect. And secondly, that they're trying to get a negotiated agreement here that can serve as the basis not only for relieving Gorazde but for getting these peace talks back on track. So that's what we hope we're doing.

Q. Are you considering actually easing the economic sanctions on the Serbs?

The President. No, not based on anything that's happened so far. We have said to the Russians that if they want to discuss that with us, that of course we would be willing to discuss it if certain conditions on the ground were met. But continued Serb aggression on the ground, not only in Gorazde but everywhere else, is hardly an encouragement to discuss that. That's not even—we can't even begin discussions in the environment which has existed for the last few days there.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:25 a.m. at the Newport News Williamsburg International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Yasushi Akashi, highest ranking U.N. official in the Former Yugoslavia; Ambassador Charles E. Redman, U.S. Special Envoy for the Former Yugoslavia; and Vitaly Churkin, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on Bosnia and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to Departure for Milwaukee, Wisconsin

April 18, 1994

The President. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to say a word or two about the situation in Bosnia. First of all, as all of you know, the situation in and around Gorazde remains grim and uncertain. I think it is important to point out why this happened. It happened because the Serbs violated the understandings of a cease-fire that they—agreement they made with both the United Nations and with the Russians. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that the Russians, working through Mr. Churkin's able leadership, have reached an agreement with the Serbs which they have not honored.

The United Nations commander on the ground, General Rose, made the judgment at several points over the last couple of days that NATO close-air support was either not practically feasible or would not be helpful under the circumstances. In Gorazde, we have—we, the United States working through NATO—basically are empowered only to provide close-air support to U.N. troops when they are under siege or under threat of attack on request of the U.N. commander.

I have monitored this situation very closely all weekend; I have spent a good deal of time on it on Saturday. I had lots of conversations yesterday about it and have met this morning with Mr. Lake. Our national security principals will be meeting today to consider what else we can and should do in this circumstance.

The main thing I want to point out is that we have to find a way to get the momentum back. The big successes in the last couple

of months in Bosnia have been, obviously, preserving Sarajevo and achieving the agreement between the Croatians and the Government—the Bosnian Government. They are very important; those things still hold, and I'm convinced we can find a way to build on them and go forward.

But this has not been a great weekend for the peace effort in Bosnia. I do think that the big things are still working in the long-term favor of peace. And we'll just have to see where we are, and we'll be reporting more as the day goes on and through the rest of the week.

Q. Mr. President, you wanted to lift the arms embargo a year ago, would you still like to do it? You would lead an effort to do that? It would take American leadership, many in Congress say, to do this.

The President. The Americans tried to lead it before. We will be discussing now what our other options are. As you know, at the time there was a clear specific reason we couldn't succeed in lifting the arms embargo, which was that not just the Russians but the French and British did not want to do it because they had soldiers on the ground. Now their soldiers on the ground are in danger. The real question we would have to work through there is how many countries would go along, and could we get it through the U.N.? But I've always favored doing it.

I just want to say, though—I want to ask you all to think about—those who say, there are many who say, "Well, we can do it unilaterally, and we ought to do it unilaterally." But remember, if we do that, first of all, there are substantial questions about whether under international law we can do it, but secondly, if you resolved all those—what about the embargo that we have led against Iraq that others would like to back off of but they don't because they gave their agreement that they wouldn't? What if we needed embargoes in the future? What about the trade sanctions on Serbia themselves? What about any possible future economic action in other countries where we have difficulties today that we'd want other countries to honor?

So we have to think long and hard about whether we can do this unilaterally. But certainly, as you know, I have always thought that the arms embargo operated in an en-

tirely one-sided fashion, and it still does. That's the reason we're in this fix today because of the accumulated losses of the Bosnian Government as a direct result of the overwhelming superiority of heavy artillery by the Serbs.

But again, I would say we have been making good progress at the negotiating table. I don't want to have a wider war. I think even if you lifted the arms embargo and you had a lot of other people fighting and killing, in the end there would not be a decisive victory for either side in a war. There's going to have to be a negotiated settlement. And the real problem now is that the Serbs agreed to a cease-fire with both the U.N. and the Russians, and they didn't keep their end of the deal. We're going to have to see where we are today, and we'll have more to say.

Q. Why do you say you're making progress, and couldn't you have moved a little faster? This has been coming on for a couple weeks.

The President. I disagree with that. What do you mean? Keep in mind, the role of the United States and NATO is to respond when the United Nations asks for close-air support when its troops are in danger. This is not Sarajevo; Sarajevo was a special case. And the no-fly zone—if planes violate the no-fly zone they can be shot down. That was done by NATO and the United States. This is a different case. We can only do what we have the authority to do.

And frankly, I think it is a little too easy to Monday-morning-quarterback General Rose who has been very aggressive, very strong, and very much supported in this country and throughout the world for his aggressive actions. It's easy to say now he should have been more aggressive in Gorazde. I think he did the best he could with the resources he had under the facts as they existed. And so I don't know that General Rose had any other options. I just know that we have a disappointing and difficult situation there today, and we'll be working on it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:12 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to Ameritech Employees in Milwaukee

April 18, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator Kohl. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for that warm welcome. I started to stand on this thing so you would think I might be the Mayor of Milwaukee, but on reflection, I decided, like all public officials I'd rather be closer to the microphone. [Laughter] I want to thank Senator Feingold for his support and his leadership and his fine remarks. Congressman Barrett and Congressman Barca, we're glad to see you here. Thank you for being here with us. Congressman Gerry Kleczka, thank you so much; I'm glad to be here with you in your district and in your hometown. I want to say a special word of thanks to the Ameritech team for the welcoming here today. Dick Notebaert came out with me, along with Morty Bahr on the airplane, so the three of us had a chance to visit a little bit about what we would be doing today. And between the two of them, they convinced me that this may be the best company in the history of the world. They were talking about—[applause] I want to thank Gary Keating and Rick Compost in Detroit and Deborah Echols in Chicago and all the employees who are there. I also want to say, in addition to the fine work done by the CWA, I know that many of you are part of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; I thank you for your support in this health care effort. There are a lot of people here in the audience—I won't recognize all of them, but I would like to say a special word of thanks to the speaker of the Wisconsin House, Walter Kunicki, an old friend of mine, for being here. Thank you very much, sir, for coming. And I'd like to thank the Wisconsin Ameritech team, Bronson Haase and Bob Johnson and others. Thank you so much. We're glad to be here.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I came to Wisconsin first as a candidate for President, I did so not simply because I wanted to have the honor of the job, although it is a very great honor indeed, the highest any American citizen can receive, but because I thought the President's job was to bring the

American people together and to move our country forward, to seize our opportunities, and to honestly face our problems. And we've been trying to do that.

We've seen a lot of talk over the last several years about our deficit, for example, but finally now, in the last year, the Congress has passed an economic plan that has brought the deficit down, helped to create a stronger economic climate, and 2½ million jobs have come into our economy, 90 percent of them in the private sector. That's more in 15 months than in the previous 4 years, in fact, twice as many as in the previous 4 years.

Congress now has a budget before it which it is passing in rapid fashion, perhaps record fashion, which does what we're supposed to do in Washington: make the difficult decisions. It eliminates 100 Government programs, cuts 200 others, reduces overall discretionary domestic spending for the first time since 1969, and at the same time, spends more money on education, on Head Start, on defense conversion, and on the new technologies which will create the high-wage jobs of the 21st century.

If this budget passes, for the first time since Harry Truman was President we will have 3 years of declining deficits in the Federal accounts. That's a pretty good record for a Congress and an administration working together, breaking deadlocks, talking less, and doing more. I think that's what we were all hired to do.

Congress has a lot of other interesting work to do this year. It is taking up sweeping education reforms, some of them modeled on a lot of the exciting things that have gone on here in Wisconsin and some of your neighboring States. I signed a bill the other day called Goals 2000 which, for the first time ever, commits America to world-class standards of educational excellence in every school in the country and at the same time, promotes a lot of innovative grassroots reforms to achieve them and encourages communities to try new and different things.

We're trying to set up a system now that takes into account the fact that young people don't necessarily have to have 4-year college degrees to get good jobs as we move toward the 21st century, but they sure need more training than they get in high school. So we

want a school-to-work transition that takes account of the real needs of people who don't go on to 4-year colleges.

Congress has a bill before it to completely redo the unemployment system. The unemployment system takes money, I would argue, under not entirely fair circumstances now from employers who pay the unemployment tax, because it used to be that when people lost their jobs, they were called back to their old jobs. So unemployment was a premium the employer paid to pay people at a lower level so they could at least get along until they got called back to their old jobs. Most workers do not get called back to their old jobs today. Most people have to find new jobs.

The economy is churning and changing, and no matter how many new jobs we can create, there will still be a lot of change in this economy. So we want, instead of an unemployment system, a reemployment system, so the minute people lose their jobs, they're immediately eligible for retraining and for job help to find new jobs and different jobs, because the average 18-year-old will change work eight times in a lifetime, and we owe it to ourselves and our future to make sure that always people are retrained and placed as quickly as possible. We intend to do that this year; that's very important.

Our administration has been committed to welfare reform, to ending the whole welfare system as we know it, something that Wisconsin has a great deal of experience in. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Mayor Norquist and the city of Milwaukee, who have a national model in Project New Hope. It says you can move people from welfare to work. I know we can do that; I'm going to talk more about it in a minute. But that is another thing we are facing this year. This is an exciting time in our Nation's Capital, because people are actually working on the problems facing America.

The first item of business now, when we go back tomorrow in Congress, will be the crime bill that's in the House of Representatives. And then the House and the Senate will get together. If the best of both bills passes, we'll have 100,000 more police officers on the street; we'll have huge new opportunities for young people to help prevent

crime, to keep our young people from getting in trouble, and give them some things to say yes to; we'll have drug treatment that is very important, that we don't now have in a lot of our programs, and alcohol abuse treatment; we will have a tough "Three strikes and you're out" law for people who shouldn't be paroled that we know are likely to recreate serious violent crimes; and we'll ban 28 kinds of assault weapons, if the best of both bills passes. That ought to happen this year in the Congress.

And I want to say a special word of thanks in that regard to Senator Kohl for his leadership in supporting the Brady bill, which we passed after 7 years of deadlock last year and his attempt to keep dangerous handguns out of the hands of minors who have no business carrying them on the streets of our cities.

Now, last year, according to a lot of independent analyses, this Congress and I did more work together in more substantive ways than had been done in the first year of an administration in a whole generation, in over 30 years. But this year can be better, if we do the things that I just mentioned and if we have the courage, finally, to solve this health care problem.

I want to talk a little bit about what specifically is in our plan and what some of the problems are, the real problems and the political problems with passing this plan, because if you're going to help us pass it, you have to understand the pressures that your Representatives in Congress are under.

First of all, what are the problems? Well, at any given time during the year, 58 million Americans will be without health insurance out of a Nation of 255 million. About 39 million of our fellow countrymen just don't have it all year long. Eighty-one million of us—81 million—almost one in 3, live in families where someone in our family has a preexisting condition: a child with diabetes, a mother who has had breast cancer relatively early in life, a father who had an early heart attack. And these people either pay much higher premiums for their health insurance or they can't afford insurance at all or they're insured at their present job but they are terrified to leave their job for fear that they will lose their insurance. And so, at a time when job mobil-

ity is highly prized, we see people never leaving their jobs. This is a huge problem.

And 133 million of us, more than half of our population and three-quarters of the Americans who are insured at work have lifetime limits on our policy. So that if one of our children were to be born with a serious long-term disease or problem—or in the case of a family I met a couple of weeks ago in another State, where they had three children and the first two sons were born with a very rare form of cancer which may well be treatable and which may well be able to be maintained—they're going to run out of their health insurance coverage before the second boy gets out of the house. And they'll have to figure out what to do and whether they can continue to work and what in the world is going to happen to their family.

Not only that, 100 percent of us just about are at some risk of losing our health insurance. If you work for a government or if you work for a wonderful company like this, you won't lose it. But what if you decided to change your job, or what if you had to quit your job, then what would happen?

And finally, as has already been said, the system we have—I was glad to hear Mr. Notebaert say this—is the most expensive system administratively in the world. We spend roughly twice as much money on paperwork and other administrative costs as any other country in the world does, with the consequence that, in America, we spend 14.5 percent of our income on health care. Canada spends 10 percent of its income; Japan and Germany spend 9 percent of their income. And half of that is for good things—I'll say more about that in a minute—and for things that we can't do anything about. We're more violent than all these other countries, so we have more emergency room bills. We have higher rates of AIDS. But half of it is the crazy way our system is organized.

There was a recent study of two hospitals, one in Canada, one in the United States, with the same number of beds, the same vacancy rate, the same patient caseload. There were 200 people in the clerical department of the American hospital and 6 in the Canadian hospital. You're paying for that.

You're also paying, as has been pointed out, a significant premium because we are

the only advanced country that permits some people just to say, "I won't have any insurance; I don't believe I'll be covered." But they all get health care if an emergency happens or when it's too late and they're too sick and they show up at the emergency room. And then the cost is passed on to the rest of you in higher premiums.

There are all kinds of other things we pay for, too. Because we don't provide prescription drugs for elderly people in a lot of family policies, our hospital bills are much greater, particularly for older people, because of maintaining themselves with adequate prescriptions, a lot of people on Medicare choose every month between medicine and food. But they wind up getting care when it's too late, too expensive, and they're in the hospital. And it adds costs to the whole system.

There are millions of Americans who have disabilities that if they were able to have some in-home care would save us money. They would be able to get health insurance and millions of them would be able to work who cannot work today.

So our whole system, because we don't cover everybody, because we are willing to spend too much on paperwork and, therefore, too little on things that keep people well, like primary and preventive health care, costs too much and does too little. You might ask, "Well, if it's all that simple why haven't we fixed it?" Well, because it's not all that simple. And I'll explain why.

There are all kinds of improvements going on now all the time. I just got a wonderful demonstration—you all heard about it already—from the Wisconsin Health Information Network. And Marsha, the lady who showed me, was terrific; I learned a lot and I was—if I hadn't been late I would still be out there fiddling with the computer to prove that even I could do it, a total computer illiterate. [Laughter] There are some things we can do. But I believe with all my heart, having studied this now for years and years, that we cannot fix these problems unless we have a national response, not a national health care system run by the Government but a national response. The Government of the United States needs to reorganize the health care system to keep what's best and fix what's

wrong. And make no mistake about it, there are a lot of things that are great about our system: the doctors, the nurses, the medical research, the technology, the advances.

I have a friend from Wisconsin here—Brianne Schwantes. Stand up and wave to the crowd here. [Applause] She was born with a problem; her bones were prone to break easily. And she comes to the National Institutes of Health on a regular basis and gets world-class care. And so here she is. And you know where I found her? Working with the flood victims in the Middle West, risking her brittle bones to help other people who were in trouble. If it weren't for the miracles of our system, she would not be able to do that. And we don't have to mess that up. But we do have to make some hard decisions. We're going to have to either cover everybody or not. If we don't cover everybody, your wages are still going to be stressed by paying too much for health care because other people won't cover their own. You're still going to have horror story after horror story of people who can't get coverage or who are terrified of losing it. And we will continue to pay more than we should.

If we do want to cover everybody, we only have two choices. You look all around the world; there are only two options. You either have to do it through a Government-funded program, like Medicare for everybody—abolish all insurance, charge everybody a tax and fund it—or you have to have insurance for everybody. And if you have insurance for everybody, then either the employers have to pay it or the employees and employers together have to pay it or the employees have to pay it for those who are working, and the Government's got to help for those who aren't working, who don't have insurance. Now, you can look all around the world. I don't think there are any other options if you believe that the only way to fix this is to make sure that we have health security.

Here's my plan. First, guarantee everybody private health insurance. Why do it that way? Because that's a system we have now and just apply it to everybody. Nine out of 10 Americans who have health insurance buy it at work, and 8 out of 10 Americans who aren't insured have someone in their family

who works. So the simplest way is just to extend the system we have now.

Second, make sure the benefits are adequate, not just catastrophic health care but primary and preventive health care, too, mammographies for women in the appropriate age group, cholesterol tests for people. Do the primary and preventive stuff that will hold down the cost of health care and keep us well, as well as take care of us when we're sick.

Next, permit people to choose their own doctors and health plans. Less than half the American people today who are insured at work have a choice of the health plan they're a part of. Now, is that because there's somebody bad in the system? No, it's because that's all the employers and the insurance companies can afford under the present system. But if everyone were insured properly, then the employees and their families could choose what kind of plan they want. And under our plan, every employee in America and their families would get at least three choices every year. If you didn't like the choice you had, next year you could make another choice. I think that's very important.

Third, have insurance reforms. Don't permit insurance companies who issue health insurance to pick and choose whom to cover. When insurance was started for health care by Blue Cross, that's the way it was. Everybody paid more or less the same thing, and we were all insured in huge pools. And insurance companies then made money the way grocery stores do: They made a little bit of money on a lot of people. Today in America, there are 1,500 different health insurance companies writing thousands of different policies and the reason is, as Mr. Notebaert noted, that 25 percent of our money goes to health care paperwork. You think about it: 1,500 companies, thousands of different policies, everybody with a different deal. Think about how many people you have to hire in insurance offices and doctors' offices and clinics just to figure out what's not covered, just to figure out what not to pay for.

And when you put on top of that the cost-control pressures so that doctors all over America are going crazy, even as we talk, because they have to call some distant insurance company employee to get credit to per-

form a procedure or practice medicine in a way that to them is perfectly self-evident and when you add to that a separate Government system for the poor, Medicaid, and for the elderly, Medicare, you have a paperwork nightmare.

And it's really tough. So we have got to reform insurance. We've got to say, you can't kick somebody off and you can't charge them more just because one of their children has been sick. You shouldn't charge an older worker more than a younger worker when the average worker is changing jobs six, seven times in a lifetime. You've got people losing jobs in defense industries that are in their late fifties and early sixties who must find new jobs and who cannot find them because their employers can't afford to provide health insurance for them. It's not right. So we've got to have insurance reform.

Fourth, I think we ought to protect Medicare, as I said. Leave it the way it is; it's working. But extend the benefits to elderly people to include a benefit of prescription drugs, which will save money, and for help for the elderly and the disabled for long-term care in the home and in the community.

I think these benefits ought to be provided at work. Why? Because it's the system we have. Now, you need to know that this is at the center of the political debate. And in Washington, a long way from Milwaukee, here's what they're saying. They're saying, "Well, that's all very well for Ameritech. They can talk about that, they're a successful company, they have a strong union, they pay good wages, they've got a great future. But what about all these small businesses in America? What about the poor guys with 10 or 20 employees who have a very narrow profit margin? They shouldn't have to do this." Well—and the argument is that they can't afford to do this. They're going to lose jobs, and most new jobs are being created in the small business sector, and it's a terrible thing, you shouldn't do it.

Now, what's my answer to that? First of all, there are a lot of small businesses in America who are providing health insurance to their employees today, and they are at an unfair competitive disadvantage to those who don't. I met a woman in Columbus, Ohio, running a restaurant and a deli, with 20 peo-

ple—20 full-time employees, 20 part-time employees. She says to me—this is a typical story—she says, “I’m in the worst of all worlds. I insure my full-time employees, I don’t insure my part-time employees, and we pay too much for insurance because I had cancer 5 years ago.” She said, “I got it coming and going. I pay more than I should. I feel guilty that I don’t insure my part-time employees. And I get punished for insuring my full-time employees because my competitors don’t even do that. I would gladly pay a little more if you made all my competitors do the same thing. That would be all right; I’d be on a fair basis with them.”

I have a friend who is a car dealer at home in Arkansas, in a little town—said to me the other day, said, “You know, I’ve been feeling sorry for myself for 20 years because I always covered my employees, and none of my competitors ever did. And I just went around feeling sorry for myself. And then I realized that three of my competitors had gone out of business, and I made more money last year than I ever have. And I think it’s because I never lost an employee because I gave them decent health care.” Interesting, right?

Today, as I was shaking hands leaving the White House, a small businessman came up to me and says, “I have got 80 employees, and I implore you to pass this health care. I am tired of these lobbies I pay my membership dues to telling you that small business doesn’t want this. A lot of us cover our employees. I cover my 80 employees. It costs me 20 percent of payroll. Under your plan my bills would go to 7.9 percent because all my competitors would have to do what I do.” The guy just stopped me in the line today on the way out to the helicopter.

Not only that, under our plan, we give discounts to small businesses. If you’ve got under 70 employees and an average payroll of under \$24,000, you get a discount. And some of these businesses will only have to pay 3.5 percent of payroll for their insurance. The average business has about a third of their cost of doing business in labor costs. So if you pay 3.5 percent, and that’s only a third of your cost of doing business, then it’s only going to cost you a little more than one percent of the cost of doing business to insure your employees.

I would submit to you that that much, if all your competitors are doing it, can either be passed along or the employees themselves will absorb it. It will only take one year to lower the raise they were going to get by one percent, and then it will all be in there. But that’s what these Congressmen are hearing, and they’re saying, “If you do this, small business in America will come to an end.” Now, the truth is, most small business people are paying 35 percent more than most big businesses for the same insurance.

The other thing they’re telling them is, this is a Government-run program and Government would mess up a one-car parade. [Laughter] That’s the other thing they’re saying. And we have all felt that at one time or another, right? Especially now, it’s so close to tax day. But that’s what they’re saying. That’s not true.

Here’s what the Federal Government does in our program. The Federal Government says everybody’s got to have insurance. The Federal Government says there must be insurance reforms so that people can be insured in large pools. And the Federal Government organizes small and medium-sized businesses so they can get buying power to get the same competitive rates that people in big business and Government have. And we have some basic quality controls which are an extension of what we have now. That’s what we do.

We also leave to the States then the ability to decide exactly how these mechanisms will be carried out. This is not a Government-run program. It is private health insurance and private medical providers just like we have today except now the worst abuses of the present system will be erased. That is what we are trying to do. And I think it is worth doing. I think it needs to be done.

Let me say to you that you will have to decide whether you agree. You’ll also have to decide whether you think you can persuade your Members of Congress without regard to party that they can do this and be reelected. Every time I go into a congressional district, there are these furious radio campaigns run to send a message to your local Congressman not to bankrupt all the small businesses in the area. But we had several hundred small businesses in Washington

the other day all asking us to do this so they could get a fair deal, so they could buy insurance on a competitive basis.

Now, what's behind this? Somebody's got to lose, right? There will be some changes. What will they be? If you endorse this program, fewer Americans will work in the clerical departments of hospitals, clinics, and insurance offices. And the small insurance companies will not be able to write policies for hundreds of thousands of people. So in order for them to keep writing health insurance, they'll either have to write specialty policies, like many do today for extra cancer coverage or something like that or somehow find a way to pool with other companies or they won't all make it. That's true. That is true.

You have to decide whether you think it's worth it. Is it worth it for every American to have the same health care security that you have and to stop your wages from being depressed and your profits from being depressed by paying too much for health care and to provide some sort of security to the working people of this country. I think it is.

We will also create more jobs in the health care industry in providing long-term care. There will not be a net loss of jobs, but there will be a shift of jobs. You need to know that. This is not a free thing. But is it a good swap? I think it is a laydown clear choice, the right thing for the country. But we have got to decide that.

And let me close by just—I don't know if these folks are here. I had three letter writers, people who wrote—we had a million people who have written to my wife or to me on health care—and I think they're here. Are Sheryl Brown, Tami Stagman, and Susan Millard here? Are you all here anywhere? Stand up there. [*Applause*] Now, I want you to—now these are not abstract theories. These are three citizens of your State. Sheryl Brown from Madison wrote a letter to Hillary about her health insurance. And her husband came down with a serious illness; he lost his insurance. She had to leave her job because she couldn't insure her husband and go on public assistance to get the benefits she needed. Then when she got herself off welfare and went back to work, her family lost

their benefits. That's the system we have today.

If you go on welfare—this is a big State for welfare reform, right? I've bragged on Wisconsin until I was blue in the face, about welfare reform all over the country. In our country today, if you go on welfare, you get health care. If you get off of welfare and go to work and start paying taxes, if you live in a family with a preexisting condition or you take a minimum wage job, then all of a sudden you are paying taxes to pay for the people on welfare to have health care, and you don't have it anymore. So if you want welfare reform, you've got to pay for the health care of the working people because the people on welfare have got it.

