

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, July 4, 1994
Volume 30—Number 26
Pages 1351-1395

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Democratic National Committee reception in New York City—1367
Medical educators—1360
National Academy of Sciences—1375
People of the Baltic nations—1359
People of Berlin, Germany—1359
Radio address—1357
Representative Richard Gephardt, fundraiser in St. Louis, MO—1351
Senators Jim Sasser and Paul Sarbanes, fundraiser—1372
Small Business Coalition for Health Care Reform—1379
White House Conference on Africa—1363
White House staff—1361

Appointments and Nominations

Federal Maritime Commission, Commissioners—1379
White House Office
Chief of Staff—1361
Counselor to the President—1361
Office of Management and Budget, Director—1361

Bill Signings

Independent Counsel Act, statement—1383

Communications to Congress

Continuation of export control regulations, message—1384
Health care reform, letter—1393
Treasury Department report on blocked accounts, letter transmitting—1389

Communications to Federal Agencies

Assistance to South Africa, memorandum—1367
Generalized System of Preferences, memorandum—1388

Executive Orders

Continuation of Export Control Regulations—1383

Interviews With the News Media

Exchange with reporters in the Oval Office—1361, 1371
Interview with Klaus Walther of ZDF German television—1390

Letters and Messages

Observance of Independence Day, message—1367

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Chile, President Frei—1371

Proclamations

50th Anniversary of the Liberation of Guam—1388
To Modify Duty-Free Treatment Under the Generalized System of Preferences and for Other Purposes—1385

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Contents—Continued

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings
Base Closure Commission—1390
Congressional action on health care—1390
Death of airmen at Fairchild Air Force Base—1351
EPA decision on renewable fuels—1389

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1395
Checklist of White House press releases—1394
Digest of other White House announcements—1393
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1394

Week Ending Friday, July 1, 1994

Statement on the Death of Airmen at Fairchild Air Force Base

June 24, 1994

I was profoundly saddened to learn tonight of the tragic aircraft accident at Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, that took the lives of four Air Force officers of the 12th Air Combat Command. The deaths of these superb airmen remind us as a nation of the hazardous risks involved in maintaining the readiness and proficiency of our Armed Forces and the debt we owe our military personnel. Hillary joins me in asking all Americans to keep the families of these distinguished Air Force officers and all the personnel of the 12th Air Combat Command in their prayers.

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

Remarks at a Fundraiser for Representative Richard Gephardt in St. Louis, Missouri

June 24, 1994

Thank you so much. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for that wonderful welcome. It's great to be back in St. Louis. Thank you, August Busch, for those kind words and for what you have done to support the work of our administration and the people of Missouri. I am delighted to be here with all of you.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Mr. Busch for two things: first of all, for stepping forward last year when it would have been easy to hang back and helping us to build a coalition of business leaders from both parties all across the country for the economic plan that Congress passed to bring the deficit down and get this economy going again; and for the work he did that Congressman Gephardt mentioned, during the great flood last year to help the Red Cross and

the Salvation Army to send drinking water to families all across the region. That's the kind of thing that we depend on our great companies to do, but it's something we should never take for granted but, instead, should appreciate.

I see Congressman Costello and Congressman Volkmer here. We were with Congressman Clay earlier today. He may be here, and Congressman Poshard. I know that Mayor Bosley is here and your county executive, Buzz Westfall. And I was with your Lieutenant Governor, Roger Wilson, and your treasurer, Bob Holden, earlier today. I don't know, I'm sure there are many other dignitaries here. But let me say that I always love coming to Missouri. You were good to me in the campaign of 1992. I've been back here often, and I always feel at home.

This afternoon, Dick Gephardt and I were in the Fox Park neighborhood with people in that community who, along with the mayor, the chief of police, and others, are trying to take control of their destiny and fight against crime. We heard things that were heartbreaking, but we saw things that were uplifting. We talked about a drug-related killing of a 12-year-old boy, the 23d child in the city killed this year. We heard about a 19-year-old young man who was gunned down with an AK-47 assault weapon, one of the kinds that Congressman Gephardt and I are trying to ban in this crime bill.

But we were on the platform with a young fellow that really is an American hero to me, a young man named Tim Hager who was severely beaten in that neighborhood by thieves when he was a teenager. He had to have pins inserted in his hips. But he never gave up his dream to join the Marines. And he joined and survived basic training, which is something in itself. And when he completed basic training, he was told after an examination that his hips had deteriorated to the point that he had an arthritic condition and he would have to be mustered out.

So he had to give up this lifetime dream because as a child he was victimized by criminals and by violence. Within one week after leaving the Marines, however, he had joined the community service effort in this community and in his neighborhood. And now he's part of an effort involving almost 8,000 other young people in what we call our Summer of Safety, a national service project growing out of a program that all the Congressmen here present helped me pass last year to give our young people a sense of mission to help rebuild our country at the grassroots level. He's organizing block patrols, turning parks into oases for families and kids instead of places of dangers, escorting senior citizens, working with the police to diminish crime. And I told that young man today, he's doing a lot for our national security right here at home by helping to make us all safer, and I think you should be proud that your city has people like that.

This fall, those 8,000 young people will be replaced by 20,000 more when we launch our national service program, AmeriCorps, fully. The head of our national service program, Eli Segal, is here with me tonight. He's done a brilliant job of creating this program from an idea I had and talked about in the campaign, that we ought to have a domestic Peace Corps. If the Congress will give us the funding, within 2 years we'll have 100,000 young Americans working every year, earning money for a college education or for job training programs, solving the problems of America at the grassroots level, giving power and purpose back to the lives of people to make them safer and to make them fuller. It represents in some ways the very best of all the reasons I ran for President. I wanted to restore this economy, to make Government work for ordinary people again, to empower individuals and strengthen communities. National service represents all that.

You know, a lot of us in my generation were inspired by the Peace Corps. At its height, the Peace Corps had 16,000 people a year. We're going to start with 20,000. If we can get it funded, we'll be at 100,000 the year after next. And I am absolutely confident if the money is there we could have a quarter of a million young Americans every year within 5 years, from now on, forever,

working to deal with our problems and build our country. That is what I think we ought to be about in this country.

Now, I wanted to start with this story to make this point. This is a very great country. And most people get up every day and go to work and try to make something of themselves, help their families, do something to help move forward. And the job of Government is not to give the American people a handout but to give the American people a hand up, to face the challenges of this time, and to forge partnerships that unleash the enormous character and energy and drive of the America people. And that is, more than anything else, what I believe Dick Gephardt has devoted his life to.

I have been in this business now for a good while. I was a Governor for a dozen years, and before that I was an attorney general. And the longer I stay in it, the more I tend to view people not just in terms of their partisan affiliation or even the way they are characterized as liberal or conservative, because that's about words and labels, but about what is really in their hearts and what they do every day.

And an awful lot of people today who are being basically barraged, I think, in this country by words and words and words and words and the rhetoric of combat and positioning. And too often, it seems to me, we wind up evaluating people based on not what they do and what they're really going to stand for but what labels are thrown around.

And it kind of reminds me of a sign that became the source of a great story we used to tell on the stump in Arkansas. On a country road there was a guy that had his business sign up. It said, "George Jones, Veterinarian/Taxidermist." And then under it, it said, "Either way, you get your dog back." [Laughter]

Well, if we ever get to the point, my fellow Americans, when politics in this country is just about words and name-calling, that's what it will amount to. And don't you forget it. It does matter what condition you get your dog back in. And as I told a smaller group of his supporters before I came out here, I appreciate Dick Gephardt for a lot of things, one is because he's a great leader in the House. And if it weren't for him, we'd have never passed that economic program last

year. And there are a lot of other things that would not have happened. I respect him because he's a great leader for St. Louis and for his congressional district as I saw as we worked through the problems of the flood last year. He's proved as well as anybody I know that you can be a national leader without giving up your local commitments and your grassroots contacts and your commitment to the specific interests of your district.

But the most important thing about him is that he believes that he's supposed to get up every day and do something. And you may think that's funny, but that's real important in this day and age, in this day and age when we're deluged with information and words fly back and forth and cynicism is so much the order of the day, the idea that a person in a position of national leadership really gets up with a vision of what America ought to be like and a clear path there. And it's made for a wonderful relationship.

Even on the couple of occasions where he and I have had a disagreement, I didn't give it a second thought because I knew it came out of his conviction that he had thought through the issue, and that he really believed he was right, and that he was determined to do something to move our country forward. And if everybody in public life could do that and we could somehow communicate that through the haze of cynicism and hard rhetoric that seems so much in evidence today, this country would be much further ahead. He is a national treasure, and I'm glad you're here to keep him in office tonight.

You know, I'll just give one example. You may never even read about this, but it's the kind of thing that I think is important. Dick is leading cosponsor of our reemployment act. Now, since nobody's dropping bombs on me for proposing it, and there's no controversy, conflict, or scandal, you will probably never hear about it. *[Laughter]*

But let me tell you, it is a big deal. Why is it a big deal? Number one, the average 18-year-old is going to change jobs eight times in a lifetime, even if that person, he or she, stays with the same employer. Number two, when a person loses a job today, unlike in previous decades, they typically are not called back to that job. A lot of big companies are downsizing permanently, which

means that the unemployment system is out of position with the modern economy. Why? Because those of you who are employers have been paying that unemployment tax for years on the theory that when someone got unemployed, it was because the economy had temporarily turned down, and then a person could draw the unemployment check and make obviously less than they made when they were working but still enough to live on until the economy came back up and the person was called back to work.

And of course, there were always some people that lost their jobs permanently, and they could go around and find the training programs and then eventually they'd get another job. But, if most people are not being called back to their old job, it obviously is a terrific waste of money and human potential for those of you who pay into the unemployment fund to keep paying people to draw a lower check to do nothing, to wait until the unemployment runs out to find out that they still have to find another job.

So what we want to do is to change the unemployment system into a reemployment system so the minute anybody is laid off, they have the option right then to start a training program, to look about whether they want to start their own business, to go to one place and find out where all the possible opportunities for them are, not to have to go through some bureaucratic maze.

Again, you might not ever hear about it if you hadn't come up here tonight, but this could make a huge difference in the long-term productivity and security of the American middle class. And it could also make a big difference for those of you who pay the unemployment taxes, because it could cut the amount of time people are unemployed and it would increase America's economic growth if we shortened periods of idleness by empowering workers more quickly to learn new skills and take new jobs.

Now, that's the kind of thing a real public servant does, thinking not of today's headlines but of tomorrow's future for our children. And that is why I wanted to be here tonight. I have seen so many times Dick Gephardt—not in public when people were looking and listening, but in private conversation—bring the talk back to the urgent obli-

gation public servants have to deal with, the real problems of real people. And if all of you could see him as I have seen him in private doing his business, you would be even prouder of him than what you have seen in public. Would that we could say that of all of us. That is a very important thing.

When I took office, Government had become more and more about talk and less and less about action. Everybody talked about the deficit while it got bigger. We never could talk it down, you know. And finally, it had gotten so big, the things we had to do about it were not popular. And ironically, the deficit had gotten bigger while middle class taxes had gone up and investments in our future in education and training and new technologies had gone down. Nobody could quite figure out how it had happened.

Well, with Dick Gephardt's help, we made some tough decisions. We cut a lot of spending programs. We raised taxes on the wealthiest Americans, including a lot of you here tonight that are still supporting it which I appreciate. But all your money went to finance a reduction in the deficit, every red cent of it.

We gave a break to one in six Americans who have children, who work 40 hours a week and are hovering above the poverty line, because we didn't want those people to be taxed into poverty and to quit working and to go on welfare. We wanted them to stay in the work force and be able to raise their children in dignity. And we didn't think people who were working 40 hours a week should be taxed into poverty.

And we brought the deficit down. This year, without a tax increase, we eliminated over 100 other programs in this deficit reduction package, cut 200 others. I presented a budget to the Congress that reduces domestic discretionary spending for the first time in 25 years. And when the budget goes through this year, it will guarantee 3 years of reduction in the Federal deficit for the first time since Harry Truman of Missouri was President of the United States of America.

And a lot of our opponents are out there running television ads saying, "Oh, they passed the biggest tax increase in history." By any rational calculation, that was not true.

It was the biggest deficit reduction package in history. Only 1.2 percent of Americans had their tax rates increased; 16 percent got a tax cut because they were in the income category I meant. And now in November we will see a contest between all the rhetoric about what was happening and the fact that, after the other crowd had it for 12 years, you simply couldn't talk the deficit down any more. You actually had to do something to get it down. And the fact that you're here tells me that you know that and you respect Dick Gephardt for having the courage and the vision to take care of our children and our children's children, and let somebody else throw the words around. And that's what we need more of.

But the good news is it actually worked the way it was supposed to. There was a big drop in interest rates; millions of people refinanced their homes; the car industry started exploding. It helped St. Louis a lot. After 4 years in which you lost 2,000 jobs in one year you gained 28,000 jobs in the St. Louis area alone; 3.5 million new jobs in this country in a year and a half, far more than in the previous 4 years, because action was substituted for talk. It almost always works. It works in your personal life too, doesn't it? It's just hard to talk things away. You always have to change what you're doing.

We did a lot of other things, too. We really tried to break gridlock. People talked about doing something about the fact that anybody with a criminal record could buy a gun easily in this country. And the Brady bill hovered around in Washington for 7 years, with all the former Presidents of both parties for it and we couldn't seem to pass it. But after 7 years of gridlock, it finally passed.

After 7 years of gridlock, we finally passed the family and medical leave law. It's really important because it says most parents have to work, but the most important work of any society is parenting. So it ought to be possible to take a little time off when you've got a sick child or an ailing parent or when a baby is being born without losing your job, because we live in a country now where we all have to be good workers and good parents. And if we sacrifice one role for the other, we will never become what we ought to be. It took 7 years to get that passed, but we

broke gridlock with Dick Gephardt's leadership and passed the family leave law and made our country a stronger country.

Now we're working on a lot of exciting other things. We're working on passing a crime bill we talked about today, a crime bill that will put 100,000 more police officers on the street; a crime bill that will stiffen punishment but will also increase programs for prevention to help young people stay out of trouble, everything from summer jobs to midnight basketball to after-school programs for latchkey children; that will ban the kind of assault weapons that make gangs better armed than police. It is a very important piece of legislation. It's been held up in Congress for over 5 years, nearly 6 years, by political gridlock. We're going to break that gridlock next month and give the American people a bill that will make St. Louis a safer place to live, thanks to Dick Gephardt's leadership.

We're working on political reform, on lobby reform, campaign finance reform. We have a lot of major environmental legislation moving through the Congress with unprecedented support from environmental groups and business groups working together. We're working on opening trade all around the world with a worldwide trade agreement that Congressman Gephardt endorsed just the other day that will add hundreds of thousands of American jobs between now and the end of this decade to our economy. And we are working to try to redeem a pledge and a commitment that Harry Truman made 50 years ago, finally to provide assurance of health care to all working families in this country, something we should have done when he was President of the United States of America.

I want to talk just a moment about this health care issue because it is just like the deficit; you just can't talk it down. And it is a difficult issue; it is not free of difficulty. But here are the facts: Of all the advanced countries in the world, only the United States does not provide health coverage to everybody—"everybody" defined as 98 percent of us or more. Everybody else has done that. In our country, we cover about 83 percent of our people with health insurance or

through a Government program like Medicare for the senior citizens.

No other country in the world spends more than 10 percent of their income on health care. In our country, we spend 14 percent—40 percent more of our income than anybody else—but we can't figure out how to cover everybody. Not only that, the burden of paying for health care is wildly uneven and unfair. The Government does not fully reimburse doctors and clinics and hospitals for health care for the poor and often for health care for senior citizens. Many others aren't insured at all and can't pay, but they get care. And all that cost is then shoved on to companies that do provide for their employees. So big companies like McDonnell-Douglas pay health care not only for their own employees but pay for the extra cost of those that take no care for themselves and make no investment.

