AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, May 23, 1994
Volume 30—Number 20
Pages 1071–1130

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings
Brown v. *Board of Education*, Beltsville, MD—1101, 1106
Death of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis—1124
Goals 2000 legislation—1092
Indianapolis, IN
Jefferson-Jackson Democratic Governors luncheon—1073
Landmark for Peace Memorial—1072
NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund dinner—1096
National Police Officers Memorial Service—1080
Nomination of Judge Stephen G. Breyer to be a Supreme Court Associate Justice—1088
Radio address—1071
San Bernardino, CA, community—1125
Video conference call on health care reform—1090

Appointments and Nominations

See also Addresses and Remarks
American Battle Monuments Commission, Secretary—1110
Education Department
Assistant Secretary—1071
Regional Representatives—1071

Appointments and Nominations—Continued

U.S. Information Agency, Associate Director—1123
U.S. Marshals—1110

Bill Signings

Human Services Amendments of 1994
Remarks—1110
Statement—1112

Communications to Congress

Army readiness for regional conflict, letter—1127
Corporation for Public Broadcasting, message transmitting report—1114
National Endowment for the Humanities, message transmitting report—1114
Prevention of nuclear proliferation, message transmitting report—1096
Iran, message—1086

Communications to Federal Agencies

Assistance to International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, memorandum—1099
Theater missile defense cooperation, memorandum—1095

(Contents continued on inside of the back cover.)

Editor's Note: The President was in Los Angeles, CA, on May 20, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

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

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

Contents—Continued

Executive Orders

Federal Implementation of the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation—1082
Implementation of the Border Environment Cooperation Commission and the North American Development Bank—1085

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Cabinet Room—1116
Oval Office—1100, 1116
Rose Garden—1088
News conference with Prime Minister Rao of India, May 19 (No. 57)—1117

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

India, Prime Minister Rao—1116, 1117
Norway, Prime Minister Brundtland—1100

Proclamations

National Defense Transportation Day and National Transportation Week—1094

Proclamations—Continued

National Maritime Day—1124
National Trauma Awareness Month—1115
World Trade Week—1113

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings
Federal Interagency Council on the Homeless—1109

Statements Other Than Presidential

Draft registration and the Selective Service System—1114

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1130
Checklist of White House press releases—1129
Digest of other White House announcements—1128
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1128

Week Ending Friday, May 20, 1994

Nomination for an Assistant Secretary and Appointment of Regional Representatives at the Department of Education

May 13, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Gilberto M. Moreno as Assistant Secretary of the Education Department's Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs. He also named officials to four other positions at the Department of Education. They are: Maria S. Mercado, Patricia H. Parisi, Trini Garza, and Suzanne G. Ramos.

"These individuals will bring to the Federal Government and the Education Department a wealth of experience in education and public service," the President said. "Their talents and expertise will advance a strong community outreach and interagency communication program within the Education Department."

In commenting on the nominee for Assistant Secretary, the President said, "Gilberto Moreno will complement the excellent team of senior officials at the Education Department who have already helped us achieve so much in the way of education reform."

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

The President's Radio Address

May 14, 1994

Good morning. This week we're reminded once again that miracles are born of hope. Seven thousand miles from our shores, in a land divided for over 300 years by the most pervasive form of racial hatred and violence, blacks and whites participated in free elections that elevated Nelson Mandela to the Presidency of South Africa.

Democracy's triumph in that distant land owes much to our own history and our own people. For over two centuries we have led the world by example, showing how human beings of different complexions, ethnic origins, and religious beliefs can come together under the great umbrella of freedom.

Yet, ironically, as we hear the call of liberty sound around the world, we find our own freedoms tested here at home, not by the enemies of totalitarianism and oppression but by those of cynicism, intolerance, incivility, and violence here at home.

Today I'm speaking to you from Mt. Helm Missionary Baptist Church in Indianapolis, courtesy of WIBC Radio, not far from the site where Senator Robert Kennedy spoke in 1968 just moments after learning that Reverend Martin Luther King had been assassinated. On that awful night 26 years ago, Robert Kennedy beckoned Americans of all races to show compassion and wisdom in the face of violence and lawlessness. Many cities in America erupted in flames after Dr. King was killed, but here the citizens of Indianapolis heeded his call. Once again, it is time for us to heed those words, time to build up instead of tear down, time to renew our faith in freedom and to refurbish our own democracy.

During the next few weeks we'll be reminded of moments in our history like that one in April of 1968 when Americans joined together to overcome great challenges. On Tuesday, we'll celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which gave Americans of all races equal access to our Nation's public schools. A few weeks later, I'll travel to Europe to represent all Americans as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of D-Day, a day on which we thank an entire generation for risking their lives so that democracy would not fall victim to tyranny.

Celebrating these great occasions is important but not enough. The pride we feel as

Americans must inspire us to renew the society we live in today. It must inspire us to overcome racial, social, and political divisions and the sheer weight of violence that threaten the very freedoms we've worked so hard to secure. After all, our Nation's motto is, *E Pluribus Unum*—out of many, one.

That's why our administration has worked hard to restore our economy, to reward work by bringing down the deficit and increasing investment and trade and creating more jobs; why we've worked hard to empower all our people to compete and win in a global economy through lifetime education programs; why we've worked to strengthen our families through the Family and Medical Leave Act, tougher enforcement of child support orders, tax breaks for lower income working families with children; why we've worked to bring our diverse culture together with the most diverse and excellent national administration in history and a real commitment to our civil rights laws; and why we're working so hard to create a safer America with the Brady bill and the crime bill now before Congress, with its ban on assault weapons, it's 100,000 more police officers, its more punishment and more prevention to give our young people something to say yes to.

But in the end, all our progress as a nation depends more on the attitudes and the values of our citizens than by the actions of our Government. In Washington, DC, recently, the residents of a local housing project became so fed up with drug dealers and gangs that they put up a big fence around the complex and stationed guards at the entrances to keep unwanted visitors at bay. In other words, poor people in a housing project did what a lot of wealthy Americans have been doing in their neighborhoods for some time. Now their children can play on the lawn again, and people can visit each other on outdoor benches. One resident called it the freedom of the nineties. Well, I applaud that community for refusing to give in to criminals who tyrannize the neighborhoods with their guns and took their children's freedom away.

But I wonder what it says about our country and our democracy when freedom has come to mean that we barricade our children from the outside world in order to protect them from harm, that we install floodlights and foot patrols in the backyards of our homes to feel secure. That isn't the kind of freedom our Forefathers conceived of 200 years ago, not the kind of freedom that Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy gave their lives for, not the kind of freedom that Nelson Mandela dreams of in a land newly introduced to democracy and looking to us for support.

As we reflect on the recent events in South Africa and celebrate times of renewal in our own history, let each of us find within ourselves the courage to overcome old animosities that get in freedom's way. And I hope each of us will find a reservoir of hope deep inside that will help to lead our Nation to a brighter and better future.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:06 a.m. at the Mount Helm Missionary Baptist Church in Indianapolis, IN.

Remarks at the Groundbreaking Ceremony for the Landmark for Peace Memorial in Indianapolis, Indiana

May 14, 1994

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, now we're all being tested by a little rain. Those of us who grew up in farming areas know that rain is a gift from God. It's going to help us all grow a little.

Let me say how honored I am to be back in Indianapolis with your Governor, your mayor, the prosecutor who supported this fine project. I'm glad to be here with Congressman Jacobs and the other Members of Congress and with Senator Lugar, who was the mayor here that fateful night in April in 1968 so long ago. I thank Mrs. Kennedy and Senator Kennedy and Martin and Dexter King for coming here, as well as others from Indiana that came down with me, Congressman Roemer, Congressman McCloskey, Congressman Lee Hamilton.

Let me tell you, folks, even in the rain I can say in a much more brief manner what I would have taken longer to say if it hadn't been raining, and it is this: I sought the Presidency because I was inspired by what you just saw on that screen, when I was a young

man. And I believed we could do better. I believed that we could build a country where we would go forward instead of backward and where we would go forward together, where people would deal with one another across the bounds of race and region and income and religion and even different political parties and philosophies with respect and honor, to try to pull this country together and push our people forward.

We just have witnessed a miracle in South Africa. We hope we are witnessing a miracle in the Middle East, as the Palestinians cheer and the police officers move into Jericho and they try to take control of their own destiny.

Everywhere in the world people have looked to us for an example. And I ask you today, have we created that miracle here at home? What you saw in Robert Kennedy's speech was a miracle that night. He was advised not to come here. The police said, we're worried about your safety. Cities all over America erupted in flames when Dr. King was killed. But a miracle occurred here in Indianapolis. The city did not burn because the people's hearts were touched. Miracles begin with personal choices.

Yes, I would like to say to you, the things I can do as your President to create jobs, to empower people through education, to reform the welfare system, to give health care to all Americans, to pass this crime bill, these things will change America. Oh, yes, they will. But in the end, America must be changed by you, in your hearts, in your lives every day on every street in this country. And you can do it.

In our Nation's Capital, just a few days ago, there was a news story about people living in a poor neighborhood who got sick and tired of seeing their children shot and living in fear, so they put a big fence up around their neighborhood. And they hired guards, just like they were rich folks in a planned development. And they got exactly the same result: people could go outside and sit on the park benches, and the children could walk and play. And one of the men was interviewed. He said, "I guess this is freedom in the nineties." Is it freedom in the nineties when we have to put up walls between our own people even as we celebrate the walls coming down from Berlin to South Africa? Is that our freedom? Are we going to live in a time when all of our political dialog becomes a shouting match? You heard what Diane said. That's absolutely true. "If you preach hate, you can get a talk show. If you preach love, you'll get a yawn."

What we have to decide today is whether we are going to live by the spirit that animates this park and this project. I want to thank the Indiana Pacers. I want to thank your prosecutor. I want to thank everybody who's responsible for this gun buy-back program. But when they melt that metal down, and they make this statue to the memory of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, you ask yourselves why don't we keep giving these guns up? Why don't we keep melting them down? Why don't we make a monument to peace where all of us can live together, not with walls coming up but with walls tearing down, so we can go forward together.

God bless you, and thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. at the Martin Luther King Memorial Park. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Evan Bayh of Indiana; Mayor Stephen Goldsmith of Indianapolis; Ethel Kennedy, wife of Robert F. Kennedy; Martin Luther King III and Dexter King, sons of Martin Luther King, Jr.; and Diane Simone, wife of Indiana Pacers owner, Herb Simone.

Remarks at the Jefferson-Jackson Democratic Governors Association Luncheon in Indianapolis

May 14, 1994

Thank you for that wonderful, rousing welcome. Thank you for your support of the Democratic Governors. And thank you, you folks here in Indiana, for your support of my good friends Evan and Susan Bayh.

You know, like Evan Bayh, when I was elected Governor of Arkansas, I was the youngest Governor in the country. Indeed, I was the youngest person elected in 40 years. Now 40 years before me, the person who was elected slightly younger than me was Harold Stassen—[*laughter*]—who later ran for President eight times. Which shows you that there may or may not be significance

to being the youngest Governor in the country. [*Laughter*]

But nonetheless, when I met Evan Bayh, I really resented him. [*Laughter*] I mean, he was so young and handsome, and I realized I'd never be that young again, I'd never look that good again. Come to think of it, I still sort of resent him for that. [*Laughter*] When we play golf he hits the ball longer than I do. When we come in, he graciously fabricates the truth and tells people that I won when I didn't. Then he put the burden on me to try to correct it. Occasionally, I do. [*Laughter*] I really admire Governor Bayh and his wife and his whole administration and all the people who have done so much to change Indiana.

I'd also like to thank your Members of Congress who came with me today: the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Lee Hamilton; Congressman Phil Sharp, who is retiring against my will, but who is going to be replaced by another good Democrat, Joe Hogsett; Congressman Frank McCloskey; Congressman Tim Roemer. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Congressman Andy Jacobs, who did so much to put over our assault weapons ban last week. I want to acknowledge your former Congressman and your nominee for the Senate, Jim Jontz, wish him well, and say a word of thanks to the other Democratic Governors who are here who have all been recognized but who were colleagues of mine in my former life when I was a Governor, or as my wife says, back when we had a life. [*Laughter*] Governor Mel Carnahan, Governor Ben Nelson, Governor Bruce Sundlun, and Governor Joan Finney. I thank them for their personal friendship and for their leadership. I want to thank Katie Whelan of the Democratic Governors Association and Ann DeLaney, the chair of the Democratic Party, her husband, Ed, Sally Kirkpatrick, Diane Simone, and all of you who did this today, this wonderful, wonderful lunch, thank you.

I feel almost like I don't have to say anything. I mean, I saw the movie and I heard everybody else's speech. [*Laughter*] It reminds me of the first time I got up to give a speech. This is a true story, in 1977, the first speech I ever gave as an elected official, I was an attorney general; I was 30 years old; I was sort of scared. I spoke to 500 people at the annual Rotary Club dinner in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and it was one of these deals where they installed officers and gave out awards. And all but three people who were there got introduced, and they went home mad. [*Laughter*]

The dinner started at 6:30 p.m., and I got up to speak at a quarter to 10 p.m. And the guy who introduced me was more nervous than I was—he later became a great friend of mine—but here is how the introduction to my first public address as an elected official started. He said, ''You know, we could stop here and have had a very good evening.'' [*Laughter*] Now, he didn't mean it the way it came out. But I feel that way today. You could stop here and have had a wonderful meal, a wonderful celebration of our party and our prospects and our future.

I was glad to see the tribute paid to Evan Bayh and his leadership in Indiana. He proved some things about Democrats that the Republicans kept trying to deny in all their rhetoric and with all their media barrages. He proved that Democrats can govern in an austere fiscal climate by cutting spending and without raising taxes. He proved that Democrats understand the importance of jobs in the free enterprise system. And he has worked relentlessly to bring more jobs to this State. He understands the link between economic growth and education. Indiana's Step Ahead program is a real model for this country. The new Gateway Education standards mirror what we're trying to do at the national level.

In 1988, he ended 20 years of Republican governance of the statehouse. The Democrats have come a long way since that election. When he was elected secretary of state, he was the only Democrat in statewide office. Republicans controlled both houses of the legislature, half the seats in Congress. Today you've got five statewide elected officials, including your distinguished attorney general, the first African-American woman elected to statewide office in the history of this State. You have 7 of the 10 seats in Congress, and I hope after this next election, Mayor Mike Harmless will give us 8 of the 10 seats in Indiana.

I owe a lot to the years I spent as a Governor. Basically, I ran for President because I was tired of what I thought was the stale rhetoric in Washington, the incredible partisan gridlock, and the politics of division and diversion and often personal destruction, everybody arguing over left and right and liberal and conservative and how this process was and who was up and down and who was in and out. And people in this country were being lost in the whole process, and we were at risk of losing the American dream as we moved toward the 21st century.

I saw hard-working people, business people, and laboring people work hard in the 1980's to improve their productivity and to try to come to grips with the realities of the eighties and the economic competition of the world. I saw all these wonderful teachers and other people trying to revitalize education. I saw community leaders standing against the tide of rising violence and declining family structure to make good things happen.

I knew a lot of Members of Congress who were honest, good, honorable people who wanted to make a difference. And yet always, always, always, what we seemed to be getting out of our National Government was more politics and less performance.

I ran for a very simple reason: because I wanted to get this country moving again and I wanted to see the American people pull together again. I wanted us to go into the 21st century a strong, united, wonderful place, living up to our promise, our potential, our past, and our own ideals. And I was tired of reading all these prognostications that my daughter was going to grow up to be part of the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents. And I believed we could do better.

I thought we could do it by organizing ourselves around three little words: opportunity for all Americans, responsibility from all Americans, and a belief that we are one community, that we really believe in our national motto, *E Pluribus Unum*, that we are one from many and that we are all in this together and that ultimately we will go up or down together.

I believed that if we followed those three little words in all of our policies and we looked at the real world, that we could find new ways to rebuild our families and our communities, to honor the American people who elect us all. I believed we could go beyond partisan gridlock. It's been, frankly, a little tougher than I thought it would be. And it's been even tougher to get the message to the American people that we are doing what we said we would do.

Last year, the Congress had the courage to pass an economic program which went beyond rhetoric to reality. It drove down the deficits; it drove down interest rates; it increased investment in critical areas. The Congress had the courage to take on a lot of tough trade issues. We did more to foster the expansion of global trade last year than in any single year in a generation. The Congress was willing to work with me to invest in new technologies and take the controls off exporting many of them in the aftermath of the cold war. And what has happened: 3 million jobs in the first 15 months of this administration, a million in the first 4 months of this year. I'll tell you, my fellow Americans, the other party talked a lot in Washington about delivering for the free enterprise system. They talked, but we delivered.

This week the Congress passed our budget for this year. A budget that, without new taxes, will increase funding for education, for training, for new technologies, for medical research, and still, for the first time since 1969, reduce overall domestic discretionary spending, along with defense reductions—for the first time since '69—by eliminating 100 Government programs and reducing 200 others. This will give us, for the first time since Harry Truman was President—and with all respect, when it had to happen at the end of World War II—3 years of declining deficits in a row, for the first time since the Truman Presidency. They talked about it; we delivered it.

The Vice President has led a path-breaking effort that we call reinventing Government to try to examine how we do things and how we can serve you better, how we can make Government less bureaucratic and act more quickly and push decisions down to the grassroots level. I'll just give you one example that you can find now if you need to apply for an SBA loan. We've got it down to a one-sheet form, and it takes 2 days to process.

And I could give you 50 other examples like that if time permitted. Perhaps the most graphic example is this: Under our budget, we will reduce the size of the Federal Government not by firing people but by attrition, by 252,000 over a 5-year period, so that at the end of the period, the National Government will be below 2 million employees for the first time since 1960. And all of the savings will be put into a trust fund to pay for the crime bill—100,000 more police officers on the street. The other party always talked about reducing the size of Government and empowering people at the local level, but we have delivered. That is our job.

We are breaking new ground in education, developing a system of lifetime learning, helping the young people who don't go on to college but do need further training, lowering the cost of college loans and stringing out the repayments but toughening the collection procedures, so that we can open the doors of college education to everyone. You heard a little talk the other day—a few moments ago about our national service program. I think in so many ways that embodies what this administration is about: opportunity, responsibility, and community. Twenty thousand young people this year will be working in their communities in national service to revolutionize places where they live, to solve problems, and earning money for their education. And year after next we will have 100,000 young Americans doing that.

I'm proud of the work we have done to stand up for the American family. You heard on the film that wonderful woman talking in the Rose Garden about the problems they had been through because that family that you saw, speaking at the signing of the Family and Medical Leave Act, had been wrenched by a childhood illness and being forced to deal with the question of whether the parents would be with the children and lose their jobs or keep their jobs and not be with the children.

I think the most moving personal encounter I've had actually in the White House since I have been President occurred on an early Sunday morning when I came in from my run, and I noticed a family taking a tour, which is very rare on a Sunday morning at about 9 a.m. And I went over and shook hands with them. There was a father, a mother, three children, all girls. And it turned out that the child that was in a wheelchair was one of these Make-A-Wish children, a child with a very serious illness. And I asked them to excuse me, and I went up and changed clothes, came down with my uniform on so we could take a picture. And I was walking away, and all of a sudden this father grabbed me by the arm. And I turned around, and he said, "Let me tell you something, Mr. President," he said, "I imagine that a lot of days you think that the work you do up here really doesn't matter and doesn't affect people's lives. But" he said, "my little girl is desperately ill, and she's probably not going to make it. Because of the family leave law, I have been able to take some time off from my job to be with my child, without thinking that I am disadvantaging my wife and other two children by losing my job." And he said to me, "It's the most important experience of my life. And it would not have happened if it hadn't been for the family leave law. Don't ever think what you do here doesn't make a difference."

Folks, the family leave law was tied up in gridlock for 7 years. The Brady bill was tied up in gridlock for 7 years. The GATT treaty took 7 years to pass. The crime bill that the Congress is now in conference on has been tied up for 5 years. It is too long for Americans to wait while partisan differences get resolved and people's lives hang in the balance. We are trying to deliver for you up there.

Let me say we have had some support from the other party on some important initiatives, on national service, and I'm grateful for it; on the education bills, and I am grateful for it; on the crime bill, and I am grateful for it. Thirty-eight brave Republicans stood up with the Democrats the other day and voted on the assault weapons ban, and I am grateful for it. But the point I want to make to you is this: A lot of you probably didn't even know some of the things I have said because our national debate is so shrouded in this shrill, uncivil, diversionary rhetoric.

We are moving to break gridlock. But we also have to break the gridlock that is in people's minds. Because no matter what we do

in the Government, very few of our specific actions will affect a majority of the American people. If you just take the welfare reform issue, for example, something I care deeply about, we're going to propose a remarkable welfare reform bill which will go with the other things we're doing to try to help people move from dependence to independence, lowering taxes for working people with modest incomes. This year, one in six working families will be eligible for a tax break so they can be successful workers and successful parents, and there will be no incentive to leave work and go to welfare.