Susan Millard wrote me because she's had a lot of health problems, and she's got a job which doesn't provide health benefits. Should she just quit and give it up? Aren't we proud of her? Wouldn't we rather her work? Isn't it better for us that she works instead of going on public assistance?

And Tami Stagman from Lancaster—in a way the most interesting letter of all. She wrote me because she had some serious health problems, but she had a good health insurance policy because of her husband's job. So she's thinking, what if my husband ever loses his job? What if he ever wants to change his job? And what about everybody just like me who doesn't have the same policy I have?

We can fix this, folks. We can fix this if we remember that there are real Americans out there who are doing their very best to contribute to this country and to move us forward and who deserve to have this fixed. It is in our common interest to do it, and I think we're going to do it this year.

Thank you very much. Bless you. Thank you.

[*At this point, Bronson Haase, president, Ameritech Wisconsin, presented the President with a jogging suit.*]

The President. I want to tell you what your fearless leader had just said to me, in a way that you couldn't hear over the microphone—[*laughter*]. He said, I want you to have this jogging suit because I keep seeing you running in running shorts, and I think

it would be better if you had long pants. [Laughter] Hey, you know it's part of my job to make people feel better, and I've made millions of Americans feel better about how they look in running clothes. I thought it was a good idea. [Laughter]

Thank you very much. I'll wear them. Great. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. at the Italian Community Center. In this remarks, he referred to Richard Notebaert, chief executive officer, Ameritech Corp.; Morton Bahr, international president, Communications Workers of America; Ameritech employees Gary Keating, Rick Compost, and Deborah Echols; Robert D. Johnson, vice president of district four, Communications Workers of America; Mayor John Norquist of Milwaukee; and Marsha Radaj, vice president of operations, Wisconsin Health Information Network.

Exchange With Reporters in Milwaukee

April 18, 1994

Interest Rates

Q. What about the Fed and the interest rates?

The President. Well, I have two reactions. First of all, there is still no evidence of troubling inflation in this economy, but there is a lot of evidence of growth. And in the last couple of weeks we've seen even more evidence of growth in the economy, for example, big backlogs on automobile orders.

When you have growth in the economy, normally short-term interest rates go up. The estimates are that inflation will be around 3 percent. Historically, short-term interest rates have been about three-quarters to one percent above the rate of inflation. So, this is still within the range of interest rates that should not do anything to harm the economic recovery. And I can only guess that that had something to do with—the signs of economic growth have been very strong in the last couple of weeks, and that the interest rates at 3.5 percent were still only a half a point above the inflation rate, so that's the real interest rate. So I don't think it's cause for real alarm; I wouldn't say that.

But on the other hand, what normally triggers interest rates going up is some evidence

of inflation. We don't have that. So we'll just have to watch this. But I think it would be a real mistake to overreact. This is a very strong economy; it's very healthy. We've got good growth.

Q. But this is not overreaction?

Q. By the Fed?

The President. All I can tell you is what I said. I don't make a practice of commenting on what they do. There is no evidence of inflation, but there is evidence that economic growth is stronger even than we thought, say 2 months ago. And historically, in times of real growth, short-term interest rates have been somewhere between three-quarters of a percent and one percent above the projected rate of inflation, which is 3 percent. So in larger historical terms, this should not be any cause for alarm. We've still got good strong growth, and everybody, including Mr. Greenspan, says that the conditions of economic growth are better than they've been in two or three decades. So I still feel very good about that.

Q. So you have no beef with the Fed? You have no beef with the Fed for raising rates again?

The President. I don't comment on what they do one way or the other, except to try to explain it to people in terms that I think are relevant. I understand what happened if the objective is to have a real rate of return on short-term interest rates. That is, the short-term interest rates ought to be something above the rate of inflation.

But even Mr. Greenspan has said repeatedly that this should not lead to an increase in long-term interest rates. He has said long-term interest rates are, if anything, too high while short-term interest rates might have been too low. So if the market is going to rationally react to this, long-term interest rates should say, well, there's not going to be any inflation in the economy, and we've got good growth so interest rates ought to stay down, not go up. That's what I hope will happen over the long run.

Bosnia

Q. Any new actions for Bosnia, Mr. President?

The President. Well, I'm going back now to find out what happened today.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:05 p.m. at Leon's Frozen Custard Stand. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Cyprus Conflict

April 18, 1994

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I am submitting to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered the remainder of September 1993, through November 15, 1993. The current report covers the remainder of November 1993, through March 1, 1994.

Ambassador Richard A. Boucher, my new representative in Cyprus, presented his credentials at a ceremony in Nicosia on November 22. In his remarks, Ambassador Boucher reiterated the strong commitment of my Administration in supporting efforts to resolve the Cyprus question. Stressing the importance of breaking down barriers of mistrust, Ambassador Boucher said he would actively promote bi-communal contacts and measures to enhance confidence between the two communities.

On November 22, 1993, the U.N. Secretary General issued his report in connection with the Security Council's comprehensive review of the U.N. Peacekeeping Operation in Cyprus (UNFICYP). The Secretary General concluded that while UNFICYP has successfully kept the peace, the resulting opportunity has not been used properly by the two sides to reach an overall settlement. The Secretary General had no doubt that, were UNFICYP to be withdrawn, the present buffer zone would be a vacuum that each side would want to fill. He thus recommended that the mandate of UNFICYP be extended for a further 6-month period, until June 15, 1994. The Secretary General also stated emphatically that the two sides on the island, as well as Turkey and Greece, should work more effectively for a negotiated settlement. He called on all parties to show a serious willingness to negotiate and urged both sides to work to promote tolerance and

reconciliation. He faulted both sides for their reluctance to undertake bi-communal activities.

On December 1, 1993, Mr. Robert Lamb was appointed as U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator. Robert Lamb, having served as U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus from 1990 to 1993, brings valuable experience to the position. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the efforts of Mr. John Maresca, who, as U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator, contributed significantly to the process.

Special Cyprus Coordinator Lamb traveled to Cyprus December 1. His arrival in Cyprus on the first day of his appointment underlined my Administration's resolve to achieve progress on the island. He conveyed the message that the confidence-building measures (CBMs) are a balanced, workable package for both communities, and that the United States was prepared to work with both communities to ensure that their concerns are addressed satisfactorily.

Assistant Secretary Stephen Oxman traveled to Turkey December 8-9, 1993, for the United States-Turkey Joint Economic Commission. While there, he met with Prime Minister Ciller and Ministry of Foreign Affairs Under Secretary Sanberk. He told Prime Minister Ciller that after the December 12, 1993, Turkish-Cypriot election, the United States wanted to move the process forward. The Turkish side pointed out that Turkey had spoken out in support of the Secretary General's efforts for the CBM package, and assured Mr. Oxman of Turkey's continued cooperation.

The Director of the Department of State's Office for Southern Europe, Marshall Adair, accompanied Assistant Secretary Oxman to Turkey and also met with a variety of Turkish government officials and parliamentarians to emphasize the importance of moving forward on the CBM package. He then visited Athens and met with Ministry of Foreign Affairs officials on this subject there. On December 12, 1993, Mr. Adair traveled to Cyprus. He and Ambassador Boucher met with President Clerides and Mr. Denktash on December 13, 1993, and stressed that the United States believes we are at a stage where a step forward could be taken.

In New York, Mr. Lamb met December 14, 1993, with the U.N. Special Negotiator for Cyprus, Joe Clark, and his deputy, Gustave Feissel. Mr. Clark said that the Turkish-Cypriot elections created a favorable atmosphere for progress on the CBMs. The United Nations noted, however, that both sides had legitimate questions that should be answered before implementation.

Also in New York on December 15, 1993, the U.N. Security Council Resolution 889 (1993) was adopted unanimously, extending UNFICYP's mandate for another 6 months. The resolution also called upon the authorities to ensure that no incidents occurred in the buffer zone and to extend the 1989 Unmanning Agreement. It also welcomed the Secretary General's decision to resume extensive contacts with both sides in order to achieve an agreement on the CBMs, and requested the Secretary General to submit a report in late February on the outcome of his efforts with respect to the CBMs.

On the same day, the Secretary General released two studies on the CBMs. The reports concluded that the reopening of Nicosia International Airport and the closed city of Varosha would offer significant economic benefits for both the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities. They went on to say that the CBMs were not a substitute for a comprehensive political solution, but rather were intended to create momentum to reach an overall agreement. The reports also noted that the work required to reopen Varosha and Nicosia International Airport would lead to much-needed direct contacts between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

Special Cyprus Coordinator Lamb traveled to Athens on December 21, 1993. He met with Director General of the Foreign Ministry Christos Zacharakis and Deputy Foreign Minister George Papandreou. On December 22-23, 1993, he continued to Ankara where he met with Foreign Minister Hikmet Cetin and other officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He thanked Turkey for its support for progress on the CBMs and an early resumption of the talks. The Foreign Minister assured Mr. Lamb that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots wanted to work within the United Nations process. The Athens and

Ankara meetings were very positive. Mr. Lamb stressed that the United States wanted an agreement soon on Cyprus, but it had to be a fair agreement that takes into account the interests of both communities. He said that we should concentrate first on the CBMs, as they offered the most promising approach.

Throughout the period, Ambassador Boucher remained in close contact with the two sides to offer U.S. encouragement and assistance to the process.

On January 10, 1994, following the December 12, 1993, Turkish-Cypriot elections, the Democratic Party and the Republican Turkish Party completed their coalition and received a vote of confidence. The stage was thus set for a quick resumption of the negotiations.

While in Brussels January 9-11, 1994, I had the opportunity to raise many issues of U.S. concern, including Cyprus, with Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou and Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller. I told them that we must move forward with a fair and permanent settlement. Both leaders assured me of their interest in finding a solution on Cyprus and promised to work diligently towards this goal.

In Cyprus Mr. Feissel continued his contacts, seeking an agreement in principle on the CBMs from the two leaders. Mr. Clark visited Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey January 22-28, 1994. He stressed the importance of proceeding quickly and directly. Following additional exchanges of correspondence with the U.N. Secretary General, both leaders confirmed their acceptance in principle of the CBMs and their willingness to discuss modalities for implementing them.

Special Cyprus Coordinator Lamb traveled to Nicosia on January 31, 1994, to consult with each side. He reiterated the U.S. message that there was an urgent need for progress on the CBMs. Both sides stated their willingness to negotiate in good faith. On February 3, U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali wrote to the parties welcoming their acceptance in principle of the package and urging the discussions on key issues be completed within 2 months.

U.N. Special Negotiator Clark opened proximity talks on key issues related to the

CBMs in Nicosia on February 17–18, 1994. He characterized these talks as constructive, and praised the goodwill he found on both sides. The talks are continuing under Deputy Representative Feissel.

Special Cyprus Coordinator Lamb consulted on February 25, 1994, with Russian Foreign Ministry officials in Moscow. These consultations were in the context of our continuing dialogue with the Russians on a variety of international issues. He also met with British Foreign Office representatives in London on February 28, as part of our routine, periodic discussions with the British. These meetings with two representatives of the Permanent Members of the Security Council once again demonstrated the international resolve to find a fair solution to the Cyprus question.

There is currently a window of opportunity that should not be allowed to close without an agreement being reached on the CBMs. They provide real benefits to both communities, not least of which is that they can form the base from which the two parties could resume discussions on an overall settlement.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Interview on MTV's "Enough is Enough" Forum

April 19, 1994

Tabitha Soren. Welcome to MTV's "Enough is Enough" Forum with the President of the United States, Bill Clinton. Joining the President is an audience of 200, 16- to 20-year-olds from here in DC and all over the country. Obviously, there are a lot of issues on the President's mind today, including some hard decisions on the U.S. role in Bosnia. But we've invited him here to talk about violence in America.

Alison Steward. "Enough is Enough" is a comprehensive campaign put forth by MTV to explore the subject of violence, giving young people an outlet for their concerns and

bringing them closer to the people who can bring about a change.

"Enough is Enough" is also the cry of a generation of young people who, according to an MTV poll, specify violence as their number one concern, surpassing the economy and job opportunity.

Ms. Soren. Despite the fact that violence is young people's number one anxiety, the country's crime rate has actually gone down in recent years. However, violent crime committed by young people has exploded. We are losing a whole generation to crime, to drugs, to lost hopes.

Mr. President.

The President. Thank you, Tabitha and Alison. Thank all of you for joining me, and I want to thank MTV for giving me a chance to keep my commitment to come back on the show, to talk about something I care a lot about: the rising tide of violence in America, especially among young people.

As you heard, the crime rate overall in our country has pretty well leveled off, but it's still going up among young people. Young people are the principal perpetrators of violent crime; young people are also the principal victims of violent crime.

You may have seen the public service announcement I did with a young teenager from here in Washington, Alicia Brown. And on the day we taped this announcement and then the day we announced it, she was on her way to the funeral of her sixth friend who had been felled by gun violence. It's a terrible problem.

I want to talk today about what we can do about it together. In Washington, we're debating a crime bill that I care a lot about, which will put more police officers on the street, working with young people in their community; which will give a whole range of prevention programs that work a chance to work in every community, everything from after-school programs to midnight basketball to jobs for young people. We are seeing that work in places, so that I know it will work if we can put it everywhere.

But I have to tell you, no matter what we do with the laws, we have to have a change in behavior and attitude and feeling among young people all across this country, in every

community in the country. And maybe we can talk a little about that today, too.

I met a young man about a week ago, named Eddie Cutanda, from Boston, who was working with the Boston police in their community policing program. And he said, before he met these two men, he hated police officers. But he wanted me to know and he wanted the country to know that he did not represent a lost generation. He said of all of you, he said, "We're not a lost generation, but sometimes I think there are a lot of adults who'd like to lose us, and we can't let that happen."

So, today, maybe together we can figure out what we can do about this awful problem and give you and your generation your future back.

Ms. Soren. Okay, Mr. President, let's get down to it. We've got our first question over here. Tell us who you are and what your question for the President is.

Teen Suicide

[A 17-year-old participant discussed the feelings of hopelessness and despair many people in her generation experience and asked what can be done to help young people understand how important their lives are.]

The President. Well, first of all, you asked a good question. Maybe the question you asked is the most important question. Suicide among young people, as you probably know, has doubled in the last 10 or 15 years. And it reflects a larger problem of millions of young people who don't commit suicide.

I think it is rooted in part in the fact that there are a lot of young folks who grow up never feeling that they're the most important person in the world to somebody. I know—there were times in my childhood when I had a difficult childhood, but I always knew I was the most important person in the world to my mother and that somehow together we would get through whatever we were going through.

With so many kids growing up in difficult family circumstances, in violent neighborhoods where there's so much destructive things around, including drugs, my own opinion is that we have to really make an effort to reach children when they're very young but not to give up on them when they're ado-

lescents and they're going through the toughest times of life, so that they always know that they matter.

The other thing we've got to do is to somehow get out of this sort of instant emergency way we tend to look at life. I mean, we all have more information today, more access to information than any generation before us. You can turn on the television and see 50 channels in a lot of the communities where you live. We've got a lot of information, but we think everything happens right now. And the truth is, a lot of things take a long time to unfold; a lot of the meaning of life takes a long time to develop.

And one of the things that I find—to go back to your comment about young gang members not expecting to live very long—is that I find a lot of young people think the future is what happens 30 minutes from now or 3 days from now, instead of what happens 5 or 10 or 15 years from now. And somehow, the adults in this country—we have to find a way to help young people think in a hopeful way about 5 and 10 and 15 years from now and understand that there are sacrifices and tough times and disappointments that never go away in life. They never go away no matter how old you are and how much you get things together. But if you can keep your eye on the future, then suicide doesn't become an option because you know there can always be a better tomorrow.

So those are the two things I think we have to do: Teach people they're the most—everybody needs to be the most important person in the world to somebody. And people need to think of the future in terms of the real future, what happens years from now, not what happens minutes or days from now.

Ms. Soren. What's your question for the President?

Caning in Singapore

[A participant discussed the sentencing of an American student to be caned in Singapore and asked if a similar penal system that does not base itself on the strong belief in individual rights would be beneficial in the U.S. in combating crime.]

The President. Well, that's not where I thought you were going with the question. Good for you.

Ms. Soren. He's obviously talking about the caning in Singapore.

The President. Yes—the young man, Michael Fay, in Singapore. As you know, I have spoken out against his punishment for two reasons. One is, it's not entirely clear that his confession wasn't coerced from him. The second is that if he just were to serve 4 months in prison for what he did, that would be quite severe. But the caning may leave permanent scars, and some people who are caned, in the way they're caned, they go into shock. I mean, it's much more serious than it sounds. So, on the one hand, I don't approve of this punishment, particularly in this case.

Now, having said that, a lot of the Asian societies that are doing very well now have low crime rates and high economic growth rates, partly because they have very coherent societies with strong units where the unit is more important than the individual, whether it's the family unit or the work unit or the community unit.

My own view is that you can go to the extreme in either direction. And when we got organized as a country and we wrote a fairly radical Constitution with a radical Bill of Rights, giving a radical amount of individual freedom to Americans, it was assumed that the Americans who had that freedom would use it responsibly. That is, when we set up this country, abuse of people by Government was a big problem. So if you read the Constitution, it's rooted in the desire to limit the ability of—Government's ability to mess with you, because that was a huge problem. It can still be a huge problem. But it assumed that people would basically be raised in coherent families, in coherent communities, and they would work for the common good, as well as for the individual welfare.

What's happened in America today is too many people live in areas where there's no family structure, no community structure, and no work structure. And so there's a lot of irresponsibility. And so a lot of people say there's too much personal freedom. When personal freedom's being abused, you have to move to limit it. That's what we did in the announcement I made last weekend on the public housing projects, about how we're

going to have weapon sweeps and more things like that to try to make people safer in their communities. So that's my answer to you. We can have—the more personal freedom a society has, the more personal responsibility a society needs and the more strength you need out of your institutions, family, community, and work.

[At this point, MTV took a commercial break.]

Ms. Soren. Welcome back to MTV's "Enough is Enough" Forum with the President.

Ms. Stewart. We punish more than any other nation. We produce more guns than any other nation, yet we have more violent crime than any other nation. What are our leaders doing about the situation? And will their newly proposed efforts trickle down to you and me?

[At this point, a videotape about proposed crime legislation was shown.]

Ms. Soren. Obviously, there was a lot of information crammed into that package. But here's our first question.

Handgun Legislation

[A participant praised the Brady bill and asked what the President proposes to do about the flow of illegal guns into this country.]

The President. Well, first, let's get that out—the Brady bill is working. It is true that you can still buy an illegal gun with cash in the streets. But it's also true that a lot of people with criminal backgrounds try to buy guns in regular gun stores, and now they're being checked. And it's really working to prevent the sale of guns to a lot of criminals. So it doesn't solve all the problems, but it helps.

Now, in terms of stemming the flow of illegal guns into the country, we can do things that I have already done, for example, to ban the import of certain guns in the country. The big problem is the number of guns we have in the country already and what happens to them. They're already about 200 million guns in circulation. And there are still a lot of things that are legal that shouldn't be.

There is a horrible—I mean, to me—story on the cover of USA Today about people making automatic weapons in the United States saying, well, you know, if one of these automatic weapons gets taken out from under a bed and used by some kid illegally, it's not their problem.

I think we should ban the—several kinds of semiautomatic assault weapons. I think we should pass the ban on handgun possession by minors, unless they're with an adult supervisor and using it for approved sporting purposes. I think we should go further in trying to regulate what these gun dealers do with these guns because they will—sometimes they put them in circulation in ways they know they're going to wind up in the hands of criminals. All these things we're moving to do now. Will it solve all the problems? No, it won't. Is it a step in the right direction? Yes, it is.

And you cannot—one of reasons we've got the highest crime rate in the world and the highest murder rate is that we have more guns in the hands of more criminals and people who are likely to act in an impulsive manner. You can't—and there's no place else in the world where this would happen, where you'd have just people walking the streets better armed than the police. It's not right, and we've got to do something about it.

Ms. Soren. Mr. President, we have a question over here.

[A participant asked why the President is spending money to make it difficult for law-abiding citizens to obtain guns legally when the money could be spent on enforcing criminal justice.]

The President. Well, first, we are doing that. I mean, this plan of mine—you heard the young people commenting about debating whether 100,000 more police officers will make a difference. It will make a difference. It will not only catch more criminals, it will prevent more crime. We know that when you have police walking the streets, knowing the families, knowing the kids in the neighborhood, making their presence felt, the crime rate goes down. We also know you catch more criminals more quickly. The crime bill actually puts more people in prison. So there are a lot of issues being dealt with there.

But keep in mind the restrictions that are put on gun ownership in terms of having to have background checks and waiting periods to catch people with criminal records. One hundred percent of the criminals in this country do not buy their guns off street corners. A lot of them buy them through gun stores, and we're going to catch those now. So it's worth doing. It's worth a little bit of sacrifice on the part of law-abiding gun owners to do that.

[At this point, MTV took a commercial break.]

Ms. Stewart. Welcome back to MTV's "Enough is Enough" Forum with the President. We're talking about crime legislation, and Tabitha's with someone who has a question.

Crime Legislation

[A participant asked who the "Three strikes and you're out" proposal applies to, and how many people it will affect.]

The President. Well, I hope only a small number of people. Let me answer your question in this way: First of all, a small percentage of the criminal population—of the criminal population—commits a large percentage of the truly violent crimes. A lot of those folks, they're "One strike and you're out". You commit murder or rape or something else, you get a life sentence.

The "Three strikes and you're out" bill is designed to deny parole to people who commit three violent crimes in a row where, by accident, the consequence was not as serious as it might have been. That is, no one died or the building didn't burn down or whatever, so the victims weren't hurt as badly. But this is a person who is plainly prone to do things that will cause life or serious bodily harm. So it will cover—the reason that I recommend coverage—it doesn't cover drug offenders, for example. It covers people who do things that are designed to hurt people repeatedly, and they're just lucky that nobody has died, so they haven't gotten a life sentence. But if they do it three times, they still have to serve unless they are specifically commuted; they're not eligible for parole.

Ms. Soren. So does that mean it ends up affecting about 200 to 300 people a year?

The President. It wouldn't affect many people. But as I said, we know that a small percentage of the people are serious repeat offenders. A small percentage of the criminals are serious repeat offenders. And if this is drawn right, it will make us safer at relatively lower costs. A lot of people go to jail when they ought to do something else, go to a boot camp, be in some alternative sentencing. Arguably, we have too many of certain kinds of offenders in jail, but there are some people who get out too quickly, like that man that kidnaped and killed Polly Klaas, for example.

Ms. Soren. "Three strikes and you're out" is so popular, but a lot of critics say that perhaps the jails will fill up with 60-, 70-year-old men and women past their crime-producing life. Do you think that's smart?

The President. Well, it could happen, but let me say that in many States today—in my State, for example, where I'm from, if you get a life sentence you can't get out unless you get parole commuted by the Governor, anyway. So about 10 percent of our prison population are people on life sentences. It is rare for people over 70 to commit those serious crimes. It sometimes happens. If they are clearly not a danger to society, they ought to be able to make their case and get their sentence commuted.

Ms. Stewart. Mr. President, we have a question up here.

[A participant asked how the President proposes to prevent violent crime in communities where children think violence is the only way to solve problems.]

The President. Perhaps the best thing about this crime bill from that point of view is that this is the first crime bill in my lifetime that—as far as I know, anyway—that has a huge amount of money allocated to crime prevention, to programs that work in the neighborhoods, for example, before and after school programs, programs to keep young people active, programs to give young people jobs in the summertime or after school, programs to give people something to say yes to, not just tell them something to say no to.

There's also a huge amount of money in this crime bill for drug and alcohol education

and prevention, as well as treatment. And there's some money in there that can be—for example, suppose in your community you've got an innovative project that you want to try. Under this crime bill, the States and the localities will be able to have the flexibility to try some things that they know work and expand them.

One other thing I want to say—just to put a plug in because it hadn't come up yet—I believe that a lot of the violence that happens among young people your age and younger, where people just pull out knives or guns and shoot each other because they've been fighting over something—I think people can be educated out of that. There's a lot of evidence that you can teach young people who grow up in tough environments that there are other ways to solve their problems other than shooting or cutting up each other or beating each other. And there's some money in this crime bill to do that in schools all across this country. I also think that's very, very important.

Ms. Soren. Next question.