Small businesses in this country who are struggling to provide some health insurance for their employees pay rates that are, on average, 35 to 40 percent higher than bigger business or Government does. So they're in the worst of all worlds.

I was in Columbus, Ohio, the other day, and I met a woman who—she and her husband ran a delicatessen where I had lunch. They had 20 full-time employees and 20 part-time employees. And she had had cancer 5 years before. And she said, "I am a living example of what is unfair about this system." She said, "We provide health insurance for our 20 full-time employees. And because I had cancer 5 years ago, we pay higher rates for our whole group. But I pay for them. And I resent the fact that my competitors don't do it. On the other hand, I've got 20 part-time employees that I can't afford to cover, and I feel guilty that I don't do that. I've got it coming and going. But I simply can't afford it. If everybody had to do it, I wouldn't be at a competitive disadvantage. The cost would actually be less than I'm paying now for me to cover my part-time employees if I could be in a big pool so that I could buy insurance on the same competitive basis larger companies do. Won't you please do something so I can do that?"

On the other hand, in America—let's take it the other way—we have a lot of people

who are small business people who operate on very narrow profit margins. They're creating most of the jobs in this country, and they don't think they can afford anything else for health care. So what are we going to do? What we've done for 40 years is nothing, except just to sort of add on one little program after another.

In 3 years, in 3 years because of the rising cost of health care, we've lost 3 million people out of the health insurance system. Three million more people uncovered. In 1980, 87.5 percent of the American people were covered with health insurance. By 1993, only 83 percent of the American people were. We are going in reverse, and we're spending more while fewer are covered.

Now, when I put out my program I went around and I listened to people talk about it. And they said, "Ah, you've got too many rules in there; it's too bureaucratic; you need to make it more flexible; change it some." And I said, fine. The only thing I want to do is find a way to cover everybody and give small business, farmers, and self-employed people a break so they can buy rates—insurance on a competitive basis and we can have some way of holding costs down without sacrificing quality. That's all I want to do. But if we don't do it, it will be just like this deficit or just like a hangnail. It won't get any easier. Sooner or later we're going to have to do this. We ought to do it now. We ought to do it now.

Let me say, I want this to be as grassroots a program as I can. The best, most popular thing we've done when people know about it is national service, because the Government provides the money and sets the goals and people at the local level decide how to organize all these young people to solve problems. That's a lot of what we're trying to do with health care. I don't want the Government to take it over. I want to leave the private insurance system in place. I want people at the State and local level to decide how to do it. But you have to have some rules that say how everybody is going to be covered and some way of organizing folks so small business can get a break. You have to do that.

And I say to you, I don't think we have a chance to do that if Dick Gephardt weren't so dedicated to it. And if we had about 10

more folks in both parties in both Houses that dedicated, there wouldn't be a chance that we wouldn't do it. And I wouldn't even have to give a speech about it tonight.

But what we have to decide on health care and crime and welfare reform and all these other issues that face us is whether it's going to be a talking deal—either way you get your dog back—or whether it's going to be about doing something, not trying to box our opponents into extreme positions and covering ourselves with labels but looking at the reality.

Back in the Middle Ages, the great Italian political philosopher Machiavelli said that "there is nothing so difficult in all of human affairs than to change the established order of things." Because, he said, people who will be adversely affected by the change know it and they'll fight you like crazy. He didn't use those words, but I'm freely translating. [Laughter] My Italian is not that bad. But he said, on the other hand, the people who will benefit are always somewhat uncertain about what the change will be, and therefore, they won't bring themselves into the fight with the same gusto as those who are afraid of the change. So it always is difficult to change.

But we know that America is around here after 214 years and more because we always changed when we had to, because we have this capacity to be faithful to our values and our Constitution and our institutions, but to change. And that's what he hired on for, and that's why I ran for President.

I had a good life, and I was as happy as I'd ever been in my life the day I entered the race for President. And everybody told me that my happiest days might be behind me. [Laughter] But I did not want to see my child grow up in a country where things were coming apart when they ought to be coming together. I did not want her to be part of the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents. And I did not believe that we were incapable of solving these problems.

So I say to you tonight, my fellow Americans, we glorify Harry Truman today because he made us face our problems, and he said what he thought. Everybody talks about how much they miss him. I came from a family

that was for him when he was alive. [*Laughter*] And you know what I'm talking about—we all—you know, he's practically a saint now in America. But when he was alive he was usually low in the polls for telling inconvenient truth and trying to get people to face up to their responsibilities at a time when we were tired of it. I mean, it was at the end of the war, and we'd been through all that, and nobody wanted to face all that.

We cannot be tired today. We have a lot to do. At the end of the cold war we're faced with a whole set of challenges and opportunities that are different. And our children's lives will be measured by the extent to which we choose to do and to pull together, instead of to talk and to divide. We got to where we are today by being a nation of believers and doers.

Dick Gephardt, your Congressman, is one of our finest believers and doers. Let the rest of us do as well on health care and all our challenges, and our country will go into the next century in great shape.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:44 p.m. in the St. Louis Ballroom at the Adams Mark Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to August Busch III, chairman and president, Anheuser-Busch, Inc. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

June 25, 1994

Good morning. This morning I want to talk about the progress we're making in our drive to provide real health care security to America's working families. But before I do, I'd like to say a brief word about families who provide real national security for the American people.

Earlier this week at Fairchild Air Force Base in Washington State, six people died and more than 20 others were injured when an unhappy former airman brought an assault weapon onto the base and opened fire. And now the men and women at Fairchild grieve again. Yesterday afternoon a B-52 bomber from the 12th Air Combat Command crashed at the base during a training mission. All four airmen aboard were lost. Their

deaths remind us again of the hazards and risks involved in maintaining our security and the debt of gratitude we owe each of our military personnel. I want to send my condolences and prayers to the families of the airmen and the good people who will continue doing the hard work of freedom at Fairchild.

After months of debate, health care reform is very much alive. And we have an extraordinary opportunity in the next few weeks to make sure that America joins every other advanced nation by guaranteeing health coverage to each and every citizen, not through a Government program but through private insurance and real opportunities for small business people and self-employed people to buy good insurance on the same terms that those of us in Government or people who work for big business can. I'm committed to making sure we don't miss this urgent opportunity.

This week we had a historic development. For the first time in American history and after 60 years of reform efforts, committees in both Houses of Congress have approved bills that guarantee universal health coverage, coverage to all American families.

Anyone who doubts the significance of this need only look at the last half century. President Roosevelt first tried to reform health care but couldn't get this far. President Truman tried several times and couldn't do it. President Nixon proposed universal health coverage with an employer-employee joint responsibility to pay for insurance, and he couldn't do it. President Carter also tried without success.

These reform efforts never got to this point. Now that we've come this far, we mustn't turn back. Momentum is building toward a solution for the health care crisis. And as we settle on one, we must make sure we go to the root of the problems in the current system.

Half measures, quick fixes, things that sound better than they actually will work, will only make matters worse. We have to help middle class Americans, whose economic success is the key to America's prosperity, know that they will always have health security, even if they have to change jobs or if they lose their jobs.

The whole purpose of our economic program is to make it possible for hard-working Americans to reap the potential of a vastly changing world economy. We're not proposing to hand anybody anything but to help all Americans get the tools they need to have good jobs and strong families now and in the future.

That's exactly what we have been doing. We've worked hard to get our economic house in order with tough deficit reduction and new investments in education, training, new technologies, the jobs of the 21st century. We've helped to restore the economy, and more than 3 million new jobs have been created since I took office last year. We've made a dramatic proposal to move people from welfare to work. We're creating educational and job training opportunities that will enable people to embrace change. We have a tough crime bill about to pass that will put 100,000 more police officers on the street, with tougher punishment, better prevention for our young people, a ban on assault weapons. We'll have 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

But unless we address the health care crisis, these other measures will not do all they should for our people. Unless we provide coverage for all Americans, our economy will continue to suffer and more and more Americans will lack the security they need to take advantage of the opportunities that lie ahead.

We've heard a lot about measures lately that wouldn't provide coverage to all families. But make no mistake, measures that are half-hearted would at best, at best, guarantee that things stay only about as good as they are now. The poor would get health care. The wealthy would get health care. The middle class would get it sometimes and not get it sometimes, but they would be either left out into the cold or remain constantly at risk of losing coverage.

Our strength in the world has always been the imaginative ingenuity of our middle class. But the lack of security about health coverage is putting a roadblock in the way of middle class Americans as more and more people have to change jobs more often. Today, 81 million Americans live in families with pre-existing conditions that could keep them

from taking better jobs or creating new businesses and already mean that millions of them either don't have health insurance or pay too much for it. If middle class Americans are held back by worries about their health care and the health of their families, they often can't do what they must to succeed.

And people on welfare, who ought to become productive members of society, won't take jobs if it means giving up their health benefits. Just yesterday in Missouri, I met a woman who has moved from welfare to work but who says that when she loses her health benefits for her children, she's not sure she can stay working and may go back to welfare. We'll be telling our people that working hard doesn't count anymore when we ask people who leave welfare to go to work to pay taxes so that those who stayed on welfare can have health care for their children while they give it up. I know you believe we can't afford to send that message.

We shouldn't assume that doing nothing will protect what we have today, either. Nothing is what we have done for years. And just this week, a new report showed that the percentage of Americans without insurance has gone from 12 percent to 15 percent of our population in the last 12 years. Now, that's over 12 million Americans who don't have health insurance. In the last 3 years alone, more than 3 million Americans have been added to the rolls of the uninsured. Even those with insurance today can't count on having it tomorrow unless we fix our system and fix it now.

Actually, not all Americans face this kind of risk. Members of Congress, along with the President and all Federal Government employees, we have a great deal right now. We work for you, the taxpayers of America, and you reward us with health coverage that can't be taken away, even if we get sick. Not only that, we have a requirement that employers contribute most of the cost of our health plan—that's you, you're our employers—and we contribute some.

Now, I believe every working American deserves these same benefits and that same guarantee. I think you ought to tell Congress that you believe the same thing.

In the weeks ahead, special interests will again be spending millions of dollars, tens of millions, to block reform. I'm going to do everything I can to make sure that the concerns of hard-working Americans don't get drowned out.

Harry Truman said it best about 50 years ago when he said, "There is no other way to assure that the average American family has a decent chance for adequate medical care. There's no way to assure a strong and healthy nation." I believe 50 years is long enough to wait to make good on that promise. Let's do it this year.

Thanks for listening.

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

Address to the People of the Baltic Nations

June 27, 1994

On July 6th, I will be coming to Riga. On that day, I will have the great honor of being the first American President to visit the Baltic nations. The honor will be even greater because now Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are free democracies once again.

In recent years, the United States observed every June 14th as Baltic Freedom Day, a day that reminded all Americans of the courage and determination of the Baltic peoples in your struggle against Soviet occupation. The American people never recognized that occupation, and we rejoiced with you in August 1991, when your three countries were reborn as independent, sovereign states. We have worked with you to achieve the early and complete withdrawal of foreign troops from your soil. And we look forward to rejoicing with you again this year when the final soldier has departed.

When I come to Riga, I will meet with President Ulmanis, President Merry, and President Brazauskas. Together we will discuss how America can work with the Baltic countries to help bolster your security and prosperity into the next century. One of the most important moments of my trip will come when I speak at an outdoor gathering in Riga to the people of all the Baltic coun-

tries. I invite all who can to come and join me for that historic occasion.

I look forward to meeting the people of your countries in a few weeks. And until then, let me leave you with three wishes: Long live the Republic of Estonia! Long live the Republic of Latvia! And long live the Republic of Lithuania!

NOTE: The address was videotaped on June 22 at approximately 6:30 p.m. in the Library at the White House and released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 27. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address.

Address to the People of Berlin, Germany

June 27, 1994

On July 11 and the 12th, I will have the honor to be the first American President to visit Berlin as the capital of a free, democratic, and unified Germany.

Berlin has stood for decades as a great symbol of freedom. Hundreds of thousands of Americans in our military and other walks of life have been symbolic citizens of your city during nearly half a century of peace.

Over the past two generations, Berlin's place in history has been the dividing line between East and West. Today Berlin is poised to play an even greater role in history, as a place that can help bring East and West together for all time.

There are few greater points of pride for the American people than the partnership we have enjoyed over these two generations with Germany and with Berlin. Now we are once again joined in partnership as we work together to build a future for the whole of Europe, democratic, united, prosperous, and free.

On July 12th, I look forward to heralding that future when I speak before the Brandenburg Gate to the people of Berlin and of all of Germany. I hope all Berliners who can will join me there on that occasion.

NOTE: The address was videotaped on June 22 at approximately 6:30 p.m. in the Library at the White House and released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 27. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address.

Remarks to Medical Educators

June 27, 1994

Thank you very much, Dr. Peck, Dr. Rabkin, Secretary Shalala. I want to thank also Dr. Michael Johns, Dr. Herbert Pardes, and Dr. Charles Epps for the work they did to bring together this very distinguished group of representatives from our academic health centers around America. And I'm sure that the press knows it, but it's not just the people who are up here but all the people who are here in the room have come from all over America, from every region of our country, in very large numbers, with very strong feelings about the central issue in this health care debate, which is whether we are finally going to join the ranks of other advanced countries in the world by providing health care to all Americans and still preserving what is best and what is excellent about our health care system.

The interesting thing is that the point which is being made here today, which I think has not been made with sufficient clarity before, is that over the long run and now increasingly in the short run, the only way to preserve what is best about our health care system is to fix what is wrong with it, to provide basic, decent coverage to all Americans. Otherwise you will see continued incredible financial pressures on the academic health care centers, continued difficulty in providing for the health care of the people who are now in your charge, and eventual difficulty in training and educating the world's finest physicians and other health care professionals. I do not believe that connection has yet been made.

I also want to thank you, particularly Dr. Rabkin, for making the point about rationing. The suggestion that somehow a very important benefit package that includes primary and preventive health care as well as guaranteeing access to the people who need it to America's finest high-tech medicine, is rationing as compared with what we have today: with 39 million Americans or more without any health insurance, with 58 million who don't have any health insurance at some time during the year, and with 81 million who live in families with preexisting conditions and often worry about accessing the health

care system. The suggestion that somehow we don't have rationing today and we will have it if this passes is, to put it mildly, a stretch of reality.

As front-line providers, you know the truth. You know the health care truth, and you know the financial truth. The significance, again, of this meeting today is this to me. I spent a lot of time in academic health care centers. I know that the people who run them are both Democrats and Republicans and independents. Maybe even some of them voted for the third-party candidate last time. I know that the board members of academic health care centers are both Republicans and Democrats. I know that where they serve, there is almost fanatic support for them among people from all walks of life. In other words, the American people, when they deal with you in your communities and in your States, put politics behind and put health care first and ask what are the facts? What are the health care facts? What is the state of medical knowledge? What is the financial truth?

If we could just get those three questions asked and answered in the Congress of the United States, we would get a health care bill that covers all Americans. In other words, if we could have people of both parties bring to the deliberations of the law in Congress less politics and more concern for health care, the way you do and the way you force people to deal with you just because of what you do, we would pass a bill in this session of Congress, with bipartisan support, guarantees health care to all Americans. This surely is not a political issue.

What I want to ask you to do today is—we're all here today "preaching to the saved," as we say at home, and hoping that through the magic of the media it will reach others. But I want to ask you to personally, personally, commit that you will speak to the Members of the Congress from your State of both parties and ask them to make these decisions based on what is good for the health of Americans, what is good for the economy of America, and how it will affect your institution in terms of health care and finances. If we can get beyond the politics to the reality, we can prevail here. And I want you to do that. You can do that. You can do that.

As much as any group in America—I don't know—when I started talking to Members of Congress, that's the one thing I found that without regard to their party, their philosophy, or their predisposition on health care reform, they all knew that they had a medical center in their home State they were terribly proud of.