Providing for health care for all Americans will mean that no one will want to stay on welfare just to get health coverage for their kids. One of the reasons that people don't leave welfare has nothing to do with the welfare check, it's because if you stay on welfare the Government will pay for your children's health care. If you get off welfare and you take a low-wage job with an employer that in today's market can't afford health insurance, you then pay taxes to pay for health care for people who didn't make the decision you did. That is not profamily; it is not prowork; it is not good policy.

We need a tax structure, a health care structure, a tough child support enforcement system, and an education and training system and ultimately a requirement that people work so that we can change this system as we know it. But to do it we have to know that we share values and we're trying to get this done because it's the right thing for our country, not because it will affect most of us, because most of us aren't on welfare. That is the problem I face all the time, how rhetoric sometimes gets in the way of reality when we're up there trying to do things that I know embody the values of the people of this country and I know will give us a chance to move ahead.

But I know ultimately we cannot prevail unless there is a new spirit among the American people, a new determination to change the way we evaluate politics and politicians and to change the way we live at the grassroots level. And let me just mention two issues. The first is health care. My fellow Americans, we cannot ever—and you can book this—we cannot ever get control of the Federal deficit as long as the Government's health care programs, Medicare and Medicaid, are going up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. We cannot hope to be fully competitive in a global economy as long as we spend 45 percent more of our national income on health care than any other country does.

Some of it is money well spent on medical research and new technologies and new drugs and the things that make us special. Some of it is money we have to spend because we're more violent than other countries. But a lot of it is money we spend because we are the only country that employs hundreds of thousands of people, literally, in doctors' offices, hospitals, insurance offices all across America to see who and what is not covered on the insurance policy. No one else does that. That adds tens of billions of dollars to our system.

Now, if this were easy to fix, somebody would have done it long ago. For 60 years Presidents have tried. Our system is based on—I mean, my plan is based on some simple ideas. And I don't ask everybody to agree with every detail, but it's based on some simple ideas. If 9 out of 10 people with insurance get it in the workplace and 8 out of 10 people without health insurance have somebody in their family that works and you want the system to be as private as possible, wouldn't the best thing be to say that people who haven't assumed any responsibility for themselves and their workers should assume some responsibility and should do their part as well? Because any student of the health care system will tell you, until you cover everybody, you're going to have massive cost-shiftings, you're going to have uncontrollable elements and costs in the system, and you're going to have abject unfairness. That's why I propose to extend the requirement of covering health care for everybody through employers and employees, not a Government mandate. It's a private system.

The second thing—what has been the objection to the health care thing? This is what I want to get at; what's happening to our national debate. Because I want to talk about your responsibilities as citizens, one, in the national debate and, second, inaction in the grassroots level. What's happened to the na-

tional debate? They say support for my plan has gone down. It has, under the weight of tens of millions of dollars of adverse efforts to try to convince you that it is a Government-run system, that it is horrible for small business, that it is a mindless bureaucracy where crazy people will be making decisions for you. I've seen all these ads. [*Laughter*]

Now the truth is—and I've read some of the letters that have gone out—the truth is quite different. The truth is, it's private insurance, private providers. The Government does the following things: The Government says everybody has to be covered. The Government establishes a pool to give discounts to small business people who would be otherwise in real trouble if they had to pay the full value of a health care policy to try to protect the small business economy. And the Government organizes buying groups so that small businesses and self-employed people can buy insurance on the same terms as Government employees and big business people. Now, that's what we do.

With all respect, the other—last Sunday, I saw on television a man I very much admire and like, President Ford, giving a speech attacking our health care program, that was doubtless prepared for him by the other party. And one of the lines in this speech—it was devastating, I mean, it was a humdinger—it said, ''They want to set up a national health care board where there are seven people in Washington to decide what is necessary and appropriate for your health care. I don't think we ought to let seven bureaucrats in Washington make decisions that you and your doctors ought to make, do you?'' And I said, ''Goodness, no. Shoot the guy that put that plan out there.'' [*Laughter*] Right? So I go to the office the next day, and I said, ''You know, that was not a fair characterization of our plan. But he wouldn't knowingly misstate that. Let's do a little research,'' because I remembered something. I remembered that President Ford and President Carter, in a nonpolitical atmosphere, were the honorary cochairs of a bipartisan effort to reform the health care system. They had a detailed health care plan very much like ours in which they—and they wrote an op-ed piece about it, signed by President Ford, proposing two national boards not—to be fair to them—not to regulate the health system or make decisions for your doctors but to do exactly what our little board was going to do, which was to evaluate claims by people that there ought to be new benefits added to health care packages and funded. And somebody needed to evaluate it in a nonpolitical, professional atmosphere to see how much these things were costing.

Now, how are you supposed to be active citizens if that's the way the debate's going? So I'm going to write a funny little letter to President Ford and send a copy of his article and underline the board deal, you know. But the point is, he didn't know that, I mean, he just was given a speech. And he is a good man. But don't you see how this kind of debate obscures what really matters?

What matters? What matters is 39 million Americans don't have any health insurance. At any given time during the year, 58 million Americans don't have any health insurance. Now, keep in mind, there's 255 million people in this country. So you add up the statistics. Eighty-one million of us live in families with preexisting conditions: a child with diabetes, a fine mother who has had premature cancer, a father who had a heart attack at an early age, people who, under the present system can't ever change jobs because they can't get insurance or they'd have to pay more than they could ever afford. Three-quarters of us who have insurance in the workplace have lifetime limits, which means if we should happen to have a baby with a terrible health problem that doesn't take the child's life away, we could run out of insurance before the child is old enough to get out of the house, at the very time we need it.

Now, those are the real problems. And I say to you, you should demand, not as Democrats but as Americans, that we face this problem this year, not with smoke and hot air and rhetoric but sitting down across the table as compassionate Americans and resolving it this year, not later.

Let me mention one last issue. Before I came here today, I was honored to go with Mrs. Ethel Kennedy, who is here with us, out to that wonderful site where Robert Kennedy spoke here in Indianapolis the night Martin Luther King was killed, to break

ground for a memorial which will be made to both those men and what they have meant to our country and to the lives of so many of us. And we know that at least some of what will be used in the sculpture will be metal that comes from weapons which were turned in in the weapons buy-back program here and melted down.

The thing I liked about that more than anything else was that this was something that I could go and celebrate as President but that I didn't have a thing in the world to do with. The citizens of this community, your basketball team, your prosecutor, your local officials, church leaders, they're going to make this work, and in the process, they will change the attitudes and the behavior of people all across this community, without regard to race or income or political party. They are going to give, around this project, thousands of people around here the chance to be Americans in the best sense again.

Now, we're going to pass this crime bill. There will be 100,000 police in it. And if they're deployed properly, they'll make a real difference on your streets. They can drive the crime rate down. And we are going to have some tougher punishment in the bill. And we're going to have a lot of prevention money to give these kids something to say yes to before they get in trouble, as well as just telling them to say no. And we're going to have this ban on the 19 assault weapons.

But let me ask you, what is it you wish to discuss about this, and what are your responsibilities? Yesterday in Greenbelt, Maryland, right outside of Washington, there was a 13-year-old boy from a poor family, standing, minding his own business, just won a scholarship to one of the most distinguished private schools in Washington—standing there on the street minding his own business. These nine kids got in a fight, started shooting, and that boy's dead today.

There's a poor neighborhood in your Nation's Capital that got sick and tired of this kind of stuff, so they just built a fence around their neighborhood and hired guards just like they were rich people in private developments. And they had the same results. Now, old folks are sitting on park benches talking, and the kids are playing, because they've constructed a wall between themselves and the rest of America.

When this assault weapons ban was voted on, it should not have been as difficult as it was. It shouldn't have been as painful as it was. But a lot of good, honest people in Indiana and in other places were told that it was a threat to their right to keep and bear arms. And I understand that. I grew up in a State where more than half the folks have a hunting or a fishing license or both. And most of us grew up shooting 22's and 410's long before we were old enough to drive a car. I understand that. But very few of those Americans were told that that bill contained explicit, I mean written protection for more than 650 sporting weapons even as we were trying to make our streets safe for the police and the people in the face of the awful, bloody assaults we see on our children every day. Why? Because of the rhetoric.

And I say to you, I will do my best as your President to fight these things. I will do my best to work with the Congress. I'll do my best to stick up for the Democrats when we're leading the way but to also give the Republicans credit when they help, just like I have today. But you have got to change the dimensions of the debate in every community in this country. And you have got to take some personal responsibility for how this happens.

The President and the Congress cannot save all those 13-year-old kids that are standing in front of bus stops today. But you can and your police officers can and your churches can. And maybe the best we can do in the short run is to put those walls up. I say hallelujah to those poor folks. Why should you have to be rich to have a wall behind which your children and your grandparents are safe? That's fine. But consider the irony of that.

In a few months, I will go to Europe to celebrate D-Day, the victory of freedom. I will go to Germany to celebrate our victory in the cold war. Do you remember what President Kennedy said when he gave that wonderful *Ich Bin Ein Berliner* speech? At the Berlin Wall he said this: He said, "Freedom has many difficulties, and our democracy is far from perfect, but we never had to put up a wall to keep our people in." No,

we never did. But now millions of us have to put up walls to keep our people out. Is that what Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy gave their lives for? I don't think so.

And I tell you, it doesn't matter who the President is; it doesn't matter how hard the Congress labors. Unless we can change the dimensions of our conversation away from all this division, destruction, the shouting, this uncivil, this often outright dishonest talk, to a calm and more hospitable and more open and more respectful tone and unless people at the grassroots level take personal responsibility for all these kids whose lives are at risk, then the political system cannot produce the results you want.

Of those little words: opportunity, responsibility, and community, I believe with all my heart, by far the most important is community. We're still around after two centuries, folks, yes, because we had good leaders, but most of all because we had good people with good hearts and good values and good minds. And more than half the time they did what was right. It is now required of all of us that we do what is right.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:35 p.m. in the Sagamore Ballroom at the Indianapolis Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to fundraiser Sally Kirkpatrick and Michael M. Harmless, mayor of Greencastle, IN.

Remarks at the National Police Officers Memorial Service

May 15, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you so much, Dewey Stokes, not only for that very fine introduction but for the 13 years that the Fraternal Order of the Police has sponsored this National Police Officers Memorial Service and for your many terms as leader of this distinguished organization. Thank you, Karen Lippe, for your service. It's an honor for me to be here with so many of our distinguished Federal law enforcement officials, including Chief Gary Albrecht, the chief of the Capitol Police; John Magaw, the Director of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Bureau, formerly the Director of the United States Secret Service and once a member of the FOP as a trooper in Ohio, a person who's given his entire life to law enforcement. I'd like to say a special word of thanks, too, to our Attorney General for bringing to the National Government a real understanding of what it's like to be involved in the world of law enforcement at the grassroots level, where the crimes are committed, where the violence is greatest against our law enforcement officials, where so much of our work needs to be done.

My fellow Americans, you know better than anyone else for every name that is added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, there's a face, a family, and a human tragedy. Three months ago in Columbus, Ohio, I met the widow and the precinct sergeant of police officer Chris Klites, who was shot to death on duty after he stopped a suspicious car. He had married just a month before he was killed. This morning I met the families of police officer Stephen Faulkner of Kansas City, and I had met Mrs. Faulkner earlier at a health care forum. I saw her two fine sons today. And Deputy Sheriff Norman Tony Silva of Denver, I met his wife and his wonderful young son today. Raymond Silva wrote me a letter at age 7, which I still have and which I reread this morning before I came over here. He said in his letter, "My Dad was 30 years old when he got shot. He used to play games with us and make us laugh. His badge number was H7048. I wish you could know him; he was the best Dad ever."

We owe a lot to that young boy. We owe a lot to every spouse, every child, every grandchild, every parent, every uncle, every aunt, every brother, every sister, every friend of all those whom we come here to honor today. We pay tribute not only to those who have died but to those who have lost them, to the survivors. And we pay tribute to the more than half million law enforcement officers who still go to work every day, not knowing for sure if that day they will be required to make the ultimate sacrifice.

I hope all of you today who come here with your personal grief bear also a continuing pride in the work that your loved ones did. I hope those of you who come to honor others will not flinch in your pride and will

continue to pray for the safety of those who serve.

Today, I would say that, more than anything else, we ought to rededicate ourselves to becoming a country worthy of the heroes we come here to honor. Every day, law enforcement officers take the oath to uphold the law and defend citizens. Fear is a constant companion. Still, law enforcement officers go out every day wearing the badge and the uniform that symbolize that commitment. These are—these commitments, in a way acts of faith that most Americans, most of the time are going to do what is right and deserve to be protected, deserve to be honored, deserve to have the risks of life as we all work together to be the country we ought to be.

That is why I say today as citizens, we are the ones who should be taking a solemn oath to the law enforcement community that this next year we will all work harder to be the country we ought to be. Because if we don't restore the fabric of civilized life in this country, then it is ultimately futile for us and unfair for you to ask you to go out on the streets and risk your lives. We must determine that we are going to become a less violent, less dangerous, less crime-ridden, more hopeful, more unified society. We owe that to the people who we will honor today, to their families, and to the future of this country.

We are clearly moving in the right direction, but sometimes it takes us too long to do the right thing. I appreciate what Dewey said about the Brady bill. Those of you who understand how it works know it is already moving to save lives, but it should not have taken 7 years and a whole national election to get that done. We are moving in the right direction, but we must move more quickly.

Under the leadership of the Attorney General, the Justice Department has already granted funds to 250 American communities of all sizes to increase their police staff. Much of what we still need to do is in the crime bill now before the Congress to which Dewey Stokes referred. If we pass it, as we should, it will put another 100,000 police officers on the street in community policing settings, not only working to catch criminals but to work with each other to make policing safer and to reduce crime before it occurs.

This bill will take assault weapons off the street, 19 different ones, making sure that police officers will not be outgunned by criminals armed with weapons of mass destruction. It should not have taken this crime bill 5 years to get to this point, but it has and now we are moving. Against enormous odds, 216 courageous Members of the House of Representatives stood up and were counted in favor of the assault weapons ban. I hope all of you in law enforcement will go home to the districts of those 216 Representatives, without regard to their political party, and stand up for them because they stood up for you.

Many of them put their political lives on the line in the hopes that it would help you never to have to put your life on the line. That is the sort of attitude we need among the American people today. This bill has tougher penalties, including the ''Three strikes and you're out'' provision. We recognize that there should be capital punishment for people who kill law enforcement officials in the line of duty. And we recognize, too, something that Congress will be called upon to grapple with as we finish this crime bill, and that is that we must invest in prevention and use law enforcement officials in the work of prevention.

Law enforcement officials tend to be much more supportive than many politicians in the work of keeping young people away from crime in the first place, because people in law enforcement know how some tender, smart, intelligent act to a young child may head off a whole life of crime and another tragedy 1 or 2 or 5 or 10 or even 15 years down the road. And I thank the law enforcement community for their leadership to keep prevention a part of our efforts to make America a safer place.

I also want to thank all of you who personally give your time to that. I'll never forget the first time my daughter came home from school and talked to me about her D.A.R.E. officer in her fifth grade class. And I'll never forget in that year how I learned more about that man and his work and his family than I did about anything else going on in the school. Do not ever think that you don't have a big impact on the young people of this country when they see you in the uniform,

standing up for what's right and showing that you care for them. There are so many kids in this country in so much trouble. They need you, and you can make a difference.

The job of law enforcement is so dangerous today not only because criminals are better armed but because our society is too often coming apart when it ought to be coming together, because too many of you deal with the wreckage coming from the breakdown of family and work and community. And I think you know that we all have to do something about that.

Just yesterday I saw the tragic story of the young 13-year-old boy here in a community near Washington, DC, who came from a poor family and had just won a scholarship to a fine school to give him a chance to live a better life. And he was standing, waiting for a bus when he got caught in the crossfire between two gangs, senselessly killed, his whole life taken away just when so much hope was opened up.

There is something profoundly wrong when so many children are out there killing other children with no thought, apparently no understanding, of the consequences. And I tell you, my fellow Americans, it is still true that the vast majority of us are law-abiding, God-fearing, family-loving, hard-working people. But too many of us are falling between the cracks of life.

And so I say again, today we must dedicate ourselves, all of us, to making America worthy of the sacrifice of the law enforcement officials who have fallen and those who still risk their lives every day. I ask today that we say a prayer on this beautiful Sunday for the law enforcement officers and their families who paid the ultimate sacrifice, for our fellow citizens who have been victims of crime and violence, and for those who live halfway in prison, behind locked doors and barred windows, and a prayer, ultimately, that somehow we can change the heart and mind of America. We must change our country so that more of us live up to its best hopes and its ideals.

I am encouraged that we are moving in the right direction. The Brady bill, the grants to communities for police, the crime bill: this means America is awakening to this problem. But in the end, it is you, the people who live in our streets, in our neighborhoods, who work in our communities, who go to our churches on Sunday, who must help to teach America to keep faith with justice, with our fellow citizens, and with our country's proud heritage. The whole future of America is riding on it. We have turned the tide, now we must continue until the work is done.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:22 a.m. on Capitol Hill. In his remarks, he referred to Dewey Stokes, national president, Fraternal Order of Police, and Karen Lippe, president, Fraternal Order of Police Auxiliary.

Executive Order 12915—Federal Implementation of the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation

May 13, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, Public Law 103–182; 107 Stat. 2057 (''NAFTA Implementation Act''), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Policy*. (a) The North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (''Environmental Cooperation Agreement'') shall be implemented consistent with United States policy for the protection of human, animal or plant life or health, and the environment. The Environmental Cooperation Agreement shall also be implemented to advance sustainable development, pollution prevention, environmental justice, ecosystem protection, and biodiversity preservation and in a manner that promotes transparency and public participation in accordance with the North American Free Trade Agreement (''NAFTA'') and the Environmental Cooperation Agreement.

(b) Effective implementation of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement is essential to the realization of the environmental objectives of NAFTA and the NAFTA Implementation Act and promotes cooperation on trade and environmental issues between the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Sec. 2. *Implementation of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement.* (a) *Policy Priorities.* In accordance with Article 10(2) of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement, it is the policy of the United States to promote consideration of, with a view towards developing recommendations and reaching agreement on, the following priorities within the Council of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (''Council''):

(1) pursuant to Article 10(2)(m), the environmental impact of goods throughout their life cycles, including the environmental effects of processes and production methods and the internalization of environmental costs associated with products from raw material to disposal;

(2) pursuant to Articles 10(2)(b), (g), (i), (j), and (k), pollution prevention techniques and strategies, transboundary and border environmental issues, the conservation and protection of wild flora and fauna (including endangered species), their habitats and specially protected natural areas, and environmental emergency preparedness and response activities;

(3) pursuant to Articles 10(3) and 10(4), implementation of Environmental Cooperation Agreement provisions and the exchange of information among the United States, Canada, and Mexico concerning the development, continuing improvement, and effective enforcement of, and compliance with, environmental laws, policies, incentives, regulations, and other applicable standards;

(4) pursuant to Article 10(5)(a), public access to environmental information held by public authorities of each party to the Environmental Cooperation Agreement, including information on hazardous materials and activities in its communities, and the opportunity to participate in decision-making processes related to such public access;

(5) pursuant to Article 10(2)(1), environmental matters as they relate to sustainable development; and

(6) other priorities as appropriate or necessary.

(b) *United States Representation on the Council.* The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (''EPA'') shall be the representative of the United States on the Council. The policies and positions of the United States in the Council shall be coordinated through applicable interagency procedures.

(c) *Environmental Effects of the NAFTA.* Pursuant to Article 10(6)(d) of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement, the Administrator of the EPA shall work actively within the Council to consider on an ongoing basis the environmental effects of the NAFTA and review progress toward the objectives of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement.

(d) *Transparency and Public Participation.* The United States, as appropriate, shall endeavor to ensure the transparency and openness of, and opportunities for the public to participate in, activities under the Environmental Cooperation Agreement.

(1) To the greatest extent practicable, pursuant to Articles 15(1) and 15(2), where the Secretariat of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (''Secretariat'') informs the Council that a factual record is warranted, the United States shall support the preparation of such factual record.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable, the United States shall support public disclosure of all nonconfidential and nonproprietary elements of reports, factual records, decisions, recommendations, and other information gathered or prepared by the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (''Commission''). Where requested information is not made available, the United States shall endeavor to have the Commission state in writing to the public its reasons for denial of the request.

(3) The United States shall provide public notice of the opportunity to apply for inclusion on a roster of qualified individuals available to serve on arbitral panels under the Environmental Cooperation Agreement.

(4) The United States shall seek to ensure that the Model Rules of Procedure for dispute settlement established pursuant to Articles 28(1) and 28(2) of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement provide for the preparation of public versions of written submissions and arbitral reports not otherwise made publicly available, and for public access to arbitral hearings.