Prisons

[A participant asked if sending criminals who commit minor crimes to prison is effective and asked if the correctional system can be changed so that prisoners do not become better trained criminals while in jail.]

The President. Well, first of all, you're echoing what was on one of the earlier film segments, that a lot of young people do not fear going to prison. A lot of them come out of prison just better trained criminals.

I think there are two things that we have to focus on. First of all, if you do a crime, you've got to expect to either do some time or be punished for it. You can't stop the system of having consequences for destructive behavior. But I think there are two things we can do. Number one, there ought to be alternatives to prison for first-time nonviolent offenders. People ought to get a chance to do something else that connects them to the community and gives them the future. Number two, if young people do go to prison and they're going to be paroled, and most everybody does get paroled, then they shouldn't be paroled unless, in prison, there is a good program for alcohol and drug abuse preven-

tion, there is a good program for education and training, there's a good program, in other words, to prepare people to reenter society and be more successful, instead of just preparing them to do what they used to do, better.

If all you do is go to the penitentiary and you deal with people who are tougher than you are, who are better fighters than you are, and you spend 2 hours a day in a weight room pumping iron, then when you get out, you're just prepared to do what you used to do better than you did before you got in. So we have to change the way people spend their time in prison, and we've got to divert as many first offenders as we can from prison the first time in community-based settings and boot camps and things like that.

Community Programs

[At this point, Ms. Stewart introduced a videotape on community programs designed to help children when they are small. A participant then asked how the President can discourage kids from becoming influenced by the high profits of drug dealing and persuade them to join community programs designed to help them.]

The President. Well, I think there are only two ways that a teenager who has a chance to make that kind of money won't do it. And maybe you need them both. One is that all the teenager's peers and family members and friends and everybody else needs to always say that this is wrong, and the teenager needs to believe it's wrong. Keep in mind, most of us obey the law most of the time not because we think we're going to get caught, but because we think it's wrong.

The second thing is we need to do a better job of making people think there is a real price. When somebody gets into something like that for serious money, then we have to do what we can to cut it off. We have to try to be more effective on the law enforcement end, and not just with the people like the teenager but with the people that are supplying them with the dope and the money, the bigger people. And we've got to try to be better at that. And of course, we're trying to give ourselves some resources to do that better, too, in this crime bill.

But I don't think it's very complicated. I think you either—if you're doing the wrong thing for money, you've either got to stop it because you think it's wrong or because you think you're going to get caught and you don't want to pay the price. And if you can't—if you don't have those two things, it's not very good.

Now, let me make one other point. I think also there has to be more hope. I think the midnight basketball and all those things are great. I really support them. And funding for them is in our crime bill. But I also think there has to be a longer term hope, that maybe you won't have \$1,500 in your pocket living a straight life tomorrow, but if you go back to school, you can get an education, and there will be a decent job and a good life for you over the long run and there will be more money at less risk with more happiness over the long run. Those are the things I think we have to do.

Ms. Soren. What's your question for the President?

Community Center Funding

[A participant asked what funding is available to help her group start a community center in east Baltimore.]

The President. First, there might be some funding through the Housing and Urban Development Department. And I would urge you to write Secretary Cisneros about that or give me something on it now. Secondly, your community, if they would support it, your local community could ask for funding through this crime bill prevention strategy to do it.

I think it's very important. These community centers can make a huge difference, especially if the tenants support them, if the adults as well as the kids support them. But I think that you should be able to get some support for that from one of those two sources.

Mayor Schموke in Baltimore has been extremely active in the whole housing area. He's done some of the most innovative and impressive things in the country, and there may be, for all I know, some help the city government itself can give you. But if you'll give me your name and address at the end of the program, I'll see what I can do to help.

Q. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Stewart. Okay, who are you, and what's your question for the President?

Television Violence

[A participant asked why the Attorney General and the Congress are focusing on TV violence when real violence has become such a problem.]

The President. I don't know that the Attorney General and the Congress want a law—at least I don't think a majority of the Congress wants a law to limit what can be on television. But there is some evidence that the accumulated exposure to random violence over years and years and years by a generation of young people who watch far more television than their predecessors did has some effect on people's willingness to then go out and recreate what they've been exposed to on television.

Now, I'm not against all violence in movies and TV. I thought—for example, I thought that movie "Boyz N' the Hood" was a great movie, because—it was a very violent movie, but it showed you the real—it was a true movie. I mean, it showed you what the horrible consequences to life and to family was of that kind of behavior.

But I think what bothers people about television is not so much this or that or the other program but the overall impact of watching several hours a day every day and just one violent scene after another coming at you. If you start doing that when you're about 5 years old, by the time you're 15, 16, or 17, there may be a whole lot of messages in your mind that may make you more prone to be violent, again, if you don't have an offsetting influence from the family, the school, the church, the community, some other place. That is the concern. It is not that there are bad people doing the television or that one program or two, in and of themselves, can make a difference. The question is whether the overall impact of it makes young people more likely to be violent.

Ms. Soren. Mr. President, our next question is over here.

Public Trust in Government

[A participant expressed the frustration and anger many young people feel toward the bu-

reaucacy of Government and asked if the present administration will be able to keep its promises and make a difference.]

The President. Well, all I can say is you just have to watch and see. Insofar as the Congress has worked with me, we've been able to do a large number of the things that I said I'd do when I ran for President. I came on MTV, and we talked about the motor voter bill; we signed it after years of not signing it. It took—for 7 years the Brady bill was hung up in Congress. When I became President, we passed it; we signed it. The national service bill was something I ran on, trying to get young people like you interested in community service and then allowing you, in return for that community service, to earn money against a college education. It was passed and signed.

So we're able—we are making progress on the commitments I made to the American people in general and to the young people of this country. We redid the student loan program, so now you can pay a loan back—college loan back as a percentage of your income. So I'm trying to do what I say I'll do. All I can tell you is—this is a general rule—cynicism is a cop-out because once you become cynical and you say somebody else is not going to do something, that lets you off the hook. And in the end, we can only go forward if we believe in each other, until we understand we can't believe in each other anymore.

So I would plead with you—it's a very fair question. You've got a lot of reasons to be disappointed. But we can make a difference if we work at it together. And neither you nor I will be able to do everything we want to do, but we can do a lot of the things we should do if we'll get to work on it.

Whitewater and Vietnam Draft

Ms. Soren. Mr. President, you speak so passionately and directly about issues like violence and education. But why is it, when the issues pertain to you personally, like the draft or Whitewater, that people seem to get the idea that you're giving them less than a straight answer, even when you have nothing to hide?

The President. Well, first of all, I think it's hard to know what the rules are; they

keep raising the bar. Let me just give you a real answer to that. I was asked by the press and the Republicans to agree to a special counsel on Whitewater, right, even though there were—no one had accused me of doing anything wrong, and therefore, there was no ground, traditionally, to have a special counsel. Everybody said, prove your innocence. In a country where people are presumed innocent, the President isn't. You've got to go prove your innocence, even though no one's accused you of anything wrong. So I agreed. I said, okay, we'll have a special counsel.

Then, in past special counsels, Presidents have resisted subpoenas, applied things like executive privilege. I cooperated entirely. And the Watergate special counsel said we were a big departure from the past; this administration has totally cooperated.

The press keeps saying, "Well, we said special counsel, but now we want to ask questions anyway. And you've got to have all the answers right now, and if you don't, you're not being forthcoming." Well, I couldn't remember everything I was asked. It's been a long time since you had somebody who's given you 17 years worth of tax returns, for example. But I don't think it's fair to say we haven't been candid.

Now, maybe in the beginning I didn't want to just shut the Government down and just do Whitewater. And I still don't. But I have tried to be as honest as I could. I also, frankly, have questions. I don't think just because you become President that everything all of a sudden should be subject to answering.

I disagree on the draft; I did my best to be candid. And that's another interesting thing, the person that made the draft charge against me was the person who changed his story. Not me, I didn't change mine; somebody else changed theirs.

Ms. Soren. I think what angers young people about Whitewater is the fact that it seems like it's slowing down all of the other important issues that they want to get through.

The President. I think that does bother you, but you shouldn't worry about that, at least not now, because the reason I agreed to have a special counsel look into it is so anybody who asks me a question, I can say, I'm going to give it all to the special counsel.

If I did anything wrong, he'll find out—so that it wouldn't slow us down.

And let me just say, this year already, we've signed a major education bill to try to improve public schools in America and set world-class standards for all our schools. We are proceeding at a very rapid rate on the crime bill. We are proceeding toward passing a budget at the most rapid rate in recent memory, which, if it passes, will lower the Government's deficit for 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. We are proceeding on health care reform. So we are moving ahead.

So far, the work of the Congress has not been diverted, and the work of the Presidency has not been diverted. I know it may be hard—you can't tell, in other words, from the news coverage that, but that's the truth. And we're not going to let it be diverted if we can possibly help it.

Violence in Schools

[Ms. Stewart showed a videotape on guns at school. A participant then described the shooting of a teacher in his school and asked when funding would be available for metal detectors.]

The President. In the crime bill there's about \$300 million for safe schools. And the money will be given out to the schools that have a demonstrated need for it. So I would urge you to apply for the money.

I don't know what all of your reaction to all this was, but I remember when we all started going through metal detectors to get on airplanes, a lot of people were upset. Now everybody just does it as a matter of course. I think until we get guns out of the hands of our young people, every school that needs it ought to have whatever security is needed to take care of that. You ought to be safe at school. Then you've got the problem of going to and from school. That's what the community policing is supposed to take care of. But I think every school that needs it ought to have this kind of security. People should be safe in the school, and they ought to know when they get there they're going to be safe.

Bosnia

[Following a commercial break, a participant stated that she voted for the President because he indicated he would not let ethnic cleansing continue in Bosnia, and she expressed frustration with the current policy.]

The President. Well, first of all, go back and talk about everything I said. I also said that the United States should not enter the war, a civil war, on the side of the Bosnian Government. I said that the United States should not put its troops there to get involved in what was a centuries-old conflict. But we should do, what we could to stop the fighting and to stop ethnic cleansing. So you have to tell the whole story; if you're going to give my campaign commitment, give the whole thing.

I advocated having NATO's air power put at the service of the Bosnian Government to stop aggression by the Serbs and lifting the arms embargo. The United Nations was in Bosnia. Our United Nations allies, France and Britain, would not support lifting the arms embargo. It took me from the time I took office until August to get NATO committed to use their air power to try to stop the aggression; they did. Then, finally, we began to do that.

Now look what's happened. In 15 months, which may seem like a long time, but is not such a long time, we now have finally relieved the siege of Sarajevo, and the Croats and the Muslims have gotten together in an agreement. The Serbs are doing what they've always done; they're just trying to get as much land as they can for greater Serbia.

We're doing what we can, but everything we do, we do through the United Nations or through NATO. I have never favored—I was explicit in the campaign—unilateral United States action. If we do that, if we go into Bosnia all by ourselves, say, "We know what's right, nobody else does," then why should any other nation ever work with us through the United Nations? Why should the nations who don't agree with the embargo on Iraq that we imposed go along with it?

So I think we have done the best we could with a very difficult situation when we don't have troops on the ground, and I don't think we should until we get a peace agreement.

I also believe that American troops should participate in Bosnia in trying to enforce a peace agreement once one is achieved.

[Ms. Soren asked if the President would support expanded air strikes given recent events in Gorazde.]

The President. Well, I'm working on that. I met for an hour and a half this morning; I'm going to work for the rest of the day. Then I'll have an announcement about what our policy will be later. But I can't announce it now.

Ms. Soren. Not now? Okay. Thanks a lot.

The President. I understand your frustration. Let me just say, I understand your frustration, but when I took office, the United Nations was already there. Their job was to try to provide humanitarian relief. Since I have been there, the U.S. took the lead in providing the longest humanitarian airlift in history, longer than the Berlin airlift after the Second World War. We pushed NATO to get more actively involved. We have been actively involved. We have made some progress.

There is still a war on the ground. The Bosnian Government has a bigger army than the Serbs do, but the Serbs have the heavy artillery. We tried to take the heavy artillery away from Sarajevo. That has worked so far. But until they reach an agreement, both sides are still fighting on the ground. Yes, Gorazde has been attacked by the Serbs; the Bosnian Government's also made some military gains elsewhere.

Do I think what the Serbs did was right? No, I don't. The United Nations recognized Bosnia. Should they have never imposed an arms embargo on them? I don't think they should have. But right now we are doing everything we can to bring an end to the war on terms that provide the Bosnian Muslims and the people who want to be part of a multiethnic state the best deal we can possibly get, given the circumstances as they exist. And that's the best we can do. The United States cannot go over there unilaterally, send its forces in, and start fighting on the side of the Bosnian Government. I don't think that is the right thing to do.

Music and Violence

[A participant stated that her favorite rapper was Snoop Doggy Dogg and asked the President's opinion on gangsta rap.]

The President. I don't know. I'm not dodging your—I just don't know. I read an article about Snoop Doggy Dogg. It is not exactly my music, you know; I don't necessarily know a lot about it. [Laughter] So I read an article about it, and I was interested in the—in the article that I read he talked about his life, you know, and the time he'd done. And the writer of the article talked about the whole idea behind gangsta rap was trying to dramatize how difficult life is for young people.

So I guess the answer is, it depends on what the end of the song is. I mean, what is the purpose of it? Is it to make people understand and empathize with and try to do something about these terrible problems? Or is it to legitimize violence and criminal conduct and, ultimately, self-defeating behavior? And for me to answer your question, I'd have to know the answer to that, and I just don't know enough to answer it.

Gun Exchange Programs

[A participant discussed the effectiveness of the gun exchange program and asked what national programs could be enacted to get guns off the streets.]

The President. Well, actually we're looking at that. We're looking at what, if anything, we can do on a national basis to try to have a more effective handgun purchasing program or gathering program.

I'm not so concerned that maybe some people buy them on the black market and make a little profit on them if the guns are actually destroyed and taken out of commission, and if then we have more control over the circumstances under which people buy the next gun. But you're talking about tens of millions of guns. We're talking about major numbers of guns. And it seems to me if we're going to do this effectively—and I think we ought to look at it—you have to know what happens to the guns when the government takes possession of them, whether it's a city or a State or the Federal Government, what happens to them then.

I think there's a lot of merit in doing this, but it seems to me you have to melt down the guns, you've got to destroy the weapons in order for it to be worth the effort so you reduce the overall supply of black market guns.

Teen Violence

[A participant stated that she believed violence among teens was becoming something of a status symbol.]

The President. You mean you think a lot of people do it because they think it's the thing to do now?

Q. Yes.

The President. I think there's something to that. But that's why I think it's so important that in the schools and wherever else young people can be found, there are real efforts to show people that it is not a status symbol, that it can ruin your life, that it can destroy somebody else's life, and that there are other more satisfactory ways to resolve your conflicts.

I mean, there was just another story today about one student shooting another student over a girl they were both interested in. Well, you know, if you live long enough, that will happen to you several times; you can't start shooting people over that. But it happens all the time now.

And I think that it's a terrible indictment of all of us, the adults in this country, that we haven't provided the kind of leadership to our young people to know that that is not the way to behave. And I think there are too many young people who just feel like they're out there on their own. How many of these films did we see where these young people say "Our parents don't care about us. No grownups care about us. Nobody really cares about us?" If you go back to that, people have to believe they're really important to somebody who really cares about them before that person can help to change their behavior. I really believe that. And I say we've got to—and that goes back to your question about the gangster rap. She asked the same question in a different way. I don't know. I just know we've got to demystify violence, and we've got to say it's a bad thing. It is not a good thing; it is a bad thing.

Drugs and Crime

[*Ms. Soren discussed drugs as a major cause of random violent crime, and a participant asked the President if he thought mandatory sentences for drug offenders were effective.*]

The President. I think the mandatory sentencing program has—of course, keep in mind, that’s basically a Federal program, although New York also has a mandatory sentencing program. Some States have it, and some States don’t. By and large, there have been a lot of problems with mandatory sentencing programs related to drugs because they tend to treat cases that are different, the same.

The second thing I have to say is that there isn’t enough drug treatment on demand. We know that appropriate drug treatment, if you also accompany it with something that a young person can do, works in more than half the cases. So I think what we need to do is to focus on having an appropriate level of punishment but also an appropriate alternative so people can move out of the life they’re living. That’s what I think.

So the mandatory sentencing program, there have been problems with all of them, largely because they tend to treat cases that really are different, fundamentally the same.

Now, on the other hand, if you listen to anybody talk, they’ll also tell you a lot of people get parole without doing an appropriate amount of time. So the system is not as rational as it ought to be. And I do think there’s some problems with the sentencing. I’d like to see some changes.

Ms. Soren. Many politicians are afraid to back away from the mandatory minimum sentencing that started in the eighties because it would make them look soft on crime. But if your “Three strikes and you’re out” becomes law, couldn’t you repeal the mandatory minimums?

The President. I think we could certainly change it some. Let me say, one of the things, though, that frustrates people when there were no guidelines is that people who were the same were treated wildly differently. That also makes—to go back to the young man’s question—this is the frustrating thing about—should there be sentencing guidelines or should there not be? When people

who are different and their circumstances are different are treated the same, we all get mad, right? And we should. But when people who are the same in their offense and their degree of guilt are treated dramatically differently, we all get mad.

So there is no perfect solution to this. But I will say again, what are the important things: crime prevention; when people get in trouble, do drug education and treatment, do education; and give people something to say yes to when they get out, because there will never be a fully perfect way of sentencing.

Would I have the power to say, maybe we ought to take another look at this, with “Three strikes and you’re out,” with my long support for the capital punishment? I think so. But there is no perfect answer to the sentencing problem when you have a crime problem as big as ours is. And the real thing you’ve got to do is focus on what happens to the people once they’re in the prison, once they’re in the boot camp. And more importantly, what can you do to keep people out of the system in the first place? What can we do to prevent this?

[*A participant stated that she believed drug addicts should not be placed in prisons and asked if there should be more drug prevention and rehabilitation programs to help drug addicts.*]

The President. I agree with half of what you said. I think there should be more drug prevention programs, and I think they’d work, the drug education programs. I think there should be more drug treatment programs. But some of you, perhaps all of you know that my brother is a recovering drug addict who actually went to prison for 14 months. It is my opinion that if he hadn’t been caught up in the criminal justice system, he probably would have died because his problem was so gross and so bad. And I think he would tell you the same thing if he were standing here with me.

So I don’t think it’s inappropriate for people to do some time for violating serious crimes when they have a drug problem, and it may actually jerk them out of the life they’re in and help to save their life. But I would say two things. Number one, you don’t

want to overdo the length of time they have to serve; if fundamentally they're not drug pushers, they're really drug users and abusers and addicts, you can overdo the length of time. And number two, you've got to have adequate drug treatment, as well as preparation for living a different life if you want a different kind of behavior coming out of the prison than you got going in. That, it seems to me, is the biggest problem.

So a little time won't hurt people who are in the process of killing themselves anyway, if you make the most of them. But if you just send them to prison for a too-long sentence and you never do drug treatment and they get nothing when they come out, then you're right, it's self-defeating.

[Following a commercial break, Ms. Soren conducted a poll of the audience to determine if they thought the Government's priority should be programs and education to prevent crime or punishment of criminals.]

Ms. Stewart. Somewhat overwhelming for prevention in the room, President Clinton. Are you surprised by that at all?

The President. No, because I think a lot of young people know others who have been to prison and haven't been deterred and because I think the problem seems so overwhelming. People know that you've got to change behavior, you have to change people from the inside out. You have to change community by community, school by school.

My own belief is that we shouldn't make a choice, because the two things can work together. You can be tough, and you can be compassionate. You can be oriented toward prevention, but when somebody does something really horrible, you just can't walk away from it. You can't. So I think you have to do both.

But one thing I'd like to say to all of you who are here—there is a limit to what the Government can do unless people are working at grassroots level. And everyone of you, if you really care about this, could make a contribution to making the problem better. Is there an organization in your school? Is there an organization in your community? If you believe in prevention, are you doing something to try to touch somebody else? Because most people have to be rescued one

at a time, just the way they get lost, one at a time. And there will never be enough police officers; there will never be enough Government workers to do this. So I would just urge you—we had one young lady from Baltimore there who said she was going to work on setting up a community center. I think that there are things that you can do to give people something to say yes to that will make this prevention strategy work. And all the crime bill funds are basically just designed to give you the right, you and people like you all over America, to get together with people who care about this and do something about it in school after school and neighborhood after neighborhood.

Ms. Soren. So even though there's approximately \$16 billion for police and prisons, some of that money is preventative and treatment and—

The President. In the House bill, I think, there is about \$7 billion for prevention. There's a lot of money for prevention, much more than ever before from the Federal Government.

Ms. Soren. One thing that we didn't get a chance to talk about, but there were a lot of questions about was the role of families in preventing violence. Can you legislate a better family? Can you—

The President. No. No, but you can have pro-family policies. A lot of this violence occurs within the family. And you can have policies, for example, that don't push people into welfare. We lowered taxes for working people, one in six American families, for working people whose incomes are very low and who have children. We're trying to pass health care reform so people will never have to go on welfare just to get health care. We passed the family leave law, so when there are problems in the family, people can get off work and take a little time off work and tend to their problems with their children without losing their jobs.

In other words, the Government can do things that say we want to support family. And with more and more single-parent families and with more parents having to work, even when their children are very young, we have to be thinking all the time about how we can do things to help people succeed as parents and as workers. And then, when fam-

ilies get in trouble, we need to work on how we can preserve the family, not just how we can deal with the kids after it falls apart.

None of these things are easy, but frankly, if all of the families in this country were functional, we'd have less than half of the problems we've got today. I think all of you know that. We'd still have some problems, but we'd have less than half the problems we've got. And so we have to really keep that in mind.

[Following a commercial break, Ms. Soren invited participants to ask brief questions on any topic they choose.]

Popular Culture and Private Life

Q. Mr. President, I'm curious to know how your meeting with Pearl Jam went.

The President. It was great. [Laughter] My daughter was jealous that she wasn't in the White House that day.

Q. Mr. President, do you speak any other languages?

The President. I studied German in college, and I can still read it and understand it a little bit, but my speaking is way down.

Q. Mr. President, I was wondering if you'd ever asked your daughter not to wear a specific piece of clothing to school.

The President. No, I haven't, although we've had a lot of general conversations about clothing. [Laughter]

Q. Mr. President, The world's dying to know, is it boxers or briefs? [Laughter]

The President. Usually briefs. I can't believe she did that. [Laughter]

Q. How do you feel about the Secret Service following you around everywhere you go?

The President. It's hard sometimes. But they do a good job protecting me and my family. And it's their job, so I'm getting used to it. But it's hard.

Ms. Soren. Do you keep a diary?

The President. No. I try to collect my recollections on a periodic basis, but I don't keep a daily diary.

Q. Mr. President, what was the best advice your mother ever gave you?

The President. Never give up.

Q. Mr. President, first of all, I want to say that I think you're great. Second of all, I want you to say, "yes," "no," or "I don't know." Will you run in '96?

The President. Probably. [Laughter]

Q. Do you have a charity you contribute to regularly?

The President. Yes, I do. We, my wife and I, contribute to a shelter for battered women and their children back home, regularly, and a number of other charities. We always give money to the Children's Defense Fund.

Q. Mr. President, what's your idea of the perfect day?

The President. A good book, a good game of golf, a long run, dinner with my wife and daughter, and movies with friends. You've got to stay up a long time to do all that. [Laughter]

Q. What do you think about the Clinton jokes?

The President. The what?

Q. What do you think about the Clinton jokes?

The President. Some are funny, and some aren't.

Presidential Nominations

Q. Do you regret not giving Lani Guinier the chance to defend her views to the Senate?

The President. Well, she defended them to a lot of individual Senators. The problem was we were facing a very divisive fight over an issue in which she and I had a fundamental disagreement, of which I was unaware at the time she was nominated. She might have been able to get confirmed, but based on what I was hearing from the Democrats, I doubt it. I think she's a very fine woman. She's one of the best civil rights lawyers in the country, and she's going to have a great career.

Q. In light of Justice Blackmun's recent decision, what do you think the chances are that you will replace the vacant seat with a minority that will, in fact, represent the needs and the concerns of minorities like Thurgood Marshall once did?