And so I ask you, as we close this ceremony today, to commit to make a personal contact and a personal appeal to every Member of the Congress from your State to put politics aside and put the health care of the American people first.

If we can do that, and if people understand that you represent what is best in American health care, and we can't preserve what is best unless we fix what is wrong and cover everybody, that central understanding will carry the American people to a victorious result.

We need you. You have done your country a great service today. Please follow it up in talking firstly with the Members of Congress.

Thank you so very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:22 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. William Peck, dean, Washington University Medical Center; Dr. Mitch Rabkin, president, Beth Israel Hospital; Dr. Michael Johns, dean, Johns Hopkins Medical School; Dr. Herbert Pardes, dean, Columbia University Medical School; and Dr. Charles Epps, dean, Howard University Medical School.

Remarks Announcing Changes in the White House Staff and an Exchange With Reporters

June 27, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. Today I want to announce some changes in personnel in the White House that will add strength and vitality to this White House and to our administration.

In the coming months, this White House faces a series of major challenges that are critical to the American people. In Congress, we're seeking to pass the first major health care reform in history, a sweeping crime bill, a significant trade bill, a reemployment act, lobbying and campaign finance reform, and welfare reform. We're seeking to pursue our

continued efforts in economic reform and deficit reduction, producing now 7,000 jobs a week. Overseas we face serious issues well-known to all of you. We've embraced an agenda that is not only daunting but profoundly important to the American people. To meet those challenges, here at the White House we must use our people as wisely as possible, matching their talents to their responsibilities.

More than a month ago, my Chief of Staff, Mack McLarty, started some discussions with me on ideas that he had for a better deployment of our people. These provided the basic framework for the decisions I announce today. I came home from D-Day determined to proceed with these changes. He and I worked with the Vice President and others on these recommendations, which I am pleased to announce today.

Today I'm naming Mack McLarty as Counselor to the President. He has been and will continue to be my closest and most trusted personal adviser. His new role will permit him to spend much more time as my personal representative to the people who are so important to the success of this administration's efforts, Democrats and Republicans in Congress, constituent groups of all kinds, friends who helped to bring me to the White House. In addition, I am asking him to assume greater responsibility in shepherding our legislative program through Congress, including GATT, health care, and welfare reform, and to help lay the groundwork for summits this year with the Latin and Asian leaders.

Mack McLarty has served this country ably and well as Chief of Staff for 18 months. He was reluctant to take the job, and I will always be grateful that he did. He selflessly agreed to serve the country, and I would say he has a record he can be proud of. We had the most productive first year of working with Congress of any administration over three decades; the sparking of an economic recovery; 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since the Truman Presidency; breaking gridlock on the Brady bill, family leave, assault weapons, and other issues; progress in pushing historic plans for health and welfare reform. He's run an open White House, treating others and their ideas with unflinching courtesy. He has, in short, delivered with the

decency, integrity, and goodwill that has endeared him to many good people here and throughout the Nation. And I thank him for his service.

I am delighted today to say that Leon Panetta will succeed Mack as White House Chief of Staff. Over the past year and a half, he has been a pillar of strength for our administration. In the early days, he was a prime architect of the economic strategy, an integrated plan that reduced the deficit and laid the foundation for sustained economic growth. Then he took the lead in formulating and gaining passage of that deficit reduction package, the largest in the history of our Republic. He will go down in history as the Budget Director who began to slay the deficit dragon.

In an hour of tightening budgets, he also found ways to fund many of my initiatives to put people first: education, job training, and technology. He's worked closely with the Vice President in reinventing the Government. He's been an innovative adviser in drawing up a host of domestic policies. And he has been a skillful manager of the more than 500 people who work under his leadership at OMB. As the good citizens of Rome have learned, he also speaks pretty good Italian. [*Laughter*] No one in Washington has a better understanding of both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue than Leon Panetta. And no one has earned greater respect at both ends.

I am also announcing today that I will nominate Alice Rivlin to be the next Director of the Office of Management and Budget. She has been a superb deputy at OMB. She's played a major role in helping to run that organization and in chairing the President's Management Council and in gaining congressional approval of our budgets.

She brought with her to this administration a long and distinguished record. She was, of course, the founding director of the Congressional Budget Office, serving there for more than 8 years. And she's written pathbreaking studies of fiscal policies while at the Brookings Institution. Economists have recognized her leadership and her brilliance, electing her in the past as president of the American Economic Association. In short, OMB will continue to be in very good hands.

Finally, I want to announce a shorter term assignment. For the past year I have drawn heavily upon the counsel of David Gergen. He has been a wise and steady voice for bipartisanship, for moderation, and for an effective Government. It has been widely understood that he anticipates returning to the private sector in the next few months. I have asked David to stay on for the remainder of the year and to concentrate his full energy in the foreign policy arena.

On several occasions in the past, and more and more in recent months, I have found him helpful in the formulation, conceptualization, and the communication on national security matters. I now want him to play a larger role, joining my team as a principal adviser in this field. Other members of our foreign policy team have expressed their enthusiasm, and David has graciously agreed to serve as a special adviser to both the President and the Secretary of State.

Taken together, I believe these appointments will produce a stronger, more energetic, and a unified team for the administration and for the daunting challenges ahead.

I thank all of them for their willingness to serve. I'd like now to ask them each in turn to make a few remarks, beginning with Mr. McLarty.

[*At this point, Thomas F. (Mack) McLarty, Leon E. Panetta, Alice M. Rivlin, and David R. Gergen made brief remarks.*]

Q. Mr. President, despite musical chairs, this may be viewed as a repudiation of your team and what you've had so far in the Presidency.

The President. Well, I long ago gave up trying to determine how it's viewed by other people. All I can tell you is, I think it's a real tribute to Mr. McLarty that he came to me several weeks ago and suggested that we consider this and even mentioned Leon's name to me, and we began to talk about it. I think the job of the President is to make the White House as effective as possible, which means you have to use the people at their highest and best use. I think that's what I'm doing. I also think it's—someone might have questioned the decision in light of the successes that have been chalked up. I think we have done a good job with a huge agenda;

I think it's getting bigger and more complex. I think that this is the right thing to do at this time, and I think it will pay off. That's all I can tell you. My job is to do the best I can by the American people and let others do the interpreting.

Q. Mr. President, recently there was documented in Bob Woodward's book a lot of criticism of Mr. Panetta from your political advisers. And I guess one question is, how do you feel about that criticism of Mr. Panetta's economic policies? Will there be a tension now between your political staff? And how do you feel about the decision to have yet another of your close Arkansas friends take a step either out or down? Sideways?

The President. He's not going anywhere. He's my closest friend. And I don't want to get into that. I can win that argument. But I can't comment on Mr. Woodward's book. I don't—"documented" may be too strong a word, but I think that everybody who's worked with Leon Panetta has a great deal of respect for him. I thought that the transition debates we had over economic policy were good, helpful, and appropriate. We were trying to turn a country around after going 12 years in one direction.

He will go down in history as the OMB Director that did, I think, virtually the impossible, not only produced the biggest deficit reduction package in history, the first two budgets to be adopted on time in 17 years, 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman, the first reduction in domestic spending, discretionary spending in 25 years but, in spite of all of that, substantial increases in Head Start, job training, other education investments, and new technologies, the things that I ran to do: bring the deficit down, get the economy going, invest in people. So I think—he's clearly done what I wanted to do. I signed off on those decisions, I think he's done well, and I think he's done it with a very effective management style. I feel a high level of confidence in him.

Q. Mr. President, I'm not clear on what you're trying to fix. What wasn't happening—

The President. He is a former Republican, and I'm a Baptist. We set great store in deathbed conversions. [Laughter] To me,

that makes him even more valuable as a Democrat. I'd like to have more people do the same thing.

Q. Mr. President, what are you trying to fix? What wasn't happening that you want to happen?

The President. I think you should let our words speak for themselves. I was trying to think of how I could characterize this. This is really an attempt to do exactly what I said: find the highest and best use for talented people of goodwill who just want to serve their country. And this shows you what a sports—I don't like all the time politicians making sports analogies, but 50 years ago, Army had an all-American backfield of Doc Blanchard and Glenn Davis. And one was called "Mr. Inside," and one was called "Mr. Outside," reflecting that they had different skills, but they were both all-Americans. I think that's what we have today, and I think it's the best thing for the country, and I think in the weeks and months ahead, we'll see it proved out.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:16 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the White House Conference on Africa

June 27, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. Ladies and gentleman and distinguished guests, thank you so much for participating, and thank you for your understanding of our tardiness here today and for waiting so that I could at least share a few of my thoughts on this subject.

When I became President, it seemed to me that our country really didn't have a policy toward Africa, that we had policies toward specific countries and very often we tried to do the right thing. We did have a policy toward South Africa that had been the subject of much division and then was the subject of a lot of unity after the election. But it occurred to me that we were really suffering from having paid insufficient attention to the entire continent as well as to various regions

and specific countries and specific problems and certain great promise.

And it became crystallized for me in a way in our involvement in Somalia, which I will always believe was a well-motivated and good thing to do that saved hundreds of thousands of lives but which was presented, I think, quite honestly but wrongly to the American people as something that could be done on a purely humanitarian basis, when in fact, unless human tragedy is caused by natural disaster, there is no such thing as a purely humanitarian enterprise.

And as we dealt with that and dealt with the complexities of trying to hand over power to the United Nations mission and the question of how long was long enough and what the U.N. could do and what our responsibilities were as a police force, in effect, after the Pakistani comrades in arms were killed there and dealing with all the various interpretations which could be given to those roles, it struck me again how we needed good intentions in Africa. We needed attention to Africa. But we also needed to bring the best minds in our country and around the world together to try to learn and to grow and to develop a policy that would make some sense and really had a chance to unleash the human potential of the people of the African continent in ways that would lead to a safer and more prosperous world, a better life for them and a better life for us.

I wish very much that I had had the chance to just sit here for the last couple of days and listen to all of you. I never learn anything when I'm talking. And I know I need to learn a lot. I was so jealous when the Vice President told me he actually got to come and sit in on one of the seminar sessions and to listen to your wonderful speech, madam, and we thank you for coming. But I assure you that I will follow the results of this conference very closely.

Africa matters to the United States. It has to matter to us. And the things we want to do, they sound so good, but we know they're hard to do: to have sustainable development, to have reasonable population growth, to stop the environmental decline, to stop the spread of AIDS, to preempt ethnic tensions before they explode into bloodbaths, to protect human rights, to integrate the rich and won-

derful spiritual heritage of Islam with the demands of modern states and the conflicts that must be reconciled in peaceful ways. These are not just conceptual, these are practical problems, not just for Africans but also for Americans.

For decades we viewed Africa through a cold war prism and through the fight against apartheid. We often, I think, cared in past years more about how African nations voted in the United Nations than whether their own people had the right to vote. We supported leaders on the basis of their anti-Communist or anti-apartheid rhetoric perhaps more than their actions. And often the United States, because it was a long way away and we had a lot of other problems, just simply ignored the realities of Africa.

But now the prisms through which we viewed Africa have been shattered. In the post-cold-war and post-apartheid world, our guideposts have disappeared, and it may be a very good thing if we respond in the proper way. We have a new freedom and a new responsibility to see Africa, to see it whole, to see it in specific nations and specific problems and specific promise.

It seems to me that a lot of what we would like to see occur in Africa is what we would like to have happen everywhere. We'd like to see more prosperity and more well-functioning economies and more democracy and genuine security for people in their own borders. We'd like to see sustainable development that promotes the long-term interest of our common environment on this increasingly shrinking globe.

Africa illustrates also a central security challenge of the post-cold-war era, not so much conflicts across national borders but conflicts within them which can then spill over. It's not confined to Africa as you see in Europe and the effort we have made to try to contain the conflict in Bosnia even as we worked to resolve it.

The United States is presently supporting seven peacekeeping efforts in Africa. And I have issued new guidelines to help us do this work more effectively. I've already discussed Somalia, but we've had special envoys to the Sudan and Angola. We supported the Organization of African Unity's attempts to find

new ways to resolve conflicts there and elsewhere.

The daily reports from Rwanda, of course, remind us of the obstacles we face. There we have provided material, financial, and statistical support for the U.N. peacekeeping mission, more than \$100 million in humanitarian relief. We've insisted that those who are committing genocide be brought to justice. And we supported the French decision to protect Rwandans at risk.

This action will end as soon as the United Nations is ready to deploy peacekeepers. And we will redouble our efforts to make sure we're providing all the support we can for that and to make sure it happens as soon as possible.

I'm not sure that we can fairly view what has happened in Rwanda as an aberration but simply as the most extreme example of tensions that can destroy generations and disrupt progress and delay democracy. It seems to be me that in the face of all of the tensions that are now gripping the continent, we need a new American policy based on the idea that we should help the nations of Africa identify and solve problems before they erupt. Reacting is not enough, we must examine these underlying problems.

I know one of the underlying problems—and I've been following this on the television, your meeting—is the enormity of outstanding debt. Last year we announced a policy at the G-7 meeting of writing off 50 percent or more of the debts of selected African nations that carry the heaviest debt burdens, and we will continue that. But we are actively searching for new solutions to that problem as well.

And let me just, among others, challenge all of you here who have to work within the existing Federal guidelines—and I just named our Budget Director the new Chief of Staff, and I don't want to criticize tough budget guidelines, because they help us to get the deficit down—but one of the difficulties the United States has that a lot of our partners don't have in writing off debt is that debt, even if it is not worth very much, is required under our budget rules to be scored in with a certain value. And we have to really work on that because we often find ourselves,

because of the mechanics of this, in a position that can be quite counterproductive.

This is a problem not just in Africa but elsewhere as well. We are actively searching for new solutions to this problem. And I believe that we have to do something about it. Even though we know lightening the debt load won't solve all the problems, we can't solve a lot of the other problems unless we do it.

The long-term goal has to be sustainable development. And the statistics are pretty grim. Look at what is happening to natural resources, to population, to the gap between rich and poor. Look at what has happened to per capita income in so many countries in the decade of the 1980's.

Africans have a daunting set of challenges before them. And yet we know that they can't do what people are always urging me to do: Just pick out one thing and do it; forget about all the rest. [*Laughter*] Right? You heard that before, here? The problem is, it gives you something to say you did, but it may not solve the problem.

I was very impressed by the writings of Professor Homer Dixon, who argued that all of these fronts must be moved on at once. There is no silver bullet; there is no magic cure. It would be nice if we could just work on one or two issues, but unfortunately it's not possible.

When the representatives from 170 nations meet in Cairo at the population conference in September, they will approve a plan of action that attacks this problem at its heart, one which will eventually bolster families, improve the social and economic status of women, and provide the kinds of family planning and health services that sustainable development requires.

The United States is a proud partner in embracing this strategy, which will eventually raise living standards and enable us to raise children better throughout the globe. I hope all of you will be supportive of that endeavor.

As Africans turn away from the failed experiments of the past, they're also embracing new political freedoms. Yes, I know there are too many nations in Africa where tyranny still drowns out opposition in human rights. But as we meet today, more than a dozen African nations are preparing for elections. Opposi-

tion voices grow louder. Someday they'll be like me and they'll wish it weren't happening. [Laughter] But it's a good sign. And the lights of freedom shine brighter. It's all part of it, right?

I think South Africa has given a great cause for hope not only on the African Continent but throughout the world. President Mandela spoke to you, I know, by videotape, and I thank him for that. I thank Reverend Jackson and others who worked so hard to make those elections work well there. And I think the \$35 million we spent there last year in trying to prepare for and help make sure the elections came off all right was about the best expenditure of a modest amount of tax dollars that I have seen in many a year.

But now the hard work begins. Governor Cuomo of New York used to have a wonderful phrase that he quoted all the time. He says, "You know, we campaign in poetry, but alas, we must govern in prose." [Laughter] And Nelson Mandela's long travail in prison, for the rest of us who did not have to suffer personally, was an exercise in agonizingly beautiful poetry. But now that those decades of struggle have come to fruition, they must govern in prose, and we must find prosaic, practical, meaningful ways of helping them.