(5) Consistent with the Environmental Cooperation Agreement, the EPA Administrator shall develop procedures to inform the

public of arbitral proceedings and Commission activities under the Environmental Cooperation Agreement, and to provide appropriate mechanisms for receiving public comment with respect to such arbitral proceedings and Commission activities involving the United States.

(6) As a disputing party, the United States shall seek to ensure, pursuant to Article 30 of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement, that the arbitral panels consult with appropriate experts for information and technical advice.

(e) *Consultation with States.* (1) Pursuant to Article 18 of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement, the EPA Administrator shall establish a governmental committee to furnish advice regarding implementation and further elaboration of the Agreement. Through this committee, or through other means as appropriate, the EPA Administrator and other relevant Federal agencies shall:

(A) inform the States on a continuing basis of matters under the Environmental Cooperation Agreement that directly relate to, or will potentially have a direct impact on, the States, including: (i) dispute settlement proceedings and other matters involving enforcement by the States of environmental laws; and (ii) implementation of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement, including Council, committee, and working group activities, in any area in which the States exercise concurrent or exclusive legislative, regulatory, or enforcement authority;

(B) provide the States with an opportunity to submit information and advice with respect to the matters identified in section 2(e)(1)(A) of this order; and

(C) involve the States to the greatest extent practicable at each stage of the development of United States positions regarding matters identified in section 2(e)(1)(A) of this order that will be addressed by the Council, committees, subcommittees, or working groups established under the Environmental Cooperation Agreement, or through dispute settlement processes prescribed under the Environmental Cooperation Agreement (including involvement through the inclusion of appropriate representatives of the States).

(2) When formulating positions regarding matters identified in section 2(e)(1)(A) of this order, the United States shall take into account the information and advice received from States.

(3) The United States, where appropriate, shall include representatives of interested States as Members of the United States delegations to the Council and other Commission bodies, including arbitral panels.

Sec. 3. *National Advisory Committee.* The EPA Administrator shall utilize a National Advisory Committee as provided under Article 17 of the Environmental Cooperation Agreement.

Sec. 4. *United States Contributions to the Commission for Environmental Cooperation.* In accordance with section 532(a)(2) of the NAFTA Implementation Act, the EPA is designated as the agency authorized to make the contributions of the United States from funds available for such contributions to the annual budget of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation.

Sec. 5. *Judicial Review.* This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and is not intended to, and does not, create any right to administrative or judicial review, or any other right or benefit or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 13, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:35 p.m., May 16, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 16, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on May 18.

Executive Order 12916—Implementation of the Border Environment Cooperation Commission and the North American Development Bank

May 13, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, Public Law 103–182; 107 Stat. 2057 (''NAFTA Implementation Act''), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States Concerning the Establishment of a Border Environment Cooperation Commission and a North American Development Bank (''Agreement'') shall be implemented consistent with United States policy for the protection of human, animal or plant life or health, and the environment. The Agreement shall also be implemented to advance sustainable development, pollution prevention, environmental justice, ecosystem protection, and biodiversity preservation and in a manner that promotes transparency and public participation in accordance with the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Agreement.

Sec. 2. (a) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico (''Commissioner''), shall represent the United States as Members of the Board of Directors of the Border Environment Cooperation Commission in accordance with the Agreement.

(b) The policies and positions of the United States in the Border Environment Cooperation Commission shall be coordinated through applicable interagency procedures, which shall include participation by the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of the Interior, the Agency for International Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, and, as appropriate, other Federal agencies.

(c) The Commissioner shall promote cooperation, as appropriate, between the International Boundary and Water Commission and the Border Environment Cooperation Commission in planning, developing, carrying out border sanitation, and other environmental activities.

Sec. 3. (a) The United States Government representatives to the Board of the North American Development Bank shall be the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) For purposes of loans or guarantees for projects certified by the Border Environment Cooperation Commission, the representatives shall be instructed in accordance with the procedures of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies (''Council'') as established by Executive Order No. 11269. For purposes of this section only, the membership of the Council shall be expanded to include the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(c) For purposes of loans or guarantees for projects certified by the Border Environment Cooperation Commission, the representatives shall consult with the Community Adjustment and Investment Program Advisory Committee (''Advisory Committee''), established pursuant to section 543(b) of the NAFTA Implementation Act concerning community adjustment and investment aspects of such loans or guarantees.

(d) For purposes of loans, guarantees, or grants endorsed by the United States for community adjustment and investment, the representatives shall be instructed by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with procedures established by the Community Adjustment and Investment Program Finance Committee established pursuant to section 7 of this order.

Sec. 4. The functions vested in the President by section 543(a)(1) of the NAFTA Implementation Act are delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 5. The functions vested in the President by section 543(a) (2) and (3) of the NAFTA Implementation Act are delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall exercise such functions in accordance with the recommendations of the Community Adjustment and Investment Program Finance Committee established pursuant to section 7 of this order.

Sec. 6. The functions vested in the President by section 543(a)(5) and section 543(d) of the NAFTA Implementation Act are delegated to the Community Adjustment and Investment Program Finance Committee established pursuant to section 7 of this order, which shall exercise such functions in consultation with the Advisory Committee.

Sec. 7. (a) There is hereby established a Community Adjustment and Investment Program Finance Committee (''Finance Committee'').

(b) The Finance Committee shall be composed of representatives from the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Small Business Administration, and any other Federal agencies selected by the Chair of the Finance Committee to assist in carrying out the community adjustment and investment program pursuant to section 543(a)(3) of the NAFTA Implementation Act.

(c) The Department of the Treasury representative shall serve as Chair of the Finance Committee. The Chair shall be responsible for presiding over the meetings of the Finance Committee, ensuring that the views of all other Members are taken into account, coordinating with other appropriate United States Government agencies in carrying out the community adjustment and investment program, and requesting meetings of the Advisory Committee pursuant to section 543(b)(4)(C) of the NAFTA Implementation Act.

Sec. 8. Any advice or conclusions of reviews provided to the President by the Advisory Committee pursuant to section 543(b)(3) of the NAFTA Implementation Act shall be provided through the Finance Committee.

Sec. 9. Any summaries of public comments or conclusions of investigations and audits provided to the President by the ombudsman pursuant to section 543(c)(1) of the NAFTA Implementation Act shall be provided through the Finance Committee.

Sec. 10. The authority of the President under section 6 of Public Law 102–532; 7 U.S.C. 5404, to establish an advisory board to be known as the Good Neighbor Environmental Board is delegated to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Sec. 11. This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and is not intended to, and does not, create any right to administrative or judicial review, or any other right or benefit or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 13, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:53 p.m., May 16, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 16, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on May 18.

Message to the Congress on Iran

May 14, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report on November 10, 1993, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979, and matters relating to Executive Order No. 12613 of October 29, 1987. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c). This report covers events through March 31, 1994. My last report, dated November 10, 1993, covered events through September 30, 1993.

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

2. The Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) of the Department of the Treasury continues to process applications for import licenses under the Iranian Transactions Regulations. However, a substantial majority of such applications are determined to be ineligible for licensing and, consequently, are denied.

During the reporting period, the U.S. Customs Service has continued to effect numerous seizures of Iranian-origin merchandise, primarily carpets, for violation of the import prohibitions of the Iranian Transactions Regulations. The FAC and Customs Service investigations of these violations have resulted in forfeiture actions and the imposition of civil monetary penalties. Additional forfeiture and civil penalty actions are under review.

3. The Iran-United States Claims Tribunal (the "Tribunal"), established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims before it. Since my last report, the Tribunal has rendered 4 awards, bringing the total number to 551. Of this total, 371 have been awards in favor of American claimants. Two hundred twenty-three of these were awards on agreed terms, authorizing and approving payment of settlements negotiated by the parties, and 148 were decisions adjudicated on the merits. The Tribunal has issued 37 decisions dismissing claims on the merits and 84 decisions dismissing claims for jurisdictional reasons. Of the 59 remaining awards, 3 approved the withdrawal of cases and 56 were in favor of Iranian claimants. As of March 31, 1994, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported the value of awards to successful American claimants from the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank stood at $2,344,330,685.87.

The Security Account has fallen below the required balance of $500 million almost 50 times. Until October 1992, Iran periodically replenished the account, as required by the Algiers Accords. This was accomplished, first, by transfers from the separate account held by the NV Settlement Bank in which interest on the Security Account is deposited. The aggregate amount transferred from the Interest Account to the Security Account was $874,472,986.47. Iran then replenished the account with the proceeds from the sale of Iranian-origin oil imported into the United States, pursuant to transactions licensed on a case-by-case basis by FAC. Iran has not, however, replenished the account since the last oil sale deposit on October 8, 1992, although the balance fell below $500 million on November 5, 1992. As of March 31, 1994, the total amount in the Security Account was $212,049,484.05 and the total amount in the Interest Account was $15,548,176.62.

The United States continues to pursue Case A/28, filed last year, to require Iran to meet its financial obligations under the Algiers Accords.

4. The Department of State continues to present other United States Government claims against Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies, and to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran. In November 1993, the United States filed its Consolidated Final Response in A/15 (IV) and A/24, a claim brought by Iran for the alleged failure of the United States to terminate all litigation against Iran as required by the Algiers Accord. In December, the United States also filed its Statement of Defense in A/27, a claim brought by Iran for the alleged failure of the United States to enforce a Tribunal award in Iran's favor against a U.S. national. Because of this alleged failure, Iran requested that the United States Government be required to pay Iran for all the outstanding awards against U.S. nationals in favor of Iran.

5. As reported in November 1992, José Marìa Ruda, President of the Tribunal, tendered his resignation on October 2, 1992. On December 4, 1993, Professor Krysztof Skubiszewski was appointed Chairman of Chamber Two of the Tribunal, filling the vacancy left by Judge Ruda's departure. On February 16, 1994, Professor Skubiszewski also was appointed the President of the Tribunal. Before joining the Tribunal Professor Skubiszewski served as Minister of Foreign Affairs in Poland from 1989 to 1993. He joined the "Solidarity" movement there in

1980, and served on several councils before becoming Minister of Foreign Affairs. In addition to his political experience, Professor Skubiszewski has had a long and distinguished academic career in the field of international law. He is currently on leave from the Institute of Law, Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw, and has lectured at universities throughout Europe. He is also the author of a number of international law publications. In announcing the appointment, the Tribunal's Appointing Authority, Charles M.J.A. Moons, emphasized Professor Skubiszewski's "extensive experience in the management of state affairs and the conduct of international relations," in addition to his "scholarly renown."

6. As anticipated by the May 13, 1990, agreement settling the claims of U.S. nationals for less than $250,000.00, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (FCSC) has continued its review of 3,112 claims. As of March 31, 1994, the FCSC has issued decisions in 2,538 claims, for total awards of more than $40 million. The FCSC expects to complete its adjudication of the remaining claims this year.

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

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 14, 1994.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 16.

Remarks on the Nomination of Stephen G. Breyer To Be a Supreme Court Associate Justice and an Exchange With Reporters

May 16, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. The distinguished Members of the Congress, Attorney General and other members of the Cabinet, the family and friends of Judge Breyer, ladies and gentlemen, tomorrow is the 40th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education,* one of the greatest and most important decisions ever rendered by a court of law. We celebrate the *Brown* decision, and as we do, we are reminded of the central and powerful role the United States Supreme Court plays in our national life and in our society, addressing profound questions of law and justice, of liberty and equality.

Today we pay tribute to one Justice who has served the Nation magnificently and we announce the nomination of another who we hope and expect will also grace the Court with greatness. We celebrate the service of Justice Harry Blackmun, a distinguished member of the Court to which we entrust our legal and constitutional rights. He discharged that trust with fortitude, vision, fairness, and enormous courage and passion. After a long season of service, at the start of a new season of fulfillment for him and his family, I offer Justice Blackmun our deepest appreciation for his devotion to duty and to the Supreme Court.

Today we also celebrate the nomination of a jurist who I deeply believe will also take his place as one of our Nation's outstanding Justices. I ask the Senate to consider and to promptly confirm the nomination of Judge Stephen Breyer as the 108th Justice of the Supreme Court.

The case for Judge Breyer's confirmation is clear and compelling: his sheer excellence, his broad understanding of the law, his deep respect for the role of the courts in our life and in protecting our individual rights, and his gift as a consensus builder. In addition to his extraordinary intellectual talents, Judge Breyer will bring to the Court an abiding sense of decency and an unswerving dedication to ensuring liberty and justice for all.

Judge Breyer has devoted his entire life to public service, as a law clerk to Justice Arthur Goldberg, as a young lawyer at the Justice Department, as a teacher opening young minds to the promise and discipline of the law, as a member of the Watergate Special Prosecutors office, as chief counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and for 14 years, as an exceptional judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

He has served in all three branches of Government with the heart and head of a reformer, always succeeding at what he has tried to do. His career shows that he understands how Government works and how laws are really made, knowledge that is indispensable for much of the litigation which comes before the Supreme Court. As chief counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee, he won the admiration of Senators of both parties for his fairness and commitment to justice and for his principled advocacy of economic reform.

He also served as a key member of the United States Sentencing Commission. Before the Commission was created, there was law but little order when criminal sentences were applied. His decisive behind-the-scenes work enabled the Commission to give us less disparate and more truthful sentences and a more principled system of justice for the victims and the perpetrators of crime.

In 14 years on the Court of Appeals, his influential decisions have protected the civil rights and individual rights of Americans, even at the cost of making powerful people uncomfortable. His insight and clarity have established him as an unquestioned leader of the judiciary. He has spoken loudly for fairness and justice.

What does it mean to the average man and woman who will read tomorrow or see tonight on the news that Stephen Breyer is a consensus builder? We would do well to recall, on this day especially, that the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* spoke strongly and clearly in one unanimous voice. That momentous decision was joined by Justices who hailed from all regions of our Nation, by Justices who had been appointed by Presidents of both parties, by Justices who thought they espoused very different philosophies.

Judge Breyer will bring to the Court a well-recognized and impressive ability to build bridges in pursuit of fairness and justice. In the generations ahead, the Supreme Court will face questions of overriding national importance, many of which we cannot today even imagine. That is why it is so important to appoint someone whom we can predict will be a Justice who seeks to ensure that the Court speaks in a clear voice, as unified a voice as it is possible to speak in furthering the goals of liberty and equality under the law.

We are honored that Judge Breyer could share this day with his family, his wife, Joanna—a clinical psychologist who relieves the pain of children undergoing cancer treatment—and his children, Chloe, Nell, and Michael. We welcome them to the White House as we acclaim Judge Breyer's supreme, superb qualifications for the Supreme Court.

Ladies and gentlemen, Judge Stephen Breyer.

[*At this point, Judge Breyer expressed his appreciation to the President and discussed the importance of the justice system in America.*]

Q. Mr. President, Judge Breyer talked about the selection process. We're wondering why——

The President. Well, first of all, the Constitution—let me give you a general answer—the Constitution requires the President to seek not only the consent but the advice of the United States Senate, and I did that. And when people made suggestions to me, I discussed it with the folks who work around here. And the more advice you seek, the more leaks you have in here. [*Laughter*] And I might say that at least—far more than half of those that I've read concerning this appointment have been downright wrong, absolutely wrong, factually wrong. But nonetheless, if you seek advice, you will have leaks. I decided that I would pay the price of the leaks, even the wrong ones, to follow the duty of the Constitution.

I think that when you do consult broadly and you think about it and you're personally involved in it, as I've tried to be, you tend

to make the right decision. I think everybody around here today thinks I made the right decision. I think that's all that really counts.

Q. If I could ask the Judge a question. There are many liberal Democrats who have been hoping someone would be named who would serve as a strong counterpoint to Justice Scalia. Do you envisage yourself as someone who can stand up to his more conservative principles and argue the merits of the sort of liberal case effectively and move that Court to a different direction?

Judge Breyer. If I'm confirmed, I envisage myself as a person who will do the best possible job I'm capable of as a Justice of the Supreme Court.

The President. I wish I could answer questions like that. His constitutional privilege is my burden. [*Laughter*]

Q. [*Inaudible*]

Judge Breyer. I believe at some time in the near future, there will be confirmation hearings at which I expect to have lots of questions and difficult ones, too, on matters of substance. And I think that I'll reserve questions and answers of substance for that time.

Q. Mr. President, Judge Breyer said over the weekend that he saw the role of Judge in the Court as making life better for ordinary citizens, something to which he alluded to here as well. What do you mean by that, sir? Do you have a goal or a special agenda that——

Judge Breyer. No, no. Well, what I think of in respect to that is if you think of law in general, there's the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, dozens of guarantees for people, laws and statutes, regulations, rules, common law. There's a whole mass of material that somehow, sometimes, in some way is supposed to fit together. And what is it supposed to do, seen as a whole? What it's supposed to do seen as a whole is allow all people, all people, to live together in a society where they have so many different views, so many different needs, but to live together in a way that is more harmonious, that is better so that they can work productively together. That's a very general statement, but that is a very general purpose, I think, of law.

The President. It's hard to be better than that.

Thank you. We're adjourned.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. I think we should let him speak for himself. I think we let him speak for himself. I don't think—if we do it right, there's not necessarily a dichotomy. We can't be free individually unless we're a responsible society. And I think he'll do very well on that.

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about the critics over the weekend who said you caved into pressure from Senator Hatch?

The President. That's just not right.

Q. ——said you're not willing to fight for someone you believe in, like Bruce Babbitt.

The President. That's just not right. I believe in this guy.

Q. Were you surprised by the Western Senators?

The President. No, we—[*inaudible*]—we could confirm all three of them. It was not an issue. I'll say again, that was not an issue. I realize these process things can—more than half the stories I read about this were wrong, and that's one of them.

Q. Which ones were wrong?

The President. ——we could have confirmed them all.

Q. What about the stories you saw on TV? [*Laughter*]

The President. They're always right. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:49 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks in a Video Conference Call on Health Care Reform

May 16, 1994

The President. Hello, Roger.

Deputy Secretary Roger Altman. Hello, Mr. President. Good afternoon.

The President. Good afternoon.

[*Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Roger Altman discussed the technological advancements that are being made in video conferencing. He then introduced Norman Gott, chairman and chief executive of PictureTel, a company that provides health care coverage to all its employees.*]

Norman Gott. Thank you, Roger.

Good afternoon, Mr. President.

The President. Good afternoon, Norman.

Mr. Gott. We welcome you up here on, hopefully, technology that will help to carry us into the 21st century.

The President. It's carrying me through the afternoon. I'm amazed by this. [*Laughter*] I'm trying to figure out how to get it.

[*At this point, Norman Gott expressed his support for the President's health care program.*]

The President. Well, I appreciate your support. You know, it is clear to me, having studied this problem for years and talked to literally hundreds of employers, that we're never going to get control of costs and have a fully efficient and effective system that is also compassionate and humane until we have guaranteed health insurance for everybody. We've got to cover everybody. And the simplest and most direct way is to do it through the workplace.

Now, as you know, all the bitter opposition we're getting here in Washington is coming from people who say it will cost jobs and it will hurt small business. But they overlook the fact that many small businesses provide health insurance today at very high rates because they don't have any market power. And under our plan, we'd have discounts for small businesses, and we'd give them market power. We would let them go into buyers co-ops so they would be able to have the same sort of muscle that larger companies do.

And over the long run, unless we do this, we're neither going to be a humane country, from a health care point of view, or as productive as we ought to be, and we're going to lose jobs. All these serious studies of the economy, such as the one done by the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office, say that we'll actually create more jobs and we'll help the small business sector over the long run as we put this universal coverage in.

So I can't tell you how much I appreciate this because the organized groups here in Washington are always complaining about this mandate as if it's the end of the world when, in fact, it's just private insurance for everybody. It keeps the Government out of it except to require people, employers and employees, to be responsible. And I really applaud what you said.

[*Norman Gott asked if there was anything businesses like PictureTel could do to help pass the health care program.*]

The President. Absolutely, there is. I think the most important thing you can do is to contact as many Members of Congress of both parties as possible, describe your business, make it clear that you're a business of the future, and make it clear that the American economy in the future depends upon providing health care for all of our citizens and that the way to do it is through the workplace.

I think that if the Members of Congress could just see over and over and over again all the responsible employers who want to do the right thing and who understand that it's good for business and will create jobs to solve the health care crisis, I think that will do more than anything else to give them the courage to overcome the intense, almost unbelievable pressure from the organized groups who are basically trying to protect the right of business to walk away from their employees and their own responsibility so that the rest of us will pick up the bill when those folks get sick.

I think that if we can just have enough real-life examples like yours that represent the future to the Members of Congress, so they can feel a higher confidence level in doing this, I believe we can get this done. And we can get it done this year. I think it's very, very important that we do this this year. This problem's been studied to death. There's no point in just taking more time. We ought to move, and move now.

Again, I would urge you to reach out to Members of both parties. Tell them, ''Don't play politics with this. Do what's right for America and do it this year.'' And tell them that you know it will be good for America's jobs. That, I think, is really critical, because you'll have a lot of credibility. And you might even set up one of these phone calls with congressional leaders. And you would certainly have a big impression on them.