The President. Well, I'm going to try to make a good appointment, but I haven't made up my mind who to appoint yet. I think Justice Ginsberg, whom I appointed last time, Ruth Bader Ginsberg, will be terrific. And I will try to make—I hope when I'm done, you will think that all my Federal judge appointments not only are the most diverse

but are the most excellent in American history. And we're on the way to having the most diverse and the most highly qualified appointments.

Ms. Soren. Can you give us your short list?

The President. I could, but I won't. [Laughter]

Popular Culture and Private Life

Q. Mr. President, I was wondering, what is your favorite song, and do you think you could sing a little bit of it?

The President. I have a lot of favorite songs, but I love the song that Ray Charles won the R&B Grammy for this year, "A Song For You," a song written by Leon Russell. I don't know if you know it, it's an unbelievable song.

Q. Would you sing—

The President. No. [Laughter] "Our love is in a place that has no space or time. I love you for my life. You are a friend of mine." Do you know the song? It's a wonderful song, but he sings it better than I do.

Q. Do you support Howard Stern's candidacy for Governor of New York?

The President. I support his right to run. [Laughter]

Ms. Stewart. Do you have a favorite Biblical passage that means a lot to you?

The President. "Let us not grow weary in doing good, for in due season we shall reap if we do not lose heart." Galatians 6:9.

Q. Mr. President, what's your favorite type of running shoe?

The President. What did you say?

Q. What's your favorite type of running shoe?

The President. New Balance, and—I normally wear New Balance or Asics. I like them both. They're slightly different. I need some that a heavy guy can run in without falling. [Laughter]

Q. What has been your toughest obstacle as President?

The President. I think sort of the culture of Washington, a lot of partisanship and a lot of negativism and focus on process, who's in and out and who's up and down; instead of let's all get together, pull the American together, put the country first.

Admiral Frank Kelso

Ms. Soren. Do you think Admiral Kelso should get all his stars when he retires, despite his role in the Tailhook scandal?

The President. Based on the facts as I know them, I do. I believe that the evidence is not sufficiently compelling that he knew about it and that he was sufficiently culpable to deny him his stars. That's a very severe thing to do, and I don't believe the evidence warrants it. That's based on the Inspector General's report in the Pentagon.

Popular Culture and Private Life

Q. Mr. President, who's your favorite jazz saxophonist?

The President. Boy, that's tough. Probably Stan Getz.

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about your likeness on "Beavis and Butthead?"

The President. Sometimes I like it; sometimes I don't.

Ms. Soren. We're about out of time. Thank you, Mr. President, for joining us today and continuing the dialog with young people.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 11:30 a.m. in the Kalorama Studio. In his remarks, he referred to entertainers Pearl Jam and Howard Stern, and Adm. Frank B. Kelso II, USN, Chief of Naval Operations. A portion of this interview could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks on Bosnia and an Exchange With Reporters

April 19, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. This morning I met for an hour and a half with our national security team to discuss what our options were to regain the momentum in Bosnia for a peaceful settlement. Several options were presented to me, and we discussed some others. When we adjourned the meeting, I asked the team to refine three points and to work on some of the options and to come back and meet with me again at 3:30 this afternoon. So we will meet again.

In the meanwhile, as I'm sure you know, President Yeltsin has issued a statement, which I very much appreciate and which I

think is very helpful, calling on the Serbs to honor their commitments to the Russians to withdraw from Gorazde, to allow U.N. personnel back in Gorazde, and to resume the negotiations toward a peaceful settlement.

We are working closely on this. And I believe that we have a chance to build on what has been done in the last several weeks in and around Sarajevo and with the agreement between the Croatians and the Bosnian Muslims. And we will just keep working on it.

As I said, I meet again at 3:30 p.m., and I'm hopeful that we'll be able to make some constructive moves over the next couple of days.

President Yeltsin's Proposal

Q. Mr. President, Mr. Yeltsin is also asking for a summit of all of the major powers to try to find some sort of solution. How do you feel about that?

The President. Well, he and I have discussed that on the telephone at least once, maybe twice, and I think it has some merit. We both agreed the last time we talked, before this development in Gorazde, that we were making progress doing what each of us was doing and that it might be a little premature, and that that sort of thing, in effect, can only be done once, and it might be better to save it for a time when, hopefully, the negotiations between the Serbs on the one hand and the Croatians and the Muslims on the other were coming down to an end point.

I presume from his statement today that he's sufficiently concerned about what's happened in the last couple of days, that he thinks maybe we ought to go ahead and do it now. I think it deserves serious consideration, and I want to discuss it with him and with the other nations that would be involved. But I think in the context of the statement President Yeltsin made today, it has to be considered seriously because it was a very important, positive statement that he made.

Air Strikes

Q. What about Boutros-Ghali's proposal to expand air strikes to the other five safe areas in Bosnia? Would the U.S. and NATO be willing to go along with that?

The President. That's what we're discussing today. And we're discussing exactly how

that would be done and, of course, whether the other NATO allies would be willing to do it and what the ups and downs of it would be and what else we could do to get this thing going. But again, I want to have my meeting at 3:30 p.m. You should know we're discussing all these options, but I reserve the right to announce a clear policy on where we go on the specifics until after the next meeting, because I did have some questions after our meeting this morning that the security team will answer for me later today.

Q. How concerned are you about empty threats—

The President. I think that there must not be any. When we had the NATO meeting in January, the one thing I implored our allies to do was not to reaffirm our position unless we were willing to see it through. I still feel that way. The possibility of misunderstanding in this area is so great anyway, because of the shared responsibility and the contingent responsibility of NATO—contingent on what the U.N. does—and the difficulty in getting all the parties together, that we simply must not be on record in favor of any policy we are not prepared to follow through on.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Statement on the Agreement on Elections in South Africa

April 19, 1994

I warmly welcome today's agreement among the South African Government, the African National Congress and the Inkatha Freedom Party to renounce violence and to bring Inkatha into the nation's first non-racial elections next week. Throughout the historic process of change in South Africa, the leaders of that country have shown great courage and a capacity for compromise. Today's bold action by Chief Buthelezi, Nelson Mandela, and F.W. de Klerk is one more act of collective statesmanship that bodes well for the prospect of free and fair elections in South Africa and for the success of the future Government of National Unity.

What happens in South Africa is of vital importance to us all. South Africa has the

potential to alter the world trend toward greater ethnic division and establish a powerful model for democratic reform and national reconciliation. We will remain steadfast in our support for South Africa as it makes this difficult and historic transition to nonracial democracy.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders
Reporting on Peacekeeping
Operations in the Former Yugoslav
Republic of Macedonia**

April 19, 1994

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

On January 8, 1994, I provided my second report to you on the deployment of a U.S. Army peacekeeping contingent as part of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. I am now providing this further report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to inform you about my decision to augment our contingent in support of multilateral peacekeeping efforts in the region.

Since its arrival in July 1993, our combat-equipped U.S. Army contingent of approximately 315 Americans has been an important part of UNPROFOR Macedonia. Along with a Nordic battalion consisting of troops from Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark, the U.S. Armed Forces have assisted in the U.N. Security Council-authorized mission of monitoring and reporting developments along the northern border that could signify a threat to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The U.S. contribution has played an important role in the UNPROFOR Macedonia effort to prevent the conflict in the former Yugoslavia from spreading while contributing to stability in the region.

In order to support the United Nations as it sought additional forces to serve with UNPROFOR Bosnia-Herzegovina, the United States offered to increase the U.S. contribution to UNPROFOR Macedonia by approximately 200 personnel. The United Nations expressed its appreciation for continued U.S. cooperation and support and requested that the additional U.S. personnel

be deployed to UNPROFOR Macedonia. We believe that the decision to deploy additional U.S. personnel to replace elements of the UNPROFOR Macedonia Nordic battalion has contributed to the decisions by member governments to deploy additional military personnel to Bosnia-Herzegovina.

As a result of these decisions, the U.S. European Command is deploying a reinforced company of approximately 200 personnel to augment the U.S. Army contingent in UNPROFOR Macedonia. The additional U.S. Armed Forces are from Company D, 1st Battalion, 6th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Infantry Division, V Corps, Vilseck, Germany. This unit is joining the U.S. reinforced company that was deployed earlier. The unit is equipped to assume sector responsibilities for departing Nordic troops as part of the ongoing U.N. monitoring and observer mission.

United States forces assigned to UNPROFOR Macedonia have encountered no hostilities, and there have been no U.S. casualties since the operation began. The mission has the support of the government and the local population. Our forces will remain fully prepared not only to fulfill their peacekeeping mission, but to defend themselves if necessary.

This additional U.S. contribution to UNPROFOR Macedonia is consistent with our commitment to multilateral efforts to address threats to international peace and security in the former Yugoslavia. I have ordered the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces for these purposes pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

I appreciate the support of the Congress for our efforts in the former Yugoslavia, and I look forward to continued cooperation with you in these matters.

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.

Proclamation 6674—National Youth Service Day, 1994 and 1995

April 19, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

On September 21, 1993, I had the great pleasure of signing into law a new national service program, using the same pen that John F. Kennedy used to create the Peace Corps. That event was particularly meaningful to me because so many of my own dreams about national service began when President Kennedy challenged my generation to ask what we could do for our country—and thousands responded as Peace Corps volunteers.

Thirty years later, a new generation of young Americans is not waiting to be asked. All along the Presidential campaign trail, young people told me again and again what they wanted most—the opportunity to make a difference. So we created AmeriCorps, a new national service program. Now, the real work of rebuilding America must begin.

This year, 20,000 young AmeriCorps members will provide hands-on community-based service to meet our Nation's urgent needs—in education, in public safety, in health care reform, and in the environment. In exchange for a commitment to service, AmeriCorps members will receive many benefits. They will get education awards to help them pay off student loans and finance further education. They will have an experience that will change their lives forever. But the most important benefit of national service will be seen in the accomplishments of the participants in the communities they serve. With young people at the vanguard, AmeriCorps can help to bring the American people back together with a sense of working toward a common purpose.

I know that it can be done. Last summer, we launched a pilot service program to see if AmeriCorps could really work to strengthen communities. As a result of our Summer of Service program, 87 participants in Texas helped to immunize over 100,000 children. Fifty participants in New York City operated summer day school programs at the Harlem Freedom Schools for 643 at-risk youths. And

74 participants through Boston's City Year program provided educational, health, and environmental services that reached more than 14,200 individuals. If national service participants can have that kind of impact in 8 weeks, just imagine what they can accomplish in a year—or two—of service to their communities.

In the youth of America lies our hope for the future. Throughout our history, our young men and women have challenged us to reach for goals that seemed beyond our grasp, to reach for an understanding between all people of good will.

The Congress, by Public Law 103-82, has designated April 19, 1994, and April 18, 1995, as "National Youth Service Day" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of these days.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim April 19, 1994, and April 18, 1995, as National Youth Service Day. I urge every American to observe these days with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities in honor of volunteers and in recognition of their extraordinary contributions to America.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this nineteenth 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, 11:33 a.m., April 20, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 21.

Nomination for U.S. Executive Director and Alternate U.S. Executive Director of the World Bank

April 19, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Jan Piercy as the U.S. Executive Director at the World Bank and Mi-

chael Marek as the Alternate U.S. Executive Director at the World Bank.

"I am pleased to nominate Jan Piercy and Michael Marek to the World Bank. I am confident their skilled leadership and first-hand experience with the global marketplace will be a tremendous asset in their new roles," the President said.

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

Nomination for Members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

April 19, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Paul Steven Miller and Paul M. Igasaki as members of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

"I am delighted to nominate Paul Steven Miller and Paul Igasaki as members of the EEOC. With their distinguished careers in civil rights, they have the requisite vision and expertise to provide effective leadership in the Commission's efforts to ensure equality of opportunity in the workplace," the President said.

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

Remarks on Signing the National Infant Immunization Week Proclamation

April 20, 1994

Thank you very much. I want to thank all the people who have participated in this wonderful program today and all of you who worked to put it together. I want to say a special word of appreciation to Secretary Shalala, who is the owner of a current Mustang. [Laughter]

You know, when we have events like this, sometimes I think that the people who are on the stage ought to be out in the audience, and the people who are in the audience should be up on the stage, because by and large, by the time we have an event like this, what we're doing is announcing something

that the rest of you have been trying to get us to do for 5 or 10 years. [Laughter]

So I want to begin by just saying to all of you who have labored so long in this field, the Members of Congress, the people in our administration, to the citizens groups—I'm sorry Mrs. Carter couldn't be with us today, but I'm glad Mrs. Bumpers, Mrs. Riegle are here—to the advocacy groups, our friend Marian Wright Edelman, the head of the Children's Defense Fund, and so many others who are here. You made this day possible, and we thank you all for it.

The second thing I'd like to do is to thank people like Dr. Johnson, who are actually out there doing something about all these poor kids that a lot of other people just talk about.

If you think about what the Vice President said and what others said about the comparative global statistics and immunization and the trends and you think about how many other areas there are like that when our country, even though we have a very powerful economy and, thank goodness, a growing one with growing jobs where we still have these continuing problems, we really, for reasons no one fully understands, continue to resist disciplined, community-based organizations where we all look after one another without regard to our race or our income. We're just not as good at it as we ought to be. And we talk about it a lot better than we do it. And I think we all have to admit it. But we are trying to do better. And this is a truly remarkable initiative. This gives us a chance to put all of our actions where our words are.

Under our plan, every one of the things we could ever think of to do to get kids immunized will be done. And I appreciate what Dr. Johnson said about our health care plan because we also try in the health care plan to take care of the needs of our children and to do more primary and preventive work. And that goes along with the work that Senator Kennedy and others have spearheaded to try to expand the reach of Head Start to even younger children and to improve its quality.

We have got to do a better job of dealing with the health, the nutrition, the educational, and the emotional needs of our very

youngest children if we expect to have the kind of future that America deserves.

Again, let me say to all of you, I am profoundly grateful for the work that has been done. I would be remiss if I didn't mention one of my pet projects, the national service program, AmeriCorps. Last year, 87 of our national service participants, in our very first summer of service, helped to immunize over 100,000 children in Texas. And it was a pretty good investment. So we will keep doing that. We'll keep working at it. Dr. Satcher, Dr. Elders, and others will keep spreading the word. But we know in the end, our ability to succeed depends upon the ability of grass-roots-based community organizations to reach everybody in a disciplined way.

When I saw Secretary Riley sitting out here, I leaned over to Hillary and I said, "You know, you'd think that as long as we've been married, we've been asked and answered all the questions." I said, "Did you ever get any shots in school?" [*Laughter*] And she said, "Yes, I did." And I got my shots in school. That's where I got them. And then I got to thinking, listening to everybody talk, that our generation, all of us baby boomers, who are often known for other things, have a great debt to the immunization movement. We were the first generation of children in the very first year to be immunized against polio. My daughter cannot imagine what it's like to go to school as a first grader and be terrified that you're going to get polio and spend the rest of your life in an iron lung. But all of us grew up with that. Surely, those of us who have tangible, personal experience from the benefits of immunization can at long last solve this problem.

When I was a young man, I read a book by a southern author named James Agee about the Great Depression called, "Let Us Now Praise Famous Men." Some of you may have seen it. It also has some of the most astonishing photographs ever taken by an American photographer, a man named Walker Evans. In this book, James Agee said something that I have carried with me for a long time now, and I'd like to close with these remarks and then get on with the business at hand. He said, in every child who is born, no matter what circumstances and no matter what parents, the potentiality of

the whole human race is born again, and in him, too, once more, and of each of us, our terrific responsibility toward human life, toward the utmost idea of goodness, of the horror of error, and of God. That is what we are here about today. And we are bound to do a better job.

I now want to sign a proclamation designating National Infant Immunization Week. And once we've done that, we're going to see an example of what it is we are all talking about. We are going to see the first infant of the week being immunized, right up here by Dr. Mohammed Akhter, the public health commissioner of the District of Columbia. The parents are Laura Loeb and Howard Morse, and their wonderful little daughter, Elizabeth. And for all of you here who are squeamish, relax; she is not going to be immunized with a shot. For all of us who had only shots in immunization, we sort of resent it, but—[*laughter*]—modern medical practice has permitted the public alleviation of pain. So let me sign the proclamation, and then we'll have the immunization.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:27 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Betty Bumpers, cofounder, and Lori Riegle, spokeswoman, Every Child By Two; Dr. Robert Johnson, director of adolescent and young adult medicine, New Jersey Medical School; Dr. David Satcher, Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Proclamation 6675—National Infant Immunization Week

April 20, 1994

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

One of my Georgetown University professors, Otto Hentz, S.J., has written, "There is no greater gesture of trust than when children expectantly thrust their arms up in the air, telling us in the universal language of toddlers, 'Pick me up.' And when we follow this command, we witness the complete serenity of children, their perfect trust that they will

not be dropped. This is an astonishing vote of confidence. . . .”

To guarantee that our children’s faith in us is justified, we must renew our commitment to protect them from deadly infectious diseases. Unfortunately, less than two-thirds of American children under age 2 have received all the immunizations they need. In some inner city and rural areas, vaccination rates are much lower than in more urban communities. The unnecessary illnesses resulting from this failure are a health disaster and a human tragedy.

To prevent suffering and to save lives, my Administration has taken new steps to protect our youngest children. In April 1993, I submitted to the Congress the “Comprehensive Child Immunization Act,” significant portions of which were enacted into law last year. In addition, our Childhood Immunization Initiative is the most sweeping childhood immunization plan in American history. This proposal includes free vaccines for needy children, increased funding to cities and States to improve the service delivery infrastructure, enhanced disease detection and immunization monitoring systems, and an aggressive national outreach program.

This Initiative will mobilize every community to practice disease prevention on a grand scale. It will allow us to increase vaccination levels for 2-year-old children from the current 64 percent to at least 90 percent and to build a vaccine delivery system that will maintain these achievements within a reformed health care system.

Adults responsible for safeguarding our youngest children must be made aware of the seriousness of this problem. Many parents do not realize that more than 80 percent of all recommended vaccinations should be given before a child is 2 years old—long before he or she begins school. We must make sure that every parent is informed that between the ages of 2 months and 2 years of age their children will require five visits to a doctor or clinic to assure their proper immunization. Doctors must also help by educating the public about the importance of immunizations and by making sure that the children under their care are monitored carefully to ensure full protection.

Last year, I proclaimed the last week of April as National Preschool Immunization Week. This year, as part of the effort to focus greater attention on the need to immunize children before their second birthday, I have changed the name of the observance to National Infant Immunization Week.

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 last full week of April 1994 and in all succeeding years as National Infant Immunization Week. I call upon all Americans, especially parents and health care providers, to do their part to help in this crucial effort and to observe this week annually with appropriate activities and recognition ceremonies.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth 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, 4:30 p.m., April 20, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 22.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Chancellor Franz Vranitzky of Austria

April 20, 1994

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, are the allies on board now for your new Bosnia policy—strategy?

The President. Well, I’ve talked to President Yeltsin and President Mitterrand today, and Prime Minister Chrétien. And I have not talked to Chancellor Kohl or to Prime Minister Major today. I haven’t been able to get them, but I talked to them in the last couple of days. And I’ll have more to—they were all good conversations and I’ll—as you know, I’m going to make a statement after I meet with Chancellor Vranitzky.

Q. Minister Kozyrev said that they are dead set against air strikes. Does that set you back in initiating the policy?

The President. I read his statement; I didn't quite read it that way. But I had a conversation with President Yeltsin, and I will report it when I go out and make my statement. I'll tell you what he said.

Q. One hundred and seven people have been injured in the last 24 hours in Gorazde. We understand 38 are dead. Do you think that this new policy will help ameliorate the situation? Will the Serbs now take heed?

The President. We'll see. I'm going to make a statement and answer questions about it.

Richard Nixon

Q. Did you get a chance to talk to President Nixon's family?

The President. No, I talked to—actually, I talked to Billy Graham right after—he was on his way to the hospital right after he had his stroke. And I had—as soon as all this is over, I'm going to attempt to get in touch with one of his daughters at the hospital. I've been getting reports every hour or so for the last couple of days.

Q. How is he doing now? Is he—

The President. I think that's for them to say.

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

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, what should Austria do concerning Bosnia?

The President. Excuse me?

Q. What should Austria do concerning the Bosnian crisis?

The President. Of course, that's partly for Austria to decide. But I think that all of us should be working toward doing whatever can be done to stop the aggression of the Serbs and to restore a diplomatic initiative that will actually work. It should be clear to everyone that this issue is not going to be solved ultimately on the battlefield. And the best thing that's happened in months and months was the agreement between the Croats and the Muslims, freely entered into, dealing with a lot of the very difficult issues between them. And I believe the same thing

could be done with the Serbs, unless they believe that they can continue through aggression to win the territory. And their actions now are inconsistent with offers they themselves have put on the negotiating table just in the last month or two.

So we're going to do what we can to exert whatever pressure and to take whatever initiatives we can to restore a climate in which a decent and honorable agreement can be reached. And I hope that that would be the same policy that Austria would have.

Q. Mr. President, do the Russians agree with the United Nations position and the position of the NATO, the current one?

The President. Well, I think we have—there is a broad agreement on objectives. I had a good talk with President Yeltsin, but I believe, frankly, we have to wait and get the details all written out, you know, so that we see whether we're in complete accord. I'm hoping that we will be. I felt very good about the telephone conversation I had with President Yeltsin.

I think—they're also very upset with the Serbs. They feel that they had a clear commitment to back out of Gorazde, not to endanger the U.N. forces there. And yesterday President Yeltsin made a very good statement about saying the Serbs should withdraw from Gorazde to a certain distance and that the U.N. forces should go back in. And my own view is that we have a chance to have a common policy.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:42 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Russian President Boris Yeltsin, French President François Mitterrand, Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and evangelist Billy Graham. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference

April 20, 1994

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to begin by saying that I want to join all the American people as Hillary and I pray for the health and the recovery of President Nixon. I want to again say how much I have appreciated the wise

counsel he has given me on the question of Russia and many other issues since I have been President.

I spoke with a member of his family just a few moments ago, and I did speak with Reverend Billy Graham shortly after President Nixon was admitted to the hospital when Reverend Graham was on the way to the hospital. And I have nothing public to report about that, except to say that his condition remains serious, and I hope he will be in the prayers of all Americans.

Over the last several days, the situation in Gorazde has become increasingly grim. The Serb forces have broken their own truce agreements, persisted in brutal attacks on civilians, United Nations personnel, and NATO forces protecting those personnel. These events are clearly a setback for the momentum achieved in recent months. The NATO ultimatum brought a reprieve to Sarajevo: humanitarian routes were reopened, agreements between Muslims and Croats changed the balance of power on the ground and offered new diplomatic opportunity.

There are reports that the Serbs have released more U.N. personnel and returned heavy weapons seized from U.N. control near Sarajevo, and they are welcome. But the imperative now is not only to address the latest Serb transgressions, it is to renew the momentum toward peace.

Let me be clear about our objective. Working with our allies, the Russians, and others, we must help the warring parties in Bosnia to reach a negotiated settlement. To do that, we must make the Serbs pay a higher price for continued violence so it will be in their own interests, more clearly, to return to the negotiating table. That is, after all, why we pushed for NATO's efforts to enforce a no-fly zone and the Sarajevo ultimatum and to provide close air support for U.N. forces who come under attack.

In pursuit of that policy, we must take further action. Therefore, the United States has today undertaken the following initiatives:

First, we are proposing to our NATO allies that we extend the approach used around Sarajevo to other safe areas, where any violations would be grounds for NATO attacks. I have insisted that NATO commit itself to achievable objectives. NATO's air power

alone cannot prevent further Serb aggressions or advances or silence every gun. Any military expert will tell you that. But it can deny the Serbs the opportunity to shell safe areas with impunity.

Second, we will work with others to pursue tighter sanctions through stricter enforcements. The existing sanctions on Serbia have crippled Serbia's economy. In light of recent events, there must be no relief.

Third, we are taking other steps to relieve suffering and support the peace process. We are offering the United Nations assistance in addressing the humanitarian crisis that is now severe in Gorazde. And we expect the Security Council to take up a resolution authorizing additional U.N. peacekeepers, which we will support.

These steps support our intensive work, along with others, to secure a negotiated settlement.