We have launched a 3-year, \$600 million trade investment and development program, which is a beginning of that but not be the end. And we have to do a number of other things as well. I want to ask all of you who are Americans at least when you leave here to help us to develop an American constituency for Africa that creates lasting links between our people and their peoples and that will help to drive not only the continent ahead but will help to drive a meaningful, sustained agenda here at home.

We can do this. And maybe the most important thing I can do to work with you in the aftermath of this conference is to do whatever the President can do to develop that constituency, to explain to the American people of whatever race, region, or background, why Africa matters to all of us and to our common future. But all Members here of the Congress who have participated in this, including many who have tried to have more attention drawn to Africa for years and years

and years, know that that is the first thing we must do in our democracy.

Let me just say one or two other things. I think it's important as we kind of wrap this up to remember that with all the problems and all the terrible things that are happening and all the economic backsliding which has occurred, there is a lot of hope in Africa, even though, for example, there are problems in Sudan, where division delays development; there is Senegal; there is Mali; there is Namibia; there is Botswana. For every Rwanda, there is Benin, Malawi, Eritrea, Ethiopia, where people are trying to draw together as a society. In spite of our continuing frustrations with Angola, we look at Mozambique reaching out for national reconciliation, looking forward to new elections.

I say this because one of the problems I always find in trying to discuss this with people who are not otherwise engaged is that they read about all these terrible problems, and they think, "Look, we've got all we can say grace over and then some. We're trying to get you to do less, and here you try to get me to think about this." This is a conversation I have now, you know, in the White House and around in town here.

And I think it is very important, as Americans have to choose whether to engage in the future of Africa, that all the things that are happening which are good and positive be known, because we can never develop a constituency for change in this country until people imagine that it will make a difference. And the level of knowledge, frankly, is pretty low, except when something really horrible happens; then it just cuts through our heart, and it seems so overwhelming that we can't do anything about it. And so that also gives you an excuse to walk away. You get the best of all worlds, "I really care about this, but lamentably there's nothing I can do."

And so I say to all of you, I will do what I can. I will never know as much as those of you who have committed your professional lives to the development of Africa, those of you who have friends and family members there, those of you who have ties of passion and history there. But I do know we need a new policy. I do know we need a policy. I do believe Africa matters to America. I do know there are a lot of good people there

leading and making good things happen. I do know there are a lot of visionaries there. And I do know my child and my grandchildren's future depends upon reconstructing the environmental and social fabric of that continent. I know that.

And so I say to you, let's build a constituency. Let's remind people there are things to hope about as well as things to fear. And let's go to work and make this the beginning, just the beginning, of a new American commitment to a better future for all our peoples.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:55 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to President Nelson Mandela, Republic of South Africa, and Rev. Jesse Jackson, head of the official delegation to observe the South African elections.

Memorandum on Assistance to South Africa

June 27, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94-29

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Eligibility of South Africa to be Furnished Defense Articles and Services Under the Foreign Assistance Act and the Arms Export Control Act

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 503(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and section 3(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, I hereby find that the furnishing of defense articles and services to the Government of South Africa will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace.

You are authorized and directed to report this finding to the Congress and to publish it in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Message on the Observance of Independence Day, 1994

June 27, 1994

As we celebrate July 4, a momentous and magnificent day in our nation's history, we

give thanks for the liberties that our courageous Founders struggled to secure. Declaring the American colonies independent and free, these brave patriots risked everything they held dear to ensure a better future for their children and grandchildren. Today, we fiercely defend the once radical notion that each individual possesses rights that our government is obliged to respect and to guarantee. The powerful ideals for which the Founders fought have become standards of citizenship around the world.

Our country's Founders gave of themselves to create a better future. As heirs to their legacy, we can do no less. If we are truly to pay tribute to them, we must rededicate ourselves to using our precious freedoms with renewed responsibility. We must work together to rebuild our neighborhoods and bring healing to our torn families and communities. We must strive to end the violence that plagues our society and to give our children the chance to grow up in safe and supportive environments. On our nation's birthday, let us rededicate ourselves to making those choices in the same way Thomas Jefferson and his compatriots did so many years ago—with a hopeful eye toward the future.

Best wishes to all for a wonderful holiday.

Bill Clinton

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Reception in New York City

June 27, 1994

Thank you very much. Boy, he was hot tonight, wasn't he? [*Laughter*] I think he's great. Thank you, Chairman Wilhelm, for your outstanding leadership and for your extraordinary work on behalf of our candidates around the country. And thank you, Senator Bradley, for being here with us tonight and for your work on this event and for your steadfast effort to get a health care bill out of the Senate Finance Committee that actually protects the American people's health care. Thank you, Senator Lautenberg, for your friendship, your support, and your leadership. And I want to ask all of you here to help him be reelected to the Senate in New Jersey this year. We need him back there.

In addition to all the dignitaries from New York, I understand that we have two Democratic congressional candidates from New Jersey, and maybe you could raise your hands. They're up front—Frank Herbert. Here you are, Frank. Shine a light on that man; he's running for office. [Laughter] And Lou Magazzu, are you here? There you are, Lou, it's good to see you.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I was nominated for President by Governor Cuomo, I thought he gave one of the best speeches I ever heard. And about halfway through it, I looked at Hillary and I said, "Who's he talking about anyway?" [Laughter] By the time he got through that speech, I felt like a real President. [Laughter] And tonight I am also in his debt for his wonderful words, for his profound way of telling the truth, for his leadership in New York, and for his love for New York.

People ask me sometimes—kind of cynics, who don't know what it's like to really love where you're from—how Mario Cuomo could be doing this again. And I said, I may be the only person in America that understands this, but if I hadn't been just absolutely obsessed with the direction the country was taking in 1992 and convinced it was wrong, I'd still be Governor of my State. It's the best job in the world if you're lucky enough to be in a place where you love. And he loves this State. He loves you, and you ought to keep him doing what he's doing.

I also want to say, I'm glad to see all the musicians here with all their talent. I hope I get to hear a little music before I have to go tonight. But there's really nothing for me to say; Mario said it all. [Laughter] Ditto, I could say.

Let me say the stakes this year are very high because they will determine the extent to which and the shape of our continued forward progress. When I was elected President, we'd had 12 years of exploding deficits. And I knew we had to bring the deficit down, we had to bring interest rates down, we had to get investment up in our people, we had to put the American people first again. And we came up with a plan, with the help of a lot of people from New York, including my National Economic Adviser, Bob Rubin, that would do those things.

And when I say, well, maybe it sounds good, but it's not human sometimes to say, we had the biggest deficit reduction in history. We're going to have 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States. We've had two budgets passed on time for the first time in 17 years. Last year we had the first year without a Presidential veto in 60 years. And so, what does all that mean? I'll tell you what it means: 3.4 million of your fellow Americans have jobs that they didn't have. That's what it means.

Sixteen million American taxpayers with children, who work for a living, are going to get an income tax cut out of our economic plan, so they'll be encouraged to stay working and not go on welfare—16 million of them. Twenty million students are eligible—20 million students are eligible for low-interest rate loans and better repayment terms under the student loan program because we changed that. So no one will ever have an excuse that the cost is too much, and I can't go to college again.

Ninety percent of the small businesses in this country, under that economic program, were eligible for a tax cut. All they had to do was invest more money in their business, hire more people, and make this economy grow. Five and a half million Americans refinanced their homes because the interest rates went down. And the automobile industry is now booming. I just came back from St. Louis; in the previous 4 years they lost 2,000 jobs. In the first year of our administration, they gained 28,000 as automobiles in America came back. That's what it means. It's a human deal.

How many million people, we'll never know, under the Family and Medical Leave Act, are now able to take a little time off when their baby's born or when their parents are sick? We'll never know. We know that thousands of lives will be saved because of the Brady bill. We know that. We have evidence of that. We know that because of that assault weapons ban, police will be able to go out on the street with a little more confidence that they won't be outgunned by the people they're supposed to protect the rest of us from. We know that. These are real things that affect the real lives of real people.

Is it easy? No. It's not easy to break habits of gridlock that, frankly, are the province not just of the other party which says no a lot of the time but of the cumbersome procedures which grip Washington. But we've been working on it. The world trade agreement, GATT, hung around for 7 years. We're going to ratify it this year. The family leave law hung around for 7 years and got vetoed twice. It's now the law. The Brady bill took 7 years, but it passed.

The assault weapons ban—to give you an idea of how difficult change is, we had for the assault weapons ban, all the living former Presidents, every police organization in the United States of America, and this President working as hard as he could, and we beat the NRA by two votes. It is not easy to change.

But we're doing it. We're breaking gridlock. We're making changes. It's affecting people's lives in ways that are profound and important. And a lot of it involves not just the Government doing something for somebody but empowering people to do something for themselves. That's what a better student loan program is. That's what our national service program is.

Governor Cuomo's son, Andrew, now a leader and Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, has been a leader in empowering people starting with the homeless, the people in public housing, to live safe, constructive lives. We're trying to change the rules. No more Government handouts but Government handups, real partnerships, real community building, really trying to help people take control of their own lives.

These things matter to real people. And the American people are beginning to sense this. And the more they sense it, the more we'll be able to cut through the fog and let the clear sky show and the more we'll be able to run on what we have done for the American people to help them help themselves. It's going to make a real difference in the life of this country.

Oh, there are all kinds of problems. Americans have a well-known cynicism for Government. As my senior Senator back home used to say that half the American people are convinced the Government would mess up a

one-car parade. [Laughter] And that's true. But you know something? We do some things pretty well.

The Republicans talked about bringing down the deficit. We did it. They talked about generating economic growth. We contributed to that. They talked about having less Government. You know, they always complained about that. But when our budgets are implemented, we will reduce over 5 years the National Government by a quarter of a million people, not by firing people but by attrition. We use all the savings to pay for that crime bill to put another 100,000 police officers on the streets of New York and the other cities of this country.

We'll have the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President. It'll be producing more work, and the American people will be safer on their streets. That is the kind of thing that we ought to do. We can make Government work for ordinary people in ways that make sense and change lives.

But let me say, everything I have tried to do to empower people to get the economy going, to make Government work for ordinary people again, all of those things are embodied in this struggle to provide health care to all Americans. And it isn't easy. People have been trying to do it for 60 years. Roosevelt wanted to do it; Truman wanted to do it. President Nixon—President Nixon proposed requiring employers and employees to buy health insurance. President Carter tried to do it. I believe we can get it done.

And so we worked. We have worked for months and months and months. We worked for 9 months and involved thousands and thousands of people to put together a proposal. And then I said, okay, here's my proposal; where's yours? It won't be right for everybody. Surely, there's some things that can be improved about it. I went out and listened to the American people. They said, do a little more for small business and make sure you're going to protect small business, and make it a little less regulatory. And trust the American people to take more voluntary actions at work, but make sure you cover everybody. So we made some changes, and we did that.

And there are now bills on the floor of the House and the Senate for the first time ever in the whole history of the Republic that would cover all Americans with health care. There never even was a bill on the floor of the Congress before, ever. And it's there.

But the forces of opposition are very strong. We were talking at dinner how the great Italian political theorist, Machiavelli, said 500 years ago there was nothing so difficult in all of human affairs than to change the established order of things. Why? Because the people that lose know it, and they fight you like crazy. And the people that are going to win are never quite sure you can deliver the goods. And so they're often not there in the trenches.

Today we had over 100 distinguished doctors and medical personnel from all over America, including many from New York City, representing the academic health centers of America. And a brilliant doctor stood up and said, you know, people say they wish to protect what's best about American health care and fix what's wrong, but they're afraid they will mess it up if they try to fix it. He said you can no longer protect what's best unless you fix what's wrong. Unless we finally join the ranks of all other advanced countries and provide health care to everybody, we're not going to be able to afford to keep our finest medical centers going, training the finest doctors and nurses and medical professionals. He said they run ads against the President's program, saying that if you cover everybody you will ration health care. Tell that to the 39 million Americans that don't have any health care. They are rationed.

I say that to make this point. We can pass health care reform this year, but it's going to require everything that all these other things did: breaking gridlock, defeating special interests, arguing for a future, and asking people to work toward that future and making Government work for ordinary people, not to give them anything but to permit them to access a system that will enable people to take care of themselves and their families.

I spend a lot of time talking to laboring groups of people, saying, I'm trying to make change your friend and not your enemy; support my trade policies. Yes, it'll change the economy more and you'll have to change jobs

more often, but we'll be more prosperous and we'll provide lifetime training policies for you. And here are all these things I'm trying to do to change our education and training policies to make change your friend.

But I just want to tell you folks, I met two kids today when I came to New York. Whenever I go to a city, I try to let the Make-A-Wish Foundation or some other group bring some children to see me who are sick and who have health problems. And one of these children had a condition that may be fatal, but it's been in remission for a couple years—12-year-old boy, just graduated at the top of his class in elementary school here in New York City. He may have a good, long, healthy life, but I'm telling you, if his parents lost their jobs, what would he do for health care? And if they tried to get another job, could they get health coverage for a child like that? I met a 17-year-old boy—Mayor Dinkins, you can be proud of this—who was wheelchair-bound, has been all his life, has a severe muscular disorder from childhood—very bright young man, computer expert, wanted to write me on the White House E-mail, and I told him I was too dumb to use it, but I'd read it if he sent it. *[Laughter]* And he gave me a letter he prepared about obstacles for handicapped children and what his life was going to be like. And he said, "You know, this wheelchair of mine cost," I think he said, "\$15,000." And he said his parents were immigrants, both of them were immigrants. And he said, "Because my mother works for the city of New York, our family has been able to maintain a middle class lifestyle because our health policy pays for 80 percent of my bills. But it's been hard even for us. I had expensive surgery. I have this expensive wheelchair; I'll have to replace it soon." But he said, "So many of my young friends are almost destitute who are physically handicapped because of the conditions that exist."

And if we were getting a good deal, the rest of us, that would be fine, but your country's spending 40 percent more on health care than any other country in the world. And it is only because we have refused to discipline ourselves to provide health care to everybody, like all our competitors do, that these stories are out there. We can do better.

But we have to believe. We have to fight those who say we cannot do it. We can turn this economy around. If we can bring this deficit down, when nobody thought we could do it, if we can break gridlock, we can do this too.

I just ask you to look at these people on this stage and remember this, this is the only thing that really counts: I ran for this job because I wanted to do what I could with the power vested by the framers of our Constitution and the Presidency to change the lives of ordinary Americans for the better. There is no other purpose. And anything—anything that diverts, divides, distracts, or destroys the spirit and the purpose of the American people, when we have so much on our plate here at home and around the world, is not good. And anything that unifies and makes us believe in ourselves and makes us better and gives our children a chance to have a better future is good. That is what we represent. That is why your contributions are well invested tonight. That is why I ask for your help to do everything you can to help us pass health care this year, help us keep reform going, and help the voters reward the forces of change and progress and humanity and unity in the elections this fall.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:37 p.m. in the Imperial Ballroom at the Sheraton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to David Wilhelm, chairman, Democratic National Committee, and Gov. Mario Cuomo of New York. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Eduardo Frei of Chile

June 28, 1994

President Clinton. I would like to begin by welcoming President Frei here. He leads a nation which has made a remarkable transformation to democracy with tremendous economic growth and support for market economics. And we are very much interested in broadening and deepening our economic relationship with Chile.

I also want to congratulate him on the speech he gave recently in the Ibero-Amer-

ican summit in Cartagena, which was a ringing endorsement of democracy, the rule of law, and human rights.

I think that during the course of his term as President of Chile, the United States will be able to work very constructively with Chile, and I believe his leadership throughout our hemisphere will be very significant. And I look forward specifically to discussing with him today what we can do to make the most of the Summit of the Americas that will be held in Miami in December.