Mr. Gott. We're going to leave that unit in there so that you can talk to a lot of leaders like this and not waste a lot of time.

The President. You'll save us a lot of travel time.

Mr. Gott. Yes, well, I want you guys to join the 21st century in technology on this information highway. And here's your best example.

The President. You are. This is—the Vice President's always telling me about virtual reality. I virtually feel like I'm there in the room with you today.

Mr. Gott. Well, we appreciate very much your taking the time to talk to us today about this because we think it's important, and I know you do, too. We'll do our part.

The President. Thank you. Thank you for your support for health care. Thank you for helping to take the American economy into the 21st century. I want to again urge all of you, just do what you can to personally contact the Members of Congress and, again, without regard to party. Say this is an American problem. We need an American solution. We need to do it in 1994, not later.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Gott. Terrific.

Deputy Secretary Altman. Mr. President, I'm bringing back 535 video conferencing-equipped PC's for every Member of Congress so Norman can plug into all of them just like this. [*Laughter*]

The President. Good for you. Thank you very much. Thanks. That is amazing.

NOTE: The teleconference began at 2:47 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Remarks on Goals 2000 Legislation

May 16, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you so much. Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Gore, Secretary Riley, Secretary Reich, Hillary, distinguished Members of Congress and educators, business and labor leaders, church leaders, community leaders, ladies and gentlemen, as I look out at this crowd, I see people in this audience with whom I was working on these problems more than a decade ago. I see people who have lectured me about what we had to do. [*Laughter*] Probably more than half of you have lectured me about what we had to do. I see my good friend Marian Wright Edelman over there. When Hillary was the board chair of the Children's Defense Fund, they said, ''Well, you can't have these national education goals unless all kids start school ready to learn.'' Well, this is part of it. Now, when we make sure they all have health care, we'll know they're ready to learn when they start.

There are people here who work with me in the Education Commission to the States and the Southern Regional Education Board and the Carnegie Council. There are people here who have written books that I have read and learned from, whose lives have been a real inspiration to me. I'm hesitant to mention any of them, but I see Marc Tucker and Ernest Boyer, and I read their books, and now I'm trying to sell them. [*Laughter*] I read Governor Kunin's book, too; it's really good. But if you will forgive me a personal indulgence, I'd like to recognize one man who has been through a particularly painful time in his own life whose work has graced American education everywhere, our friend Jim Comer from Connecticut. Please stand up and be recognized. Thank you, sir.

I see Mike Cohen and Gloria Cabe, who stayed up all night with us in Charlottesville when we were writing the national education goals. All of you here today—I can barely contain myself—here you are clapping for things that matter. Here we are, all of us, the Members of Congress without regard to party, celebrating something that will move America forward. This is why I ran for President, not to pull this country to the right or the left but to move it forward, to get people together, to cross the divide, to face the problems, to deal with the issues.

In the next decade, more than 7 million children will enter our Nation's schools. That's the largest number since my crowd started; I'm the oldest of the baby boomers. That means that we have a special responsibility to make sure that we have done everything we possibly can to guarantee real freedom and opportunity to our people through an education for all that will enable our people, without regard to their race, their income, their standing in life, or where they happen to live, a chance to compete and win,

to live up to their God-given capacities. That's what all these goals mean.

These goals were just a way that people could put into words what it would mean if we actually produced results which guaranteed us the kind of educated citizenry that will keep America strong, leading the world well into the 21st century.

We insist, with Goals 2000, that every student can learn. We insist that it's time to abolish the outdated distinction between academic learning and skill learning. We know now that most academics has practical application and that more and more practical problems require academic knowledge. And I hope to goodness we don't do anything else—we've finally erased that divide so that we can teach our young people to learn in the way that best suits their own capacities and the work they have to do.

This law tells us that we need a national mobilization for education reform but that it has to be carried out at the grassroots level. The President, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Labor, well, we can work together, but we have to put you in charge.

A lot of you have heard me say this for a decade because I've had the chance, I guess, to be in more schoolrooms than any person who ever was able to serve as President. But I am absolutely convinced that there is not a single, solitary problem in American education that has not been solved by somebody, somewhere. Now, that's the truth. And the longer you live with this and the longer you spend time with teachers and kids and parents and the more schools you visit, the more you know that is true.

What we have done as a nation is to resist learning from each other, to resist institutionalizing change, to resist, therefore, holding ourselves accountable for results as a nation. Many of us who were Governors had tried our darnedest to do that at the State level, and we found that, even in every State, people would repeatedly resist learning from each other, borrowing from each other, capturing each other's best ideas.

The Founding Fathers were as smart a group of people as we ever got together in this country. And the seminar they had on how to get things done, which produced our Constitution, was just about as good as any we've ever attended. And when they conceived of the States as laboratories of democracy, they intentionally thought of a scientific model in which people would learn from one another what works and then build on it.

What we try to do here with Goals 2000 is to say: Here are the goals. You figure out how to get there, you learn from each other. Come up with aggressive plans. We will help you fund them and go forward, but you are in charge. That is the sort of partnership the United States ought to be engaged in. The Federal Government can't tell you how to do it, but we can help you get it done.

We do establish these national education goals. We also established a skills standard board, and I want to thank the Congress for that. We do need to know what skills are required of our people and our workers in the competitive world in which we are living and the one toward which we are going. We do seek to create the information superhighway that the Vice President's always talking about to bring to bear technology in all of our classrooms. But behind all of this, there is a simple moral premise, and that is that the promise of educational opportunity and educational excellence is for everyone. And we are determined to fulfill that promise in this time.

Forty years ago tomorrow, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education.* We are still striving to fulfill the promise of *Brown.* You can read articles that are accurate, talking about how we have not fulfilled the promise. You can know that there is still inequality of opportunity. You can know that some places are more segregated than they used to be. But no one can doubt we are better off than we would be had that decision not been handed down.

What this Goals 2000 movement, with the school-to-work program, with the adult education program, with the retraining program, and the reemployment program, what it all seeks to do is to give America a system by which at the grassroots level we can fulfill the promise of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* for all our people, not a set of national rules and mandates but a national set of goals, of objectives, and a sparking of enormous grassroots reform effort all around this country,

which will lead in every community in this country, in every school in this country, and every learning environment to more responsibilities for principals and teachers, to the courage for people who think they need to, to try new experiences and new experiments, everything from charter schools to other forms of management that will give teachers in many cases the chance to teach other teachers and to engage in operating their own schools more, that will bring parents into these schools where they have been shut out.

But I will say again: In order to make this work, we have to both foster reform and foster a humble, willing, listening attitude that permits us to learn from one another. The Founding Fathers knew that was one of the great strengths of establishing State governments and making us what we are as a federation with National, State, and local governments.

We must remember this: Goals 2000 is a new way of doing business in America. It represents the direction our Government must take in many problems in the 21st century. But I know the reason it has a good chance to work is because of you and the thousands and thousands like you who have been out here working on these same issues that are finally codified in law for 10 or more years. I thank you for that. Please leave this place with the determination to make this law fulfill its promise.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:55 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Marian Wright Edelman, president and founder of the Children's Defense Fund; Marc Tucker, president, National Center on Education and the Economy; Ernest L. Boyer, president, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Education Secretary Madeleine Kunin; Mike Cohen, director of Goals 2000; and Gloria Cabe, former educational adviser to President Clinton when he was Governor of Arkansas. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Proclamation 6689—National Defense Transportation Day and National Transportation Week, 1994

May 16, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The United States has entered a new era in transportation. We are in the midst of a technology explosion, and our Nation's transportation infrastructure stands to benefit tremendously from these innovations. New industries are racing to meet the demands of reinventing American transportation, creating jobs and economic opportunities for companies and individuals alike.

A smoothly-functioning transportation system is a fundamental building block of a growing economy and a prosperous society. The ability to move people and materials safely and efficiently affects the price of goods in our markets, our ability to sell our products overseas, and the lives and livelihoods of all Americans. The decisions we make now in transportation will serve as the catalyst for improving both the safety and quality of life for our citizens for decades to come.

This new era requires a new way of thinking about transportation needs. The challenges we face in today's transportation arena involve making what we have already built work better. By reinforcing and modernizing the existing infrastructure, we can create jobs, spur even more technological development, and fuel long-term economic growth. Even in this time of limitation and deficit reduction, strategic investments and continued leadership can make technology work to meet the needs of our country's transportation system.

One important effort toward reaching that goal is the Technology Reinvestment Project, designed both to encourage research and to deploy "dual-use" technologies. Such innovations can be applied to both defense and civilian use, making possible, for example, the

application of materials from the Stealth bomber to build new bridge projects. This is the kind of ingenuity that has made America great and the kind of leadership that will enable American companies to find continued success in the international marketplace.

In December 1993, my Administration submitted a proposed National Highway System (NHS) to the Congress. The NHS identifies priorities for a high-quality interconnected system of highways that will serve major population centers, international border crossings, ports, airports, rail terminals, public transportation facilities, intermodal transportation facilities, and major travel destinations; meet national defense requirements; and serve interstate and interregional travel. The NHS will enhance economic growth, international competitiveness, and national security.

At the same time, the Department of Transportation has also announced the beginning of an effort to identify a National Transportation System (NTS) for the 1990s and beyond. Not just roads, but air and waterways, ports, pipelines, rail, and mass transit—all will be working together to form an integrated system with the common goal of moving people and goods as expediently and securely as possible.

For the first time in American history, and for generations to come, the NTS will force us to look at America's transportation system as a whole instead of as individual projects—to pinpoint our weaknesses and to correct them; to identify our strengths and to build upon them; to not just answer our questions, but to help us anticipate and answer questions that have not even yet been asked. With new tools in technology and by wisely using strategic planning and investment, we will bring America into the 21st century, well-prepared for the challenges ahead.

In order to honor the men and women who work so diligently to meet America's transportation needs, the Congress, by joint resolution approved May 16, 1957 (36 U.S.C. 160), has requested that the third Friday in May of each year be designated as ''National Defense Transportation Day'' and, by joint resolution approved May 14, 1962 (36 U.S.C. 166), that the week in which that Friday falls be proclaimed ''National Transportation Week.''

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Friday, May 20, 1994, as National Defense Transportation Day and the week of May 15 through May 21, 1994, as National Transportation Week. I urge all Americans to observe these occasions with appropriate ceremonies and activities and to give special recognition to those who build, operate, safeguard, and maintain our vast and complex system of transportation.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this sixteenth day of May, 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, 3:12 p.m., May 16, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on May 18.

Memorandum on Theater Missile Defense Cooperation

May 16, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94–24

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense

Subject: Theater Missile Defense Cooperation with the Allies

1. Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, Public Law 103–160, I hereby certify that the Director, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, has formally submitted to representatives of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Japan, Israel, and South Korea a proposal concerning coordination of the development and implementation of U.S. Theater Missile Defense (TMD) programs with TMD programs of our friends and allies.

2. You are authorized and directed to notify the Congress of this determination and to publish it in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on the Prevention of Nuclear Proliferation

May 16, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As required under section 601(a) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–242; 22 U.S.C. 3281(a)), I am transmitting a report on the activities of United States Government departments and agencies relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation. It covers activities between January 1, 1993, and December 31, 1993.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 16, 1994.

Remarks at the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund Dinner

May 16, 1994

Thank you, Elaine. Thank you, I think. It's pretty hard to follow Elaine Jones, especially when she's on a roll like she was tonight. [*Laughter*] And the rabbi, sounding more like a Baptist preacher every day. [*Laughter*] And Vernon, who speaks well when he's asleep. [*Laughter*] And Dan Rather with a sense of humor. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, I come here overwhelmingly to do one thing, to say on behalf of a grateful nation, thank you. Thank you to the Legal Defense Fund. Thank you to Thurgood Marshall, in the presence of his wonderful wife. Thank you to Bill Coleman. Thank you to Jack Greenberg. Thank you to Julius Chambers. Thank you, Elaine Jones. Thank you, all of you who have made it possible for us to come here today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of *Brown*. Thank you. I thank Bob Bennett and Chester Davenport and all those who made this dinner possible. But most of all, I just wanted to say thank you.

I was sitting out there looking at Elaine, listening to her say all these nice things, waiting, wondering how many days it would be before I would get my next lecture—[*laughter*]—and what new challenge would be presented.

Thurgood Marshall and this organization won 29 victories before the Supreme Court but none as important as *Brown*. It changed our country and our lives. In a clear voice it said that we could no longer be two nations, separate and unequal. We are one people, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That's what it said. And it said that about the schools. And I was thinking what a difference it had made. I was thinking tonight as Elaine gave me my report card on judges and told me to do a little better—[*laughter*]—that today, since I have been privileged to be your President, there is a new minority in the Nation: A minority of those who have been appointed to the Federal bench are white men. A majority are women and people of color. And yet, the appointees that I have sent to the Senate have the highest percentage of people rated well-qualified by the American Bar Association of any President since those nominations have been made. And I am proud of that. And *Brown* v. *Board of Education* helped to make that possible.

Oh, there's lots of other good things that happened because of *Brown*. I wonder if some of the people who are in my administration today could be there were it not for *Brown*. Thurgood Marshall and Bill Coleman and Jack Greenberg, they believe we're one nation indivisible under God, we're all going up or down together. What I wonder is whether the rest of us still believe that and, if so, whether we are prepared to endure the rigors of this time to make that real.

You know, I was raised in the South when I knew a lot of people who were second-class citizens. I lived in a State where it took the President of the United States calling out the National Guard simply to let my friend Ernest Green and eight other people go to high school. And thanks to the work of this organization, my daughter got to go to that school system and never know that, and I'm grateful.

I think it's important for us not to let young people today forget that. Tomorrow, Secretary Riley and Ernest Green and Thurgood Marshall, Jr., and I are going to Martin Luther King Junior High School in Beltsville, Maryland, to teach young people why *Brown* and its ideas are still important, why they still

matter. But we have to ask ourselves whether we think they still matter.

Recently in various speeches, my good friend Vernon Jordan and then, last weekend at Howard, General Colin Powell have reaffirmed the fundamental meaning of *Brown* in the face of blacks and whites alike who seem to be retreating from its lesson, either out of fear or resignation that it is no longer possible to make it real in our lives.

We see an alarming new study among African-Americans that warns of a pervasive sense of alienation, especially among the young, so that fully half of them want to opt out of the American system. They want to separate themselves. They believe that they're already a nation within a nation. That's why so many large crowds, I think, are drawn to the message of those who preach separatism in a negative way. There are too many extremists of all kinds across the entire political and racial spectrum who think the only way they can advocate their own ideas and build themselves up is by putting other people down, sometimes in the most devastatingly vicious ways.

I say to all of you, we have to ask ourselves: Do we still believe in *Brown*? And if we do, what are we prepared to do, not only to stand up for it but to make it real in our time?

Tomorrow we must celebrate *Brown* with the realization that a lot of folks have a mood that threatens to sever the ties that bind us. And we must confront a new segregationism that would tear us apart. To do it, we must recognize that *Brown* was ultimately not an answer but a challenge. And now 40 years later, you and the LDF must challenge me and our Government, and together we must challenge the Nation to revitalize the meaning of *Brown* in our time.

When the courts were hearing *Brown*, America was reading a book by Ralph Ellison, called "Invisible Man." He died just a month ago today. That book had an incredible impact on me. And still today when I see people denying each other's humanity, I remember the words of Ralph Ellison, and I think we are trying to make people who make us uncomfortable, who threaten us, who frighten us, invisible. But they will not go away. There are too many of us in this country today who simply don't accept one another's legitimacy.

Last March, the leading moral voice for tolerance and reconciliation in Northern Ireland came to our country. His name is John Hume. He's a Catholic member of the British Parliament who represents a city in Northern Ireland where Catholics and Protestants have waged fights and built walls of hatred for 300 years. The day after he had dinner with us at the White House, he gave a speech in which he said this: "The essence of the Irish problem is a division in the hearts and minds of our people . . . let us walk to Abraham Lincoln's Memorial and look at the message of peace that's written there for everybody, *E Pluribus Unum*—from many, one. The essence of unity is the acceptance of diversity."

To be sure, there can be no unity when people have not learned to accept one another as they are and when they think they can only fulfill themselves by denying others' humanity. But accepting diversity is only half the story. And that is our challenge today. Diversity is not an end in itself, although it is a very good thing; it is simply the only way we can build in a free society a larger community to which everyone belongs, in which everyone has a common stake in the future, and in which everyone can have a decent life.

Anyone who knows the history of this organization knows you don't have to have the same skin color to have the same values. But we also have to be able to frankly speak about our problems and our differences.

You know, I thought a lot about what I should say here tonight, and I got all kinds of advice. Like I normally do when I get in trouble, I discarded it all and decided to say what I thought. [*Laughter*] If you think about what's going on today—what motivated Vernon to say what he did in his Urban League speech and General Powell to say what he did, what motivates people to go hear Mr. Farrakhan in large crowds—what are all these cross currents? Why is it that we're having trouble living with *Brown* and living by *Brown*? Well, it's because *Brown* didn't solve all of our problems, and we've got some new problems. And in the face of those, there's more than one response, and it's really tough.

No one can doubt that we are much, much, much better off today because of *Brown* and all those other decisions that said we had to be one people. It changed us forever for the better. But no one can doubt that it couldn't solve all the problems. There's still racism. There's still inequality. There is more trouble with violence and the breakdown of family and community and the absence of work in parts of our country. The vacuum that has created has given rise to all kinds of terrible conditions.

We had, in a town near here, last weekend, a 13-year-old boy who just won a scholarship that could have led him out of poverty through an excellent education—the promise of *Brown*—shot dead on a street corner because he happened to be in the wrong place; two groups of people were feuding and shooting at each other.

We have here in this community a poor neighborhood where people decided that if they wanted their kids to be able to play in the yard and their old folks to be able to sit on park benches, they'd have to do what rich folks do. So they just built a little fence around their living quarters, and they got some security guards. And sure enough, they might as well have been out in some fancy neighborhood in southern California: The kids could play again and the old folks could sit again in safety.

But we have these problems. Now, what are we going to do about them? There seems to me four things we can do, and three of them are wrong. One is, we can come to a dinner like this and talk about how wonderful *Brown* was and preach until the day we die and not do anything to deal with the problems of this time. If so, we will lose a whole generation of young people to other courses of action.

Or we can do what I said—Elaine mentioned if you preach venom, you get a talk show; if you preach love, you get a yawn. Deborah Tannen, a professor at Georgetown, has written a book called "You Just Don't Understand." She says we're caught up in what she calls a "culture of critique," where shouting matches drown out constructive conversation and where you only really have any status at all in society if you're just slamming somebody else and putting them down and you don't really have to do anything as long as you just talk. So you can do that, you can say the wrong things and reject the spirit of *Brown* and do nothing but cash in, and that's wrong.

Or you can do what is disturbingly working: You can say the wrong things; you can preach division; you can deny the Holocaust ever occurred. But you can help people solve real problems. You can tell families they've got to stay together, and daddies they've got to take care of their kids, and people they ought to stay off drugs and everybody ought to show up for work every day. And that is a very dangerous thing, because in the end, we will still lose; because in the end, you cannot have a democracy where you lift up one group by putting somebody else down. But it is a tempting thing when people are doing things that change lives.

I say this to make this point. People desperately wish their lives to change. They want to do something that will make a difference. They want safer streets, not nice talk. They want schools that work, not nice talk. They want children to be raised by caring parents, not nice talk. So we have to recognize that the only acceptable thing to do is to do what Thurgood Marshall and Bill Coleman and Jack Greenberg did 40 years ago. We have to not only talk the talk, we have to walk the walk. We have to not only advocate *Brown*, we have to deal forthrightly and aggressively with the problems we face today in a way that actually changes people's lives. That is what we have to do.

There are a lot of people that don't think we can do this. There are a lot of people that are filled with doubt. I had Members of Congress walk right up there and vote for the Brady bill last year—after 7 years of fooling around with it and looking for excuses and caving in and finally passing it—who did not believe it would make a difference. But it has. It's just like *Brown*: It hasn't solved all the problems, but it has saved lives already. We had people put their political careers on the line here last week, walking down the aisle in the House of Representatives to vote for the assault weapons ban, putting their necks on the line, afraid it might not make a difference. But it will.

And I'm telling you, that is the kind of thing we have to deal with, knowing that there is no ultimate perfect answer but that we expect something that will not occur if we think we can simply advocate the ideas that are embodied in the *Brown* decision and not change our own behavior and the behavior of our country to give our kids a safe and decent and well-educated childhood to put things back together again. There is no alternative for us if we want to keep this country together and we want, 100 years from now, people to celebrate the 140th anniversary of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* in the greatest country the world has ever known, fully diverse, where everybody, all God's children, can live up to the fullest of their God-given potential.

And in order to do it, we all have to overcome a fair measure not only of fear but of resignation. There are so many of us today, and all of us in some ways at some times, who just don't believe we can tackle the big things and make a difference. But I tell you, the only thing for us to do to honor those whom we honor tonight is to tackle the big things and make a difference.