I have just spoken at some length with President Yeltsin, as well as with President Mitterrand. I spoke earlier today with Prime Minister Chretien. I have not yet spoken with Chancellor Kohl or Prime Minister Major today. I have attempted to do so, but I have spoken with them in the last couple of days about this important issue. President Yeltsin and I agreed to work closely together to pursue peace in Bosnia. President Mitterrand expressed his agreement with the general approach.

I was very encouraged by President Yeltsin's statement yesterday, calling on the Serbs to honor their commitments, insisting that they withdraw from Gorazde and that they resume talks and that they permit U.N. personnel to return to Gorazde.

I think you can look forward to a major diplomatic initiative coming out of our common efforts, but I cannot discuss the details of the outlines of that with you at this moment because we have agreed, all of us, that our foreign ministers need to talk and flesh out the details before we say exactly what approach we will take. The telephone conversations themselves were an insufficient basis for the kind of specific detailed approach that I think would be required.

In any case, it is clear that our test of Serb intent must be their actions, not their words. Those words have often proved empty.

Let me reiterate what I have said often before. The United States has interests at stake in Bosnia: an interest in helping to stop the slaughter of innocents; an interest in helping to prevent a wider war in Europe; an interest in maintaining NATO as a credible force for peace in the post-cold-war era and in helping to stem the flow of refugees. These interests justify continued American leadership and require us to maintain a steady purpose, knowing that there will be difficulties and setbacks and that in this world where we have a set of cooperative arrangements, not only with NATO but with the United Nations, there will often be delays that would not be there were we acting alone or in a context in which our security were more immediately threatened.

Ultimately, this conflict still must be settled by the parties themselves. They must choose peace. The agreement between the Croats and the Muslims was a very important first step, but there is so much more to be done. By taking firm action consistent with our interests, the United States and our NATO allies can, and must, attempt to influence that choice.

Thank you. Go ahead.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, did President Yeltsin raise any objections to this expanded use of NATO air power? And are all the NATO allies on board on this, such as Britain and Canada?

The President. Well, first of all, we are still involved in our consultations about it. Secondly, I don't think I can commit President Yeltsin to a course until he sees our proposal in writing.

I can tell you, in general, what he said, however, which was that he agreed that the present understandings for air power were ineffective and that the Serbs plainly violated their agreement and overreached in Gorazde, something he's already said publicly. But he feels, as everyone does, that over the long run, NATO air power alone will not settle this conflict; this conflict will have to be settled by negotiations.

Let me tell you the argument I made to him and the argument I want to make to you, because I know a lot of you have been

as frustrated as have we by what happened in Gorazde.

We have, through NATO, three separate authorizations for the use of air power, and air power has been used under two of those three. And arguably, the possibility of air power has been successful under two of those three, but they're not the same.

Authorization number one is to enforce the no-fly zone. We have done that and planes have been shot down, as you know. And I think the no-fly zone clearly has been successful in preventing the war from spreading further into the air and the slaughter from coming from the airplanes.

Option number two was the Sarajevo option. That is, a safe zone was created around Sarajevo, and all heavy weapons either had to be withdrawn from the safe zone or turned over to United Nations personnel. Then any heavy weapons shelling within the Sarajevo safe zone by anybody could trigger NATO air strikes. There were no NATO air strikes under that, but it clearly worked, and it was clearly more enforceable.

Option number three is what you saw at Gorazde. Option number three gives the United Nations commander the authority to ask for United Nations civilian approval to ask for NATO air support to support the U.N. forces on the ground when they're under duress.

Now, consider what the difference is between that and the Sarajevo option and all the conflicts that came along. First of all, you have to go through the approval process, which came quickly the first time when the NATO planes went in, the United States planes, and took the first action. But then you have to keep coming back for that approval. And you're always subject to an argument about who started what fight and what the facts were. And then what happened to us in Gorazde was, if an assault results in having the NATO forces close at hand with the aggressing forces or if NATO forces are captured, then any use of air power may lead to the killing of the very people we're there trying to protect. Whereas under the Sarajevo model, you can just say, "Okay, here's the safe zone. All the heavy weaponry has to be withdrawn or put under U.N. control,

and if there's any violation by anybody, there can be air action." It is a much clearer thing.

That is a point I made very strongly to President Yeltsin. I think he was quite sympathetic with it. His only point was the same point that everyone makes, which is that in the end, the use of air power by NATO cannot bring this war to an end. Only a negotiated settlement can do that. I think that, generally, you will see the United States and Russia working together, and I've been impressed by how aggressive the Russians have been with regard to the Serbs in this.

Yes, go ahead. I'll take it.

Q. Mr. President, do you think that now the Serbs should be prepared for strategic air strikes, as well as tactical, that you would need to go after their supply lines or their ammo dumps? And secondly, are you also pressing the allies to try to lift the arms embargo, as many in Congress are demanding?

The President. Let me answer the first question first by simply saying that I do not think it is appropriate for me to discuss the tactical details of our policy—not ever probably—but certainly not until they have been worked out with our allies. We have to do that through NATO.

Secondly, as you know, I have always favored lifting the arms embargo. And I am glad that there is so much support for it in the Congress now from—much of it coming from people who've not said it before. And I think that's encouraging. But many of them are saying that somehow we should not be in a cooperative effort with the United Nations and NATO but instead should just, on our own, lift the arms embargo, make sure the arms get there, and then, with no danger to ourselves, we can permit these people to fight against their own abuses. That has a great deal of appeal. There are certain practical problems with it.

First, I would say that if we ignore a United Nations embargo because we think it has no moral basis or even any legal validity but everyone else feels contrary, then what is to stop our United Nations allies from ignoring embargoes that we like, such as the embargo against Saddam Hussein? How can we ever say again to all of the other people in the United Nations, you must follow other embargoes? That's a serious question for me

because there are a lot of things that we want to do through the United Nations.

Secondly, what are the practical problems with raising the arms embargo? Do the Croats, who now have this agreement with the Muslims, support it? Will it be facilitated? How long would it take to get there? Would that increase Serb aggression in the short run while we're waiting for the arms to be delivered? There are a lot of practical problems with it. Do I favor lifting it? I do. Do I believe the allies with whom we are working now would vote to support it? I don't. Will there be continuing discussions about it? Yes, there will. I will say this: I think the more the Serbs turn away from this opportunity for peace, the more the allies are likely to be willing to vote to raise the arms embargo. But I don't think they're there right now.

Yes, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Q. President Clinton, it seems as though, frequently, you have characterized this as a civil war; yet the Serbs seem to be the main aggressors here. How would you define the Serbs for the American people? Are the Serbs villains in this piece?

The President. Well, first of all, I think it is a civil war in the sense that people who live within the confines of a nation we have recognized are fighting each other for territory and power and control. So in that sense, it is clearly a civil war.

I have always felt that the Serbs were the primary aggressors, even though at various times there have been three different factions fighting, and at various times in various specific instances, you could make an argument that the Serbs were not always the initiators of a particular aggression.

The Serbs have gotten a lot of what they wanted, which was more territory to create a greater Serbia in areas where Serbs were ethnically either exclusively occupying the territory or dominant. And so I've always felt that they were the primary problem there. But in the end, there's going to have to be an agreement. Not very long ago, I would remind you, the parties didn't seem too far apart on an agreed-upon territorial division, and then this fighting resumed, I think, with quite unfortunate consequences.

Q. Are you reluctant to condemn the Serbs' behavior?

The President. No, I've been condemning their behavior for 2 years now. And let me just say this: I think—you asked me in general terms—in general terms do I consider them to be the primary aggressor? The answer to that is yes.

More specifically, and far more importantly, were they wrong in Gorazde? Yes, terribly wrong. What is their defense? That the Muslims shot at them. Did they overreact to that, even if it's true? Unbelievably. Does that justify shelling a hospital, shelling the U.N. headquarters, taking United Nations hostages when we have never been involved in the war against them, when all we did was to do what we said we would do all along, which is if they threatened our people, we would use air power? They are the complete aggressors and wrongdoers in the case of Gorazde.

Q. [*Inaudible*]*—*suggesting there is some reluctance to support air strikes in the House?

Q. Is it too late for Gorazde?

The President. Is it too late for Gorazde? No, it's too late for—you know, a lot of people have been killed there. But if the Serbs would do what the Russians demanded, as well as what we demand, if they would get out, withdraw, let the United Nations come back in, and then we could resume the aggressive humanitarian relief effort that we have offered to help in, it would not be too late for Gorazde in the sense that it could be restored as a genuine safe area and the town could be safe.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Q. Nothing that you are proposing today is intended to deal specifically with Gorazde, is it? And just a second thing is, have you thought through what you would propose to do if your attempt to recreate the Sarajevo model elsewhere does not deter the Serbs and they keep coming, much as they did at Gorazde?

The President. Let me answer your first question first. Our proposal would create Sarajevo-like conditions, that is, sort of safe zones around all the safe areas, including Gorazde. So we would assume that as a part of this, if our allies will agree with us, that

any heavy weaponry, any heavy firing in and around that area would be subject to the same action as Srebrenica or any other safe zone.

So, that's that. The second question is, have I thought about what would happen if this doesn't work? I have. But I think we should stick with this policy, and if the Serbs continue their aggression in an irresponsible way, then there are other things that can be done. I have given a lot of thought to it, but I don't want to talk about it now. I want to talk about this policy.

Go ahead, Sarah [Sarah McClendon, McClendon News Service].

Admiral Frank Kelso

Q. Mr. President, you've had a lot of other things on your mind besides this war. Would you please do something about Admiral Kelso? Can you veto that bill that gives him pay for four stars when all he needs is pay for two. And that is in the traditions of the past. The military men only got their own regular pay. They didn't have to go to Congress and get paid for two more stars. That's spending Government money that we can't afford now.

The President. No, that's not what happened.

Q. If he didn't know what was going on in Tailhook, then he should have known because he's head of naval operations.

The President. Well, the—I agree with the decision made by the Pentagon and ratified by the Senate. So I can't agree to do it because I agree with it.

Q. Why do you agree with it because—why do you agree with spending more money on this man's salary?

The President. Because I believe—because I disagree with you. I believe the evidence does not condemn the conduct or knowledge of Admiral Kelso sufficient to justify taking the two stars away from him.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, can I just follow up on this Sarajevo model? How long will it take, in your opinion, in your military advisers' opinions to (A) expand this model to protect the five other safe areas, especially because

you say you need another U.N. Security Council resolution? So it seems that that process could take a long time.

The President. Well, no, no. We believe that the United Nations has the authority under Resolution 836 to do this or that you could have a Presidential statement from the head of the Security Council. There are lots of ways to do it.

Q. But in terms of expanding the U.N. personnel who are required—

The President. We believe that what's been lacking there is just an agreement on how many more people, where they'll come from, and how the money will be provided. But General Rose has wanted 10,000 more. There was agreement among those of us who contribute but do not provide troops but who provide money, for something like 3,700 more recently. And my announcement today should be read as our willingness to play a major role in contributing to a larger peace-keeping force.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, are you going to put U.S. troops in?

The President. No.

NOTE: The President's 55th news conference began at 4:49 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to evangelist Billy Graham; Russian President Boris Yeltsin; French President François Mitterrand; Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien; German Chancellor Helmut Kohl; British Prime Minister John Major; Iraqi President Saddam Hussein; Adm. Frank B. Kelso II, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; and Lt. Gen. Michael Rose, Commander of U.N. Forces in Bosnia.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Embargo on Haiti April 20, 1994

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

Six months ago I provided you with my initial report on the deployment of U.S. Naval Forces in the implementation of the petroleum and arms embargo of Haiti. I am now providing this further report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to inform the Congress about the status of the U.S. contribution to the ongoing U.N. embargo enforcement effort.

In response to the continued obstruction by the military authorities of Haiti to the dispatch of the U.N. Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) and their failure to comply with the Governors Island Agreement, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 875 (October 16, 1993). This resolution called upon Member States "to use such measures commensurate with the specific circumstances as may be necessary" to ensure strict implementation of the Haitian embargo on petroleum and arms and related material imposed by United Nations Security Council Resolutions 841 and 873 (1993). Under U.S. command and control, and acting in concert with allied navies and in cooperation with the legitimate Government of Haiti, U.S. Naval Forces began maritime interception operations on October 18, 1993, in order to ensure compliance with the embargo terms.

Since that time, U.S. Naval Forces have continued enforcement operations in the waters around Haiti, including at times in the territorial sea of that country. The Haiti maritime interception operations generally have employed up to six U.S. surface naval combatants serving on station in the approaches to Haitian ports. The maritime interception force has been comprised of naval units and supporting elements from the United States, Argentina, Canada, France, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

The objective of these maritime interception operations is to ensure that merchant vessels proceeding to Haiti are in compliance with United Nations Security Council sanctions. The enforcement operations have been conducted in a thorough and safe manner. As of April 18, 1994, more than 6,000 vessels had been queried, 712 boarded, and 44 diverted to other than Haitian ports due to suspected violations or cargo that was inaccessible to inspection. These operations have been generally effective in preventing the sale or supply of embargoed items through sea trade and have specifically deterred tanker shipments of petroleum products, as one important aspect of the Haitian embargo enforcement effort. There have been no U.S. personnel casualties during the conduct of these operations.

The valuable U.S. contribution to U.N. embargo enforcement operations is impor-

tant to U.S. goals and interests in the region and, fundamentally, to the restoration of democracy in Haiti. I am not able to indicate at this time how long the deployment of U.S. Naval Forces in this multilateral operation will be necessary. I have continued the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces for these purposes pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

I appreciate the support the Congress has provided for this important U.S. contribution to multilateral efforts to restore democracy to Haiti, and I look forward to continued cooperation with you in these matters.

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. An original was not available for verification of the content of this letter.

Nomination for Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration

April 20, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Fredric K. Schroeder as Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA).

“As one who gradually became blind as a teenager, Dr. Schroeder knows all too well the challenges facing people with disabilities,” the President said. “He has devoted his life to empowering disabled people, and I’m confident he will continue in his new assignment to help disabled Americans achieve their goals.”

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

Remarks at the Democratic Congressional Dinner

April 20, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for that enthusiastic introduction and for your equally enthusiastic leadership of the House.

Senator Mitchell, Congressman Gephardt, Senator Graham and Congressman Fazio, Senator Rockefeller, Congressman Torricelli, to the host committee, and especially to our chair, Hugh Westbrook, all of you who have made so many sacrifices for the Democratic Party and for our country.

The Vice President and I are glad to be here tonight to see so many old friends; to know that what we have done together has made you willing to continue to work to keep our majority so that we can continue to work for you. And I have to tell you that I’m very proud—very, very proud—of all the Democratic Members of Congress who have worked with us and without whom we could not have done anything over the last 15 months to deal with the profound problems this country faces.

In that context, I am praying for the large-mindedness to forgive George Mitchell for retiring. I have found the silver lining in that cloud. I finally figured out what George had in mind, you know, when he said at least he was going to give his whole heart and soul to passing health care. I didn’t have it figured out until he announced today his engagement to the director of a sports marketing firm. [*Laughter*] This is the method behind his madness. He is always methodical.

What he’s got in mind for the rest of the year is a bunch of commercials with George and Larry Byrd and Michael Jordan. [*Laughter*] And they’ll be at the top of a building or in space somewhere, and he’ll say, “Here’s how we’re going to pass health care.” He’ll say, “Off the Finance Committee, over the Ways and Means Committee, through the Conference Committee, to the President, nothing but net.” [*Laughter*]

I will say Senator Mitchell has caused me some minor inconvenience, not at all of his own doing, but because of developments in the last 24 to 36 hours when he decided he did not want to be on the Supreme Court. I had to go back to the drawing board. Well, you know, it’s a real pain to get anybody confirmed in the Senate today. Have you noticed that? [*Laughter*] I mean, it’s gotten to the point where I don’t even want to go to dinner with anybody that can get confirmed in the Senate. [*Laughter*]

Anyway, we did, because this is the second time this has happened, we had a lot of sterling candidates for the Supreme Court whom we thought we had thoroughly vetted. And now, lo and behold, I've got to go back to every one of them and ask them, boxers or briefs? [Laughter] Can you believe the indignities you have to endure if you're President these days? [Laughter] James Carville said the other day that the President ought to be accountable, but he shouldn't become America's piñata. [Laughter]

I want to say a special word of tribute and appreciation to Tip O'Neill and to Millie and to the O'Neill family. I loved that film. And I loved being reminded that in the midst of all the things that we sometimes get diverted by in this town, engagement in politics can serve a deeper purpose and it must. I am proud of the life that Tip O'Neill lived and the legacy he left.

And I guess what I want to say to you tonight—I've given a lot of thought to it; I don't have to recount what we've done; others have done that—is to ask you to remember what was in that film. I have often wondered what I would think about 5 minutes before I left this old Earth if I had only 5 minutes' notice. I think that I would think about the people that I loved, my family and my friends, the people with whom I shared friendship, the exhilarating things in which I was involved, and maybe what the flowers looked and smelled like in the springtime. And that most of the things that we obsess about for most of our lives would just vanish away if we all had 5 minutes' notice.

So the trick is always to live as if we were on 5 minutes' notice. I say that because you and I know that this election season, if history is any guide, will be a challenging one for us. We know that because we have more seats up than the other party. We know that because, historically, the President's party loses some ground at midterm. We know that because we have so many people who are retiring after justifiable, laborious service.

But I know something else: I know that for 15 months, we have worked hard to say yes to America and that by and large, vast majorities of the other party, at every turn in the road, have focused on how to keep saying no. I know that we have tried to come

to grips with problems that were long ignored. I know that I have tried to reach out beyond party divisions and invited others in good faith to join us. I know that together we have tried to lift up our common efforts, not tear other people down, to unite this country and not to divide it.

You can't blame the American people for being cynical after all they've been through and the way it's all portrayed. And you can't blame people for expressing their frustrations and their hurts when they still haven't felt the updraft that is in this economy. And many of you go on to face difficult races in an atmosphere that may seem slightly unrealistic and sort of shrouded in a fog, but what I want to say to you tonight is to pierce the fog. You must show the conviction that what you have done matters to you and will matter to the last day you're on this Earth and that you intend to keep on facing these problems and seizing these opportunities and what pierces the fog is the record.

There is a truth here, there is a reality. The deficit is down. We are dealing with the problems of crime and the problems that working families face and the problems of health care and the need for more jobs and all the difficult challenges facing America. And we are trying to seize opportunities that we had for too long ignored.

And even in the areas in foreign policy that have taken so much of my attention in the last 2 weeks, that have no easy answers, we at least are squaring our shoulders to the wheel and trying to honestly face the problems facing this country and move it forward.

And so, we believe the purpose of politics is to unite the American people and to move this country forward, to enter the next century with this still being the greatest country in the world, to give everybody in this country a chance to live up to his or her God-given capacities. And we believe that Government has a role in that, that we can't live other people's lives for them but neither can we walk away from people's problems.

We offer a partnership in America; we offer opportunity; we insist on responsibility. But we know that what binds us together is more than a bunch of words; it's a shared existence, a shared set of values, and com-

mon future whether we all like it or not. We are going up or down together.

And for 15 months we have begun to push away the fog. We have begun together to take on these problems and to move this country forward and to give people a sense of possibility again so that politics could be more than personal advantage or personal harm. It could be about how to lift ourselves up together and to give people chances they don't now have and to solve problems that only Government can solve. This must be the message of this election year.

For those of you who have come here to make it possible for the campaigns to be staffed and the ads to be run, I say to you, we have a record to run on. We have a message to take out there. And we can defy the odds because the odds are about statistics and not about the reality of 1994.

The reality of 1994 is that we are fulfilling the promise of that remarkable campaign in 1992. And eventually, in race after race, in district after district, in State after State, if there is conviction and if it's backed up by reality and we keep working this year to build on what happened last year, then the people of this country will respond whether they are retired to sunny Florida in Senator Graham's State or whether they live in Co-op City in Congressman Engel's district or whether they're living in one of those beautiful towns in Speaker Foley's wonderful district in Washington or someplace in between, the truth will prevail if we believe it, if we have conviction, and if we fight not for ourselves but for some higher purpose.

It is no accident, my fellow Americans, that in the face of the march of progress you have seen in these last 15 months, there has been an intensified atmosphere of highly personal attacks and negative, often, histrionics. It is because we are on to something. And good things are happening, and we are moving forward.

But we focus on those things at our peril. The American people have a lot of sense and an enormous capacity for discounts. And they know politics for what it is. And yes, they make a mistake every now and then, but more than half the time on more than half the issues for over 200 years now, they have

been right. And that's why we're all sitting here tonight, because our system has worked.

Tip O'Neill once said, if you take care of the people, that'll take care of the next election. Well, we're taking care of the people, and we've got to make sure they know what we're doing, and we've got to make sure that we know that we will be rewarded.

So, I say to you, what's the prescription for '94? People like you helping the Members of Congress to get their message out, Members of Congress full of conviction and courage, and a record in Congress in '94 that equals the one in '93 with a crime bill, with health care reform, with the education reforms, with the training reforms, with a message that says, we're going to face our problems and seize our opportunities.

I want you to feel good about this year. So what if it's a higher hill to climb. The reason we've got more folks up is because we've got more folks in. And if we didn't have more folks in, we wouldn't be doing what we're doing. And we have to keep it that way.

I used to tell people in the campaign of 1992 that I was a Democrat by heritage, instinct, and conviction. And even though I get mad from time to time at things that happen, I never thought about leaving. I always felt that when I was home serving in State government and for a dozen years as my State's Governor—but I'll tell you something, after spending 15 months here, I know it's true more deeply, more profoundly than I could have ever imagined before I showed up. I want you, every one of you, to leave this room tonight and say, "We're not going to have to run against the other guys. We're going to defend ourselves, but we're going to run on our record and for the people of the United States, and we are going to lift this debate in 1994. We will not let it be torn down. We will not let the fog of inaccuracy and negativism embrace the American people. In every district, in every State, we will be proud of what we have done. We will assert it with conviction." And when it's all over, when people vote in November, they will look and say, "We want those people to stay in because they're interested in us, not themselves. They're fighting for us, and they're making a difference. And it's good for America, and it's good for my children. It's good for the

grandchildren,” like that wonderful little girl that Tip O’Neill held up.

Don’t forget what this is about, folks. And imagine what you want to be remembered for because you were in politics if you get your 5 minutes’ notice. If we take that 5 minutes’ notice to the American people in 1994, we will have a thunderous victory.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:32 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Hugh Westbrook, director of finance, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the Observance of Earth Day

April 21, 1994

Thank you, Josephine—I saved the environment; did you like that? [*Laughter*] Thank you, Josephine, for that wonderful statement. Thank you, Steve, for your work, and all of you who helped to restore this wonderful park. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for coming.

There are so many people here we could introduce, but I do want to mention two others who are here: First of all, the wonderful Representative of the District of Columbia in the United States Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton, thank you for coming. And the head of our national service movement, which is providing a lot of our foot soldiers in our attempt to merge the community and the environment, Mr. Eli Segal, thank you for coming, sir. I also see in the audience two people that make me wonder if we’re going to be extras in a 1994 movie, Dennis Weaver and Chevy Chase. Thank you for coming, guys. Thank you both for coming. Stand up. [*Applause*] We’re all available for tryouts, aren’t we? [*Laughter*]

I want to say a special word of thanks as I begin to Josephine Butler and to all the people in this community for making this park what it is. I’m proud to say that the Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt has designated this park as a national heritage site, not only because of its beauty but because

of what it represents about what we, as a people, can do.

The people of this community took this park back. They made it a place where families could come and young people could come and children could play. I don’t know how many times in the 1980’s when I was just visiting Washington like any other American, when I went out right by this park, when I would ask people over and over and over again, I said, “That is the most beautiful place I’ve ever seen,” and somebody from Washington would say, “Well, don’t go in there. It’s a dangerous place.” I mean, in broad daylight. I must have asked a half a dozen times.

And now, because of what you have done—look at it, I mean, look at the fountain, the water, the beauty of this place. It’s absolutely unbelievable and a great, incredible tribute to the people in this community. That’s the most important thing I think we can say or do today, just to recognize the power of ordinary citizens to rebuild their own lives, environmentally, responsibly, and make their lives better at the same time. You are a shining example of that.