Haiti

Q. Will you be talking about Haiti? And Mr. President—

President Clinton. Yes, we will.

Q. —is there a big increase now in the Haitian refugees, and will you open up Guantanamo Bay?

President Clinton. Yes, we will discuss Haiti. And we are discussing what our response should be. There has been a significant increase in Haitian refugees, I think as a result of political repression in Haiti, perhaps intensified anxiety over the tougher sanctions. And we're going to examine what our options are there.

We do have, as you know, another processing center coming on-line, but we have not gotten it up and going yet. And as I have said all along, we have to calibrate our response based on our capacity to deal with this.

I would also note that the safest and best thing for the Haitians to do is to apply at the in-country processing center. The rate of approval there has gone up as well. And that is the safest and best route to the United States, and I would hope that more Haitians would use it.

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

Chile-U.S. Relations

Q. President Clinton, please, why did you invite President Frei to the White House?

President Clinton. Well, I invited him here because of the enormous importance I attach to the relationship between the United States and Chile, because of the remarkable success that his nation has had in moving to democracy and maintaining an enormously

impressive rate of economic growth, because there are many issues that we need to consult on and work together on, the upcoming Summit of the Americas in December, and Haiti, just to mention two, as well as our bilateral economic relationships, which are very important. So I wanted to see him, and I'm honored that he was able to make time to come up here and have this meeting.

Q. Mr. President, what is the position of your administration vis-a-vis the U.S. trade agreement with Chile as opposed to entering through NAFTA? Would you favor Chile entering through NAFTA or through a free trade agreement which is bilateral?

President Clinton. I don't really have an opinion on that at this time. I want to discuss it with the President, and I want our advisers to be able to discuss it and just determine the best way.

The most important thing for me now is to get the Congress to approve the fast-track negotiations with Chile so that we can accelerate this economic partnership whichever way we decide to go. That's very important to me to know that the Congress will support that, because I have said all along that I thought we ought to move next with this free trade agreement to Chile, and that that could be a model for all of South America.

So my emphasis now has been getting the Congress to support this. I think they will. The President's met with Members of our Congress in both parties. And in terms of which is the best way, I want to hear his view on that, and then I want to let our people talk it through, because I just want the objective to be achieved. I don't have an opinion about which is the best way to get there.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Fundraiser for Senators Jim Sasser and Paul Sarbanes

June 28, 1994

Thank you very much, Senator Graham and Paul and Christine and Jim and Mary. I'm delighted to be here tonight in your be-

half with a lot of old friends. I thank all the Members of the Senate for coming.

Senator Graham really is sorry that Paul and Jim didn't bring their charts. When he was Governor of Florida, he spent 80 percent of his time, when he wasn't out doing those work days on television, with charts, showing the people of Florida why they should change whatever it was they were doing at the time. [*Laughter*] And I love charts, too. I was made an honorary member of the Senate's "Wonk Caucus," chaired by Sarbanes and Sasser. Together we put more people to sleep than all the pills designed for that purpose in the history of the country. [*Laughter*]

I want to say seriously, I appreciate what Bob Graham said. You know, I served with I think 150, roughly 150 Governors. Unlike him, I never could get a promotion until this job came along. [*Laughter*] So I kept just struggling to hold on to my job. And I was a Governor for 12 years, over a 14-year period. And I served, literally, with 150 Governors. And if you asked me to go in a private room and write down the five best Governors I served with out of 150, Bob Graham would be on that list. And I say that because he had a quality as Governor which I have seen Paul and Jim bring to their work in the Senate, and of course Bob, and that is that he had this crazy idea when he got elected—really a rather radical idea in today's politics—that his job was to accomplish something, not to position himself, not to blame his opponents, not to divide his State but to actually do something, that he got hired to show up for work every day with an agenda which would be implemented which would change the lives of the people for the better.

Now, you may think that it's self-evident, but the longer I stay here the more I wonder whether that is the real purpose of politics for many people. Senator Mitchell has labored in the Senate, oftentimes to try to put together a majority of votes, when the real issue is, is the purpose here to get something done, or is the purpose to just sort of talk about it, position it, use a lot of rhetoric and spray a lot of blame?

It's interesting because I think, in a State when people get a feel for who you are and what you stand for, they will stick with you

through tough times and sometimes unpopular decisions if they know that you hired on to do what you honestly think is right and you're working as hard as you can to do it.

I am really elated at the prospect of Paul Sarbanes becoming the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee. And I frankly can't imagine what my life would be like if Jim Sasser were not the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. He sort of took all my good lines, but it is true, you know, that the other party spent years and years and years telling us how terrible the Government was and how terrible Government spending was and how terrible the deficits were. And they were able to get away with it, even though the evidence was that in every single year the Congress, whatever you think of its faults, always actually spent a little less money than Republican Presidents asked them to spend. So the thing was out of hand.

Now finally, we got a little partnership. We got in harness. We got two budgets passed on time, the budget resolutions, for the first time in 17 years. We're going to have 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States, and they're scurrying around to say, "Well, they must have done it in the wrong way, and it doesn't count."

Well, one of the things I want to say to you today is that when you get in a tight and you have difficult decisions to make, whether it is in public life, business life, or personal life, there is often no painless alternative. Every one of us knows some experience we had as a human being, growing up as a child, in our early adulthood, struggling to help our family, something where we knew we had to make a decision that would determine whether we would go forward, whether we would continue to grow as people, whether we'd be able to be faithful to our commitments and our values. And we looked around, oftentimes for a long time, for the easy way to get that done. But there just was no easy way. And if you take the difficult way, it turns out to be better than walking away and living with the consequence of that. Now, that's what Jim Sasser has done in the Senate. That's what Paul Sarbanes has done in the Senate. That's what we are trying to do in this administration.

I could have written the ads in my head I now see played—I'm seeing played in all these races about our terrible budget plan and what a terrible tax increase it was. Well, the fact is it raised income taxes on 1.2 percent of the American people, including most of the people in this room—[laughter]—which says a lot about your devotion to your country. It says a lot about your devotion to this country. It lowered income taxes on one-sixth of our taxpayers, about 16 million of them, with about 50 million Americans all over—around 20 percent of our total population and their families, working people with families.

It made 90 percent of the small businesses in this country eligible for a tax cut. A lot of those folks are active members of the NFIB, and they may be involved in the Republican Party. And the Democrats gave them a chance to get a tax cut if they reinvested more money in their business. Most of them may not know it, but it's true. It happened. And it happened because of that economic plan.

That economic plan gave 20 million college students the chance to borrow money at lower interest rates with better repayment terms, so they could continue their education. It brought interest rates down. It got investment going. It started this economy up again. We've now had 3.4 million new jobs since January, 3.1 million private sector jobs, more than 3 times as many private sector jobs as were created in the previous 4 years.

Now, I still believe that the purpose of public life is to move our collective ball forward, to advance the interest of our people, to do things that will bring us together and to move us forward. And our system will not work unless there are people in the Congress of the United States willing to make the tough decisions even when it is difficult, at least in the short-run, willing to believe that they can still convince their constituents in the old-fashioned way, not withstanding the blizzard of 30-second ads, not withstanding the palaver content of our public discourse, still willing to believe that they can go home and lay it on the line and talk to their folks in the country crossroads, in the small civic clubs, in the union halls, on the factory floors, in the sale barns, and make the sale.

And I cannot begin to tell you how much my respect for and appreciation for the Members of the Congress that are willing to take these kinds of risks and make these kinds of decisions because they know we cannot grow as a country at a time of profound change, just like a person can't grow, without making tough decisions—my respect has grown immeasurably. And Jim and Paul, they don't go around saying, "Look at me; I'm a brave soul." They just sort of show up for work every day. And they do right by America.

The other party, they talk all the time about how tough they are on crime. And the crime bill won't be like the budget where we got zero votes from the other side. We're going to get some Republican votes. And we've always had some. But that bill languished in gridlock for over 5 years, and now we're on the verge of passing it. And it's profoundly important. We just decided to put aside gridlock and get after it.

This bill does something that I don't think a lot of Americans have focused on. Since 1965 the violent crime rate's increased sevenfold. Now the crime rate is kind of tapering off, but the irrational rate of crime among younger Americans, unfortunately, is still going up. But the crime rate has gone up 7 times, the violent crime rate, sevenfold since 1965. In 1965, America had 500,000 police officers. In 1994, America has 550,000 police officers. So we spent a fortune expanding our courts, a double fortune expanding our prisons, when if we had spent some money expanding our police forces, we not only would catch more criminals, we would prevent more crimes by having police presence out there in the neighborhoods, knowing the kids, knowing the neighbors, understanding what can be done. This Congress, with the leadership of these people, is going to put 100,000 more police officers on the streets. It's very important.

I could go through issue after issue after issue, but if you look at the things that will shape the future for the children of this country, whether it's immunizing millions of more kids, putting tens of thousands more children in Head Start, securing the kind of future that our children need, these two men have been there.

Now, let's face facts. In addition to the extraordinary nature of the public debate today, which so often is completely disconnected with what is actually being done and what will affect the lives of our people, we know that historically, in the 20th century, there's only been one election in which the sitting President's party actually picked up seats in both Houses of the Congress at midterm. Why is that? That's partly because of what Governor Cuomo says, "We always campaign in poetry, but we have to govern in prose." So at midterm people say, "Well, the novel wasn't quite as good as the song was." [Laughter] "The movie was better than the book." The hard work sometimes takes some time not only to bear fruit but to be felt.

But I say to you that this year, given the nature of our national politics, that would be a mistake. The people say they want change. We're giving it to them. We had an historic first year last year. Since World War II, our first year was the most productive in partnership between the President and Congress of any except President Eisenhower's and President Johnson's first years, the first year in 60 years when there was no Presidential veto; breaking gridlock—7 years for family leave, 7 years for the Brady bill, 5 years on the crime bill, 7 years on the worldwide trade agreement. No one thought we could get the assault weapons ban passed in the House, even after the Senate passed it.

This thing is rocking along. But we have got to keep people in the Congress who have this old-fashioned notion that the founders were right, that this is not a place where people just position themselves and throw blame grenades across the ramparts of their opponent's defenses. It is a place where people are supposed to show up for work every day and do things which will affect the lives of their constituents. That is really what is at issue.

And I implore all of you—I thank you for giving this money. And I agree with what Jim said about roots: Everybody has got to have them. And they'll need the money for the defense to rebut some of the grenades. But I ask you to think more deeply about what this election means for the continuation of progress in this country.

We're doing our best to face the health care issue. Why? We had 100 health care professionals in yesterday to the White House from the academic medical centers. We had people from Washington State; we had people from Senator Exon's State of Nebraska; we had people from all over the country. And their spokesperson read an agreed-upon statement calling for health care coverage for all Americans. He said a very profound thing. He said, "Everybody wants to keep what's best about American medicine and fix what's wrong about our health care system. And that's a good thing." He said, "What I don't think people have focused on is we're getting to the point where you can't keep what's best unless you do fix what's wrong."

And he went on to describe the inordinate pressures our great medical schools are facing, keeping their patients and paying for their care and having enough money to train doctors and continue to make progress, because medical schools used to be able to pass along the cost of operation to people who would pay it. If they took poor patients, the Government didn't reimburse them at the full cost, but they got a little extra program from the Government, and they passed the rest of it along to wealthy businesses who had well-insured people coming there. And if people showed up without any insurance, well, they'd do the same thing.

But now all the businesses are becoming much more competitive; they have to lower the cost of health care, so they're not there. And the doctor went on to say, "They say if we give coverage to everybody, well, we'll be rationing health care." He said, "We're rationing health care today. We decided 39 million can't have it. Everybody else figured out how to solve this problem; all these other nations have. But we ration that."

Now, the point I want to make is not to give another speech for my health care program, the point I want to make is this: This is one of those kind of growing pain issues. If there were a simple, easy answer, somebody would have done this before. And I would never have been elected President. The American people took a chance on me because I said I wanted to move beyond the dogmas, the partisan fights, to grow the econ-

omy, to break gridlock, to make Government work for ordinary people. This is one of those growing pain issues. We either will decide to do something that is a little difficult today to give ourselves a much better future tomorrow, or we will not.

The chances of America meeting not only this challenge but all the challenges—I'm telling you, for the next 10 or 20 years there are going to be a lot of very tough questions facing this country. The chances of our meeting those challenges in the proper way depend as much as anything else on the ability of the people to sort through the high-temperature rhetoric to the true reality of the spirit, the soul, the mind, and the courage and the real character of their candidates. It depends, in other words, on whether we will have the capacity to reward people like Jim Sasser and Paul Sarbanes for serving well and bravely. I hope we will, and I believe we will.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:30 p.m. in the Crystal Ballroom at the Sheraton Carlton. In his remarks, he referred to Mary Sasser, wife of Senator Sasser, and Christine Sarbanes, wife of Senator Sarbanes.

Remarks to the National Academy of Sciences

June 29, 1994

Thank you. Now, the next time someone asks me—some irate, self-proclaimed expert in these matters—asks me, why in the wide world did you ever appoint Tim Wirth at the State Department, I'll say, "Well, I had to get Ted Turner up off the floor." [Laughter] "Didn't have much to do with public policy; couldn't stand to see a man with all that energy prone for the rest of his life. Seemed like an incalculable waste of human potential." [Laughter]

Thank you. Thank you, Ted, and thank you, Jane. When I was down in Atlanta the other day to do the global press conference—which is one of the most exciting experiences I have had as the President or, indeed, in my entire public life, and I loved meeting all the journalists from around the world and trying to answer their questions and commu-

nicating with them. When it was over, I got a handwritten note from Jane Fonda that said, well, you did a pretty good job on that, but don't forget about population. [Laughter] It was more formal, more polite, but that is the distilled essence of the letter that I got. So for both of them, I thank them for being here, although I do believe being on a stream in Montana is a way of supporting sustainable development that all of us could appreciate.

I want to thank, also, Dr. Bruce Alberts and the staff at the National Academy of Sciences; the Shorenstein Barone Center of the Kennedy School, and the Pew Global Stewardship Initiative for this event. And I do want to say a special word of thanks to Tim Wirth. All of you who care passionately about this issue know how well he has done, what a great advocate he has been for bringing the world's attention to the kinds of challenges that will command all of us for decades to come. It's not always easy, and it's now almost become trite to say that anyone who wants to truly change things has to be willing to be misunderstood. And sometimes I think Tim is competing with me for first in line on that subject. [Laughter] But the country is in your debt, sir, and we thank you very much.

I've been trying to prepare to go to the G-7 meeting in Naples. And I've been working on this organization for the last, well, year and a half—as long as I've been in office—to try to first get them to focus on global growth in the short run, about what we can do in our nations and together, and then to think about what the world will look like in the next century and what we must do. And I must tell you, I am of two minds. I am so happy and proud to be going there, basically to say that what we agreed to do is working; in the near-term, it is clearly working.

The United States has 40 percent of the gross domestic product of the G-7. But in the last year, we've had 75 percent of the growth, almost 100 percent of the jobs, twice the investment rate, twice the export increase rate, the highest rate of productivity growth. We've got the second lowest deficit; next year we'll have the lowest deficit of all of the G-7 countries. These things are heartening to me. And as a group, our economy is in the best shape it's been in in 4 years. There is

a sense that we're working together and that our Nation is fortunate enough to lead the way.

But when you look at the long-run trends that are going on around the world—you read articles like Robert Kaplan's article in the Atlantic a couple of months ago that some say it's too dour—still, if you really look at what is going on, you could visualize a world in which a few million of us live in such opulence we could all be starring on nighttime soaps and the rest of us look like we're in one of those Mel Gibson "Road Warrior" movies.