I'm proud that Elaine Jones and all the rest of you are trying to deal forthrightly with the problem of violence and the fear it produces and what it's doing to drive our people apart. I want you to think about what we can do to honor the sacrifices of those whose shoulders we stand on tonight. They did not do all this work to preside over the collapse of American society, to give people an equal opportunity to get an inferior education, to give people an equal opportunity to be unemployed, to give people an equal opportunity to stand on the street corner and be gunned down by some kid that nobody ever loved enough or disciplined enough or cared enough about to give a different way of living to.

We cannot stand chaos and destruction, but we must not embrace hatred and division. We have only one choice.

Let me read this to you in closing. It seems to me to capture the spirit of *Brown* and the spirit of America and what we have to do today, starting with what is in our heart. These are lines from Langston Hughes' wonderful poem "Let America Be America Again": "Oh yes, I say it plain, America never was America to me. And yet I swear this oath, America will be." Let that be our oath on this 40th anniversary celebration.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:15 p.m. in the International Ballroom at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to Elaine R. Jones, director counsel, LDEF; Rabbi David Saperstein, director, Religious Action Center, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Vernon Jordan, dinner chairman; Dan Rather, dinner host; Cecelia Marshall, widow of Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall; William T. Coleman, former Secretary of Transportation; Jack Greenberg, Columbia University law professor; Julius L. Chambers, chancellor of North Carolina Central University; Robert Bennett and Chester Davenport, dinner corporate cochairs; Ernest Green, one of the Little Rock Nine who integrated the public school system in Little Rock, AR; Thurgood Marshall, Jr., Deputy Counsel and Director of Legislative Affairs for the Vice President; and Minister Louis Farrakhan of the Nation of Islam.

Memorandum on Assistance to the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia

May 16, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94–25

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Drawdown of Commodities and Services to Assist the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia

Pursuant to section 548(e) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1994 (Titles I–V of Public Law 103–87) (the "Act"), I hereby:

direct that the provision of commodities and services to the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal will contribute to a just resolution of charges regarding genocide or other violations of international law in the former Yugoslavia; and

direct the drawdown of commodities and services of an aggregate value not to exceed $6 million from the inventory and resources of the Departments of State, Justice, and Defense, the Federal

Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, and other agencies of the U.S. Government under the authority of section 552(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and, as provided in section 548(e) of the Act, without regard to the ceiling limitation contained in paragraph (2) thereof. Amounts to be drawn down from each agency shall be decided by that agency and the Department of State.

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

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This item was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 17.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland of Norway

May 17, 1994

Interest Rates

Q. Mr. President, the Federal Reserve seems likely to increase interest rates today. How is that going to affect economic growth and your calculations for deficit reduction if you have to spend more to service a $4 trillion debt?

The President. Well, first of all, if it happens, it will be because we have growth. I mean, now let's get the fundamental facts out here. We have more jobs, lower inflation, and a lower deficit and expectations for high growth this year, good growth.

And so—I make it a practice generally not to comment on what the Fed does. There is clearly some room for short-term interest rates over the rate of inflation that won't slow down our economic growth. And I have every confidence that we're still going to have another good year this year and that we will be able to offset any modest increase in interest rates with increased growth. And so far—I talked to Mr. Panetta yesterday—we're well within our projections on deficit reduction.

Norway

Q. Mr. President, have you ruled out the possibility of sanctions against Norway because of whaling?

The President. We are working on this whaling issue. You know, the United States has taken a position opposed to commercial whaling, and we're working through this with Norway. The Vice President and I had a conversation about it this morning. We are working through the issue, and we feel comfortable about what we're doing. We think we're doing the right thing.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—environmental groups say you——

The President. Some environmental groups do. The most mainstream environmental groups have not joined these rather extreme claims that have been made against our country. Give us a chance to work through this. I think we'll come out in the right place.

Q. Madam Prime Minister, do you agree with the Commerce Department's opinion that your country's resumption of whaling goes against efforts to save the whale, so to speak?

Prime Minister Brundtland. No, I certainly don't. We would never have a policy which is not in accordance with international law. We would never have a policy which is not long-term sustainable development, not on this issue, not on any other.

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

Q. [*Inaudible*]—whaling, Mr. President?

The President. We are working—we'll work through that. I have confidence that we will be able to work through it.

Q. Mr. President, in that letter to Congress last October, you said that you're going to work with Norway to create an inspection regime for commercial whaling within scientific limits. Is that still the U.S. position?

The President. What were you going to say, Mr. Vice President?

The Vice President. I was going to say, we're opposed to commercial whaling. We have always been committed to good, sound science. And as the President said, we're working with Norway to work through this issue. We're opposed to commercial whaling. We hope that we'll also, incidentally, be able to establish a sanctuary in Antarctica. We hope Norway will support that. But we're just going to work through the issue.

Q. Are you going to visit Norway, Mr. President?

The President. I hope I'll be able to go back. I went to Norway once when I was a young man. I loved it. I'd love to be able to go back someday; one of the best trips I ever made in my life.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:07 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Question-and-Answer Session on *Brown* v. *Board of Education* in Beltsville, Maryland

May 17, 1994

The President. Good morning. Do you know why we're here? Why are we here, somebody?

Q. To talk about the *Brown* v. *Board of Education* decision and how it affects us today.

The President. That's right, we are. What was the ruling in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*? What did the Supreme Court say?

Q. That "separate but equal" was unjust and unconstitutional.

The President. And what were the facts in the case? What gave rise to the case? What was the case about?

Q. Unsegregating schools in the South.

The President. In the South and in Topeka, Kansas. It was about a little schoolgirl named Linda Brown whose parents thought she should not be sent to a segregated school. The United States Supreme Court made that decision in 1954, 40 years ago today. Before that, the Supreme Court had ruled that "separate but equal" was constitutional, right? And when the Supreme Court makes a ruling like that, it's the law of the land until they change their minds.

During the Civil War, President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves, in 1863 in the White House, on the same floor that I sleep every night, in what is now the Lincoln Bedroom—the room where your father spent the night last night, right? Secretary Riley's 93-year-old father spent the night last night in the room where President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, freeing the slaves.

Secretary Riley. He said he heard Lincoln all night long. [*Laughter*]

The President. Then, after the Civil War was over, the 14th amendment to our Constitution was adopted, which declared that everybody had to be equal under the law. But there was still a lot of racial prejudice in the country and a lot of discrimination. And a few years after that, the Supreme Court decided a case called *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*. Have you studied that? And the problem with *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was that blacks and whites had to sit in a different place on the train, and the 14th amendment said that nobody could be discriminated against under the law. And by law, they were required to sit in a different place on the train. So what did the Supreme Court say in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*?

Yes?

Q. That trains or whatever were equal, and they could be separate.

The President. That's right. If the facilities were equal, they could be separate without violating the 14th amendment, right? So the *Brown* decision overruled that. Now, why did they overrule that? What was the argument? Why was "separate but equal"—what's the matter with that?

Go ahead.

Q. Well, people were still being——

The President. So they——

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. One argument was that even though they were supposed to be separate but equal, they weren't really. Right? Okay, what else? What else is wrong with "separate but equal"?

Q. That if they are separated, they wouldn't be equal.

The President. That's the heart of it. Because they were separated, right, they wouldn't be equal. That's very important. The argument was that if they were separated, the act of separating people by race under the law itself was a message of inequality.

Do you believe that? Do you believe that? Nearly everybody believes that now, right?

You look around this room today. This is America: people from all different racial and

ethnic groups. We have one county in America, maybe more than one but at least one, Los Angeles County, that now has people from 150 different racial and ethnic groups. And someday, if the population trends continue, the number of nonwhites in America will be greater than the number of whites, so that everybody will be ultimately protected by a requirement that no one can be discriminated against by the law based on their race.

But the essence of *Brown* was two things, and you guys got them. One is, well, they're not really always equal, these separate facilities. The other is, the act of separating people by their race under the law is itself an act of inequality.

Now, since then, we've had all kinds of problems and challenges with the aftermath of the *Brown* decision. You know, what do you do when people's living patterns are separate? That's how busing got into the whole issue of how to integrate the schools. And what do you do when people in one place are a lot poorer than people in another place? And how do you deal with the practical problem—there are all kinds of practical problems. Many of them have been solved more satisfactorily in places like in magnet schools, where people come as a matter of choice. And they come together and you try to get different kinds of people, both different races and different incomes.

So I wouldn't—by no means have all the problems that were dealt with in the *Brown* decision, the problems of racial inequality and income inequality and the history of discrimination, those problems have not all been overcome. And today we have some new problems, at least problems that are more severe. There's more violence. The families and communities are under greater stress. There are a lot of problems that you face that people our age 40 years ago didn't face. We know that.

But the number one lesson I want to leave with you is that this is a very much better country because of that *Brown* decision, and it is a very different country because of the *Brown* decision. And the three people who are here with me today each have a different insight on that.

But I want you to think about how different the country might have been. We're in the basketball playoffs now, so I'm thinking about this is the first one in a long time where Michael Jordan hasn't played. Michael Jordan played at the University of North Carolina: Would he have been able to play there, would he have even gone there if there had been no *Brown* decision? We're not sure.

So I want to introduce these three people, each in their own turn, and ask them to say something. First, I'd like to start with Thurgood Marshall, Jr. His father argued the *Brown* decision and many other decisions before the Supreme Court and became the first African-American Justice on the Supreme Court. He now works in the White House on the staff of Vice President Gore. And I'd like to introduce him and have him say a few words.

Mr. Marshall.

[*At this point, Mr. Marshall made brief remarks on the importance of the case and the responsibility of society and all individuals to advance the spirit of the case.*]

The President. I'm going to give you a chance to ask them questions, too. But I want all of them to talk first.

One of the big issues that was inevitably a part of the *Brown* decision was, okay, the Supreme Court says you can't have any "separate but equal" school districts anymore. They're unconstitutional. Well, it's one thing for a court to issue an order and another thing for millions of people to change their lives, right?

I mean, how are you going to integrate all these schools? And what happens to the teachers, and what happens to the principals? And how do the kids get to new schools? And do the white kids go to the black schools, or do the black kids go to the white schools? Do you have to build new schools? There are mind-bending details that had to be worked out, plus the fact that in many parts of the country, there were still millions of Americans who didn't agree with the decision who were determined to resist it at every turn.

So the Supreme Court's in the news this week because I just appointed Judge Breyer

from Boston to the Supreme Court. And he's a very distinguished judge. I think he'll do a wonderful job. And they'll have these hearings in a couple of months, and you'll be able to follow that. And I urge you to follow these hearings, see the questions they ask him and the answers he gives. Supreme Court's very important.

But the Supreme Court is nine people. They don't have any enforcement authority. So, then the lower courts have to somehow figure out how to enforce an order and approve plans and do things to try to figure out how was this *Brown* decision going to be implemented.

One of the States involved in the *Brown* decision in addition to Topeka, Kansas, was the State of South Carolina. Secretary Riley, the Secretary of Education, was the Governor of South Carolina before he became Secretary of Education. His father was the lawyer for one of the school districts involved in the desegregation effort in *Brown* 40 years ago. And he, as a Governor, made a national reputation for his commitment to improving the education of all the children of South Carolina, which is why I named him the Secretary of Education. So I'd like for him to talk a minute now about this *Brown* decision and what happened after it was decided and how it affected his life.

Secretary Riley.

[*Secretary Riley described growing up in a segregated environment, his experience in integrating the schools of South Carolina, and his regret for the lack of social interaction with African-Americans during his youth.*]

The President. After the *Brown* decision was decided, like I said, all people had to figure out, well, how are we going to integrate our school system, and how fast? So they went back to the Supreme Court, and there was a second *Brown* decision that said "with all deliberate speed." So, who knows what that means, right? For people who didn't want to integrate, they said "with all deliberate speed" might be 4 or 5 years. For people who did want to integrate, they said it would be 4 or 5 weeks.

So that was the issue there: How long could they take to integrate? And the court order in Greenville said, "'All deliberate speed' is 30 days. Do it." And they did it, because they had leaders like Secretary Riley and his family who believed it was the right thing to do and who made it work. I'll say a little more about that in a minute. But believing in your heart that something is the right thing to do makes a big difference in whether it gets done or not.

Now, after these things happened, there was still resistance to integration all across the South and in other parts of America, and there were still other questions that had to be resolved and other issues about how this would be done.

In my home State and Mr. Green's home State of Arkansas, in Little Rock, there was a case that went all the way to the Supreme Court involving the Little Rock school system, called *Cooper* v. *Arens*, which was also a very large decision in the history of the Supreme Court law affecting the schools.

In Little Rock, the then-Governor of our State called out the National Guard to stop the integration of the school, which had been ordered by the Supreme Court, devised by the local school board. And then the President of the United States, as you saw in the movie, took over the National Guard and used it to protect the right of Ernest Green and eight other people to attend Little Rock Central High School.

I want him to talk a little bit about his experience, how he felt, what he went through. You saw the movie, which was premiered, interestingly enough, in the auditorium at Little Rock Central High School, and he and I were there the night that it was premiered in the auditorium where he became the first black student to go and to graduate. He's done rather well. I want him to tell you a little bit about what he's doing with his life now so you'll understand the enormous consequence of this decision. But first, I think you need to understand a little more about what happened. So I'd like to ask Mr. Green to talk now.

Ernest Green.

[*Mr. Green described his experience in integrating Central High School in Little Rock and pointed out the clear connection between the* Brown *decision and the recent events in South Africa.*]

The President. I want to give you a chance to ask questions, if you have any questions of any of them or me. But let me just follow up on one thing Mr. Green said.

You heard Dick Riley say how much he regretted the fact that he grew up in a segregated society. A lot of us who were southerners, who grew up in the South, really knew better. We knew that segregation was wrong. And we knew that—those of us who were white knew that it was hurting us, that we were being deprived of the opportunity to know people, to share their feelings, to share their life experiences, to share their music, their culture, to deal with people who were just being cut off.

And the things which happened to integrate the country integrated the South, at least in the beginning, more than any other part of the country because it was the most segregated part and it was the part that had the highest percentage of African-American population. And I am convinced that those things, first the education decisions and then the voting rights decision, they did help to inspire and give energy to what ultimately happened in South Africa.

The United States contributed $35 million last year to helping to build democracy in South Africa, helping train people to vote, helping conduct, show people how to run the elections, helping to figure out how this could be done. But I also have to tell you that I think it is virtually inconceivable that I would have ever become President of the United States had it not been for the *Brown* decision because of the relationships—and the voting rights decision—and the relationships that subsequently I developed with the African-Americans in my State whose support helped to make me Governor and with people around the country who made me President. So there is a sense in which, in very tangible, real ways, these decisions freed a lot of Americans to be more than they otherwise would have been.

So, do you have any questions to any of them or me that you want to ask? Yes, in the back.

[*A student asked Mr. Green what kept him going in that very difficult situation. Mr. Green said that his main motivation was the goal of opening up opportunities in Little Rock, but that support from the other eight students involved and their families and churches was important.*]

Q. When you were in school, how did integrating your school affect you?

The President. My public schools were not integrated until 2 years after I left. That's the point I was trying to make with Ernest. The integration of the schools throughout the South basically took about 15 years after the *Brown* decision. So I'm a little bit younger than Ernie, not much.

And so our school—what happened was, a lot of these school districts sat around and waited for the Justice Department to come after them, the Federal Government to say, where is your plan, or for somebody to force the States to adopt a plan. And that's why I wanted to make the point that after *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, all of these schools didn't integrate overnight, and it took a significant number of years before it happened throughout the South and throughout the country.

Ernest Green. Mr. President, I think one of the things you want to point out about the Little Rock case is that Little Rock was much earlier than many of the other cases, and that the fact that the Federal Government finally used their power and might to underscore it may have helped, I like to think, fuel part of the modern civil rights movement.

As you know from the movie, we had 1,000 paratroopers that came to Little Rock to enforce the Court order. But this was the first time that school desegregation had been undergirded by Federal support in that manner.

The President. I also want to make another point that I think might have been passed over. Ernie mentioned this. Arkansas was actually a good candidate for a peaceful, successful integration of Little Rock Central High School. We were the first State in the South to integrate our law school. We had an integrated medical school. We had a newspaper in Little Rock, the Arkansas Gazette, which was, I think, one of the—by any standard—one of the finest papers in the country, which was strongly supportive of integration. We had a lot of leadership, white

leadership, in Little Rock that was strongly supportive of integration.

And in cases like this, when countries or cities or States can go one way or the other, the impact of leadership is pivotal. When the Governor called out the National Guard to stop the integration, it wasn't even all that popular in Little Rock; a lot of the white people didn't like it. But it was wildly popular out in our State in the more rural areas where the racial animosity was greater and the fear of change was greater. And so it was a politically popular decision. But it wrecked the chance we had to become the first southern State that would really have a beginning statewide successful, peaceful integration.

Later when Atlanta began to integrate, a lot of leaders in Atlanta looked at what happened in Little Rock and said, ''We don't want that to happen here, and we're not going to permit it.'' Very interesting.

So how people behave in times of crisis is very important and makes a big difference. The Court decision still is carried out by people, and as I said, what's in their heart makes a difference.

Do you have any questions for them? Any more?

[*A student asked Mr. Green how he felt the first day at Central High School. He responded that he and his companions were fearful, but seeing their struggle televised, reinforced their determination to stick it out.*

Another student asked how Mr. Green's brother felt about the situation. Mr. Green said his brother thought he was a little wacky at the time but that his brother was now in the building trades which opportunity he thought was directly attributable to the Brown *decision.*

A student then asked Mr. Marshall how the Brown *decision has affected his life. Mr. Marshall responded that it gives him a perspective on problems that society now faces, such as racism and violence, and reminds him of the need for everyone to work together to oppose the politics of division.*]

The President. Go ahead, you're next.

Q. This is for both Mr. Green and you, Mr. President. While the integration was going on, did you ever feel like taking the law into your own hands and doing something drastic? [*Laughter*]

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. President. [*Laughter*]

The President. There are some benefits to this job. [*Laughter*]

[*Mr. Green responded that he and the other eight students faced 2,000 white students and that fighting was not an option. He advocated nonviolence as a real and effective tool for resolving conflicts.*]

The President. I want to make two points about it. First is, back then, the law was our friend and lawlessness was our enemy. In other words, the Supreme Court was the friend of integration. The President was enforcing the Supreme Court order. And after President Kennedy was elected, Robert Kennedy was the Attorney General. He was out there killing himself trying to get the schools integrated and to enforce the law. So the law was seen as the friend of the people who wanted change.

The second point I'd like to make is, people were willing to put themselves on the line, these people like Ernie. Mr. Marshall's father worked for years and years and years. They were willing to pay the price of time. What you have today in a lot of communities is young people taking the law into their own hands either because they can't manage their own aggressions and they've got a gun handy, or because they're doing it for some—it arises out of drug dealing or something like that, where people want a quick benefit instead of a long-term benefit.

And I think one of the things the schools have to drum into our kids today is that you always have to be living for your lifetime. You always have to be thinking about what it's going to be like down the road. No one is entitled to instant gratification all the time, to get what they want when they want it, right now. You have to be willing to pay the price of time.

And these nine young people of whom Ernie was the leader were willing—they paid an enormous price for themselves as well as for everybody they represented by saying, ''In my life this will be better.'' And if I could change one thing about what's going on today, when there's so much mindless violence among young people and kids are just getting shot at random, it's because people

are going around acting on their impulses in the moment.

And the law can still be your friend if you're willing to work and have discipline and take time with it. Nobody gets everything they want just when they want it. You have to pay the price of time and be willing to take the kind of disciplined risks that Ernie Green did. And that, I think, is one of the things we really have got to somehow hammer home to everybody in your generation.

You've been great. The teacher's telling me it's time to stop. The principal is. Thank you all very much. You were terrific. Thank you, gentlemen.

[*At this point, the President was presented with several gifts.*]

The President. The great thing about the United States, the great thing about the United States is that all the history of our country lives in the present and helps to pave the way for the future.

I had Senator Byrd in my office last night, who is the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They have to approve all the money that gets spent, like if we send any money to your school, it comes through that committee. And he had just finished reading "The Federalist Papers" written by Madison and Hamilton, just read them all again, because he said they have relevance to today.

Brown is important today. It's living in your life today. And what you have to do is to make the most of this experience and make the most of your own life, so that 40 years from now young people will be sitting in this school and other schools around the country, and they will be living the accumulated history of America.

That's the only way this works. That's the brilliant thing about our country. That's why we wanted to come here and talk about it, because we know the spirit and the meaning of that decision is alive in your lives today. And as long as you believe that and you do your part, then this country is going to be around a long, long time.

Thank you.

NOTE: The question-and-answer session began at 11:35 a.m. at Martin Luther King, Jr., Middle School. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the 40th Anniversary of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* in Beltsville

May 17, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much. My good friend Ernie Green; Secretary Riley; Attorney General Reno; your principal, Bette Lewis. I'd also like to recognize in the audience today two of my partners in trying to make America a better place, two of your distinguished Representatives in Congress, Senator Paul Sarbanes and Congressman Steny Hoyer. Thank you for being here.