Today, we honor the community leaders who reclaimed the park: the president of the Friends of Meridian Hill—how many hours have you donated to this, sir?—over 5,000. Reverend Morris Samuel, who courted his wife under a cherry tree not far from here and never stopped visiting this park; Malcolm Peabody, a businessman who helped to bring 150 businesses into the Meridian Hill coalition; Antonio Montes, a community leader and assistant to Congresswoman Norton, who helped to get the first funding increase for this park in the Federal budget in almost 20 years; and Lieutenant Henry Berberich of the U.S. Park Police, who turned down several promotions because he wanted to keep protecting this park and who embodies the spirit of community policing at its best. Where are you, sir? Let’s give him a big hand. [*Applause*]

In just 4 years, crime in this park has declined by 90 percent. That’s a pretty good standard for America to try to emulate. New businesses have moved nearby. I was in the Kalorama Studios just a couple of days ago doing the MTV forum with young people.

Just as this community has restored this park, the park has helped to restore the community.

I am here today because what this community has done is what our country as a whole must do. In restoring a piece of nature, the people here have helped to restore a strong sense of place, of their history, of their roots, a sense of purpose, a sense of pride, and a sense of hope for their children, proving the wisdom of the great American naturalist John Muir, who founded our national parks and whose birthday we celebrate today. He said almost a century ago, "Garden- and park-making goes on everywhere in civilization, for everybody needs beauty as well as bread, places to play in and pray in, where nature may heal and cheer and give strength to the body and soul."

Each of us has a special place where we can stand silently all alone, except for the presence of nature and the Creator. And if we don't, we need it, and we deserve it. When I was growing up, it was the lakes, the woods, the hills of my native State. For a young man or woman growing up in this community, it may well be this wonderful park. Preserving those things enables us to bring our communities and our country back together.

There is clearly today a hunger in our national spirit not only for more security, for more economic opportunity but for something we can all be involved in that is larger than ourselves and more lasting than the fleeting moment. Reclaiming our rivers, our forests, our beaches, and our urban oases, like this one, is a great purpose worthy of a great people. The love of nature is at the core of our identity as individuals, as communities, and certainly as Americans and increasingly, thankfully, a part of the community of nations.

Preserving the environment is at the core of everything we have to do in our own country, building businesses, creating jobs, fighting crime and drugs and violence, raising our children to know the difference between right and wrong, and restoring the fabric of our society. For we are here today to bear witness to a simple but powerful truth: As we renew our environment, we renew our national community.

Since the first Earth Day 24 years ago, our Nation has been on a journey of national renewal. But as long as 70 million Americans live in communities where the air is dangerous to breathe; as long as half our rivers, our lakes, and our streams are too polluted for fishing and swimming; as long as people in our poorest communities face terrible hazards from lead paint to toxic waste dumps; as long as people around the world are driven from their homelands because what were their fields are now deserts, their fisheries are dying, and their children are stricken by diseases, our journey is far from finished.

That's why we are trying to bring a new spirit of community to the work of protecting and restoring the environment. I have often said in many places that governments don't raise children, parents do. I'm here today because governments alone cannot save the environment, people and communities must.

In everything we do to protect the environment, we must, it seems to me, be guided by four fundamental principles. First, we understand that a healthy economy and a healthy environment go hand-in-hand. In the long run we cannot have one without the other.

Tomorrow people all around the world will celebrate Earth Day, because they care about the air they breathe and the water they drink just as much as we do. That's why there is now a \$200 billion to \$300 billion market for environmentally conscious products, from technologies for cleaning toxic dumps and scrubbers for power plants to energy-efficient air conditioners. Last October we started our strategy to help American companies, large and small, get their share of that market. If your company makes a product or offers a service that will protect the environment, all over the world you can find capital, customers, and expert advice. We Americans can do what we set our minds to do, including slowing down global warming without cooling down our economy.

A year ago on Earth Day, we made a commitment to reduce greenhouse gases which cause climate changes, from global warming to increasingly severe hurricanes. In October, we produced a plan to cut greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by the year 2000. Today, thousands of companies have come to Wash-

ington as partners in that goal. Many are causing less pollution because they're using less energy, cutting fuel bills, investing more in new products and new jobs, proving that good environmental policies are, in fact, good business.

Last night, Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary signed an historic agreement with virtually the entire electric utility industry to cut greenhouse gases. That means some of our largest industrial polluters are going to clean up their act and clean up our air.

Our climate change programs help companies and consumers save energy and money with air conditioners, computers, refrigerators, and light bulbs that use less electricity than ever before. And we're helping American companies to build those products and create those jobs.

Anyone who believes that environmental quality threatens jobs can talk to one of the people who has already been introduced. I'd like to ask her to stand again, Fabiola Gonzalez. Stand up. [*Applause*] She came here today from Maybrook, New York, one of 400 workers from the Osram-Sylvania factory who make energy-efficient, compact, fluorescent light bulbs. Now, I have to tell you, to show you that we never do things as quickly as we could, the first time I ever heard that these light bulbs were the wave of the future was in 1978 from Amory Lovins, who is sitting out there today. Thank you, sir. This is a 23-watt replacement for a 90-watt bulb that lasts 10 times as long as the average light bulb and will save \$67 in energy costs, one light bulb. And there is a huge market for them all over America and indeed all over the world, and a job for this fine woman and others who are contributing to our future. Thank you so much.

There are some people who still say that if you protect the environment, you're going to hurt the economy. Well, there are tough choices to be made, but those choices can lead to more opportunity, as we have seen. We can't turn back the clock, and we cannot deny that Government has a role in helping to preserve the natural beauty of our rivers, our forests, our mountains, our beaches, and our parks; and not to create bureaucracies that grow faster than garden weeds.

That's where the second principle comes in: reinventing the way we protect the environment so that Government is a partner, not an overseer. The Vice President has led the charge to make this administration a leader in the global environmental effort, and at the same time, to give us a Government that works better and costs less. He's a proven friend of the environment who's making Government a more effective friend of the environment.

And I must tell you that when we started our partnership back in 1992—and we couldn't have known even then whether we would win the election or not—one of the major reasons that I asked him to be part of a new and different relationship, to be a true partner with me, was because of the phenomenal insight and knowledge he had of environmental issues and how they had to be woven into the fabric of our life and no longer set out as a special problem and a special issue just for Earth Day but needed to be something for every day. And all Americans are in debt to the work that Al Gore has made the work of his lifetime.

This year we're asking Congress to pass new and stronger laws to protect our lakes, our rivers, our beaches, and the water we drink, the "Safe Drinking Water Act" and the "Clean Water Act." And we're offering new approaches to get the job done.

Just a few months ago, folks right here in Washington, maybe a lot of you, had to boil their water just because the experts said it might be contaminated. Just a year ago in Milwaukee, a dangerous microorganism got into the water supply, killing more than 100 people and causing tens of thousands to become ill. In New York and in other cities all across the country, people are afraid they might be next. In this great country we can do better, and we must do better than letting people die from dirty drinking water. That's why we're fighting for a stronger and smarter "Safe Drinking Water Act." We want to keep communities with healthy water systems, so parents won't feel a fear when their children brush their teeth in the morning. We can do it for our children and our families and our future, and we will.

But rather than dictate from Washington, we want to help communities develop their

own plans to clean up their own water supplies without a bureaucrat telling them that water problems in Philadelphia are the same as they are in Phoenix, because they're often just not the same. With a stronger and smarter "Clean Water Act," we can reclaim our waterways, make it safe to eat fish and swim in the rivers and surf in the beaches. And in the process we'll create new jobs, from engineers to pipefitters.

We've proposed changes in the Superfund to make cleanups faster, cheaper, and more effective. Many of these toxic waste dumps cause urgent dangers to public health. And we owe it to communities to make the Superfund work for them.

And we want to give you a Government that leads by example, not just by command and control. You know, the United States Government, for example, is one of the world's leading buyers of goods and services. And we're using that buying power to create a new market for new products that save energy and protect the environment, wasting less of your natural resources and less of your tax dollars.

A year ago on Earth Day I pledged to use the Presidential pen to make our Government the greenest in history. I've signed Executive orders to use recycled products, from paper to retread tires. We're reducing Federal energy consumption by 30 percent and saving the taxpayers a billion dollars a year using more cars and trucks that run on alternative fuel that cause less pollution, from compressed natural gas to electrical power. Our Federal facilities are cutting their own toxic emissions by 50 percent and complying with community right-to-know laws.

The White House is becoming a showcase for energy efficiency and environmental responsibility. Hillary and Chelsea and I have recycling bins in our kitchen. We have a new refrigerator, built in my home State, that uses 50 percent less electricity than most refrigerators and doesn't use gases that deplete the ozone layer. We're using less water on the lawn, fewer pesticides on the ground, and more efficient air conditioners in the big Old Executive Office Building. We're trying to do our part.

Protecting the environment begins in our homes and in our communities. And I came

here to demonstrate that commitment in a third principle: Government should work with local folks, not over them. You did this; we didn't. We provided a little more tax money, but you did it. We're working with communities through our national service program, AmeriCorps. Thousands of young men and women are working in communities while earning money for their education. Starting 2 months from now, a special part of AmeriCorps will work not far from here. The new National Civilian Community Corps, based out of the Aberdeen Army Base in Maryland, will work with community groups to reclaim the Anacostia River, stabilizing its banks, skimming off the trash, re-designing and replanting it.

For too long, this kind of pollution has been associated and concentrated in poor communities, from central cities to small towns. And for too long, Government has been part of the problem, not part of the solution.

I'll never forget a young man named Pernell Brewer, whom I met at our children's town hall meeting last year. He comes from a part of Louisiana now known as "Cancer Alley" because it's filled with chemical plants that may contribute to the unusually high cancer rates found there in Louisiana. And he told me that 20 of his relatives have had cancer; many have died of it, including his 10-year-old brother who died of a rare brain tumor.

We cannot stand by while people are suffering and dying. That's why I signed an Executive order on environmental justice, to make sure that Government controls environmental hazards in every community in this country. And Government should encourage people to work together, not pit business and workers and environmentalists against each other.

When I asked for the Presidency 2 years ago, I met people whose lives were literally torn apart because Government refused to resolve the tensions between protecting our ancient forests and logging on Federal lands. Just over a year ago, at a conference in Portland, Oregon, we brought together loggers, environmentalists, and community leaders from the great Pacific Northwest and Cabi-

net officials responsible for environmental policy, for commerce, and for labor.

I met people like one man who's come all across the country to be with us here today. I'd like to introduce him to you, Mr. Eric Hollenbeck. Eric, stand up. [*Applause*] Eric came here today from Eureka, California. His family business was logging. He cares about his community with all of his heart, and he understands that in order to survive, his industry and his community have to embrace change. That's why when hard times hit the logging industry, Eric changed his company from logging to woodworking. And that's why today he's teaching young people woodworking, masonry, home building, metal working, and printing. He has made a change to help save the environment and preserve the economy of his community. And we owe him a lot for his courage. Thank you, sir.

Most of the people I met out there had differences of opinion on a lot of these issues. But they wanted an end to the posturing, an end to the conflict. They wanted us to make some tough decisions so that people could move on with their lives and move on with the common goal of making a living and preserving the environment.

Our fourth principle is that we have to understand the urgency and magnitude of this environmental issue as a global crisis. We have to work to stop famine and stabilize population growth and prevent further environmental degradation. If we fail, these problems will cause terrorism, tension, and war. None of us can live without fear as long as so many people must live without hope. That's why we're working around the world to protect fresh water resources, to preserve forests, to protect endangered species, leading a fight for strong environmental protection in our global negotiations on trade.

We must never forget that we share the air and the planet and our destiny with all the people of the world. And we must help people in poorer countries to understand that they, too, can find better ways to make a living without destroying their forests and their other natural resources.

The nations of the world are working together to achieve what is now called "sustainable growth," growth that meets the needs

of the present without sacrificing the needs of the future. It's an ethic as modern as microprocessors and as old as the Scriptures. In our homes and houses of worship, we often learn the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Sustainable development is the Golden Rule for our children and our grandchildren and their grandchildren.

And I want to give you the last example of that. Last June I asked 25 leaders from across the country to join the President's Council on Sustainable Development, to look carefully at communities practicing sustainable development with an eye toward developing a strategy that any community in the country could embrace.

And we can all learn from a town called Valmeyer, Illinois. Under the leadership of Mayor Dennis Knobloch, who is also with me here today—stand up, Mayor—[*applause*]*—*this community is literally recreating itself. It was part of the great middle-western flood. They were in a flood plain. And they decided that they would move and recreate a totally sustainable development community. They're building their homes, their stores, and their schools to be energy efficient. They're even thinking about solar-powered street lights and geothermal heating systems.

We can go to this community and watch it grow, keeping the community roots, understanding what happened in the flood, being committed to a sustainable environment for the river, for the land, and for a new community that is as old as the deepest roots in the beginning of Valmeyer, Illinois. We owe a lot to these people. They're setting an example that all of us will be able to learn from, too, for years and years to come.

So today, in this wonderful park, let me end where we began. Let every American look to the example of the people here in this park, to the example of people like Fabiola Gonzalez and Eric Hollenbeck and Mayor Dennis Knobloch and the wonderful people of Valmeyer, Illinois. We can all listen to the love of nature in our hearts and rejoice in our responsibilities to pass along a better and more beautiful country to our children and their children and understand that part of our common responsibility to the future

is preserving the environment and that that will make our present better.

Three decades ago, President Kennedy said, "It is our task in our time and in our generation to hand down, undiminished to those who come after us, as was handed down to us by those who came before, the natural wealth and beauty which is ours." This wonderful community has kept that faith. So must we all.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:21 a.m. in Meridian Hill Park. In his remarks, he referred to Josephine Butler, vice chair, Stephen W. Coleman, founder and president, and Rev. Morris Samuel, vice chair emeritus, Friends of Meridian Hill; actors Dennis Weaver and Chevy Chase; and Amory Lovins, director of research, Rocky Mountain Institute, Snowmass, CO. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on Presenting the Teacher of the Year Award

April 21, 1994

Thank you very much, Secretary Riley, and thank all of you for being here to recognize Sandra McBrayer, our 1994 Teacher of the Year.

I want to say as I begin that the work in the Senate and the House has kept Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein and Congresswoman Lynn Schenk from coming here today. But all three of them called and asked to be remembered at this occasion and to say they are proud of and strongly support the work that Sandra McBrayer has done.

One of the things I hoped to do when I ran for President was to increase our national effort to improve education in ways that made sense to grassroots educators who were out there making a difference. After serving for 12 years as a Governor and spending more time on schools and jobs than any other two issues, I have probably spent more time in more different kinds of classrooms than any person who has had the privilege to hold this office. And one of the things that I always believed was that virtually every challenge in American education had been met with genuine excellence by someone somewhere, that there were people committed, good people

all across this country, that were trying to come to grips with the awesome challenges of educating all America's children to world-class standards and that what we had to do at the national level was to clarify what those standards are, to give people some means of measuring whether they were being achieved, and then to support the grassroots reforms and the people who were carrying them out. That's what we're trying to do with Goals 2000, with the school-to-work bill, with all our other educational initiatives.

And that's why I was so pleased, when I first met Sandra McBrayer in California not very long ago and heard about her work, that she was actually chosen as the Teacher of the Year. We met when she came to the Goals 2000 signing when she was just a California Teacher of the Year, and I didn't know she was going to get such a quick promotion, but I sort of suspected it because of what she has done.

I cannot tell you how much it means to me to have someone here who's proved that you could teach homeless kids and that they count and they matter and they can learn and they can achieve great things. She knows that children have to be fed; they need clothes to wear and a place to sleep at night, and it's harder if they don't have those things.

She started the Homeless Outreach School in San Diego in a storefront in 1988. Her school provides, in addition to education, two meals a day, showers, and laundry facilities. Her students don't follow a regular schedule; they come to class between their jobs or when they're not caring for children of their own. But they each fulfill a weekly contract of studies that are completed either at home or in school.

This is very important. This is one of the central ideas of Goals 2000. We should measure our educational effort not by how teachers do everything all day, every day, but by whether certain results are achieved. And then we should allow our teachers and our school principals to devise their own best ways to achieve those results based on the realities that they deal with.

She is living every day what I believe is the central idea that would do more to transform and revolutionize American education than any other single thing in public edu-

cation, at least, if we could implement it and implement it all over America.

The most important lessons of these students may not be learned inside the classroom. Maybe it's the confidence they gain by finally having someone like Sandra McBrayer to believe in them, someone who believes they count in society and they have something to contribute and the rest of us need them.

You might have heard the line that teaching kids to count is fine but teaching them what counts is best. Sandy McBrayer has done even more than that; she's taught her children that they count. Over 25 of her students who started out on the streets are now in college.

So I want to thank her for her dedication to the students of the Homeless Outreach School, for being a model for all teachers throughout the country, and for the whole idea of education reform. And I'm proud to present her the 1994 Apple Award as America's Teacher of the Year. I'll hold your apple for you. I'll polish your apple for you. [Laughter]

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:13 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments

April 21, 1994

I commend the work already done by Secretary O'Leary, other members of the Cabinet, and the many other agency officials on the issue of Government-sponsored human radiation experiments which took place during the past 50 years. Today's first meeting of the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments is another step by the administration to have an honest and open approach to its investigation of the cold-war-era experiments.

The Advisory Committee has an important task in determining whether the U.S. Government treated its own citizens wrongfully through human experimentation. Both those

Americans who were the subject of these questioned experiments and the scientists who performed them deserve a fair and thorough investigation.

Only by dealing honestly with the past can we hope to build a better future.

Statement on Passage of the School-to-Work Opportunities Legislation

April 21, 1994

I am gratified by today's final passage of the "School-to-Work Opportunities Act". I am particularly pleased that this vital economic opportunity legislation passed with such broad bipartisan support.

This legislation will help millions of our young people enter the middle class and secure the American dream for themselves and their families. It will give them the opportunity to receive advanced, academically rigorous technical training. And it will help them obtain the knowledge and skills they need to get jobs that pay well and offer real chances for career advancement.

School-to-work is central to our efforts to guarantee lifetime learning for every citizen. In a rapidly changing world economy, what you earn increasingly depends on what you learn. We are putting in place an ambitious agenda to prepare our people. Last year Congress enacted my proposal to make college loans more affordable for middle class students. Just 3 weeks ago, I signed into law the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which set national educational standards. And by the end of this year, I look forward to signing legislation that will reform and expand Head Start, reconfigure Federal aid to elementary and secondary education, and transform our outmoded unemployment system into a world-class reemployment system.

This is a time of real ferment and real achievement for America's workers and students. Working together, we can continue to break gridlock and build new opportunities for American families to prosper in a rapidly changing economy.

Proclamation 6676—To Amend the Generalized System of Preferences

April 21, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. Pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (“Trade Act”) (19 U.S.C. 2461 and 2462), and having due regard for the eligibility criteria set forth therein, I have determined that it is appropriate to designate South Africa as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of the Generalized System of Preferences (“GSP”).

2. Section 604 of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2483) authorizes the President to embody in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTS”) the substance of the provisions of that Act, and of other acts affecting import treatment, and actions thereunder.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including but not limited to sections 501 and 604 of the Trade Act, do proclaim that:

(1) General note 4(a) to the HTS, listing those countries whose products are eligible for benefits of the GSP, is modified by inserting “South Africa” in alphabetical order in the enumeration of independent countries.

(2) Any provisions of previous proclamations and Executive orders inconsistent with the provisions of this proclamation are hereby superseded to the extent of such inconsistency.

(3) The modifications to the HTS made by paragraph (1) of this proclamation shall be effective with respect to articles that are: (i) imported on or after January 1, 1976, and (ii) entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after 15 days after the date of publication of this proclamation in the *Federal Register*.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-first 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, 1:39 p.m., April 21, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 25.

Message to Congress on Trade With South Africa

April 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am writing to inform you of my intent to add South Africa to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program offers duty-free access to the U.S. market and is authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

I have carefully considered the criteria identified in sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974. In light of these criteria, I have determined that it is appropriate to extend GSP benefits to South Africa.

This notice is submitted in accordance with section 502(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 21, 1994.

Memorandum on Trade With China

April 21, 1994

Memorandum for the United States Trade Representative

Subject: Import Relief Determination Under Section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974 on Honey from the People’s Republic of China

Pursuant to section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2436) and sections 202 and 203 of the Trade Act of 1974 (as those sections were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988), I have determined the action I will take with respect to the affirmative determination of the United States International Trade Commission

(USITC), on the basis of its investigation (No. TA-406-13), that market disruption exists with respect to imports from China of honey provided for in heading 0409 and sub-headings 1702.90 and 2106.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

After considering all relevant aspects of the investigation, including those set forth in section 202(c) of the Trade Act of 1974, I have determined that import relief for honey is not in the national economic interest of the United States. However, I am directing the United States Trade Representative (USTR), in consultation with the appropriate agencies, to develop a plan to monitor imports of honey from China. The monitoring program is to be developed within thirty days of this determination.

In determining not to provide relief, I considered its overall costs to the U.S. economy. The USITC majority recommendation for a quarterly tariff rate quota (a 25 percent ad valorem charge on the first 12.5 million pounds each quarter, increasing to 50 percent on amounts above that level), to be applied for three years, would cost consumers about \$7 million while increasing producers' income by just \$1.9 million. Overall, national income would be reduced by approximately \$1.2 million. The other forms of relief recommended by other Commissioners would also result in substantial costs to consumers while offering little benefit to producers and reducing national income.

In addition, the gap between production and consumption in the United States is approximately 100 million pounds, with imports of honey from China helping to fill that gap at the low end for industrial use. Any restrictions on imports of honey from China would likely lead to increased imports from other countries rather than significantly increased market share for U.S. producers.

Although rising somewhat since 1991, U.S. honey inventories are not large by historical experience, either in absolute amounts or relative to consumption. Honey stocks reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture were much higher in the mid-1980's (about 75 percent of consumption in 1985 and 1986), before falling to their lowest level in a decade in 1991 (26.6 percent of consumption). 1993

stocks were 37.8 percent of consumption, well below the 1980-1993 average level of 46.4 percent.

The U.S. government has supported honey producers since 1950, in part, to ensure enough honeybees would be available for crop pollination. This is an important national interest. I believe that current trends in the provision of pollination and honey production will not be significantly affected by not providing relief. Crop producers indicate that they believe pollination will still be cost effective even if service prices rise.

I have also concluded that, in this case, imposing trade restrictions on imports of honey would run counter to our policy of promoting an open and fair international trading system.

This determination is to be published in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Message to Congress Reporting on Trade With China

April 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2436) and sections 202 and 203 of the Trade Act of 1974 (as those sections were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988), I have determined the action I will take with respect to the affirmative determination of the United States International Trade Commission (USITC), on the basis of its investigation (No. TA-406-13), that market disruption exists with respect to imports from China of honey provided for in heading 0409 and sub-headings 1702.90 and 2106.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

After considering all relevant aspects of the investigation, including those set forth in section 202(c) of the Trade Act of 1974, I have determined that import relief for honey is not in the national economic interest of the United States. However, I am directing the United States Trade Representative (USTR), in consultation with the appropriate agencies to develop a plan to monitor imports

of honey from China. The monitoring program is to be developed within thirty days of this determination.

Since I have determined that the provision of import relief is not in the national economic interest of the United States, I am required by that section 203(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 to report to Congress on the reasons underlying this determination.

In determining not to provide import relief, I considered its overall costs to the U.S. economy. The USITC majority recommendation for a quarterly tariff rate quota (a 25 percent ad valorem charge on the first 12.5 million pounds each quarter, increasing to 50 percent on amounts above that level), to be applied for three years, would cost consumers about \$7 million while increasing producers' income by just \$1.9 million. The other forms of relief recommended by other Commissioners would also result in substantial costs to consumers while offering little benefit to producers.

In addition, the gap between production and consumption in the United States is approximately 100 million pounds, with imports of honey from China helping to fill that gap at the low end for industrial use. Any restrictions on imports of honey from China would likely lead to increased imports from other countries rather than significantly increased market share for U.S. producers.

Although rising somewhat since 1991, U.S. honey inventories are not large by historical experience, either in absolute amounts or relative to consumption. Honey stocks reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture were much higher in the mid-1980's (about 75 percent of consumption in 1985 and 1986), before falling to their lowest level in a decade in 1991 (26.6 percent of consumption). The 1993 stocks were 37.8 percent of consumption, well below the 1980-1993 average level of 46.4 percent.