And I was so gripped by many things that were in that article, and by the more academic treatment of the same subject by Professor Homer Dixon. And I keep trying to imagine what it's going to be like to bring children into this world in this country or that one or the other. That is really what we are forced to come to grips with. And when I think about it, my mind starts bursting in those ways that some people say are undisciplined, but I think are productive. [Laughter]

If you look at the landscape of the future and you say, we have to strengthen the families of the globe; we have to encourage equitable and strong growth; we have to provide basic health care; we have to stop AIDS from spreading; we have to develop water supplies and improve agricultural yields and stem the flow of refugees and protect the environment, and on and on and on, it gives you a headache. And of course, on that list, you have to say, if you look at the numbers, you must reduce the rate of population growth.

Tim was talking about Haiti. My daughter and I once were talking about Haiti a few months ago, and I was telling her about how her mother and I had gone to Haiti once many years ago, shortly after we married, and what sadness and hope I had seen there at the same time, and what had happened since then. And she said to me, "I know all that, Dad, because I've seen aerial photographs from in space. And if you look at the island, you can see where the Dominican Republic ends and where Haiti begins. And there couldn't be all that environmental destruction without all those other problems you talked about." It was a stunning thing from

the perspective of an American school child that sort of wraps all this up.

I say that to make this point: We have to be disciplined in saying, "Well, all right, how much time and how much money and how much energy have we got, and we have to order our priorities." But we cannot be naive enough to think that it is so easy to isolate one of these issues as opposed to another, that there is some silver bullet that solves the future of the world.

If you look at the rate at which natural resources are disappearing and you look at the rate at which the gap between rich and poor is growing, if you look at the fact that the world's population has doubled since only 74 nations met in Rome 40 years ago, it is clear that we need a comprehensive approach to the world's future. We call it under the buzzword of "sustainable development," I guess, but there is no way that we can approach tomorrow unless we at least are mindful of our common responsibilities in all these areas.

During the 9 days of the upcoming Cairo conference, more than 2 million people will enter our world. More than 2 million new babies will be born into a world in which one-third of our children are already hungry, 2 of every 5 people on Earth lack basic sanitation, and large parts of the world exist with only one doctor for every 35,000 or 40,000 people. Reversing these policies will require innovation and commitment and a determination to do what can be done over a long period of time, while all of us around the world are busy with our own business within our borders. It will require us to be willing to think anew about the relationship of human development to what is going on in all of these nations, to cast aside a lot of our ideas in the past when it was always tempting to believe that there was one single thing we could do, some silver bullet, that would make everything all right.

To bring about shared prosperity, as Professor Homer Dixon has written, the nations of the world simply must move forward on many fronts at one time. Reducing population growth without providing economic opportunity won't work. Without education, it's hard to imagine how basic health care will ever take hold. Ignored, these challenges

will continue to divide people from one another. We simply have to solve these problems together, both the problems together and together as the people of the world.

I'm really proud of the fact that the G-7 has agreed to address some of these issues in a serious way this week in Naples. We're going to talk about what we can do within the G-7 to promote not just growth but more jobs, because a lot of the wealthy countries are finding they can't create jobs even when they grow their economy. And then, when they can't do that, they lose the constituency at home to engage the rest of the world.

We're going to talk about how we build an economic infrastructure for the 21st century. What's this new world trade organization that we create with GATT going to look like? And what should the World Bank and the IMF do? We're also going to talk about how we can help economies in transition, like the states of the former Soviet Union, and what we can do with the economies that are not in transition or, if anything, are going the wrong way, to address our common responsibilities.

This is quite a unique thing, really, for the world's advanced nations. And I'm quite pleased that, with all the economic problems that exist in many of these countries, they are willing to have a serious look at where we should be 10 or 20 years from now, far beyond the election prospects of all the world leaders who will be there.

As we head for the Cairo conference, I think that same approach has to guide us. The policies we promote must be based on enduring values, promoting stronger families, having more responsibility from individual citizens, respecting human rights, deepening the bonds of community. Here at home and around the globe, that's where the future lies, beginning with our families. When they're whole and they function, families nurture and care for us. They provide role models. They communicate values and enable people to live together in peace and to work together for common objectives. Therefore, that is the most important thing we can do.

Since the beginning of this administration, we have worked to promote policies that would permit families to grow in strength at home and abroad. I reversed the so-called

Mexico City policy because I thought that doctors and medical workers around the world should be able to really work on family planning and provide a full range of family planning information.

Since then, we have increased by about 50 percent, at a very tough budget time, the Agency for International Development's budget for international family planning and support services. To bolster families here at home, we passed a big increase in the earned-income tax credit to help keep 15 million working families off welfare, out of poverty, and in the work force. We increased Head Start availability and nutrition programs to hundreds of thousands of children, cracked down on delinquent child support payments, increased immunization funds so that we can increase by literally more than a million the number of children who are immunized. We're working to reduce out-of-wedlock and teen births.

Through the Family and Medical Leave Act, we're working to make it possible for people to be successful workers and successful parents, a big issue everywhere in the world now, where more and more parents must work. In any society which forces people to choose, we are doomed to failure. If people have no option to work and we all need people to continue to bear children, surely all of our parents must be successful workers, and our workers must be able to succeed as parents.

Our population policy is rooted in the idea that the family should be at the center of all of our objectives. Therefore, there must be a support for the concept of responsibility of parents to their children, of men and women to one another, and of our current generation to future generations.

Progress brings freedom; freedom requires more disciplined responsibility. And we must teach our young people to choose wisely and tell them that their choices must include abstinence. Our policy has always been rooted in the ethical principles of compassion and justice and respect for human rights. We have supported every individual's dignity and worth. And we will continue to oppose and to condemn all forms of coercion in family planning.

Helping to translate these principles into reality is the charge that the Vice President will take to Cairo in September. No one is better suited to this task than he is. He has shown his commitment to these long-term challenges, and he has been thinking in large ways about them long before they were politically unpopular or even the source of much current discussion.

In Cairo, we'll join the international community in pursuing a new plan of action to attack the population problem as part of the larger issue of sustainable development. At the top of our agenda will be active support for efforts to invest in the women of the world. Maybe over the long run, maybe the most important thing that Cairo policy will call for is that every nation make an effort to educate its children on an equal basis, to put an end to the widespread practice of withdrawing girls from school and forcing them to go to work before boys do. To ensure that nations can develop at a more rapid pace, it will call on each of us to recognize women's work and development and to engage them fully in the work force. It will help to give women the full rights of citizenship and to end discrimination which exists still nearly everywhere and slows progress wherever it exists.

At Cairo, the United States will also join the international community in launching new, high-quality, voluntary family planning and reproductive health programs. Our goal is to make these programs available to every citizen in the world by early in the next century. Parents must have the right to decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children.

Now, I want to be clear about this. Contrary to some assertions, we do not support abortion as a method of family planning. We respect, however, the diversity of national laws, except we do oppose coercion wherever it exists. Our own policy in the United States is that this should be a matter of personal choice, not public dictation and, as I have said many times, that abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. In other countries where it does exist, we believe safety is an important issue. And if you look at the mortality figures, it is hard to turn away from that issue. We also believe that providing women with the

means to prevent unwanted pregnancy will do more than anything else to reduce abortion.

Finally, let me say, we must take to Cairo the same basic commitment to provide health care for every citizen of the world that we have brought to the public debate here in America. I must say that there is less disagreement among the representatives of the 174 countries going to Cairo than there is among the 535 Members of Congress. Maybe we can bring the spirit back home.

Experience shows that investing in maternal health, prenatal services, preventive care for children does not only save lives, it eventually gives people the confidence they need to know that their children will survive. And that changes all kinds of attitudes that affect the way children are raised. Every country has committed itself to improving the health of women and children. And every one that has really done that has seen a decline in population growth and a rise in prosperity.

The Cairo conference, therefore, can do a great deal to advance our vision of sustainable development and stabilized population growth, to help us fulfill a vision of a world of intact families in which every member is cherished; a world that has the wisdom and the strength to tackle challenges head on, instead of to talk about them and use words to divide people so they don't really address them; a world that will lead to equal opportunity and shared prosperity.

When President Roosevelt died in 1945, there was a typed manuscript of his last speech which was found with just a single sentence written in his own hand. This was the last sentence of the last speech that Franklin Roosevelt had written, one that he never got to give. His handwritten sentence said, "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith." In the face of so many seemingly intractable problems, it is certainly tempting to let those doubts take control. But I think those of you here tonight believe as I do that we can, instead, search for and find solutions that will help generations yet to come. President Roosevelt governed at a time when doubt was a luxury the American people could not af-

ford. I say to you tonight, doubt is a luxury the world can no longer afford.

I commend you for your compassion and your commitment. I urge you to turn this faith into action and to help me to do my job to do the same.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:06 p.m. in the Benjamin Franklin Room at the State Department. In his remarks, he referred to Ted Turner, president and chairman of the board, Turner Broadcasting System, Inc., and his wife, actress Jane Fonda; and Bruce Alberts, president, National Academy of Sciences. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Nomination for Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission

June 29, 1994

The President announced today his intention to nominate Harold J. Creel, Jr., of Woodville, Virginia, to a 5-year term and Delmond J.H. Won of Honolulu, Hawaii, to fill a 3-year unexpired term on the Federal Maritime Commission.

"Hal Creel and Delmond Won have the education, background, and experience we need to maintain the quality of our Federal Maritime Commission, especially as we work to make essential reforms in the maritime industry," the President said.

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

Remarks to the Small Business Coalition for Health Care Reform

June 30, 1994

Thank you so much, Brian McCarthy, for your testimony and your enthusiasm and the incredible work you've done. Thank you, Mike and Micki, for what you have said today. Thank you, Butler Derrick, for sticking your neck out and going through this big fight. I thank Congressman Gephardt, Congressman Bonior, Congressman Fazio, all the Members of the House who are here today.

And I want to say a special word of thanks to Erskine Bowles, the Administrator of the

SBA. You know, when I asked him to do this job, I pointed out that, even though he was a supporter of mine, his primary qualification was that he was not a political appointment; he was someone who had spent a lifetime helping people to start and to expand small businesses. So when he came to me and said, "The biggest winners in this health reform plan will be small business; I don't understand why the NFIB is campaigning against you," I knew if we could get the truth out, the facts, we could have a day like today. I thank him for that, and I thank all of you for being here, too.

You know, we have established again today that an awful lot of small business people in this country do support universal coverage, are prepared to contribute to the health coverage of their employees, and understand that without a system that requires everybody to be involved in health care, small business will continue to get the short end of the stick.

Now, there are powerful interests in this country and here in Washington who have spent millions and millions of dollars to convince the American people otherwise. Your presence here today is a sharp rebuttal to what they have tried to do. There are about 50 Members of Congress here today who have felt the relentless pressure of all that organized lobbying, but instead of giving in to it, they've been thinking about you and sticking up for you and standing up for you. And I think you ought to stick with them and encourage others to join with you.

I do want to reiterate what Brian has already said. The Small Business Coalition for Health Reform now represents over 620,000 small businesses. That is the most astonishing growth in such a short time. He came up with—he knows I love charts, so he gave me a chart to prove that. [*Laughter*] But what that means is that when 4,700 small businesses a day come on board to an organization like this, those who claim to speak for small business and claim to say it would be good for small business if we continue to have the status quo, do not, in fact, do it.

We know that you're a young organization. You don't have television ads on the air. You don't have mass mailings going out, but you represent more real American businesses and their employees than the NFIB with their

intense disinformation campaign about our health care reform effort.

Now, I want to just try to put this in some perspective for all of you from my point of view as well as yours. I ran for President because I wanted to get the economy going again and I wanted to make Government work for ordinary people again, to actually solve problems, and to be a partner. I'm about to leave, on July 5th, for the so-called G-7 meeting, the meeting of the world's seven big industrial powers. And as I look back on the last year and a half, as I go into this meeting, I feel pretty good.

The United States has 40 percent of the annual income of those seven countries. But in the last year and a half we've had 75 percent of the growth, generated 100 percent of all the new jobs, had 3 times as many private sector jobs come into this economy as in the previous 4 years; 1993 had a record number of new business incorporations in America. Our investment is growing more quickly, our productivity is growing more quickly than all of our major competitors. Our exports are growing at twice the rate of the average of all of our competitors. The economy is moving again.

But as I look down the road and I think about the context in which we operate, I know that the economic plan we passed last year and the budget plan we passed this year had a lot to do with that. We're going to reduce the deficit 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States.

This year's budget eliminates over 100 Government programs, cuts 200 others, reduces domestic discretionary spending for the first time in 25 years. The other folks talked a lot about cutting spending and the deficit; we are delivering that to you. And still we have increased our investment in education, in training, in new technologies. Last year in the economic plan there was a 70 percent increase in the expensing provision for small business, which made 90 percent of the small businesses in this country eligible for a tax cut if they invested more money in their businesses.

Now, I believe that this is the direction we should take. But let's face it, if we want to see America strong and growing, if you

want our deficit to continue to come down, if we want to see every year a record number of small businesses starting, we have got to find a way to deal with this health care problem.

The only thing that's going up in the budget, folks, faster than the rate of inflation, is the cost of Medicare and Medicaid. That's it. We're bringing down everything else. And yet, still, those of you who cover your employees are paying for cost shifting for people who don't cover their own and for inadequate compensation in some of the Government programs. So from my point of view, your long-term financial health and your Nation's and your Government's long-term financial health depend absolutely on dealing with this issue.

Now, let me say one other thing. Every single group of experts who has testified before any committee of Congress has always said you have got to find a way to cover everybody in America, get them in the health care system if you want to control costs, stop cost shifting, and preserve quality. We have 100 members of academic health centers here this week saying the same thing, saying you cannot preserve what is best about American health care, providing the doctors, the nurses, the technology, unless you fix what is wrong with it, the financing system, and get everybody involved.

Now, we've been at a terrible disadvantage in this fight before right now. Because while 70 percent of the American people or more will say, "We are for coverage for everybody; we believe in shared responsibility; we want small businesses to get a break and be able to organize so they can buy health insurance on competitive terms; we believe people should not be discriminated against because someone in their family has been sick," because they will say that, doesn't mean we've been able to keep up support for our plan. Why? Because we've been the only kid on the block. Everybody else is out there criticizing, looking for an easy answer, and lobbing rockets at our program.

You've seen all those ads. They say, "Well, it's a Government-run program." It isn't, is it? It's a private insurance program. They say we're going to ration health care. Folks, we don't ration health care—we're rationing

health care now. There are 39 million Americans without it. There are 3 million people who have lost their coverage in the last 3 years. And every one of you who is providing health insurance on your own is having to ration it because you can't buy it on the same terms as big business and Government.

They say that you will lose benefits if our plan passes. But the truth is our plan doesn't take anything away from anybody; it puts a floor under what you can lose and gives everybody some protection, some real protection for middle class people and for small business people for a change. What's happening is today, as you know, every year people are losing—more and more—more benefits, more choices, paying more. It's a myth.

Then they say, well, our cost figures aren't right. The truth is we've got the only plan in town where the costs have been verified, validated, and supported. And for very small businesses in this country, operating on a modest margin, the cost of this plan will be less than the cost of the minimum wage bill passed by Congress and signed in the previous administration. And that is the fact.

So the support for the fundamental principles is strong. I have said to people in the Congress of both parties, if you don't like some detail of our plan, come forward. What we're interested in—cover everybody, have shared responsibility, have a private system, put a floor under it, and give small business a break—that's all I care about. If you've got a better way to do that, come forward, let's talk about it.

Well finally, finally, we're seeing enough action so that there will be alternative plans. Yesterday Senator Dole offered a plan. Well, let's just talk about it. Small business and middle class families are not affected by it, except they lose more under the plan if it passes. It leaves small business at the mercy of insurance companies, who can still discriminate against certain businesses, still charge small business more than big business, still leave millions of workers in small firms uncovered.

Under the proposal there are no discounts for small business, nothing to end the cost shift from big firms to small ones, nothing to guarantee that the buying clout will be evened up. And since millions will remain

uncovered—millions and millions—small businesses who do offer insurance will continue to pay higher rates to give others who are competing with them directly a free ride.