I have a number of people here who work in the White House, but I want to recognize one in particular. We just finished teaching a class here on *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. I was joined in that class by Secretary Riley, who as a young man was involved along with his father with the integration of public schools in South Carolina; and with Ernest Green, whose background you know; also with Thurgood Marshall, Jr., now a member of the Vice President's staff in the White House, whose father argued the *Brown* v. *Board of Education* case before the Supreme Court and later became the first African-American ever to sit on the United States Supreme Court. Thurgood Marshall, Jr., I'd like him to stand up and be recognized.

I'd like to thank Robin Wiltison and the students who were in her class today. They certainly showed us why Martin Luther King Middle School is a blue-ribbon school. I was deeply impressed with the students. And they asked good questions, and they were very well-informed. And I think it's fair to say that those of us who came here to participate may have enjoyed the class even more than they did.

We are here today because, as all of you know by now, 40 years ago on this day the United States Supreme Court handed down the decision called *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. The Supreme Court has been in the news a lot lately because I've just announced the appointment of a distinguished judge, Judge Stephen Breyer, from Boston, to be the new Justice to the Supreme Court to fill

the vacancy created by the resignation of Justice Blackmun.

Many Americans don't think about the Supreme Court very much and only hear about it when it issues a great decision. I can tell you that every American thought about the Supreme Court when *Brown* v. *Board of Education* was decided. Forty years ago, in some parts of this great country, African-Americans couldn't vote, couldn't be served in certain restaurants or stay in certain hotels, couldn't even get medical care in certain hospitals. Before a brave woman named Rosa Parks refused to budge off a bus in Montgomery, Alabama, and a brave minister named Martin Luther King helped her fight back, African-Americans were told they had to sit in the back of the bus and give up their seats to white people. They were told many other things that deprived them of the freedom today we all take for granted.

Forty years ago, a school like this one, with white and Hispanic and African-American and Asian-American students, a real kaleidoscope of America's great diversity, it was unthinkable, it wouldn't even have existed in major parts of the United States. The decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* helped to change all that.

We have to remember two things about this: First of all, the change didn't happen overnight. And secondly, the people who helped to bring that change didn't wait around for anybody to do the hard work for them; they did it for themselves. They knew that the future is not something you inherit; it's something you have to earn by your own efforts.

When I say it didn't happen overnight, let me explain exactly what I mean. We talked about this somewhat in the class today. The Supreme Court can hand down a decision and say schools that are separated solely on the basis of the race of the students are unconstitutional; stop it. Then millions of people had to figure out, well, what does that mean? Where do the teachers go? Where do the students go? Whose schoolbooks do you use? What do you do? What are the mechanics of integrating the schools? But then there was another *Brown* decision in which people said, "How fast do we have to do this?" And the Supreme Court said, "With all deliberate speed." And in every school district in the country where they were working it out, somebody had to say, "What does 'all deliberate speed' mean?" There were still millions of Americans who were against it. They thought "all deliberate speed" meant several years. Then the millions who were for it thought "all deliberate speed" means tomorrow.

So these things took a long time. It took, at least, I'd say, 15 years after the *Brown* decision before the public schools in this country were basically integrated through the system. It did not happen overnight. There were a lot of people who had to keep working. And that's an important lesson for you today: Nothing worth doing happens immediately. You have to make efforts that take time.

Brown laid a foundation—you heard Ernest Green talking about the connection between the *Brown* case and the ultimate liberation and reconciliation of South Africa. We had a Civil Rights Act in 1964. We had a Voting Rights Act in 1965. The struggles for freedom in this country were seen as a symbol of what could be done by people all over the world. There are always going to be people who fight for these kinds of changes and, frankly, always going to be people who resist them. The *Brown* decision gave courage to people like Ernest Green. It also gave moral backbone to our Nation's leaders. When Ernest Green—for those of you who have seen the movie about his life story, you know that when he attempted to integrate Little Rock Central High School just a few years after *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, the Governor of my State then tried to stop him by calling out the National Guard, on the theory that people were too upset about it. But the President, under the authority of the Supreme Court decision, instead turned the National Guard into a United States force and enforced the integration order.

That's the kind of thing that a Supreme Court decision can do if there are people like Ernest Green who are willing to pay the price to carry out the promise of equality and opportunity in America, even if it takes years to do. Thurgood Marshall, the man who brought the *Brown* v. *Board of Education*

case to the Supreme Court and who later served on the Supreme Court, literally spent his life fighting for these principles and these opportunities.

Now, I say this to make the second point. There have been a lot of—you may see this if you watch these sort of things on the evening news, you'll see a lot of people your parents' and grandparents' age talking, or even younger than that, talking in very cynical terms saying, "Well, this is still a society with a lot of segregation," or "Well, this is still a society with a lot of racial discrimination," or "Well, this is still a society where racial minorities don't have the same economic opportunities others do," or "Well, we're still more violent than we were 40 years ago." And all those people will be saying that sort of as an excuse. They'll be saying, "Therefore, maybe this decision didn't count for so much." Well, I want to tell you that's flat wrong. This is a much better country today because of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* and because there were people who came before all of you who were literally willing to put their lives on the line to see you got an equal education, to see that you had a chance to make something of your lives. The world and this country are markedly better because of this decision and these principles. It is better today. And just because not all the problems of this country have been solved, that's no excuse for people to say that this *Brown* v. *Board of Education* decision didn't make a huge difference.

You heard the Attorney General and the students in the class heard the Secretary of Education and me say all three of us grew up in the South in segregated societies. And we suffered, too. We were deprived of the right to play and go places with and know and live with people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. And we paid a terrible price for it. And when it began to go away, our lives were also very, very much enriched. I do not believe I would be here as President today if it hadn't been for *Brown* v. *Board of Education* and the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act that gave all the people of my State a chance to come together as one people.

What I do want to say to you today is that this generation faces a whole lot of challenges that are part of the unfinished business of helping us to live together as one people. And we need some more miracles like *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. And they have to begin, however, the same way *Brown* did, by individual Americans making choices.

You look at what the problems are today. Is there still racism in America today? Of course there is. Is there too much violence today, especially among young people? Of course. Are there still too many people who don't think they're going to get a fair shake in life and don't think they have much of a future to look forward to? Of course there are. So what are you going to do about it? And what am I going to do about it?

What we should say is we are going to build on the things which have gone before that are good. You have to make choices. If you look at what's wrong with our country today—too much violence, too many guns in the hands of young people that are too willing to use them, too many people victimized by the breakdown of family life and community life, too many people victimized by the fact that they don't have a good job or a good education, too many young people who are willing to make decisions in the flash of a moment that may ruin their entire lives, too many schools that still don't work as well as this one does—it all begins with personal choices. I ran for President because I made a personal choice that I did not want my daughter to grow up in a country that was coming apart instead of coming together, and I didn't want you to be the first generation of Americans to do worse than your parents, and I thought there were things we could do about it. And we're working hard to do those things, to create more jobs, to improve our schools, to deal with our health care problems, to make our streets safer and our schools safer and take on some of these tough law enforcement issues that relate to crime and drugs.

The Congress voted last week to ban assault weapons. It's high time to put more police officers on the street, to give young people more programs that will help to prevent them from getting involved in a violent life. We have made some personal decisions. But you have to make some personal decisions, too. The magic of education starts in every

school, in every classroom. You have to decide that you will not drop out of school and that you will stay in and that you will do well. You have to decide that you will not use alcohol or drugs or take up guns. You have to decide that you will not become a mother or a father before you're old enough to understand and take responsibility and do the job right, instead of wrecking your life with it. You have to decide that you are going to have the discipline and commitment necessary to continue your education and to tone down the frustration and anger that every person feels.

A lot of these kids getting killed today are getting killed with the same sort of anger and frustration that people have always felt when they were fighting over things, except now they can go pick up a gun and do something about it. You have to take the lead, every one of you, in dealing with your own lives and your own schools to try to stop this. This is crazy, all this violence among young people. And a lot of these kids that are killing their lives by shooting other people are people who don't even have prior criminal records. You've got to get together and talk about what makes people mad, and what do you do when you get mad and when you get frustrated, and how do you walk away from that. And that's something that the President and the Congress and all the people in the world can't do for you if you won't do for yourselves.

We are very fortunate in this country today that 40 years ago the people did what was necessary to bring that case to the Supreme Court and that every Justice on the Supreme Court said separate but unequal educational facilities are wrong. And if they are separated by race by law, they are by definition unequal, and they are unconstitutional. We are all a better people because of that. And you all wouldn't be here together, doing what you're doing in this school today, if that hadn't happened.

But what you have to do now is to say, "That didn't solve all the problems, but it got me to the starting line. It gave me a chance to live in an America that was more honest in living up to its creed that we are all equal under God. And now I have a chance, and I'm going to make the most of it." The whole future of America is riding on whether we can have young people who are well-educated, well-disciplined, hopeful about the future, and more interested in helping each other than hurting each other, more interested in books than guns, more interested in 5 years from now than 5 seconds from now. You have to do that. Your country is counting on you.

I will do everything I can as President. And all these people will do everything they can to make sure that you have a good country to grow up in, that you can succeed, that you can have a good life. But a lot of it is in your hands. I urge you, on this 40th anniversary of one of the greatest decisions for freedom ever made, to stand up for your own freedom and make the most of it.

God bless you, and good luck. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:45 p.m. at Martin Luther King, Jr., Middle School.

Statement on the Report of the Federal Interagency Council on the Homeless

May 17, 1994

Last year, I directed the Federal Interagency Council on the Homeless to forge a single, coordinated plan to break the cycle of homelessness and prevent future homelessness.

Today, the Interagency Council released their report, which recognizes the magnitude of the problem of homelessness for the first time and proposes a comprehensive, innovative approach, the continuum of care, to move millions of Americans off our streets and back into our communities and our families. The 17 member agency, under the leadership of the Secretaries of HUD, HHS, and VA, and with the unprecedented consultation of thousands of people across the country, deserves credit for a thorough and honest examination of this complex problem.

"Priority Home: The Federal Plan to Break the Cycle of Homelessness" is part of a larger strategy of health care reform and welfare reform which will give every American the opportunity to break the cycle of dependence, become self-sufficient, and

work towards a better life for themselves and their families.

NOTE: Copies of the report were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. An additional release of May 18 announced that the President proposed funding increases for homeless programs in cities across the country. A State-by-State breakdown of dollar amounts was also made available.

Nomination for United States Marshals

May 17, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Robert Henry McMichael as U.S. marshal for the Northern District of Georgia, John W. Caldwell as U.S. marshal for the Southern District of Georgia, Roy Allen Smith as U.S. marshal for the Southern District of Ohio, and David William Troutman as U.S. marshal for the Northern District of Ohio.

"I am pleased to nominate these individuals as U.S. marshals," the President said. "They are well-qualified, and I am confident they will make a positive difference in our fight against crime."

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

Appointment of Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission

May 17, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Joseph S. Laposata as Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

"I am happy to name Joseph Laposata as Secretary to the American Battle Monuments Commission," the President said. "His career with the Armed Forces will provide the Commission with a wealth of experience that will certainly prove beneficial."

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

Remarks on Signing the Human Services Amendments of 1994

May 18, 1994

Thank you so much. I think Dr. Johnson is a stronger statement for the merits of what has been done and what is about to be done than anything any of the rest of us can say. If every American child could grow up to be like him, we wouldn't even have more than half the conversations we have every day in this town. So I thank President Johnson and all those wise people, including the founders of Head Start who are here and the Members of Congress who were there then, for starting this program 29 years ago. I thank the Members of Congress here today for working together across party lines, across philosophical lines, across racial lines, across district lines, from the city and from rural areas, to make this dream real in our time and to make the improvements and the changes in the Head Start program that we ought to make. I'm glad that Jeanne Kendall was here from Kentucky to make her profession about the Head Start program. And she brought one of her children, too, who's down there, a fine young man. Stand up. I want him to—[*applause*]—see, he's done quite well—to remind us that children everywhere need this program.

Everybody knows that this is not just a national Federal program, not the kind of preconceived thing that people think when they think about the Federal Government, you know, "I'm from the Federal Government, and I'm here to help you." [*Laughter*] This is not a program involving bureaucrats in Washington making decisions that individuals and families and teachers have to live by. This is a program that is built at the grassroots by families and teachers and communities.

I've often said that governments can't raise children, that people have to do that. But parents need help in a lot of places in this country today, just like they did 29 years ago. As I traveled America in 1992, I'd meet children in every corner of this country who would still be on the verge of showing up for school not knowing their colors, their shapes, their numbers, how to spell their

names. And you ask, well, is that all that important? You bet it is.

You heard the doctor talk about how he got his degree in biology. Maybe there is nothing new under the sun, but when the Scripture says that people perish without vision, I think there's something to that. And the flip side is plainly true: In order to visualize, to imagine the future, you have to have some structure in your head, some way of organizing all the things that are coming in. And there's no doubt in my mind that one of the reasons we have so much violence among our young people today is they have no way of organizing and processing and dealing with and turning outward a lot of the things that they are forced to confront day-in and day-out.

Head Start helps these little children—can you believe—I mean, first of all, they're the second best advertisement. How can they sit here and listen to all these politicians and people talk—[*laughter*]—and behave in this way? Look at them. I mean, it's been amazing. But it helps these children to know they're special and to begin to see the world in a wonderful but still organized way. And that is a very, very significant thing.

I do want to say to the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion and to Secretary Shalala and to Secretary Riley and to all those who worked on this program, we all knew that there were some things we ought to do to help Head Start move into the 21st century. We knew we had to invest in reform and put quality first. We knew we needed performance standards because if we're going to spend the public's money to make the program work at the grassroots level, we want children to turn out like the man who introduced me.

We knew we had to expand the program, that it was no longer justifiable with all the kids in trouble in this country and needing help, to do that. So Head Start will go from serving 621,000 children in 1992 to about 840,000 in 1995. And we're struggling hard, Marian, with the budget—we met yesterday—[*laughter*]—so that we can keep expanding it beyond 1995. We're going to give local communities the option to meet the new needs of parents and children with full-day and full-year programs, which I think is very important.

The bill contains new provisions to meet families' needs who have infants and toddlers from birth to age 3. And I'm especially pleased by the broad coalition in Congress and the executive branch and among concerned Americans all across the country that focused on this vital area. Just a few years ago, this would have been enormously controversial. You would have had all kinds of ideological arguments, unrelated to the reality of these children's lives. And because of the spirit of primarily the leaders of Congress who are here present and those who are not here who supported it and those of you who brought information to the table about the real lives of these children and their families, you made that happen. And that is a dramatic change.

The third thing that this bill does is to act to keep the gains that Head Start makes going through the later years, because we learned, much to our sadness, that some children kept the gains all the way through their lives and others were lost because of intervening events. So we had to ask ourselves what could we do to make these gains keep going, to make sure that these children would take the richness and the vision and the hope and the self-esteem that they leave this program with and be able to hold it close and live by it and gain from it throughout their lives. So I think that that is a terribly important advance in this program that will help not only the children but their parents.

Well, this is in some ways maybe the biggest part of the lifetime learning program we've been pushing, all of us, through the Congress with remarkable bipartisan support: the Goals 2000 program to establish national standards for our public schools and to erase the difference between academic learning and skill training; the school-to-work program to help those young people who don't go on to 4-year colleges but do need greater skills; now, the reemployment program that we're going to try to develop out of the unemployment system, recognizing that most people don't get their old jobs back. But today we begin where our parents always told us we ought to begin, at the beginning.

And this is a wonderful day, I say again, a tribute to those whose vision made it possible 29 years ago, a tribute to those who have worked on these significant, dramatic improvements today, a tribute to the parents and the students who have proven by their statements today and the lives they have lived that together we really are one community and we can pull together and help each other in ways that make us all better people, better citizens, and later, better parents.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

Now, let me tell you what's going to happen. This is Brian Rivera; he's 5 years old. He's the best dressed man here. [*Laughter*] And I'm going to ask him to join me with the congressional leadership; we don't have room here for all the Members who are here. I would like for Senator Kennedy, Senator Kassebaum, Senator Mitchell, and Congressman Ford, Congressman Goodling to come up here and stand behind me. And as they come, I'd like for all the Members of Congress who are here to stand and be applauded by the rest of us, because without them this would not have happened. Please stand up. [*Applause*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:17 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. Ansel Johnson, former Head Start student, and Jeanne Kendall, parent of a former Head Start student. S. 2000, approved May 18, was assigned Public Law No. 103–252.

Statement on Signing the Human Services Amendments of 1994

May 18, 1994

Twenty-nine years ago today, President Lyndon Johnson announced a program of hope for our Nation's most vulnerable children and their families, a program designed to give children a true "Head Start."

I am particularly pleased that many of those who helped launch Head Start could join us today to witness the fruits of their vision and see the faces of those who entered Head Start programs in that first summer of 1965. They represent more than 13 million children and families whose lives have been touched by this great program.

It is with tremendous pride that I help turn the next page in the distinguished history of Head Start by signing S. 2000, legislation that sets forth a bold new agenda for the future of the Head Start program. Over the years, Head Start has been successful in improving the lives of low-income children and their families by providing health and social services and education. These comprehensive services have changed numerous lives and contributed to a stronger future for our Nation.

I am particularly pleased that this legislation, which authorizes a wide array of human services programs, is the product of extraordinary bipartisan cooperation. This effort began last June when Secretary Shalala announced the establishment of the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion. Its groundbreaking report set forth a blueprint for creating a 21st century Head Start and laid the foundation for the landmark legislation that we celebrate today.

This legislation seeks to re-energize the Head Start program for generations to come. Through this legislation, strong new efforts will be made to improve the quality of Head Start programs, and an important new initiative will be launched to provide Head Start services to families with children under age three. Services will be tailored to meet the needs of today's families, and creative partnerships will be forged with other key programs at the State and local level.

Head Start reminds us that our country cannot afford to waste its young or ignore their families. We must value every child and help every parent succeed. Head Start creates the sense of community that all of us need in our lives. The dedication of thousands of volunteers, staff, and parents helps create the special relationship that defines the Head Start program. Head Start is indeed a celebration of human diversity and creativity.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 18, 1994.

Proclamation 6690—World Trade Week, 1994

May 18, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As we observe World Trade Week, 1994, we find our Nation well-positioned to compete in the 1990s. Our economy is the strongest in the industrialized world. Our work force is second to none. Our system of higher education is unequalled. And our people are more optimistic—and have reason to be.

Yet, success in world markets is not automatic—it requires planning and effort.

"U.S. Exports Equal U.S. Jobs," the theme of World Trade Week, illustrates why the United States must make the push to increase the involvement of American business in international markets. Exports have become a critical engine of our Nation's economic progress. In the past 5 years, exports of goods and services have been responsible for more than 40 percent of U.S. economic growth.

Today one in every five manufacturing jobs is linked to exports. Exports of goods and services support some 10.5 million jobs. And exports lead to better paying jobs. American workers producing for export earn 17 percent more than the overall average wage.

The intersection of domestic and international business makes it more important than ever to emphasize all of the factors that make America competitive. Sustainable economic growth is possible only if we solve those societal problems that keep our people from achieving their best.

The first order of business for this Administration was to improve the economic climate at home, and this continues to be my priority. We have made great strides in bringing the Federal budget deficit under control. Fiscal restraint has prompted a surge in business investment. We are in the process of implementing a policy that encourages private and public partnerships. We have begun the difficult job of helping the defense industry to convert to a more commercial business. And we are devoting more attention to secondary education and to training and retraining our work force.

This Administration is working vigorously to secure a health care plan for all Americans, and we have proposed a reform of our welfare system. We have major initiatives underway to fight crime and drug trafficking.

These steps toward healthy economic growth and a more secure society represent the essential underpinning for America to compete in the world economy.

However, U.S. companies must have fair access to international markets. We have placed a high priority on reducing trade barriers abroad, and we are making progress. The North American Free Trade Agreement creates a vibrant, integrated market on our own continent and opens up great possibilities for an even larger free trade area in the future. The successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round of GATT trade negotiations after 7 years of hard bargaining now should lead to a significant expansion of global trade.

Partnership between the United States Government and the private sector is necessary if we are to reach the economic goals outlined early in my Administration. The Federal Government is committed to being a constructive partner by creating a favorable environment for the U.S. private sector to conduct business at home and abroad. However, the main responsibility for developing overseas markets lies with the private sector. It is up to business to take the risks, but the risks bring the right to reap the rewards.

Our workers will reap the rewards in the form of many new jobs, because exports can be our number one method of creating high-wage jobs.

All this leads to only one conclusion: We must thrive globally to secure a healthier economy, and it is in the interest of business, workers, and the entire population to do so. We must sell more in the global marketplace—and we are continuing to do our best to expand that marketplace for American goods. We must also promote trade in a way that benefits workers and encourages sustainable development.