The U.S. government has supported honey producers since 1950, in part, to ensure enough honeybees would be available for crop pollination. This is an important national interest. I believe that current trends in the provision of pollination and honey production will not be significantly affected by not providing relief. Crop producers indicate

that they believe pollination will still be cost effective even if service prices rise.

I have also concluded that, in this case, imposing trade restrictions on imports of honey would run counter to our policy of promoting an open and fair international trading system.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 21, 1994.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this message.

Interview With Journalists on South Africa

April 20, 1994

Q. Could I begin, Mr. President, with a two-part question? What is the significance of the South African election to you and the American people? And do you have any particular message for the people of South Africa that we could take back to them?

The President. First of all, I think it would be difficult to overstate the significance of this election to the American people for many reasons, first of all, our own history of racial division. We, after all, fought a great Civil War over slavery, and we continue to deal with our own racial challenges today. So all Americans, I think, have always been more drawn to the problems and the promise of South Africa than perhaps other nations have been.

Secondly, our own civil rights movement has, for decades, had a relationship with the antiapartheid movement in South Africa. So this will be a great sense of personal joy to many, many Americans who have been involved in this whole issue personally.

And finally, it's important to the United States because of the promise of harmony and prosperity in South Africa and what that might mean, not only to South Africa but to many other nations in the region and to the prospect of a revitalization, a new energy, a new peace, a new sense of possibility throughout at least the southern part of Africa. So it's very important.

Q. Any particular message?

The President. The message I would have is this: The United States is elated at the prospect of these elections. We have contributed to the effort to fight apartheid. We have tried to support the effort to have good elections and to make them meaningful, and we want to celebrate with and support South Africa. But we realize that the real work will begin after the election, of continuing to live in harmony, of fighting the new problems every day, of making democracy work, of dealing with the social problems and the very severe economic problem. And we intend to be a partner from the beginning. We intend to be a full partner.

Shortly after the election I will announce a substantial increase in United States assistance and support for building South Africa economically, dealing with the social problems, helping the political system to work. And then in June, we will have here a very large conference sponsored by the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, in Atlanta, bringing together large numbers of American business people to give us the opportunity to urge them to be involved with South Africa in the rebuilding.

[At this point, an interviewer cited the Marshall Plan following World War II and asked if a similar plan might be suitable for South Africa.]

The President. Well, I do believe that we ought to dramatically increase our assistance, which we will do. I think we ought to dramatically increase our private investment in South Africa, which I intend to work on. I think we ought to do what we can to mobilize the resources of other nations to also contribute. And I intend to spend a lot of time and effort on that.

I don't know that I would say it's exactly like the Marshall Plan or that that is exactly what is needed, but it's obvious that a lot of money, a lot of investment, and a lot of opportunity is going to be needed to sort of jump-start South Africa. It's a very rich country. And I think that the promise of this new democracy is that people will be able to live up to their potential. And I intend to do what I can to be a strong partner in that.

Q. This is the last one to—would you—you would probably be going to Africa soon,

and is there any intention of paying a visit to our country?

The President. Well, I hope that I can go, and I very much want to go. I assure you I'm going to send a very high-level delegation to the inauguration to celebrate the elections. And I have been talking with my staff about when I can go to Africa.

This year, because of the 50th anniversary of the ending of World War II, I will wind up making three trips to Europe, and I will go to Asia in the fall. But in 1995, 1996, my travel schedule is more open. And I very much want to go there.

I think that the United States, frankly, has not—with the exception of South Africa—has not paid as much attention to Africa as it should have and to its long-term potential and particularly to those countries that are trying to resolve their political problems and do things to help their people. So I would be honored to go there. I don't have a trip scheduled, but I hope I can go.

[An interviewer indicated that the world faced increased racial and ethnic conflict and asked for the President's thoughts on whether a successful South African venture would help the world confront the problem.]

The President. Well, I do have some thoughts, actually. I think it has worked in South Africa partly because people with enormous influence decided to be statesmen instead of wreckers. After a certain amount of time, you had the leaders of the various groups deciding that there was no longer a future in fighting and killing and dying, that splitting the country up was not an option, and that somehow they were going up or down together. And then they translated those understandings into concrete commitments, not just an election. An election is only part of it, although a big part.

I think the decision to go for a government of national unity for 5 years is absolutely critical to this and making the decision before you know the outcome of the election. The decision to have a bill of rights, the decision to have a constitutional court, I think all these things have made a huge difference. And I think what you've got in other places, these sort of ancient divisions—racial, ethnic, and religious divisions—where people have not

come to that wisdom; they don't understand yet, for whatever reason, that in the end they'll be better off if they work together and that controlling territory is nowhere near the significance in terms of quality of life and meaning of life that it was 100 years ago.

It's almost as if, in some of the places that you've mentioned—and you've written so powerfully about Bosnia, and I know you care a lot about Azerbaijan; you have the Abkhaz problem, you have all these things—it's almost as if the cold war sort of imposed a freeze-frame on the history of a lot of these places. And then when it went away, people woke up and resumed the attitudes that they had held in the early part of the 20th century, which they carried over from the 19th century, as if there had been no communications revolution, as if there had been no changes in the global economy, as if all these things had happened.

Here in this country, too, the ethnic diversity of the United States ought to be our greatest asset as we move into the next century. It used to be in America that the burden we carried was the burden of the fight between blacks and whites going back to slavery and the Civil War and the aftermath. Now, in Los Angeles County alone there are 150 different racial and ethnic groups, 150 different ones in one county. And there was a study released in our press last week that said sometimes these groups resented each other as much as they resented the white majority, depending on what the facts were. So we're still dealing with this.

I have to tell you, I believe that if the elections come off well, and especially in the aftermath of the agreement yesterday where Chief Buthelezi agreed with Mr. Mandela and Mr. de Klerk to participate in the elections and they worked out the constitutional role for the King of the Zulus—I think when that was done—I think if this election comes off, it will send a message around the world that there is another way to deal with these problems and that if it can be done in South Africa, how can you justify the old-fashioned killing and fighting and dying over a piece of land, over divisions which are not as important as what unites people in other places.

I mean, it's amazing; you think of it—contrast what we see in Gorazde with what we

see about to happen in South Africa. It's a matter of enormous historical impact. And I think that when it is shown around the world it has to reverberate in ways that we can't fully assess but that have to be positive.

[An interviewer indicated that the proposed aid package for South Africa was much smaller than the one offered to Russia; he asked the President to respond to those who believe the proposed aid package for South Africa was insufficient.]

The President. Well, first of all, we've not finalized the amount of the aid package. We're working on it now, and we're going to get as much money as we can during this fiscal year from funds that are idle in the appropriate accounts. That is, there are some—we are looking, we are scouring the Government accounts for things, money that won't be spent that we can put into this. And we will do as much as we possibly can.

South Africa is a country of 40 million people where 7 million are homeless, for all practical purposes. There is an enormous amount to be done. If you look at it in the larger sense, if you look at the amount of investment we have, we have only a billion dollars invested now in South Africa since the advent of the sanctions—and I'm glad that I could lift the sanctions—but a billion dollars. In the early eighties we had \$3 billion. And one of the things that I intend to do in June with this conference that Secretary Brown is having is to do everything I can to accelerate return of American investment to the levels of the early eighties, and then to exceed that, because we know, as a practical matter, if you look at the incredible human and natural resources of South Africa, that there would be more American money, private sector American money than Government money.

Now, next year and the year after—we're going to stay after this thing on a multiyear basis—we may be able to do better. But I think, given the condition of our budget laws and where the money is right now and the fact that we're in the middle of a fiscal year, we're going to do quite well.

I don't want to be—we're in no position to be dictating that; we should be asking them. But I can tell you, I know we can make

it available for economic development projects, for human resource projects like housing and health and education, and for democracy and institution building—how do you set up a system which will deliver these services and function properly.

It occurs to me, for example, the interconnection in South Africa and southern Africa generally, the transportation and waterways and the potential for telecommunications interconnection to leverage economic growth explosively throughout the region, is very great. It might be that your leaders would say, “Well, if you have this amount of dollars, put it into these investments because they’ll generate more opportunities.” It may be that your leaders will say, “We can’t stand the sight of all these people living in substandard conditions; put more of it in housing.” It might be that there’s a public health problem that you want to deal with. I think that we should be guided in part, or in large measure, by what we’re asked to do by the new leaders of the new South Africa.

Q. Mr. President, do you have any plans to invite the new South African President to Washington?

The President. Absolutely, I do.

Q. Quite soon?

The President. Yes, I will issue the invitation promptly after the election.

[An interviewer suggested that South Africa’s crucial need is education in democracy and tolerance and said America might be particularly helpful in this regard.]

The President. Well, we’re certainly prepared to do that, to make that kind of investment. And we have, as you know, invested some money, as I said, since I’ve been President I think somewhere in the range of \$35 million, just to try to make the political process work right.

If you ask me one thing I have learned in my own life growing up as a young boy in the segregated South, it is that this is something that you never solve. You just have to keep improving. You have to keep working with it.

My own interest in politics in America was inflamed overwhelmingly by my opposition to racial segregation in my own State, my own community, our own neighborhoods,

our schools, and the terrible consequences which flowed from that. And so I thought, well, you know, when I grow up maybe there’s something I can do to solve this. And when I ran for public office and when I served as a Governor of my State, and then when I became President, I think that I’ll always be able to say I did things to make it better.

But this is not the sort of thing you solve. Unfortunately, human nature being what it is, identifiable differences will always be used by narrow-minded people or frustrated people or ignorant people or sometimes bad people as a lever, a wedge, a means of acquiring power or influence or dominance or just inflicting harm. But it can get better and better and better.

That will be the test. The ultimate test of your democracy will be whether a disciplined effort can be made to take the attitudes represented, as you acknowledge, by your leaders and keep working until they become more and more and more real in the daily lives of every citizen of your country. But it is not a job that will ever be completely done. It will always be something you have to work on. At least that’s our experience here. It will get better, but you’ll always have to work on it.

[An interviewer said that despite some progress, the United States is still a largely segregated country and asked if it will improve.]

The President. If they work at it I think it will get better. But I think you will, first of all, people will always tend to show a certain affinity to organize their living patterns around people who are more like them. But some people will seek a more integrated life. That’s my experience in the South; that’s my experience in America. I mean, I was amazed when I traveled around in other parts of America that a lot of people that I knew in other parts of the country lived a more segregated existence than I did, for whatever reason, maybe just the nature of the population of their communities.

But I think there will always be a certain amount of cohesion of people of the same race or ethnic group or religious group, particularly if they have strong religious convic-

tions. You see that all over the world. You see that here. To a certain extent, there's nothing wrong with that and it's not unhelpful. What is unhelpful is if that is used as a way to divide people and if it leads to some sort of legal or practical discrimination. And I think what Mr. Lewis is saying is absolutely right. We still have too much of that in America.

We had a meeting here this morning, just for example, we had a meeting this morning; we had a couple of hundred people in the Rose Garden to talk about how to better immunize all of our children in America. And it's appalling that a country as wealthy as we are only immunizes about two-thirds of our kids, about 64 percent of our children under 2 with all the recommended childhood immunizations. And it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that one of the reasons is that children under 2 are more likely to be children of color and more likely to be poor than adults over 50 who tend to make the decisions that control public policy in this country. That's one reason. That's not the only reason, but it's one reason.

So we had a meeting today to celebrate trying to organize ourselves with some discipline at the community level to eradicate not only a health problem but a problem of discrimination against the young, the poor, and often, children of color. But I think you see this played out over and over and over again in every society. But I do believe you can make it better.

And what I think is going to happen in this country is that increasingly we will come to understand that the fact that we are a multiracial society is an enormous asset in a global economy, but only if we take advantage of it, only if we educate all our children, keep them healthy, and teach people to live together in ways that permit them all to succeed. Otherwise, this potential asset becomes an enormous problem.

South Africa has an enormous asset now. You have a biracial society; you have some other ethnic groups, too, I know, and mixed race, but you have essentially two great large ethnic groups of people, each of whom have different experiences, different backgrounds, different contacts throughout the world now. It can be a terrific asset for you that you are

different, but only if you use it. It has been a terrible handicap. You can now turn it into an asset.

So I guess my answer to Tony is, some places it will be better; some places it will be worse throughout the world. But if you look at the way the world is going, you basically are going to have two kinds of societies that will do well, it seems to me: highly homogeneous, coherent societies that think they can operate with great discipline by their own sets of cultural rules which are widely accepted within the society, who will then attempt to do well in the global economy by having high rates of savings, investment, and exporting to others but keeping their own life; or open, multiethnic societies which welcome the whole world and try to find a way to make strength out of diversity. And what you're going to see is each of those societies will be dealing with the conflicts that any course of action dictates.

You've got a great reform movement going on in Japan, fighting great opposition, because they're saying, "We need to be more open; we need to appreciate diversity more," but "We don't want to be so open, we don't have any discipline or control or direction or whatever." And you have America saying, "This diversity is a great asset for us, but not if we have so little discipline, our crime rates are too high, our education systems are too poor, or whatever." So you have these two great models, each of them trying to find the strengths of one another.

You have a chance to do that in South Africa. And it's a unique opportunity, at least in that part of the African Continent. And I think it's an extraordinary thing. And I think the world will come beating a path to your doorstep. It won't just be the United States; the whole world will start showing up down there when you pull this election off, because they will be so exhilarated by the moral and the practical potential of what it is you're engaged in. That's what I believe.

[An interviewer cited the concern expressed by a white South African journalist about possible human rights abuses by the new government.]

The President. I'd like to answer the question—it's a good question and a fair

one—and I'd like to sort of—I'll give you two answers, consistent one with the other, but I think showing what I perceive to be the dimension of the problem.

First of all, the leaders of the country have taken great steps to minimize the prospect of that development by agreeing to a constitution with a strong bill of rights and a constitutional court and by agreeing to a government of national unity and by also, frankly, siding with international global developments that are consistent with human rights, renouncing terrorism, renouncing the spread of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. All these augur for a government that will be balanced and fair and will not tolerate as official policy the abuse of human rights. If that should occur, I think the United States should have the same obligation to speak against it there as we did before in South Africa, and as we do now elsewhere in the world. I think that's hopeful.

I think the far greater danger for the man who wrote the piece—and it was a very moving piece, I thought—the far greater danger is what is in the heart of millions of people who—to go back to your question—who have not yet bought into the whole process that is unfolding. And who knows how many people there are carrying what wounds inside who may think they have some opportunity and some position to which they might be elected or just some opportunity because of their newfound freedom for payback time? I mean, that is something that no one can calculate.

In other words, democracy requires every day millions and millions and millions of decisions in a country as large as 40 million, by people—they just make decisions—sometimes you'll begin to make them almost subconsciously—to support the democratic process, to show personal restraint, to respect the rights of other people, to deal with all these things. I think what's going to be the far bigger challenge, is when you get the government in place and you've got the laws, you've got the bill of rights, you've got all this stuff, the government's going to try to do the right thing, I think the majority party will try to do the right thing—what will happen is, what about all the people up and down the line? And what is in their hearts?

What kind of temptations or opportunities will be there? Those are things that happen to free societies, and you'll just have to work at stamping them out and minimizing them. I think that's what the real problem is.

[An interviewer asked if the United States would make a greater effort to uplift and assist Africa.]

The President. I think the United States should focus more on Africa as a whole, as a continent.

Q. Do you intend to do that?

The President. And I intend to do that. Now, you know today, of course, we're profoundly—I know that—I won't use your term, but you know what occupies our headlines, of course, are in the north, Somalia and Sudan and the problems there and then moving down the continent to Rwanda and Burundi and then moving down to Angola where more children have been injured by land mines than in any war in human history. It's not on CNN at night, so people don't talk about it. And we're terribly troubled by Rwanda now, but it wasn't so many months ago that in a period of months it's estimated that as many as a quarter of a million or more people died in Burundi.

So it is true. But there are other stories in South Africa as well. There are other countries where progress is being made, where democracy is beginning to work, where people are beginning to try to put together these things that will make a successful country. And it seems to me that the United States ought to be working with countries that are trying to make good things happen, as well as doing what we can to alleviate human suffering where there's a tragedy.

And I think we need a more balanced and more aggressive policy in Africa, and I am hopeful that we'll be able to provide one. We've been so caught up with our own financial problems and cutting back on everything. And in our country, foreign aid of all kinds has a history of being unpopular among the people and, therefore, among the Congress. But I think that if there is a success in South Africa, which I expect there to be, I believe America will try to come to you; I believe the world will try to come to you; I think there will be a fascination about it. And I

think that it will not only spark greater development in the southern part of Africa, but it will give us a more balanced view of what our overall policy should be. I realize I'm an optimist, but that's what I believe will happen.

[An interviewer praised the President's sincerity and stated that South Africa was fortunate to have Mr. Mandela and Mr. de Klerk as role models in the move toward tolerance and democracy.]

The President. Well, if I might just comment on that and say one thing—I thank you for saying that. And I thank you for being positively inclined toward me. If you lived here, you would have an obligation to be more critical of me. *[Laughter]* I accept it.

Let me tell you what I think about that. I think that both Mandela and de Klerk are remarkable stories, and together, they are a stern rebuke to the cynics of the world: de Klerk for the reason you said, because he was an Afrikaner and because of the image we all have of that and what it was and what it meant politically and racially and every way; Mandela because he spent the best years of his life in a prison cell, walked out by most standards an older man, still ready to be young and vigorous and able to free himself of the bitterness that would surely have destroyed most people who had to live for 27 years behind bars. That also is an astonishing story.

If these two people are capable of that sort of internal growth and wisdom and understanding, there must be a way for the rest of us to impart some of that to the society at large in South Africa and the United States or wherever, so that they, in turn, can live together. But both stories are truly astonishing.

I think also they owe a lot to others, too. We were talking before I came into this interview—I believe, in the history of the Nobel Prize, the conflict in South Africa between the races is the only thing that's produced four Nobel Prizes over the same issue: Albert Luthuli, then Bishop Tutu, and then Mandela and de Klerk. I mean, this is something that the world has been fixated on with you for a long time.

But the internal changes of those two people, that's what you have to find a way—that goes back to where you started. You have to find a way to mirror that down here where people live and buy newspapers and go to work every day and find a way to live together.

Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 7:03 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. The interviewers were Richard Steyn, editor-in-chief, *The Star*, Johannesburg, South Africa; Aggrey Klaaste, editor, *The Sowetan*, Soweto, South Africa; Anthony Lewis, *New York Times*; and Clarence Page, *Chicago Tribune*. This item was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 22. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou of Greece

April 22, 1994

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, are you going to start bombing, or are the allies going to start bombing Gorazde very shortly as a result of the NATO Council ultimatum?

The President. They're meeting now. Let's see what they do, and I'll have more to say about it later.

Q. Do you want the NATO allies to allow NATO to select the bombing targets and move more independently of the U.N.? And do you expect them to—

The President. We want to continue to work with the U.N., but they're working—our people are there now, working on the arrangements. So let's see what comes out of the meeting today, and we'll—I'll have comments about it after they do.

Haiti

Q. Sir, I wonder if you could tell us why the Haitian boat people are being allowed this time, sir.

The President. Well, two reasons: First of all, they were very close to the United States. The whole purpose of the return policy was primarily to deter people from risking their lives. Hundreds of people have already drowned trying to come here. These people were only 4 miles from the shore. The second

was that we had evidence that the Haitians might have been subject to some abuse by the people who were in control of the boat. And so for those reasons, we thought the appropriate thing to do was to bring them on in, which we did.

Q. Is this a change in the policy for the future?

The President. No change in policy.

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

Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Q. President Clinton. Mr. President, are you going to discuss the problem with Greece and Skopje and the measures that Greece has got against Skopje?

The President. Absolutely.

Q. What do you believe about these measures?

The President. What I think is that we have Mr. Nimetz over there and Mr. Vance. We're trying to help work it out. I think that it's very much in the interest of Greece and Europe and the world community for the matters to be worked out between the two countries, and I think they can be.

Q. How committed are you to delaying the process until Greece's concerns are satisfied, sir?

The President. I think it's obvious that we've shown a real concern for Greece's concerns. That's one of the main reasons I sent a special envoy over there, and we're trying to work through it. We'll discuss that today. We just started out—we haven't even had our discussions yet.

Q. There's been some criticism that the U.S. side has not exercised enough of its good—[inaudible]—to Skopje and to come up with a solution.

The President. We're working hard on that now, and we'll continue to. I think there will have to be some changes from the point of view of Skopje.

Q. Are you going to visit Greece, sir?

The President. Oh, I'd love to do that. I've never been there.

Cyprus

Q. What about Cyprus?

The President. We're working hard on Cyprus, and I think—I hope there will be some movement from the Turkish side on

Cyprus in the next couple of days with regard to the confidence-building measures. I think that the ball has been sort of in Mr. Denktash's court, and I hope he will take it up. And then I hope that Greece and all others will support pushing forward. I have worked hard to resolve this since I've been in office, and I will continue to stay on it. More later.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:45 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to Matthew Nimetz, U.S. Special Envoy to the United Nations to resolve the conflict between Greece and Macedonia; Cyrus Vance, United Nations Special Envoy to the Former Yugoslavia; and Rauf Denktash, leader of the Greek-Cypriot community. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou

April 22, 1994

Bosnia

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Before I comment on my meeting with Prime Minister Papandreou, I would like to make a brief statement about developments with regard to Bosnia today.

About 2 hours ago in Brussels, NATO's North Atlantic Council reached agreement on new steps to address the crisis in Gorazde and to promote a negotiated settlement in Bosnia.

As NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner just announced, the North Atlantic Council decided that continuing Bosnian Serb attacks against Gorazde justify firm action. Therefore, the North Atlantic Council decided that the commander in chief of NATO's Southern Command, United States Admiral Leighton Smith, is authorized to conduct air strikes against Serb heavy weapons and other military targets in the vicinity of Gorazde unless three conditions are met: First, unless the Bosnian Serbs immediately cease their attacks against Gorazde; second, unless by 8 p.m. eastern daylight time tomorrow evening, the Bosnian Serbs pull back their forces at least 3 kilometers from the city's center; and third, unless by 8 p.m. to-

morrow evening, the Bosnian Serbs allow United Nations forces, humanitarian relief convoys, and medical assistance teams freely to enter Gorazde and to permit medical evacuations.

This decision provides NATO forces with broader authority to respond to Bosnian Serb attacks. The Bosnian Serbs should not doubt NATO's willingness to act.

In addition, the North Atlantic Council has begun to meet again to decide on authorization for NATO action concerning other safe areas. I applaud NATO's decision, the resolve of our allies, and once again, the leadership of NATO Secretary General Woerner. The United States has an interest in helping to bring an end to this conflict in Bosnia. Working through NATO and working along with Russia and others, we are determined to save innocent lives, to raise the price for aggression, and to help bring the parties back to a negotiated settlement.

Greece

Now let me say what a pleasure and an honor it has been for me to welcome Prime Minister Papandreou back to the United States. Last night we celebrated the Prime Minister's arrival at a reception at Blair House, and today we had a very productive meeting here at the White House. It has been about 20 years since the Prime Minister has been to America, and he told me today that 50 years ago this year, as a young man, he saw President Roosevelt in a touring car right outside the White House.

In a sense, every one of us in this country has roots in Greece. After all, the Periclean faith in freedom helped inspire our own revolution. The Athenian model of democracy helped to shape our own young republic. The common values that we share have made Greece and the United States allies. Half a century ago, our two nations stood together to launch a policy of containment. Now with the cold war over, we are joining to meet new challenges and seize new opportunities.

Consider, for example, the U.S.-Greece Business Council which was just recently established. It will enhance the economic contacts between our two nations, contacts that generated nearly \$1 billion in trade last year alone.

Nowhere are the challenges of this era clearer than in the Balkans. Greece and the United States share an interest in working to resolve the conflict in Bosnia and to prevent it from spreading into a wider European war. The Prime Minister and I discussed the most recent developments, and I underscored my view that further NATO action is necessary to restore the momentum toward peace.

We also talked about the effect the embargo on Serbia is having on other nations in the region. We discussed the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the United States understands the serious Greek concerns on this issue. Over the past week, both sides have been working with Cyrus Vance and my special envoy, Matthew Nimetz, to narrow their differences. We are hopeful that an agreement can soon be reached that will lead to the lifting of the trade embargo and a resumption of a dialog to resolve the legitimate differences which Greece is concerned with.