Now, I've heard time and time again that we've got to do something about this. That's what small businesses say they want. I've had so many small businesses say what Micki said, "If all my competitors had to do it, and I could buy it on affordable terms, I would be happy to do this."

Now we have an alternative plan. And the alternative plan is really old-style Government, the same thing you used to get really from both parties. It does a little bit for the poor. It leaves all the powerful vested interest groups with everything they've got, and it walks away from the middle class and small business. It is politics as usual. And now we have a choice, so the American people can make up their mind. Do you want everybody covered? Do you want something done about the cost? Do you want a break for small business? Or do you want us to appear to do something and not do anything to change the fundamental problems of this system? I think Americans will vote for the real thing if you will help us lobby for it and you will help us.

Let me say something else. This is not a partisan issue anywhere in America except Washington, DC. You don't have to declare, because I wouldn't want to embarrass you or me, but I know that there's plenty of Republicans in this audience today. I know that. I know there are independents. There may be people in this audience that voted for Ross Perot. I don't care. I just want you to have a chance to be part of a thriving, growing American economy. It is not a partisan political issue.

My fellow Americans, now that the debate will be shifting into the public arena and votes will be cast and amendments will be offered, let me say again, I want the most flexible possible plan. I want the plan that has the Government doing the least possible. But I know that our objectives must be secured. We have to find a way for full coverage for the American people. We have to find a way for people to bear a fair share of responsibility for providing that coverage. And we have got to find a way to find a break

for small business people and not to bankrupt folks just because they've had somebody in their family or because they have been sick.

There are more than one or two ways to do this. But there are difficult decisions involved. And that is the last point I want to make. Hillary and I have often talked about the small businesses we worked in when we were younger and how brave we thought the owners of those businesses were to take out their life savings, to put their necks on the line, to be personally at risk year-in and year-out, often until the business got up and going. And how many small businesses go under every year in the churning, competitive marketplace?

One thing I know about you is that you have no place to hide. You have to face whatever the realities of your situation are. And you have to make decisions. And you know that when you have a difficult decision to make, making a decision that may not be 100 percent right is better than walking away and letting your whole business go under.

Too often the political system, when the going gets rough and the tension is intense and the pressure is hot, just walks away. And so I say to you this finally: You and this coalition should impress upon the United States Congress that even though this is an election year and even though this has become too partisan an issue in Washington, it is not a partisan issue where you live; it is not a partisan issue when you need a doctor or you're in the hospital; and it is not a partisan issue when you calculate how in the wide world you are going to deal with your health care costs and keep your business going.

And we must not walk away. We need to show the same discipline and maturity in doing the people's business this year in Washington that you have to show simply to survive and certainly to prosper.

That is what I implore you to tell the Members of the Congress. We can do this, folks. Just because we've been trying for decades and have not been able to do it before doesn't mean we can't do it this year. And if it gets done, it will be done in no small measure because there are hundreds of thousands of small business people who said, "This is not a partisan issue. This is an Amer-

ican issue. Do something; do it right; and do it now.”

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:39 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Brian McCarthy, owner, McCarthy Flowers, Scranton, PA, and founder of the coalition; Michael Oakley, vice president, Oakley Industries, Clinton Township, MI; Micki Schneider, owner, Spirals, Palo Alto, CA; and Representative Butler Derrick. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Signing the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act 1994

June 30, 1994

I am pleased to sign into law S. 24, the reauthorization of the Independent Counsel Act. This law, originally passed in 1978, is a foundation stone for the trust between the Government and our citizens. It ensures that no matter what party controls the Congress or the executive branch, an independent, nonpartisan process will be in place to guarantee the integrity of public officials and ensure that no one is above the law.

Regrettably, this statute was permitted to lapse when its reauthorization became mired in a partisan dispute in the Congress. Opponents called it a tool of partisan attack against Republican Presidents and a waste of taxpayer funds. It was neither. In fact, the independent counsel statute has been in the past and is today a force for Government integrity and public confidence.

This new statute enables the great work of Government to go forward—the work of reforming the Nation’s health care system, freeing our streets from the grip of crime, restoring investment in the people who make our economy more productive, and the hard work of guaranteeing this Nation’s security—with the trust of its citizens assured.

It is my hope that both political parties would stand behind those great objectives. This is a good bill that I sign into law today—

good for the American people and good for their confidence in our democracy.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 30, 1994.

NOTE: S. 24, approved June 30, was assigned Public Law No. 103–270.

Executive Order 12923— Continuation of Export Control Regulations

June 30, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including but not limited to section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (“Act”) (50 U.S.C. 1702), I, WILLIAM J. CLINTON, President of the United States of America, find that the unrestricted access of foreign parties to U.S. goods, technology, and technical data and the existence of certain boycott practices of foreign nations, in light of the expiration of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*), constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and hereby declare a national emergency with respect to that threat.

Accordingly, in order (a) to exercise the necessary vigilance with respect to exports and activities affecting the national security of the United States; (b) to further significantly the foreign policy of the United States, including its policy with respect to cooperation by U.S. persons with certain foreign boycott activities, and to fulfill its international responsibilities; and (c) to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and reduce the serious economic impact of foreign demand, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. To the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, and the provisions for administration of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, shall be carried out under this order so as to continue in full

force and effect and amend, as necessary, the export control system heretofore maintained by the Export Administration Regulations issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended. The delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977, as amended by Executive Order No. 12755 of March 12, 1991; Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980; Executive Order No. 12735 of November 16, 1990; and Executive Order No. 12851 of June 11, 1993, shall be incorporated in this order and shall apply to the exercise of authorities under this order.

Sec. 2. All rules and regulations issued or contained in effect by the Secretary of Commerce under the authority of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, including those published in Title 15, Subtitle B, Chapter VII, Subchapter C, of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 768 through 799, and all orders, regulations, licenses, and other forms of administrative action issued, taken, or continued in effect pursuant thereto, shall, until amended or revoked by the Secretary of Commerce, remain in full force and effect as if issued or taken pursuant to this order, except that the provisions of sections 203(b)(2) and 206 of the Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)(2) and 1705) shall control over any inconsistent provisions in the regulations. Nothing in this section shall affect the continued applicability of administrative sanctions provided for by the regulations described above.

Sec. 3. Provisions for administration of section 38(e) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(e)) may be made and shall continue in full force and effect until amended or revoked under the authority of section 203 of the Act (50 U.S.C. 1702). To the extent permitted by law, this order also shall constitute authority for the issuance and continuation in full force and effect of all rules and regulations by the President or his delegate, and all orders, licenses, and other forms of administrative actions issued, taken, or continued in effect pursuant thereto, relating to the administration of section 38(e).

Sec. 4. This order shall be effective as of midnight between June 30, 1994, and July 1, 1994, and shall remain in effect until terminated. It is my intention to terminate this

order upon the enactment into law of a bill reauthorizing the authorities contained in the Export Administration Act.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 30, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:38 a.m., July 1, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order will be published in the *Federal Register* on July 5.

Message to the Congress on Continuation of Export Control Regulations

June 30, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b), I hereby report to the Congress that I have today exercised the authority granted by this Act to continue in effect the system of controls contained in 15 C.F.R., Parts 768–799, including restrictions on participation by U.S. persons in certain foreign boycott activities, which heretofore have been maintained under the authority of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, 50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.* In addition, I have made provision for the administration of section 38(e) of the Arms Export Control Act, 22 U.S.C. 2778(e).

The exercise of this authority is necessitated by the expiration of the Export Administration Act on June 30, 1994, and the lapse that would result in the system of controls maintained under that Act.

In the absence of control, foreign parties would have unrestricted access to U.S. commercial products, technology, technical data, and assistance, posing an unusual and extraordinary threat to national security, foreign policy, and economic objectives critical to the United States. In addition, U.S. persons would not be prohibited from complying with certain foreign boycott requests. This would seriously harm our foreign policy interests, particularly in the Middle East.

Controls established in 15 C.F.R. 768–799, and continued by this action, include the following:

- National security export controls aimed at restricting the export of goods and technologies, which would make a significant contribution to the military potential of certain other countries and which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States.
- Foreign policy controls that further the foreign policy objectives of the United States or its declared international obligations in such widely recognized areas as human rights, antiterrorism, regional stability, missile technology nonproliferation, and chemical and biological weapons nonproliferation.
- Nuclear nonproliferation controls that are maintained for both national security and foreign policy reasons, and which support the objectives of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act.
- Short supply controls that protect domestic supplies, and antiboycott regulations that prohibit compliance with foreign boycotts aimed at countries friendly to the United States.

Consequently, I have issued an Executive order (a copy of which is attached) to continue in effect all rules and regulations issued or continued in effect by the Secretary of Commerce under the authority of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, and all orders, regulations, licenses, and other forms of administrative actions under the Act, except where they are inconsistent with sections 203(b) and 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

The Congress and the Executive have not permitted export controls to lapse since they were enacted under the Export Control Act of 1949. Any termination of controls could permit transactions to occur that would be seriously detrimental to the national interests we have heretofore sought to protect through export controls and restrictions on compliance by U.S. persons with certain foreign boycotts. I believe that even a temporary lapse in this system of controls would seriously damage our national security, foreign policy, and economic interests and undermine our credibility in meeting our international obligations.

The countries affected by this action vary depending on the objectives sought to be

achieved by the system of controls instituted under the Export Administration Act. Potential adversaries may seek to acquire sensitive U.S. goods and technologies. Other countries serve as conduits for the diversion of such items. Still other countries have policies that are contrary to U.S. foreign policy or nonproliferation objectives, or foster boycotts against friendly countries. For some goods or technologies, controls could apply even to our closest allies in order to safeguard against diversion to potential adversaries.

It is my intention to terminate the Executive order upon enactment into law of a bill reauthorizing the authorities contained in the Export Administration Act.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 30, 1994.

**Proclamation 6704—To Modify
Duty-Free Treatment Under the
Generalized System of Preferences
and for Other Purposes**

June 30, 1994

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

1. Pursuant to title V of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (“1974 Act”) (19 U.S.C. 2461 *et seq.*), the President may designate specified articles provided for in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTS”) as eligible for preferential tariff treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences (“GSP”) when imported from designated beneficiary developing countries. Pursuant to section 504(a)(1) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2464(a)(1)), the President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment accorded under section 501 of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2461) with respect to any article or with respect to any country, after considering the factors set forth in sections 501 and 502(c) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(c)). Pursuant to section 504(c) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2464(c)), beneficiary developing countries, except those designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries pursuant to

section 504(c)(6) of the 1974 Act, are subject to limitations on the preferential treatment afforded under the GSP. Pursuant to section 504(c)(5) of the 1974 Act, a country that is no longer treated as a beneficiary developing country with respect to an eligible article may be redesignated as a beneficiary developing country with respect to such article if imports of such article from such country did not exceed the limitations in section 504(c)(1) (after application of paragraph (c)(2)) during the preceding calendar year. Further, pursuant to section 504(d)(2) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2464(d)(2)), the President may disregard the limitations provided in section 504(c)(1)(B) with respect to any eligible article if the appraised value of the total imports of such article into the United States during the preceding calendar year is not in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to \$5,000,000 as the gross national product of the United States for that calendar year (as determined by the Department of Commerce) bears to the gross national product of the United States for calendar year 1979.

2. Pursuant to sections 501, 503(a), and 504(a) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2461, 2463(a), and 2464(a)), in order to subdivide and amend the nomenclature of existing provisions of the HTS to modify tariff treatment under the GSP, I have determined, after taking into account information and advice received under section 503(a), that the HTS should be modified to adjust the original designation of eligible articles. In addition, pursuant to title V of the 1974 Act, I have determined that it is appropriate to designate specified articles provided for in the HTS as eligible for preferential tariff treatment under the GSP when imported from designated beneficiary developing countries, and that such treatment for other articles should be terminated. I have also determined, pursuant to section 504(a)(1) of the 1974 Act, having considered the factors set forth in sections 501 and 502(c) of the 1974 Act, and pursuant to sections 504(c)(1) and (c)(2) of the 1974 Act, that certain beneficiary countries should not receive preferential tariff treatment under the GSP with respect to certain eligible articles. Further, I have determined, pursuant to section 504(c)(5) of the 1974 Act, that certain countries should be

redesignated as beneficiary developing countries with respect to certain eligible articles. These countries have been previously excluded from benefits of the GSP with respect to such eligible articles pursuant to section 504(c)(1) of the 1974 Act. Last, I have determined that section 504(c)(1)(B) of the 1974 Act should not apply with respect to certain eligible articles pursuant to section 504(d)(2) of the 1974 Act.

3. Proclamation 6641 of December 15, 1993, implemented the North American Free Trade Agreement. Certain conforming changes and technical corrections to the HTS were omitted from this proclamation. I have decided that it is appropriate to modify the HTS to make such changes and corrections.

4. Section 604 of the 1974 Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2483), authorizes the President to embody in the HTS the substance of the relevant provisions of that Act, and of other Acts affecting import treatment, and actions thereunder, including the removal, modification, continuance, or imposition of any rate of duty or other import restriction.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including but not limited to title V and section 604 of the 1974 Act, do proclaim that:

(1) In order to designate certain articles as eligible articles for purposes of the GSP when imported from designated beneficiary developing countries, the HTS is modified as provided in Annex I to this proclamation.

(2)(a) In order to designate certain articles as eligible articles for purposes of the GSP when imported from any designated beneficiary developing country, the Rates of Duty 1-Special subcolumn for the HTS subheadings enumerated in Annex II(a) to this proclamation is modified by inserting in the parentheses the symbol "A" as provided in such Annex.

(b) In order to designate certain articles as eligible articles for purposes of the GSP when imported from any designated beneficiary developing country excluding India, the Rates of Duty 1-Special subcolumn for the HTS subheading enumerated in Annex II(b) to this proclamation is modified by in-

serting in the parentheses the symbol "A*" as provided in such Annex.

(c) In order to terminate preferential tariff treatment under the GSP for certain articles imported from all designated beneficiary developing countries, the Rates of Duty 1-Special subcolumn for the HTS subheading in Annex II(c) to this proclamation is modified by deleting the symbol "A*" as set forth in such Annex.

(d) In order to restore preferential tariff treatment under the GSP to a country which has been excluded from the benefits of the GSP for an eligible article, the Rates of Duty 1-Special subcolumn for each of the HTS subheadings enumerated in Annex II(d) to this proclamation is modified: (i) by deleting symbol "A*" in parentheses, and (ii) by inserting in such subcolumn the symbol "A" in lieu thereof.

(e) In order to provide that one or more countries should no longer be treated as a beneficiary developing country with respect to an eligible article for purposes of the GSP, the Rates of Duty 1-Special subcolumn for each of the HTS provisions enumerated in Annex II(e) to this proclamation is modified: (i) by deleting the symbol "A" in parentheses, and (ii) by inserting in such subcolumn the symbol "A*" in lieu thereof.

(3) In order to provide that one of more countries that have not been treated as beneficiary developing countries with respect to one or more eligible articles should be redesignated as beneficiary developing countries with respect to such article for purposes of the GSP, and to provide that one or more countries should no longer be treated as beneficiary developing countries with respect to an eligible article for purposes of the GSP, general note 4 to the HTS is modified as provided in Annex III to this proclamation.

(4) In order to provide for the continuation of previously proclaimed staged reductions on certain Canadian goods, falling under HTS provisions modified in Annex I to this proclamation, effective with respect to goods of Canada under the terms of general note 12 to the HTS, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the dates specified in Annex IV to this proclamation, the rate of duty in the HTS set forth in the Rates of Duty 1-Special

subcolumn followed by the symbol "CA" in parentheses for each of the HTS subheadings enumerated in Annex IV to this proclamation is modified as provided in such Annex.