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 the laws of the United

States, do hereby proclaim the week beginning May 22, 1994, as "World Trade Week." I invite the people of the United States to join in appropriate observances to reaffirm the potential of international trade for creating prosperity for all.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of May, 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, 4:20 p.m., May 18, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on May 20.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting

May 18, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 396(i)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for Fiscal Year 1993 and the Inventory of the Federal Funds Distributed to Public Telecommunications Entities by Federal Departments and Agencies: Fiscal Year 1993.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 18, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities

May 18, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my pleasure to present to you the twenty-eighth annual report of National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). In terms of breadth and number of projects funded, this agency is the largest grant-making entity for the humanities in the country. The Endowment supports scholars, teachers, and students in their research and studies, and provides funds for projects such as documentary films and museum exhibitions that reach a large general audience. These humanities activities strengthen the cultural resources of the nation and provide insight into the problems that face our increasingly complex society.

In addition to direct federal support of the humanities, NEH programs have stimulated private contributions, to date almost $1.3 billion in matching gift funds. The Endowment also requires grantees in most programs to commit their own funds for part of the project costs. The NEH support of a project is highly respected and often attracts additional funding from other sources.

The country can be proud of the role the Endowment has played as a catalyst for the support of excellent humanities scholarship and education in the United States over the past twenty-eight years.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 18, 1994.

Statement by the Press Secretary on Draft Registration and the Selective Service System

May 18, 1994

The President has announced that he has approved a National Security Council recommendation to maintain peacetime draft registration and the Selective Service System (SSS).

In letters to the House and Senate, President Clinton stated that ". . . it is essential to our national security to continue draft registration and the Selective Service System. While tangible military requirements alone do not currently make a mass call-up of American young men likely, there are three reasons I believe we should maintain both the SSS and the draft registration requirement."

First, the President stated that the SSS and registration provide ". . . a hedge against unforeseen threats and a relatively low cost 'insurance policy' against our underestimat-

ing the maximum level of threat we expect our Armed Forces to face.''

Next, ''. . . terminating the SSS and draft registration now could send the wrong signal to our potential enemies who are watching for signs of U.S. resolve.''

And finally, ''. . . as fewer and fewer members of our society have direct military experience, it is increasingly important to maintain the link between the All Volunteer Force and our society at large. The Armed Forces must also know that the general population stands behind them, committed to serve, should the preservation of our national security so require.''

The NSC review leading to the President's decision has been conducted since January and consisted of representatives from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the DOD Inspector General, the Joint Staff, the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Selective Service System.

President Clinton urged Congress to support the Administration Fiscal Year 1995 request for $23 million for the Selective Service System.

Proclamation 6691—National Trauma Awareness Month, 1994

May 18, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

All of us are potential victims of physical trauma. Even though we may lead relatively calm and safe lives, we can never fully escape the risks of traumatic injury. Each year, no fewer than 150,000 Americans die as a result of massive damage to skin or to internal organs, providing a sobering reminder that we must renew our efforts to create a healthier and safer society.

While traumatic physical injury threatens all of us, young children are at particularly high risk for its tragic effects. In fact, six times as many children are killed by traumatic incidence than by cancer. No matter who falls victim, trauma exacts a tremendous toll.

In addition to the vast physical and emotional suffering that occur, trauma also causes staggering economic losses. This year alone, Americans will spend more than $175 billion for the health care costs and loss of productivity associated with trauma.

We now consider trauma to be among the most neglected medical conditions in our country, and it is vital that we take steps to diminish its terrible damage.

Fortunately, we can substantially reduce the threat and the impact of traumatic injury through a concerted campaign of prevention and of improvement in care. By using established safety procedures in our homes and at work and by teaching basic safety to our children, we can significantly lower the number of traumatic accidents that occur each year. We can also help prevent many of the fatalities associated with trauma by learning how to properly treat its victims. By rededicating ourselves to understanding life-threatening trauma and by making the most effective uses of emergency medical services, we can all contribute to creating a healthier society.

The Congress, by Public Law 103–39, has designated May 1994 as ''National Trauma Awareness Month,'' and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this month.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of May 1994 as National Trauma Awareness Month. I call upon all Americans to observe this month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of May, 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, 2:10 p.m., May 19, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 19, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on May 23.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Military Leaders

May 19, 1994

Representative Dan Rostenkowski

Q. On Rostenkowski, sir, should the public be concerned at all that you and he have the same lawyer?

The President. No.

China

Q. Mr. President, did you send Michael Armacost to China to negotiate some kind of deal?

The President. Well, we've had a number of Americans in China and speaking with the Chinese, and those conversations are ongoing. And I think until they are resolved, one way or the other, I shouldn't say more about them.

Q. It's being reported that you have made a decision to go ahead and renew MFN.

The President. We are still in discussions with the Chinese. I don't know that I should call them negotiations; that's not an accurate characterization. We are having discussions with them about our differences and about the importance of our relationship. And I will have a decision on the matter in a timely fashion. No decision has been reached yet; we're still talking with them.

Q. Is it true that China has—[*inaudible*]—leaders willing to make concessions on human rights——

The President. I don't think I should speak for the Chinese. All I can tell you is there are some things which have been reported which have actually occurred, and we've had discussions about other matters. But I don't think I should discuss them now. We're still in discussions with them.

Q. What's the purpose of this meeting?

The President. What?

Q. What's the purpose of the meeting?

The President. We meet on a regular basis to discuss a number of national security issues. And there are a number of things that the CINC's are going to bring me up to date on. I have some questions to ask them about some of the challenges we face around the world.

North Korea

Q. On North Korea, sir—[*inaudible*]—North Korea divert its spent nuclear fuel? And if so, is it too late to avoid sanctions?

The President. Well, let me say I certainly cannot answer that first question in the affirmative. That's why we have inspectors there now. And they are working hard, and as far as we know, they're—I got a report this morning—they are proceeding with their inspections. They should be in a position to give us a report imminently, in the near future. So I don't think you'll have to wait long for an answer to that. But the inspectors are there and working, and we should know more about it. And I think that the better course of action is for all of us to refrain from any kind of comment until we know what the facts are, because we will have the facts soon.

Q. Sending troops anywhere? [*Laughter*]

The President. To Normandy. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:14 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Michael Armacost, Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao of India

May 19, 1994

The President. Let me say that it's a great honor for me personally and for the United States to welcome Prime Minister Rao and his delegation here.

India is the world's largest democracy, by a long ways, and a very important partner for the United States on many issues, with a very impressive rate of economic growth now and the prospect of a real partnership with our country, spanning not only economic but many other issues. And I'm really looking forward to our discussions. And I'm delighted that he's found the time to come and be here with us.

Nuclear Nonproliferation

Q. Mr. President, how much of a hang-up is the issue of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and India's resistance to signing it? Will

that come up? And do you think there's any way of persuading India to sign this treaty?

The President. Well, we'll have a chance to talk about a number of issues. I think that, as you know, we have a broad-based approach. We're supporting the comprehensive test ban. We want to have the fissile materials production ban. We've got a lot of things to discuss, and we'll have a chance to talk about them.

But he just got here. I don't want to presume upon the conversation that hasn't yet occurred.

Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis

Q. Mr. President, do you have anything to say to the Kennedys? Do you have any words for the Kennedys? You know, Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis is——

The President. Hillary and I have been in touch with Mrs. Onassis in the last several days and are getting regular updates. She's been quite wonderful to my wife and to my daughter and to all of us. And we're thinking about her, praying for her.

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

The President. I would like to say it's a great honor for me personally and for the United States to welcome Prime Minister Rao and his party here.

India is not only the world's largest democracy, but a very impressive one, having preserved democracy through all manner of difficulties and challenges. We are mindful of the profound importance of our relationship with India, and the many aspects of that relationship. And I am looking forward to establishing a good working relationship with the Prime Minister and to building on that as we go into the future. I'm very hopeful about it.

India

Q. Mr. President, may I ask you a question? The economic reforms in India and the end of cold war—what kind of an impact do you think these two events have had on the Indo-American relationship?

The President. Well, I think it should—both those things should permit that relationship to grow and to flourish, to deepen, and should permit us to do things that together as leaders in the community of nations, as we work together in the United Nations. And India, for example, has been very constructive in Somalia and Mozambique and other places around the world. So I think we'll have a deeper and better partnership now. and I'm looking forward to building on it, and that's one of the things that I hope to have a chance to discuss with the Prime Minister.

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]—said that this trip was a turning point in Indo-U.S. relations. What do you think? Would it prove to be a turning point?

The President. Well, if it's a positive turning point, that would make me very happy because I think it's very important that the United States and India have good relations and strong relations. And so I'm hopeful of that.

Let me remind you, we're going to have a time that the press—at the end of this, where we can both make statements and answer questions. So let's do that after we have a chance to visit.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:40 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Rao of India

May 19, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. I have just completed a very productive meeting with Prime Minister Rao. It's an honor for me and for the United States to host the leader of the world's largest democracy, a nation of almost 900 million people.

It was a distinct pleasure for me to meet the Prime Minister who has led India through what to me is an absolutely astonishing period of economic transformation. He's kept a steady hand on the helm of Indian democracy through many challenges.

India has sustained its commitment to representative government for many decades now. And I expressed my admiration to the Prime Minister for the remarkable achievement of India's people in social, cultural, and scientific areas.

Today we began what I hope will be a very close working relationship as our two countries forge stronger partnership. Our nations share many common values. And speaking as friends, we explored ways to deepen our ties and to expand cooperation.

The Prime Minister and I shared our concerns and our hopes about world events. We talked about the many challenges facing international community and discussed how each of us is working through the United Nations and other organizations to solve those problems. In particular, I expressed my appreciation to the Prime Minister for India's contributions to peacekeeping in Somalia, Cambodia, Mozambique, and elsewhere.

I told the Prime Minister that we heartily support his ambitious program of economic reform that brings India's economy into the global marketplace. This important reform plan will be the engine of growth in our relationships. Our Commerce Department has identified India as one of the 10 biggest emerging markets around the world. We are pleased at the rapid expansion of trade and investment between our two countries. We are now the largest bilateral trading partner and investor with India. We're proud of that, and we want that relationship to grow.

We also discussed some of the obstacles to trade, and we pledged that we'd work hard to resolve those. We talked about security issues that affect India in the post-cold-war era. We discussed common efforts to curb weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We pledged to intensify our efforts to achieve a comprehensive test ban treaty and a verifiable global ban on the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons.

I told the Prime Minister that I hoped that India and Pakistan would continue their constructive dialog on ways to resolve their differences, including their differences over Kashmir.

In our talks today, we also agreed to increase the frequency of high-level visits and exchanges between our two countries. I've asked our Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary, to visit India in July to further our talks on renewable energy. And I've asked the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, to go to India in November to continue our important discussions on trade and to promote further growth in trade and investment.

Today's visit was the first between Indian and United States leaders since Rajiv Gandhi came to the White House in 1987. I hope that the promising future in our relations will permit more frequent exchanges. Along with the United States, India is one of the world's great experiments in multicultural democracy. Its people share our love for freedom, entrepreneurship, and self-expression. And they have fought for more than four decades now to keep their democracy alive under the most amazing challenges.

India's freedom was born out of a remarkable struggle led by Mahatma Gandhi and others whose courage and vision still inspires us and people all around the world. The Prime Minister has been part of that struggle and that history from the beginning of his country and since he was a very young man. Today he struck me as a leader of great wisdom and experience. He shared some of that with me today. And under his leadership, India is taking its rightful place as a major world economic power and a partner in world affairs. We look forward to working with India in that way.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Rao. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I am greatly pleased to be here today and to have had an opportunity of meeting you. My fellow citizens of India join me in conveying to you, Mr. President, and to the citizens of this great country our warm greetings and friendship.

As the President has already told you, our talks today were held in an extremely friendly atmosphere. They were constructive, useful, and candid, as discussion between friends should be. We discussed international issues of concern to both sides, as also ways and means of strengthening bilateral ties.

The President and I agreed that we have an unprecedented opportunity to free India-U.S. bilateral relations from the distortions induced by the cold war, to look for areas of converging interest in the changed international situation, and work together for our mutual benefit.

We reviewed the tremendous economic opportunities thrown up by the sweeping economic reforms in India. I thank you, Mr.

President, for your administration's strong support to our endeavor. The U.S. is India's largest trading partner. India is one of the big, emerging economies of the world, offering vast opportunities for trade and investment. Corporate America, too, is attracted by the prospects that have opened up in India. We will continue steadily along this path of economic liberalization. There will be no turning back.

The United States has a crucial position in promoting international cooperation. As the first post-cold-war President of the United States, you, Mr. President, have a special role to play in this regard. I'm happy to note in this context that Indo-U.S. cooperation flourishes in many areas in bilateral and multilateral, ranging from cooperation in U.N. peacekeeping and our joint advocacy of the nuclear test ban treaty to our rapidly expanding economic ties.

As the growth and size of the Indian economy expands with the stimulus of international linkages and competition, we expect India to be in a position to make increasingly important contributions to the shaping of the world in both its political and economic dimensions. We look forward to working with the U.S. administration on the many areas in which our interests converge.

The United States and India are the world's largest democracies. We share many cherished ideals and values. None are more important than democracy, individual liberty, and rule of law. My discussions with President Clinton have strengthened my conviction that our two nations can work together closely for international peace and development.

Mr. President, I thank you for your gracious invitation and your generous remarks. I shall cherish your warm hospitality, your vision, and our stimulating discussion. I look forward to working with you to further strengthen Indo-U.S. relations. I would also like to take this opportunity of wishing you success in your very important tasks.

And finally, Mr. President, I had the pleasure to invite you to visit India. You graciously accepted it. Please come at the time of your convenience.

Thank you.

The President. Thank you.

Let me say I'd like to alternate questions between the American and the Indian press. So we'll begin with Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International] and then Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press]. Go ahead.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, U.N. inspectors in North Korea say there's evidence that spent fuel rods are being withdrawn from a nuclear reactor, raising these concerns that it's going to be reprocessed into plutonium for a nuclear weapon. How serious is this development? And is it still your position that North Korea must not be allowed to make a nuclear bomb?

The President. Let me tell you, first of all, I have nothing to add to what I said when I met with the Joint Chiefs this morning about that. I want to make sure that I have the facts from the inspectors and that the facts are there. When I know what the facts are, I will then make a statement about them.

I think it would be an error for North Korea to continue to thwart these inspections after they have agreed to comply with them. But I want to know what the facts are. And when I do, then I will make a more definitive statement.

Yes, sir.

India

Q. Mr. President, would you say after your talks with the Prime Minister that some of the problems which have dogged Indo-American relations, but no outcome, but in other words, the areas of agreement are so large that you can afford to play down the areas of the disagreement or leave them aside for future reference? And also, you mentioned the global partnership, and in that connection I'd like to ask you about the statement made by the new Ambassador—Ambassador-designate—that if India is included in the Security Council, it will undermine cohesion. When you have a strong partner like India, why should it undermine cohesion? And if the largest democracy in the world cannot be a member of Security Council, then who can be?

I also have a question for the Prime Minister—wait, wait—the question is that in India, people said that President Clinton is

going to twist your arm. I want to ask you what is the state of your arm after your talks today?

The President. I can answer you the three questions very quickly. Or at least two, and then you had one for the Prime Minister.

First of all, when two nations are friends, it doesn't mean that they agree on everything or that they should. But in the context of their friendly relationships, they are then able to discuss differences, problems, or issues between them. We discussed in a very, I think, open way all the things that you might imagine we discussed today. But I have been disturbed by the apparent either strain or perhaps the better word is limitation on the relationships between the U.S. and India as reported in the press, not only here but in your country.

We have a very great stake, it seems to me, in the end of the cold war in having not only a friendly relationship but a constructive and operating relationship—we, the two great democracies, with a great future together. And we emphasized that positive today, not in any way not dealing with other issues of difficulty, but knowing that it all has to be put in a proper context in the interests of the American people and in the interests of the Indian people.

Secondly, with regard to the Security Council issue, that is an issue that I think the United States should keep an open mind on. We have been on record—I have personally and our administration has—for some considerable amount of time favoring permanent membership for Germany and for Japan, who were our two principal opponents in World War II and who since then have built enormous economic superpowers in the context of peaceful countries, not on the backs of military domination, not even with the development of nuclear weapons but basically because of their enormous ability to develop the capacities of their people.

That does not mean that I think we should have a definitive position prohibiting anybody else from participating in that way. I think that's something we should keep an open mind on.

Prime Minister Rao. I think I owe you an answer. My arm is absolutely intact. The President didn't even touch it. [*Laughter*]

The President. I'm very grateful you said that, Mr. Prime Minister, in more ways than one.

Go ahead, Helen.

Human Rights

Q. You've met with your foreign policy advisers today, and maybe it's misunderstood, but there's a widespread perception that you really don't have a definable, resolute foreign policy, that it's ad hoc, crisis to crisis, village to village. Is that true?

Mr. Prime Minister, there are widespread allegations of Indian human rights violations in Kashmir. Are they true?

Prime Minister Rao. No. They're not true.

The President. No. [*Laughter*]

Foreign Policy

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. No, the answer is no. Let me—wait—if you want to say that this administration has not waved a magic wand and solved all the problems that I dealt with, that I was given when I came to office, that's one thing. But to say that we don't have a clear policy which says our first priority is the safety and security of the American people; in that context we need to continue the work that we are doing with Russia to denuclearize the other former republics, the republics of the former Soviet Union, and to reduce the nuclear threat—and we are doing that; that we then have a serious issue in terms of maintaining our security commitments in the Asian-Pacific region and dealing with the Korean issue—we are doing that—and we have done it, I think, with remarkable consistency in the face of attempts, rhetorical attempts by others to try to tilt the balance one way or the other; that we have a new national security interest, or a renewed national security interest in promoting economic growth and democracy and partnerships which we have manifested with NAFTA, with GATT, with the APEC meeting, with the Summit of the Americas; that from the beginning of my campaign for President, I said that we should not introduce ground troops into Bosnia but that we should try to do what we can to stop ethnic cleansing and to increase the multinational efforts, led by the Euro-

peans who have primary interests there, to bring an end to the fighting on honorable and decent terms—we have certainly done that. And the initiative taken by the Americans and by my administration led to the actions that NATO has taken, has funded and carried out the longest humanitarian airlift ever in our history, and is in large measure responsible for the progress that has been made there.

Now, the fighting in Bosnia continues; the fighting in Haiti continues. I continue to try to look for new solutions. If we look for new solutions when old solutions don't work, does that mean we don't have a coherent foreign policy? I don't think so. So I dispute that. I think we have made remarkable progress in the Middle East, another place where our national interests are plainly at stake, where the Secretary of State has plainly done a very good job and has the dialog between Syria and Israel further along than it has ever been, as far as I know. And we have played a very constructive role in the progress that has been made in the agreement between the PLO and Israel with regard to Jericho and Gaza. So I feel good about those things.

Do we still have some problems that we had the day I showed up? Yes, we do, and I guess the day I leave office we'll still have some problems. And if we last another 218 years, we'll still have some problems. But I think we are moving aggressively to address these. So that's still—no is as good an answer as that.

Kashmir

Q. My question is, Mr. President, to you regarding Kashmir, and it is in two parts. Recently a report was released by State Department in which it said, and I quote, "There were credible reports in 1993 of official Pakistani support to Kashmiri militants, who undertook attacks of terrorism in India-controlled Kashmir," unquote. Last year, the House Republican Task Force on Terrorism branded Pakistan as a terrorist state. My question is, will U.S. now put Pakistan back on the list of states that sponsor terrorism? With all the radical statements made by State Department, what is your stand, Mr. President, on Kashmir now?

The President. Well, since the spring of last year, based on our best evidence, official Pakistani material support to the Kashmiri militants has dropped. The Secretary of State concluded last July and again this past January that the available evidence did not warrant a finding that Pakistan—and I've got the exact language here—has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism. Plainly there is still assistance to the militants by private parties in Pakistan. And all I can tell you is we will have to continue to monitor that situation and deal with it based on the facts as we see them.

The ultimate answer there is for these two great nations to get together and resolve that.

China

Q. This kind of follows the question that Helen raised before. At one point, you made it sound as if giving China most-favored-nation status was going to be a pretty easy decision. Why has it taken so long to come to this decision, and what are some of the factors that are going into your decisionmaking on this right now? And can you tell us about Mr. Armacost's mission a little bit?

The President. First of all, it's the decision of great moment for this country that involves not only the economic interests of the American people and the people of China and the human rights interests of the people of China and the human rights commitments of the American people and our Government but also enormous national security interests and international security considerations for a long time to come across a broad range of areas. So it is a very important issue.

Secondly, the decision is due to be made, based on facts as they exist, moving up to the deadline of June 3d; so it would have been inappropriate to make the decision in January, February, or March based on that, based on the Executive order, and also the ongoing contacts we had with China.