The Prime Minister and I also discussed Cyprus. The United States supports the U.N. confidence-building measures. Those measures grew out of discussions with President Clerides soon after he took office, and we hope that both sides will support them. My coordinator for Cyprus, Bob Lamb, has just returned from talks with both sides. A settlement in Cyprus would benefit all the nations in the region, especially Greece and Turkey, two vital members of NATO.

I have asked the Turkish Government to address the status and working conditions of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul. And I encourage Prime Minister Papandreou to ease his government's objections to the level of European Union assistance to Turkey. We must do what we can in these areas to promote greater understandings between these two critical nations and, in the process, to promote progress on Cyprus.

As a former professor here in the United States, Prime Minister Papandreou personifies the durable ties between Greece and America. It's been a pleasure to welcome him here as the leader of his nation. And I look forward to continuing to work with him based on the good relationship we have established in the challenging period ahead.

We face some thorny problems; together, I am convinced we can make some progress in dealing with them.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Papandreou. Mr. President, I want to express deep appreciation for your invitation to me to visit you in Washington, to continue a discussion that we started in Brussels a few months ago.

I must say that I found our discussions to be extremely useful. We have a clear understanding of the issues before us, and I want to stress that we consider you a friend of Greece and in whatever Greece signifies, as you have said to the world.

I am very honored and pleased to be here. For me, it's a return after many years of absence; it's been 20 years ago that I last visited the United States. And I must say, I'm quite moved by the fact that I'm here now standing next to the President of the United States in this room. It's a great honor and a great moment.

No doubt we are going through a period of great international difficulties. There are many spots in the world that, after the fall of the Wall, the Iron Curtain, many spots of the world that challenge, again, peace. Wherever you look there is conflict. And indeed, in the area from which we come, the Balkans, the Balkan Peninsula, we have, really, dynamite on our hands.

No doubt there is grave responsibility for having attempted to break apart ex-Yugoslavia. And all of us, all the 12 European members of the European Union, bear equal responsibility for this. It's a fire that can spread very fast. It is Bosnia today, a tragedy, indeed, a great tragedy. And there is undoubtedly danger also lurking ahead in Krajina; there is danger in Kosovo. There are plans of expansion on the part of some Balkan countries. Many interests are in conflict in that area, and one begins to sense already the development of zones of influence.

The President has just announced the important decision of NATO to proceed with—to give an ultimatum to the Serbs either to withdraw or to face bombardment. The position of the Greek Government on this is that we do not block this decision; we do not veto this decision. We accept it, but we do express our reservations. And there is only one res-

ervation, indeed: our fear that, step by step, we may be dragged into a land war which would be really, by modern standards, a tragedy much greater than we have seen in Bosnia.

So far as the question of the Balkans is concerned, Greece is a country that seeks peace and wants to play an active role, economically and culturally, in that region. It was not with pleasure that we imposed an embargo, with the exception of food and pharmaceutical, on Skopje.

Skopje is a country that must survive. It is in the interest of Greece that it survives. And this may sound to you a bit contradictory, and it is contradictory, that while we believe in this, we have imposed an embargo in the expectation and hope that an SOS signal will be understood. And this SOS signal is simply that it is a matter of security for Greece that the irredentist articles of the constitution of that state, that the flag with the Birgina Sun, that the daily newspapers and radio emissions—all of them are looking to an irredentist and aggressive position which involves Greece because they talk about the Macedonia of the Aegean, meaning Greek Macedonia.

At this moment, of course, we are discussing with Mr. Vance and Mr. Nimetz. But fundamentally, I want you to understand one simple thing. What we say to Mr. Gligorov is that we are prepared to lift the embargo, to normalize economic relations fully, to vote for the membership of the state in CSCE, to support an agreement between the community, the European community and that state, provided simply that he does one act: remove the Sun of Birgina and declare that the constitution in those particular articles is not valid.

We are not asking for anything more, and we are offering normalization, complete economic normalization, keeping the question of the name, which is a difficult one, as a matter of negotiation under Mr. Vance with the assistance of Mr. Nimetz, continuing discussions under question of the name. But we separate it out to simplify the issue.

Sorry to have taken so much time on this particular issue, but because I know there will be questions, I thought it was important that I tell you what our point of view is. We

hope that as soon as possible that the embargo will be removed and that will be an act on the part of Mr. Gligorov to signify his willingness to live in peace with us and to cooperate with us to develop truly a strong economic relationship.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't have anything else to say, except for Cyprus, I want to thank the President. Because the President has taken action not once but more than once to further the Cyprus cause, to get, finally, a resolution after 20 years of Turkish occupation of the north part of the island. He brought us some good news today, a member of the staff of the President, that possibly Mr. Denktash has accepted the confidence-building measures. This I did not know until I came to the White House. This, though, is a good sign. But in any case, our thanks to the President, who has stood by us on this important issue, not only for Greece but for the world.

Thank you.

The President. We'll start with Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International], and then I'd like to alternate between the American and the Greek press.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you and the Prime Minister a question. Some of your officials, Mr. President, have indicated that you would no longer be adverse to sending in ground troops to Bosnia, and I think the Secretary of State's statement has been so interpreted. Mr. Prime Minister, even though you have accepted the NATO position, you obviously are against bombing the Serbs. How would you bring them to the negotiating table?

Prime Minister Papandreou. Look, one, I don't have the magical answer; I wish I had it. But I know there is a lot of frustration. The question is this: Is there a military solution to the problem? For me, there is no military solution; there is no possible military solution to the problem. Accordingly, it has to be a political solution. And of course, the United States has made significant efforts to push us all forward to the negotiating table, and has no responsibility, may I add, for the initial developments in the region.

The President. Helen, let me say, first of all, there has categorically been no discussion in which I have been involved, or which I have encouraged or approved, involving the introduction of American ground forces into Bosnia, with the exception that you already know, as I have said for more than a year now: If there is an agreement, then I believe the United States should be willing to be part of a multinational effort to enforce and help to support the peace agreement.

I agree with the Prime Minister, we must be, all of us, very mindful of the fact that we are not in this business to enter this war on one side against another. But I would also remind you that we were seeing peace talks unfold in which at least the stated positions of the Bosnian Government and the Bosnian Serbs were not all that different just a few weeks ago.

We had the peace zone around Sarajevo. We had the agreement between the Croats and the Muslims, which was very, very important. And until this travesty in Bosnia occurred in an area in which the United Nations had declared a safe area, I thought we were on the way to a negotiated settlement. Will this have to be resolved through negotiations? Absolutely. Our objective is to restore that and to stop slaughter of the innocents and a dramatic alteration of the territorial balance which would make it almost impossible to restore that sort of negotiating environment. But that's our objective, to be firm with the Bosnian Serbs because they are trying to do something that is inconsistent with the position they, themselves, have taken as recently as just a couple of weeks ago.

Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Q. Mr. President, I would like to ask you whether you're more optimistic after the meeting with the Prime Minister on the resolution of the Macedonian issue, and also, what kind of steps you would like to see or expect to see from both sides in the near future?

The President. I would say I am more optimistic about the possibility of the resolution of it. And what I would like to see is for both sides to work with Mr. Nimetz, who is here, and with Mr. Vance to try to resolve the legitimate concerns.

As you know, the United States believes the embargo should be lifted, but we also believe Greece has some very legitimate concerns, some concerns which ought to be able to be allayed. They are rooted in history—they are rooted in recent history, not just ancient history—and we believe that these things have to be resolved.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, you say that you're not even considering at all the possibility of sending ground troops under any scenario in advance of a full peace arrangement on the ground.

The President. That's correct.

Q. Well, what do you say to the leaders of France and Canada and Britain? You're asking them to put their ground forces in harm's way, to send them into Bosnia and the United States will provide the funding. But the world's largest military, the world's greatest military, is refusing to put its soldiers in harm's way. I'm sure they've asked you about this.

The President. But we have not asked them to put their soldiers into combat. We are trying to protect their soldiers. And if we have respected—over a year ago—reluctantly their conclusion that at that time the arms embargo should not be lifted because it might subject their soldiers to more danger. Their soldiers are there now, not to fight the war, not to take sides, but to be agents of peace.

I talked with the Canadian Prime Minister just this morning, and he said to me again, he said, "You know, in spite of all the tension there, I really believe if they would just let our troops back into Gorazde, it would tend to restore the conditions of humanity, because we have not been attacked when we have been present in substantial numbers."

When the United States goes into a situation like this, I think it fundamentally changes the character and nature of the engagement. That is why I have always said we would contribute a substantial number of troops, but it ought to be in the context of a peace agreement, and I still believe that. And I have no reason to believe that our allies understand differently.

We don't want to create the impression that the United States or the U.N. is entering the conflict to try to win a military victory on the ground. We do want to create the clear and unambiguous impression that we are angry and disappointed at the aggression and the continued aggression of the Bosnian Serbs in the area of Gorazde and their refusal to return to the negotiating table on the terms that they, themselves, set just a few weeks ago.

Greece-Turkey Relations

Q. Mr. President, I would like to ask you if you are aware of the tension that exists in the area of the Aegean and what the United States is going to do on this issue? Are you going to discuss with Turkey, or are you going to put any pressure there?

The President. I have had extensive discussions with Turkey, with the Turkish Prime Minister just recently about the relationship of Greece and Turkey. And I might as well say to you in public what the Prime Minister and I discussed in private. I don't want to commit him. This is just my thinking.

My thinking is that at this moment in history, we have better conditions to resolve the differences between Greeks and Turkey and to have a new basis of responsible and fair cooperation than at any time in a long while.

The Turkish Government is concerned, obviously, about instability within its own borders, the rise in Islamic fundamentalism. The Government is interested in building a new and modern economy closely connected to Europe and maintaining a secular and responsible nation that is overwhelmingly Islamic. It seems to me that that is in the interest of all of us. And I think that Turkey understands that that can be achieved, and particularly, closer ties with Europe as a whole can be achieved only as the issues that divide Turkey and Greece are more nearly resolved.

So I'm quite hopeful, and I've been pushing this line with the friends of the United States in Turkey for more than a year now, and I will continue to do so.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, the Serbs' past general behavior is that when they're faced with a specific demand, they'll duck and come into

compliance, but then they'll turn around and they'll come back harder someplace else. What can be done while you're trying to achieve this negotiated settlement to be sure that they don't just turn and come into Tuzla or Bihac or someplace outside the safe areas?

The President. Well, we're taking up—that's two different questions. We are taking up the question of the other safe areas through the North Atlantic Council. As a matter of fact, I imagine the debate is going on now. All of the members decided that the issue of Gorazde should be addressed first and separately, and then the other safe areas should be taken up. And as I explained—I think Mr. Hume asked a question yesterday or the day before—we're trying to create, in all the safe areas, more or less the conditions we have in Sarajevo.

Now, in the nonsafe areas, let me remind you that there is fighting going on and initiative being taken, but not just by the Serbs. The Government forces are also engaging in them. We believe that they should both stop and go back to the negotiating table. But we also believe that there should not be a measurable and dramatic change of the situation on the ground and, specifically, that there should not be an assault on areas the United Nations, itself, has declared as safe areas. So our clear objective here is first to try to reverse the terrible things that have been happening in Gorazde; second, to try to make the safe areas, safe areas; and third, through the display of firm resoluteness, to encourage the parties to get back to the negotiating table and work this out.

As you know, in addition to that, we are discussing with the Russians and the European Community—and Prime Minister Papandreou talked about it a little bit today—what the appropriate next diplomatic initiative ought to be on our part. The Russians and the French have put forward proposals, as has the Secretary General of the United Nations, and I think that you will see some progress on that front next week.

Q. After your meeting with the Greek Prime Minister at the White House, would you like to say a few words about American foreign policy regarding the Balkan situation today?

The President. Well, I think I just said all I have to say. We talked a lot about it, and Prime Minister Papandreou gave me some very good insight. And we both agreed that, in the end, we have to have a negotiated settlement. But the United States believes that we have to, in the meanwhile, be absolutely determined not to let the prospect of a negotiated settlement be destroyed by the actions of the Serbs on the ground.

Q. Senator Nunn has said that we really need to dramatically escalate our bombing and go to Belgrade, go to Serbia. Why not? Why not take that step?

The President. I think that step is not an appropriate thing to do at this time, for a number of reasons. For one, the Bosnian Serbs themselves, it seems to me, when confronted with the reality that we are serious and we continue to go forward, are likely to return to the negotiating table. Number two, the Serbian government in Belgrade could be, and should be, an ally of the peace process. We know already that they have suffered greatly from the sanctions, and we're trying to stiffen the enforcement of the sanctions at this time. Thirdly, our partnership with the Russians continues, and while the Russians are angry and frustrated that they have been misled by the Bosnian Serbs, they have continued to adopt our position that there must be a withdrawal of Serb forces from Gorazde and a cessation of shelling.

In other words, I think there are still possibilities within the framework in which we are operating to achieve a return to the negotiating process and a legitimate return. So I think at this time, it would be inappropriate to escalate the bombing that much.

Q. Would you consider that—if this does not work, sir, would that be the next step?

The President. Well, I don't like to deal in contingencies in a matter like this. But I think my answer should stand on its own.

Security of Greece

Q. Mr. President, due to the Balkan crisis, could you please clarify the U.S. position vis-a-vis to the security of Greece on a bilateral level?

The President. Well, Greece is also a member of NATO, sir. And so our obligation to the security of Greece, as well as our his-

toric commitment to it, I think, is quite clear, and there should be no doubt about it today.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, how do you plan to avoid mission creep in Bosnia if expanding the air umbrella doesn't work? Will the United States push in further or pull out? In other words, what's your exit strategy here?

The President. Well, our exit strategy is a return to the peace negotiations. In other words, this is a different thing. Keep in mind—it is difficult to analogize this conflict from the point of view of the United States and the United Nations to others which occurred during the cold war and which had some sort of cold war rationale which sometimes broke down.

What we are trying to do now is to confine the conflict, first of all, stop it from spreading into a wider war and secondly, to get the parties back to the negotiating table where they were most recently. If what we are doing doesn't work, then I will consider other options. But there is more than one way for the mission to be altered in pursuit of the ultimate objective.

I will reiterate what I said to you in the beginning: There has been absolutely no discussion that I have participated in, authorized, or approved, dealing with the introduction of our ground forces here before a peace settlement.

Q. Mr. President, how do you account for the fact that peace in Bosnia has been so difficult to be achieved? And do you think that this could be due to conflicting messages the warring parts have received from different countries?

The President. It could be due to that. But I think it's mostly due to the fact that they have profound differences over which they have been willing to fight and die and that there are differences, apparently, even within each camp about the extent to which they should seek advantages on the battlefield or at the negotiating table down to the present day.

I think it's more about the internal dynamics, about what is going on there than about anything else. I think that it is important not to be too arrogant about our ability to totally dictate events so far from our shores. But

I do think we can influence them in a positive way. I think we have when we've acted firmly and acted together; we should continue to try to do so.

Press Secretary Myers. Two more questions.

Q. Mr. President, you just spoke about divisions within the camps, and you mentioned a moment ago that you thought the Bosnian Serbs would be likely to go back to the negotiating table and my understanding is—

The President. No, I don't want to say that. I think that they have gone there before, and I hope that they will. I wouldn't say that—I have no information that indicates that they are likely to do that. That's the rational thing for them to do.

Q. The assumption that a lot of policy-makers have made is that the Serbs have basically taken most of the territory that they want, but we hear repeatedly statements from the Serb militia leaders indicating that they have a much more militant, aggressive desire to seize more territory.

I'd like to ask you two things. One is, do you have any sense as to who's really in control over there? Are we negotiating with the people who can make a deal? And secondly, is there anything that U.S. policy can do to try to influence which parties to that internal conflict come out on top?

The President. I think from time to time there are differences between the Bosnian Serbs and Serbia-proper and its government. I think from time to time there are differences between and among various factions in Bosnia, between political and military factions, and between command centers and people out in the country, as often happens in this kind of war with this level of decentralization and with the developments that can occur in community after community.

And that means that we have to be—we have to take those things into account in developing our strategies. But we can't let the rumor of that, in effect, divide and weaken us; we just have to work ahead. Is there anything we can do to exploit those or to use those? I don't know yet. But I do know that maintaining a firm hand on these sanctions is a very important part of our policy now. And I would think that, particularly, that there may be people on the ground who,

once they've been fighting, don't want to quit, especially if they think they are in a position to win in a place where they happen to be fighting. But that's what leadership is for.

You know, you could say—look at this election that's about to unfold in South Africa. I mean, I could give you lots of other examples. I'm sure there are people on the ground that don't want to quit fighting because it's what they know, and they think maybe they can press an advantage. But that's what leadership is for. And the leaders of the Serbs and the Bosnian Serbs need to assert themselves at this moment and avoid further wreckage.

Balkans

Q. The Balkan question—there is also the issue of the recent tensions between Greece and Albania. Did you discuss this issue as well as the status of the Greek minority there and the alleged human rights violations?

The President. Well, first of all, I think Greece has proceeded with real restraint and sound judgment. We are concerned about the status of the Greek minority there as we are concerned about the status of the Albanians in Kosovo. This whole area is a tinderbox, which is one of the reasons we have paid as much attention to it as we have and one of the reasons we are trying, within the limits of the United Nations and NATO, to confine the conflict.

I think the plain answer to this is to tone down the rhetoric, to observe the rights of the minorities, and not to let the war which is raging in Bosnia spread to the surrounding areas where there are equally deep tensions.

I'll take one last question.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. Rostenkowski made a speech in Boston today in which he said that he is unwilling, or will recommend against, in his committee, financing the health care bill through savings anticipated in future years from the health care, from the effects of the health care bill, and that he prefers to finance it through a broad-based tax issue. Could you give your response to that and tell us how you think it would go?

The President. I think Mr. Rostenkowski is trying to achieve our common objectives, which he defined as: universal coverage, cost control, and 218 votes. [Laughter] And I think he has a strategy for pursuing that.

I believe that our savings are good. I believe that obviously we intend—we always knew we'd have to make some modification once the Congressional Budget Office cost estimates came out. We are prepared to do that. But we have dealt with an awful lot of health economists. We've worked very hard on the numbers; we think they are good. But I'm going to have to let him characterize his strategy.

All I can say is that, of all the things I'm worried about in dealing with Congress over the question of health care, the commitment of the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to providing health care security to every American is not one of them.

Thank you very much. We've got to go.

NOTE: The President's 56th news conference began at 2:14 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this news conference.

Statement on Nomination of Governors to the Federal Reserve Board

April 22, 1994

A stable monetary system is the platform upon which any efforts for economic renewal must be built. My administration recognized that our first task was to put our fiscal house in order, so that an ever-growing Federal budget deficit did not absorb capital and slow economic growth. I believe that we have now put our Nation on the path to sustainable economic growth. The Federal Reserve Board is the critical institution that preserves the stability of our monetary system and the confidence of our markets. The position of Governor of the Federal Reserve Board requires acute sensitivity to the need to strike a careful balance, to prudently manage the money supply and avoid the excesses of inflation, while ensuring that the men and women in our economy have the opportunity to prosper and fulfill their dreams.

To fill the vital job of Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve, I am delighted to nominate Dr. Alan Blinder, currently a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. Dr. Blinder is one of the world's most respected macroeconomists. He is an expert on fiscal and monetary policy and productivity, has served as chairman of the economics department at Princeton, authored countless articles and books, including one of the Nation's top textbooks, "Economic Principles and Policy," which he coauthored with William Baumol.

Alan has been an integral part of my economic team over the last 15 months. He has always expressed his views to me freely, with intellectual integrity, force, and clarity. He is a keen intellect who reached the top of his profession without losing the common touch or ever forgetting the human implications of the often abstract economic decisions we in Government must make. He has served as an economic conscience in my administration, striving to ensure that our policies met the test of rationality and workability for real people.

I am also pleased to announce my intention to nominate Janet Yellen to a full term on the Federal Reserve Board. Dr. Yellen is one of the most prominent economists of her generation on the intersection of macroeconomics and labor markets. She is also an expert in international economics on such issues as the determinants of the balance of trade. She was a clear and unanimous choice of my top economic advisers who found her to be a top-flight intellect with a pragmatic approach to monetary policy and a judicious temperament.

I am confident that both candidates, if confirmed, will serve this Nation with distinction as Governors of the Federal Reserve Board.

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

Statement on the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program

April 22, 1994

When people enter this country illegally and commit crimes while they are here, it

is not fair to ask the States to bear the entire cost of their imprisonment. This new program will help them considerably.

After many years of virtual neglect of the illegal immigration issue, our administration is taking major steps to address this problem. First, we are making a substantial investment in efforts to reduce the flow of illegal immigration, primarily by toughening our border enforcement. That is the Federal Government's primary responsibility in this area.

But we also need to help those States with large numbers of undocumented aliens to shoulder the resulting financial burdens. Today, we take another important step in that direction.

NOTE: This statement was part of a White House press release announcing the creation of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program to help States pay for the costs of incarcerating illegal aliens convicted of a felony.

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 16

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Williamsburg, VA, where they attended the Senate Democratic Policy Committee Annual Issues Retreat.

April 17

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Charlotte, NC, where he attended the 30th Anniversary Mustang Celebration at Charlotte Motor Speedway. The President then returned to Washington, DC in the evening.

April 18

In the morning, the President traveled to Milwaukee, WI. Following his arrival, the President was given an Ameritech demonstration of the Wisconsin Health Information Network at the Italian Community Center.

In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

April 19

The President announced his intention to nominate Marilyn Peters as a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agriculture Mortgage Corporation.

April 20

In the morning, the President went jogging at Hains Point with the winners of the 1994 Boston Marathon.

April 21

In the evening, the President attended a reception for Prime Minister Papandreou of Greece at Blair House.

The President declared a major disaster exists in Missouri and ordered Federal funds be released to help individuals and families in that State recover from severe storms, tornadoes, and flooding, which began on April 9.

The President declared a major disaster exists in Oklahoma and ordered Federal funds be released to help individuals and families in that State recover from severe storms and flooding which began on April 11.

April 22

In the afternoon, the President honored the recipients of the National Volunteer Action Awards on the South Lawn at the White House.

**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 19

Paul M. Igasaki,
of California, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for

the remainder of the term expiring July 1, 1997, vice Evan J. Kemp, Jr., resigned.

Laurie O. Robinson,
of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Jimmy Gurule, resigned.

Jeremy Travis,
of New York, to be Director of the National Institute of Justice, vice Charles B. DeWitt, resigned.

Simon Ferro,
of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1994, vice Carlos Salman, term expired.

Simon Ferro,
of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1997 (reappointment).

Manuel Trinidad Pacheco,
of Arizona, to be a member of the National Security Education Board for a term of 4 years, vice Richard F. Stolz.

Marilyn Fae Peters,
of South Dakota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, vice Derryl McLaren, resigned.

Jan Piercy,
of Illinois, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, vice E. Patrick Coady, resigned.

Submitted April 20

Joseph R. Paolino, Jr.,
of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malta.

**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 16

Transcript of a press briefing by Housing and Urban Development Secretary Henry Cisneros and Acting Associate Attorney General Bill Bryson

Released April 18

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing the Presidential Emergency Board final offer of recommendations to settle the contract impasse on the Long Island Rail Road

Released April 19

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Tony Lake's meeting with leaders of the Unionist Party of Northern Ireland

Released April 20

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's meeting with Chancellor Franz Vranitzky of Austria

Listing of Boston Marathon winners jogging with the President

Released April 21

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt, and Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Carol Browner

Announcement of nomination for eight U.S. marshals

Released April 22

Transcript of a press briefing by Vice President Albert Gore, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administrator Jim Baker, National Aeronautics and Space Administrator Dan Goldin, Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Carol Browner, National Science Foundation Director Neal Lane, Deputy Secretary of Education Madeleine Kunin, Assistant Secretary of State Eleanor Constable, Office of Environmental Policy Director Katie McGinty, and Science Adviser to the President Jack Gibbons on the GLOBE program

Transcript of a press briefing by Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, and Federal Reserve Board nominees Alan Blinder and Janet Yellen

Transcript of a press availability with Hillary Clinton

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on appointment of Joseph Connor as U.N. Undersecretary General

Announcement of appointment of member of Board of Trustees for the Kennedy Center

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Tony Lake's meeting with Rwanda human rights monitor Monique Mujawamarija

**Acts Approved
by the President**

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