Thirdly, I can't comment on the question you asked with regard to Mr. Armacost, because we have had a number of people who have gone to China, who have discussed the issues relating to this matter with the Chinese. And we are continuing to have discussions with the Chinese. That's the final an-

swer to your question. The reason that I have not made my statement yet is that we have not concluded our discussions with the Chinese. And I think anything I say about them until we have concluded them would be inappropriate.

India

Q. How far advanced do you think India's nuclear program is, and how many bombs do you think India possesses?

The President. I think you asked the wrong person that. I don't think I can or should comment on that.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, you have said that all options are open with regard to Haiti. Can you tell us if that's correct—if, or what, the American interests would be in using military action inherent in that threat, and how that differs from Rwanda, say, or Bosnia, where you have specifically ruled out the possibility of using U.S. troops?

The President. In Bosnia, since February of 1993, I have said that the United States should contribute to a multinational NATO effort to enforce a peace agreement, if one is reached.

Q. In a possible combat situation——

The President. The difference is, first of all—again, I say, I think it is a mistake for an American President to discuss hypothetical uses of force. But we plainly have a significant interest in Haiti. First, it's in our backyard. Second, we've got a million Haitian-Americans. Third, we've got several thousand Americans in Haiti. Fourth, we believe drugs are coming through Haiti to the United States. Fifth, we face the possibility, continuous possibility, of a massive outflow of Haitian migrants to the United States; they were free to do so because of conditions in Haiti. So we have a lot of very significant interests there. Sixth, Haiti and Cuba are the only two nondemocracies left in our hemisphere, and unlike Cuba, Haiti at least had an election and voted overwhelmingly for a democratic government, which has been denied.

India

Q. After this summit, are there differences between India and the U.S.? NPT and human rights, have they narrowed down, or does it stand where it is?

The President. I wouldn't say they have narrowed down, but I think they should be seen in the context of the whole relationship. We both support a comprehensive test ban treaty. We both support an end to the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons. If we did both those things, that would dramatically reduce the prospect of nuclear development anywhere in the world if, in fact, those treaties were adhered to by everyone and enforced.

We have some things that we have agreed to continue to discuss with regard to the human rights issue and the proliferation issue, and we will continue to discuss them. But I think what you should say is, the differences remain, but in the context of our common interests and our common values, we believe they can be managed in a very constructive way and still allow this relationship to grow and strengthen.

Welfare Reform

Q. Mr. President, if I could ask you a domestic question. Welfare reform, which has been delayed repeatedly over these months—so many of your colleagues, or so many Democrats in Congress say health care reform should have the priority now, that if you do go forward with the welfare reform package, in terms of financing, that would muddy the waters, make it more difficult to get health care reform. Since welfare reform is dependent, as you often say, on health care reform, why not simply delay welfare reform a little bit longer so you get health care first?

The President. Well, first let me say, Congress, just as it did last year when we had the most productive first year of a Presidency in 40 years, I guess, Congress has a lot to do. They've already passed major education reform, school-to-work, Goals 2000, Head Start expansion. They still have to deal with lobby reform, campaign finance reform, most importantly to me, the crime bill, as well as the health care issue.

But as you have seen with health care or with welfare reform, introducing a piece of

legislation starts a process that does not finish in a week or a month. And I think the outlines of the principles that I have embraced on welfare reform are very well known. Indeed, my own views on this are not markedly different from the bill introduced by Mr. McCurdy and others except for the way that I would propose to pay for it.

And so I think that putting out in the late spring—we're a little later than I thought we'd be; I thought we'd have this bill out around the first of May—but putting out the bill so that the Congress can see it and see what I think ought to be done and how I would propose to pay for it and so the Democrats and Republicans alike can evaluate it, is an appropriate thing to do. It might catch fire; the whole thing might catch fire. We might have a bipartisan consensus to move the bill in a hurry and get it this year. I wouldn't write that off. But I don't see that that will undermine health care.

It is, however—the flipside is true. Until you find a way to provide health coverage for all workers, you will never have full welfare reform because you're going to have people staying on welfare because that's the only way their kids can get health care. And you're going to have the anomaly of people getting off welfare, taking low-wage jobs, giving up their health coverage so they can earn taxes to pay for the health care of the people who stayed on welfare. So that is the more important issue for the long run. But I don't believe that my introducing my plan will undermine our ability to achieve health care reform this year.

Nuclear Nonproliferation

Q. Mr. President, Israel is known to possess nuclear arms, but the U.S. doesn't seem to be doing anything about it, while there is a lot of pressure on countries like India. Why this double standard?

The President. Well, first of all, sir, we are trying to deal with the international nuclear problems. But we also believe very strongly that the fewer countries who become nuclear powers, the better off we're all going to be.

And if there is a system in which the security of nations who think they may have to develop nuclear weapons to protect themselves can have their security guaranteed in other ways, we think that that's our job to try to put the system out there, to put those alternatives out there, so that people will see it is not in their long-term security interest to develop such weapons. That's our position.

What we're trying to do is to keep the number of people in the nuclear club as small as possible and then reduce the nuclear arsenals that they have, including our own. As you know, we've worked hard to reduce our own with the Russians.

So that is our position. But our position further is that no one should be asked to put their own security at risk to achieve that. So any dialog we have with India on this would be in the context of what is pivotal for India's security: How can we enhance your security, not diminish it? It would be wrong for the United States to tell your great nation, or the smallest nation on the face of the Earth, that we recommend a course of action for them that would reduce security. We should be in the business of increasing security.

But I believe you can increase your security and avoid becoming a nuclear power. Japan did it. Germany did it. A lot of other countries have done it. We can do it together.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 57th news conference began at 2:04 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this news conference.

Nomination for an Associate Director of the United States Information Agency

May 19, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Barry Fulton as Associate Director for the United States Information Agency's (USIA's) new Information Bureau.

"I am pleased to name Barry Fulton to serve as the first Associate Director of this new Bureau," the President said. "He was instrumental in the development of the new Information Bureau and is uniquely qualified to lead USIA's information programs in a changing global environment."

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

Proclamation 6692—National Maritime Day, 1994

May 19, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Soon, our Nation and much of the world will pause to remember the historic events that took place 50 years ago—events that secured the freedom we have long enjoyed. As we honor the heroes of D-Day and World War II, it is fitting to include among them the civilian American merchant mariners who sailed in harm's way to supply the needs of our Allied fighting forces. More than 700 cargo ships and 6,000 seafarers were lost to enemy action. Their sacrifices were crucial to victory, as were the unparalleled efforts of American shipbuilding.

The world has changed in many ways in the last half century, but America remains a maritime Nation. We depend upon ocean vessels to transport the vast majority of our huge international trade, which continues to expand. We also consistently rely on sea power to support our military forces.

As we look to the future, it is vital to maintain an American presence in the movement of our international commerce and to retain the capability of building ships. During the past year, this Administration has proposed, and is implementing programs to ensure, the future of America's maritime industries.

Last October, we announced a five-step plan to strengthen the American shipbuilding industry and to make it more competitive in the international market. Our plan promotes innovative, standardized ship designs that will reduce costs through state-of-the-art technology and series production methods.

In March, we sent the Congress the Maritime Security and Trade Act of 1994. Its enactment will ensure that United States flag merchant ships will maintain their role in carrying a significant portion of our vast trade and that American ships and American seafarers will continue to provide reliable sealift support in national emergencies.

Our Nation is charting a new course, reinforcing our heritage as a great maritime power and supporting our interests as the world's leading international trader.

In recognition of the importance of the U.S. Merchant Marine, the Congress, by a joint resolution approved May 20, 1933, has designated May 22 of each year as "National Maritime Day" and has authorized and requested the President to issue annually a proclamation calling for its appropriate observance.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim May 22, 1994, as National Maritime Day. I urge the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities and by displaying the flag of the United States at their homes and other appropriate places. I also request that all ships sailing under the American flag dress ship on that day.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this nineteenth day of May, 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, 4:29 p.m., May 20, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 20, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on May 24.

Remarks on the Death of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis

May 20, 1994

On this sad occasion, Hillary and I join our Nation in mourning the loss of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. Jackie Kennedy Onassis was a model of courage and dignity for all Americans and all the world.

More than any other woman of her time, she captivated our Nation and the world with her intelligence, her elegance, and her grace. Even in the face of impossible tragedy, she carried the grief of her family and our entire

Nation with a calm power that somehow reassured all the rest of us.

As First Lady, Mrs. Onassis had an uncommon appreciation of the culture that awakened us to all the beauty of our own heritage. She loved art and music, poetry and books, history and architecture, and all matters that enrich the human spirit. She was equally passionate about improving the human condition. She abhorred discrimination of all kinds. And through small, quiet gestures, she stirred the Nation's conscience. She was the first First Lady to hire a mentally retarded employee here at the White House. And she made certain for the first time that minority children were all welcome in the White House nursery.

She and President Kennedy embodied such vitality, such optimism, such pride in our Nation, they inspired an entire generation of young Americans to see the nobility of helping others and to get involved in public service.

When I became President, I was fortunate enough to get to know Mrs. Onassis better, and to see her and her children as friends as well as important American history models and good citizens. I can say that, as much as anything else today, I am grateful for her incredible generosity to Hillary and to Chelsea, the way she shared her thoughts on everything from how to raise children in the White House to ideas about historic preservation, to her favorite current books.

We hope that Mrs. Onassis' children, John and Caroline, and her grandchildren find solace in the extraordinary contribution she made to our country. Our thoughts and prayers are with her children and grandchildren and her entire family as we grieve over the passing of a cherished friend.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:39 a.m. in the Jacqueline Kennedy Garden at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the Community in San Bernardino, California

May 20, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator Feinstein, for that fine introduction, Senator Boxer, Congressman Brown, and Congressman Lewis. I'm glad to see Supervisor Jerry Eaves; he's already been to see me in Washington. Mayor Minor, it's good to see you. We talked on the phone about law enforcement not very long ago. I was thinking, when I saw Mr. Larson up here talking, he's about a head taller than I am; he could run any airport in the country for me. [*Laughter*] I kind of like that.

And I also want to thank our Secretary of the Air Force, Sheila Widnall, for being here and for the very poignant remarks that she made about the importance of these military bases to our communities and our life here. I would like to say also a special word of appreciation for the intense efforts that the California delegation has made to bring to bear in the Oval Office the needs of the people of California. I know you thought that Senator Feinstein was being somewhat aggressive here on the public forum. That is nothing compared to what I hear in private. [*Laughter*] If you've never been worked on by Feinstein and Boxer at one time, just imagine if somebody took a huge fingernail file and applied it to your head. Sooner or later you just say, "All right, whatever you want, take it and run." [*Laughter*] I'd like to say a special word of thanks, too, to George Brown for his brilliant leadership in the fields of science and technology, trying to help us to modernize the economy in ways that can only help. And I want to say a particular word of thanks to Jerry Lewis for his work with me on a number of issues and for his kind comments today and for holding out the prospect that we can still bridge some of the awful partisan divide that still paralyzes Washington too often. I thank him for what he said, especially thank him for what he said about Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis.

This is a very sad day for my wife and for my daughter and for me because, in addition to being a very important figure in our Nation, she was a personal friend of ours. Last summer, and on our family vacation, we had one of the most wonderful days I ever spent with Jackie and her daughter, Caroline, and her son-in-law and her brother-in-law and a number of members of her family. She was an astonishing woman who I think did a remarkable thing in raising two very fine chil-

dren in what could have been the destructive public glare of the spotlight.

I'd like to just echo one thing that Jerry said. When President Kennedy was elected, he inspired a whole generation of Americans, I think, without regard to party, with the promise that public life could be a noble and good thing and that together we could make a difference. The country had grown somewhat weary after the burdens of World War II and then the war in Korea, and he said we ought to get moving again; we ought to get the country moving again. And people felt good about it, even when they disagreed about the specifics. The main reason I ran for President is that I thought we ought to get the country moving again and that we ought to pull the country together again.

I'll never forget the day I came to the Inland Empire and played in that big softball game. Some of you might have been there. It wasn't my best softball game, but it was one of my better days. And I left that crowd thinking, "You know, this is America. We are a very diverse country, but we're at our best when we're pulling together." And out here in the real world where people worry about base closures and their kids' education and whether their streets are safe, most of our problems do not have an answer that pulls us hard to the left or the right or calls for a label of party or philosophy. And most of them can only be solved if we air our differences in a civilized and honest and listening way and then pull together and work together.

I was afraid in 1992 that we weren't doing what we needed to do to go into the 21st century. The deficit was going up when it ought to be going down. Unemployment was going up when it ought to be going down. We weren't adequately preparing our workers and our children. We weren't investing in new technologies. We weren't coming to grips with the demands of change. And nothing made it more clear to me than an experience I had as Governor of my own State dealing with a base closing, when a base closed in a part of my State that already had double-digit unemployment before it closed. And they told me that I could have some of this land for a public park but not to put people back to work. They told me that we'd have to come up with all kinds of money if we wanted to convert the base, and the whole area, as I said, had double-digit unemployment before the base closed.

Well, we tried to change all that. Our economic plans got the deficit going down and unemployment going down—3 million new jobs in 16 months. We'll have, if the Congress passes this plan—and I believe they will pass this one on a bipartisan basis—for the first time since Harry Truman was President, the deficit will go down for 3 years in a row. And that's something that America can be proud of.

And we came up with this new strategy to try to help people who had won the cold war for us but were losing the aftermath because of base closings deal with that. You've heard a little bit about it today. The announcement of the DFAS center here and in three other places in California is a symbol of that. But I want you to know how it came about. When I became President, I knew that the Defense Department had plans to collapse over 300 very small data processing centers into some smaller number, perhaps as few as 8, perhaps as many as 13. And I said, "Well, what are the economies of this?" And they had basically opened the bidding process, again, inviting communities to put up as much money as they could in facilities and other things to get these things. And it seemed to me that that was wrong, because this was a defense investment after years and years of defense disinvestment in communities all over the country. And I know how a small investment like this can really jumpstart a whole economy and what it can do to the psychology of a community.

So we decided that we would go back and change the DFAS process, not to pick communities—we didn't know who would win and who wouldn't—but to give special consideration to communities that had suffered from base closings. And we also learned that the economies of this were such that we could do 25 and save about as much money as we could if we just did 10 or 12. So we decided that we would do that.

You were the victor in that process, partly because you had the talent and the resources and because you had a base closing. So you didn't have to win a bazaar; all you had to

do was to show that you could do the job, you could do a very fine job, and that you had suffered grievously from the base closing process. That, I think, was the right thing to do.

The second thing we did was to change the rules for how we handled these bases. Under the old rule, we could give away bases free, as I said, for new parks but not for new jobs. Under our plan we give planning grants to communities that put together groups like this; we speed up the environmental cleanup; we cut a lot of the redtape, and we focus on creating new jobs.

As you know, about 1,300 acres, if I remember my briefing right, has already been approved here for your new San Bernardino International Airport. There will be a few other acres approved in the course of this year for good public purposes, dealing with parks and education and other problems that you have. And we are working now on the neogitations for the transfer of the land which will permit economic development of all kinds.

The thing I want to say to you is that normally when a politician comes to a place like this, the emphasis is on what we are giving to you. And what we gave to you here was the DFAS center. Now, I'm proud of that, but you got it because you deserve it. You got it because you lost a base and because you have the capacity to do it.

But over the long run—and I predict 10 years from now you all will look back on this and agree with me—as important as that DFAS center is, the far more important thing we have done is to change the rules by which this base is given back to you because that empowers you to create your own future with a resource that rightfully belongs to you. And you should be very proud of that today.

When I leave here, I'm going over to UCLA to speak at their convocation, and I'll try to remember that the most important thing for young people at graduation time is that the speaker be brief. [*Laughter*] But I'll be thinking about you over there and the spirit of John and Jackie Kennedy and the simple idea that the future is something that none of us can ever take for granted, that we always have to make for ourselves, for our children, and for our grandchildren.

If I could leave that legacy as President, if I could make the American people feel good about embracing the changes that we're confronting, instead of feeling threatened by them, and believe again that by pulling together across all the lines that divide us, we can solve our problems and seize our opportunities, that would be a legacy worth leaving. More important than any specific project, my fellow Americans, we have to believe in our better selves again. We cannot be, we cannot be distracted, divided, diverted, dragged down. This is a time for uplift, for looking to the future, and for pulling together. You have proved that it works. Let us do it for all America.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:32 a.m. at the San Bernardino International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Jerry Eaves, county supervisor and chair of the Reuse Project; Swen Larson, president, International Airport Authority, San Bernardino International Airport; and Mayor Tom Minor. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Army Readiness for Regional Conflict

May 20, 1994

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

As required in section 403 of the 1994 National Defense Authorization Act, I am hereby certifying that the Army is capable of providing sufficient forces (excluding forces engaged in peacekeeping operations and other operations other than war) to carry out two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously, in accordance with the National Military Strategy.

Moreover, the attached report specifies the active Army units anticipated to deploy within the first 75 days in response to a major regional conflict that are currently engaged in peacekeeping operations and other operations other than war. The report also specifies my estimate of the time required to redeploy and retrain those forces.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

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.

May 14

In the morning, the President traveled to Indianapolis, IN. Following his arrival, he met with Prime Minister Albert Reynolds of Ireland at the Mount Helm Baptist Church.

In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced that the Congressional Medal of Honor would be presented posthumously in a White House ceremony on May 23 to M. Sgt. Gary I. Gordan and Sfc. Randall D. Shughart, who were killed in action in Mogadishu, Somalia, on October 3, 1993.

May 18

The President announced his intention to nominate Robert A. Pastor to be Ambassador to the Republic of Panama.

The President announced his intention to nominate John Shattuck, Ashton Carter, and Charles Meissner as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

May 19

The President announced his appointment of Benjamin O. Davis and Jeffrey H. Smith as members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

May 20

In the morning, the President traveled to San Bernardino, CA.

In the afternoon, he traveled to Los Angeles, CA, where he attended the 75th anniversary convocation at the University of California, Los Angeles.

In the evening, the President attended a reception for Senator Dianne Feinstein at a private residence in Beverly Hills.

The President announced his intention to nominate Harold A. Monteau to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission and the appointment of Lacy H. Thornburg to serve as an associate member of the Commission.

The President announced the appointment of James W. Wold as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense and Director of the Defense Prisoners of War/Missing in Action Office.

The White House announced the President will met with President Abdou Diouf of Senegal on May 23 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 May 16

Mary Ann Casey,
of Colorado, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Tunisia.

Submitted May 17

Stephen G. Breyer,
of Massachusetts, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Harry A. Blackmun.

Michael Nacht,
of Maryland, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Linton F. Brooks, resigned.

Amy Sands,
of California, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Manfred Eimer.

Lawrence Scheinman,
of New York, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Bradley Gordon, resigned.

Phyllis Nichamoff Segal,
of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of 5 years expiring July 1, 1999, vice Jean McKee, term expiring.

Submitted May 18

Raymond Edwin Mabus, Jr.,
of Mississippi, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Paul Steven Miller,
of California, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 1998, vice Joy Cherian, resigned.

John W. Caldwell,
of Georgia, to be U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice Jimmy C. Carter.

Robert Henry McMichael,
of Georgia, to be U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice Lynn H. Duncan.

Roy Allen Smith,
of Ohio, to be U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of Ohio for the term of 4 years, vice Robert W. Foster.

David William Troutman,
of Ohio, to be U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of Ohio for the term of 4 years, vice Albert Z. Moore.

Submitted May 19

Julie D. Belaga,
of Connecticut, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for the remainder of the term expiring January 20, 1995, vice Cecil B. Thompson.

Julie D. Belaga,
of Connecticut, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 1999 (reappointment).

Joseph F. Vivona,
of New Jersey, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy (new position).

Rachel Worby,
of West Virginia, to be a member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 1998, vice Ardis Krainik, term expired.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released May 16

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on Haiti

Released May 17

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Special Counsel to the President Lloyd Cutler on the President's public financial disclosure report

Released May 18

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

White House statement on proposed increases in Federal funding for homeless programs in individual cities

Released May 20

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's planned meeting with President Abdou Diouf of Senegal on May 23

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's appointment of Melissa F. Wells as his special representative on Sudan

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on Presidential election results in Malawi

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on U.S.-UNHCR cooperation on Haitian migrants

Acts Approved by the President

Approved May 16

H.R. 4204 / Public Law 103–249
To designate the Federal building located at 711 Washington Street in Boston, Massachusetts, as the ''Jean Mayer Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging''

H.J. Res. 239 / Public Law 103–250
To authorize the President to proclaim September 1994 as ''Classical Music Month''

S.J. Res. 146 / Public Law 103–251
Designating May 1, 1994, through May 7, 1994, as ''National Walking Week''

Approved May 18

S. 2000 / Public Law 103–252
Human Services Amendments of 1994

Approved May 19

H.R. 1134 / Public Law 103–253
Clear Creek County, Colorado, Public Lands Transfer Act of 1993

H.R. 1727 / Public Law 103–254
Arson Prevention Act of 1994

S. 341 / Public Law 103–255
To provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and Eagle and Pitkin Counties in Colorado, and for other purposes