(5) In order to provide for the continuation of previously proclaimed staged reductions on certain Mexican goods, falling under HTS provisions modified in Annex I to this proclamation, effective with respect to goods of Mexico under the terms of general note 12 to the HTS, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the dates specified in Annex V to this proclamation, the rate of duty in the HTS set forth in the Rates of Duty 1-Special subcolumn followed by the symbol "MX" in parentheses for each of the HTS subheadings enumerated in Annex V to this proclamation is modified as provided in such Annex.

(6) In order to provide for certain modifications to the GSP, the HTS is modified as set forth in Annex VII to this proclamation.

(7) In order to correct certain technical errors and to make certain conforming changes in HTS provisions, the HTS is modified as provided in Annex VI to this proclamation.

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

(9)(a) The modifications made by Annexes I, II, and III to this proclamation shall be effective with respect to articles both: (i) imported on or after January 1, 1976, and (ii) entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after July 1, 1994.

(b) The modifications made by Annexes IV, V, VI, and VII to this proclamation shall be effective on or after the dates set forth in such Annexes.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:57 a.m., June 30, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation and the attached annexes were published in the *Federal Register* on July 1.

Memorandum on the Generalized System of Preferences

June 30, 1994

Memorandum for the United States Trade Representative

Subject: Actions Concerning the Generalized System of Preferences

Pursuant to section 504 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the 1974 Act) (19 U.S.C. 2464), I am authorized and to modify the application of duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) currently being afforded to such beneficiary developing countries as a result of my determinations.

Pursuant to section 504 of the 1974 Act, after considering various requests for a waiver of the application of section 504(c) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2464((c)) with respect to certain eligible articles, I have determined that it is appropriate to modify the application of duty-free treatment under the GSP currently being afforded to certain articles and to certain beneficiary developing countries.

Specifically, pursuant to section 504(c)(3) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2464(c)(3)), I have determined that it is appropriate to waive the application of section 504(c) of the 1974 Act with respect to certain eligible articles from certain beneficiary developing countries. I have received the advice of the United States International Trade Commission on whether any industries in the United States are likely to be adversely affected by such waivers, and I have determined, based on that advice and on the considerations described in sections 501 and 502(c) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2461 and 2462(c)), that such waivers are in the national economic interest of the United States. The waivers of the application of section 504(c) of the 1974 Act apply to the eligible articles in the HTS subheadings and the beneficiary developing countries set opposite such HTS subheadings enumerated below.

HTS SUBHEADINGS AND COUNTRIES GRANTED WAIVERS OF SECTION 504(C) OF THE 1974 ACT

HTS Subheading	Country
4203.21.40	Philippines
7113.19.21	Israel
8402.20.00	Philippines
8407.34.15	Brazil ¹
8407.34.45	Brazil ²
8409.91.91	Brazil ³
8471.20.00	Indonesia
8471.20.00	Malaysia
8471.91.00	Indonesia
8471.91.00	Malaysia
8521.10.60	Indonesia
8525.20.20	Philippines
8525.20.50	Malaysia
8525.20.50	Philippines
8527.31.40	Malaysia
8529.90.01	Indonesia
8529.90.29	Indonesia

¹ 8407.34.1580 only.

² 8407.34.4580 only.

³ Aluminum cylinder heads only.

These determinations shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:47 a.m., June 30, 1994]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on July 1.

Proclamation 6705—50th Anniversary of the Liberation of Guam

June 30, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Fifty years ago, on July 21, 1944, after two and a half years of occupation, 55,000 United States Marines and soldiers stormed the small Pacific Island of Guam in an effort to bring about the liberation of a people oppressed by tyranny.

The conquest of Guam by Imperial Japanese forces had begun shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor when Saipan-based Japanese bombers launched the first in a series of raids on the island. The small defending

force consisted of a handful of military and civilian construction workers, as well as the local Guam Insular Guard and the Guam Militia. Hopes of defending the island ended in the early morning hours of December 10, 1941, when the island's governor surrendered his post and the island, thus making Guam the only American community to be occupied during World War II.

The Chamorros, the indigenous people of Guam, endured great hardships during the occupation as their captors forced them to work long hours in the fields, repair or build airfields and defense installations, and dig hundreds of Japanese shelter caves. But liberation was close at hand. Guam offered an ideal strategic position for the Allied forces, as it would provide a centralized location between the Japanese homeland and the Philippine Islands to launch long-range bomber attacks. By taking the Marianas Islands back, we would also be able to sever vital enemy supply lines, thus cutting off thousands of enemy soldiers and ending their effectiveness in the war.

The battle for Guam was fierce. Enemy forces continued to launch counterattacks despite their lack of supplies or hope of winning. But the Americans were just as determined and went to great lengths to complete their mission.

Chief of Staff General Dwight D. Eisenhower stated it best when he said:

"In a nation at war, teamwork by the whole people is necessary for victory. But the issue is decided on the battlefield, toward which all national effort leads. The country's fate lies in the hands of its soldier citizens; in the clash of battle is found the final test of plans, training, equipment, and—above all—the fighting spirit of units and individuals."

And it was the spirit of the Americans fighting on Guam that brought a quick end to organized resistance on the island as it was secured by the American forces on August 10, 1944.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim July 21, 1994, as the "50th Anniversary of the Liberation of

Guam." I call upon all Americans to observe this day with appropriate programs and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirtieth day of June, 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, 2:20 p.m., June 30, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on July 5.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Treasury Department Report

June 30, 1994

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As required by section 511 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 94-95 (Public Law 103-236), I hereby transmit the report prepared by the Treasury Department on expenditures from blocked accounts.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Lee H. Hamilton, chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Claiborne Pell, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Statement on the EPA Decision on Renewable Fuels

June 30, 1994

I would like to commend the Environmental Protection Agency for its decision to make renewable fuels a major ingredient in reformulated gasoline under requirements of the Clean Air Act. Today, we are making good on a longstanding commitment to a cleaner environment and a stronger economy. This decision offers tremendous potential to provide the U.S. with thousands of new jobs for the future.

The use of reformulated gasoline will help to improve the quality of the air in the Na-

tion's dirtiest cities. Furthermore, a greater use of ethanol and its derivatives could help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

I especially support the use of ETBE, a fuel derived from ethanol, because of its special environmental promise.

Relying on renewable fuels also presents a major opportunity to farmers and other members of rural communities to get to work helping America. The rule could boost demand for corn by 250 million bushels a year.

Again, I commend EPA on this important decision to use renewable fuels to help achieve the objectives of the Clean Air Act. I believe our economy and our environment can go hand in hand. This policy is good for our environment, our public health, and our Nation's farmers, and that's good for America.

Statement on Congressional Action on Health Care Reform

June 30, 1994

Chairman Gibbons and the Ways and Means Committee stepped up to their responsibility today and took a giant stride forward on the road to comprehensive health care for all Americans. I want to commend Chairman Gibbons for his leadership and longstanding dedication to quality health care for every American.

The Ways and Means Committee understands what the American people want. They want universal coverage. They want shared employer-employee responsibility. And they want costs controlled. Others pretend that piecemeal tinkering with the health care system will satisfy the American people. But the 78 percent of the public that supports universal coverage knows they are wrong.

The Ways and Means Committee joins two other committees which have approved bills that build on the current system of workplace-based insurance, providing quality and affordable care for working Americans. The real progress that is being achieved in these committees is proving the naysayers wrong.

In a mere few weeks' time, Congress and the Nation have made extraordinary progress in the fight for real health care reform. While the special interests will continue to try and

stand in the way of history, they will not succeed. The voices of doctors, nurses, hospitals, hundreds of thousands of large and small businesses, and American families must and will be heard. The Ways and Means Committee answered their call today. We must all answer the call this year. There is no turning back.

Statement on the Base Closure Commission

June 30, 1994

I would like to offer, on behalf of our Nation, my heartfelt thanks and appreciation for Jim Courter's important contributions in leading the 1991 and 1993 base realignment and closure reviews.

I am proud of the success of the Base Closure Commission during my administration. The base closure process has been non-partisan, very effective, and continues to be of the highest importance to our efforts to reduce unnecessary base infrastructure in order to keep our military forces ready and strong.

While serving as Chair to the Commission, Mr. Courter recommended base closures and realignments which will enable the Federal Government to save billions of dollars over the next several years.

I am grateful for Jim Courter's tenacity, hard work, and commitment to building a stronger economy, and I wish him the very best in his new endeavors.

Interview With Klaus Walther of ZDF German Television

July 1, 1994

President's Trip to Germany

Mr. Walther. Mr. President, what are your expectations in front of the first trip to the united Germany? You will have a speech in front of the Brandenburg Gate; the Wall has come down. What will your message be?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say it's an incredible personal honor for me to be able to go as the first President to a united Germany. One of the formative political images of my childhood was seeing President Kennedy stand there in Berlin at the

Wall and give his speech. So, for all of us in America, it's been a source of great joy to see the Wall come down and to see what is happening now in Germany.

My message will be that we've torn down the walls, but now we have to build the bridges. We have to unite Europe, and we have to move forward on security issues, on economic issues to make a better world.

U.S. Military in Germany

Mr. Walther. What will be the significance of the remaining troops in Germany for the future?

The President. I think it's quite important. I think it's a statement that the United States puts great importance on our relationship with Europe, with NATO, and with Germany, especially, and that we have a common security future with NATO.

One of the great successes, I think, of the last year has been the Partnership For Peace, the establishment of cooperative relationships between NATO and now 21 other countries, 19 from the former Communist bloc and Sweden and Finland. So this is a very exciting time, I think, and the United States, as long as Europe wants to be our partner, should maintain that partnership and should stay in Europe.

German-U.S. Relationship

Mr. Walther. Let me return to Germany. Is Germany still the most important ally of the United States?

The President. Germany is a critically important ally, always has been, certainly since the end of the Second World War. And I think if you look to the future, the kinds of things we have to work together on, the way our interests tend to converge and the way we see the world, the relationship I have enjoyed with Chancellor Kohl, all the things we work together on, Russian aid, international peacekeeping, a whole range of issues, trying to find a solution in Bosnia, the German people and the American people and their Governments need to work very, very closely together, not only for the well-being of Europe but indeed for the entire world.

U.S. Aid

Mr. Walther. America is the last remaining world power, and there is more aid necessary than first expected to build up the East. Is the United States willing to increase their contributions for the East, because Germany and Europe, they have spent billions of dollars?

The President. Yes. I think we should do more, and we will. There is a limit to how much we can do. We've been very active in Russia and in other republics of the former Soviet Union. And we are trying to maintain a very vigorous international defense posture as a superpower in the cause of peace. And of course, that costs a lot of money. But I do believe in Central and Eastern Europe, we should be more active, and we will be. There are limits to what we can do, but we will be more active.

Eastern European Elections

Mr. Walther. Talking about peace, does it bother you that the old powers in the former Eastern bloc countries are getting back into power again?

The President. Well, it depends on what they do. I mean, change is difficult. And the changes that a lot of those former Communist countries are going through are quite painful. And I think it is only predictable that from time to time the election results will vary, depending upon the mood of the people, the level of personal security they feel, the level of results being achieved. That is inevitable.

And as long as there is a continued commitment to openness and democracy and human rights and to working with the West, I don't think we can be deterred from our policies by particular elections. After all, you know, none of us always agree with the outcome of every election in our own countries.

Bosnia and the United Nations.

Mr. Walther. Mr. President, your administration started to solve a lot of international crises through the United Nations. The strategy failed, obviously, in Bosnia. When is U.S. unilateral action in the future appropriate or necessary?

The President. I don't know that—first of all, I don't know that it has failed in Bosnia.

It has not yet succeeded. That is, keep in mind, there has been an agreement between the Croatians and the Muslims. It is functioning. It has stabilized a lot of the country. There has been much more peace and less slaughter around Sarajevo and some of the other safe areas. So I think the United Nations, the United States working with the U.N. and working through NATO has done a lot there to improve the situation. And of course, we hope that the contact group will come up with a map that will result in a peace settlement.

If you ask me the question, will the United States continue to work through the United Nations, the answer to that is yes, wherever we can. But we must be in a position to act alone when our own vital interests are at stake. That's what we did, for example, when I received proof that there had been an attempt to assassinate former President Bush in Iraq. But I wouldn't give up on the U.N. yet or on multilateral efforts. I still think there's a great deal that can be done there. I also think you're going to see variations of that. Look at Rwanda, where the French got, in effect, permission of the U.N. to lead in an area where they had an historic interest and historic ties. So I think we will be finding new ways for international cooperation for quite some years yet.

Mr. Walther. Talking about United Nations, would you support Germany to be a member on the Security Council?

The President. Yes. I have been publicly supportive of that for almost 3 years now.

NATO

Mr. Walther. You talked about NATO, Mr. President. How do you envision NATO's future? There's no more threat coming from the East, and how do you envision NATO's future?

The President. Well, right now what we're doing is using NATO to try to build a united Europe from a security point of view and to be available to take actions in Europe out of NATO's area. That's really the significance of what has happened in Bosnia, where the NATO planes have been involved in enforcing the no-fly zone and trying to enforce the safe area, where NATO planes can be

called in if needed to try to preserve agreements and make sure both sides adhere to them. And I don't think there's any question that NATO has made a contribution to the progress that has been made in Bosnia.

And the NATO Partnership For Peace is the most important thing we've done in the last several years, because it gives us the chance to have a united Europe, the chance, really, for the first time since nation states were in existence in Europe.

So that's what I see. I think NATO should be working on integrating Europe from a security point of view; toward looking toward expanding its membership to other countries as appropriate; and toward the use of coordinated action, military capacity, outside its area of membership but within Europe.

Middle East Peace Process

Mr. Walther. Mr. President, today Mr. Arafat is visiting the Gaza Strip. Is this a milestone in the development in the Middle East?

The President. Yes, it's a very important trip because it symbolizes what has happened, which is that the Palestinians are beginning to have control over their own lives and affairs. It is a tribute to the courage of the Israelis and the Palestinians and to their leaders, to Mr. Arafat and to Prime Minister Rabin. And it's also a tribute to the peace process in which the United States, as you know, has been very actively involved.

The only way to settle the peace problems in the Middle East is to continue the peace process. I saw King Hussein just last week. We are in close touch with President Asad. We are working with Lebanon. We are hoping for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. And I hope this trip today will show that peace can be achieved and what a good thing it will be.

NOTE: The interview began at 12:10 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

**Letter to Members of Congress on
Health Care Reform**

July 1, 1994

Dear _____:

As you leave to celebrate the Fourth of July after weeks of hard work, I wanted to point out what a remarkable week this has been on health care. When Congress returns after the recess, you will have the opportunity to vote to provide guaranteed health coverage to every American.

The Committees have been hard at work, and for the first time ever bills guaranteeing universal coverage will be ready to go to the floor. We can make history in the month ahead if we listen to the American people.

Look at the events of this week—

- A *Washington Post*/ABC poll reports that 78% of Americans support universal coverage; 72% support employer responsibility; and 75% support cost containment. The public knows what the health care debate is about.
- The deans of over 70 of our most prestigious medical schools announced their support for universal coverage.
- The Small Business Coalition for Health Care Reform, which supports universal coverage and employer responsibility, announced they have over 625,000 small business members, making it the largest small business coalition in the country, with more members than the National Federation of Independent Business.
- More than 100 big businesses, including 28 of the Fortune 100, have announced their support for universal coverage and employer responsibility.
- The American Medical Association, in a full page newspaper ad, added its voice to that of other physician groups, nurses and other providers urging Congress to pass universal coverage and employer responsibility.
- *The Wall Street Journal* on June 27 reported that the percentage of adults who work but have no public or private health insurance has risen to 17.5% in 1992 from 15.3% in 1988.

We will have the opportunity to give the American people what they need and want,

and to give the American economy what it needs—guaranteed private insurance for every American.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Members of the 103d Congress.

**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.

June 25

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Camp David, MD.

June 26

In the evening, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton returned from Camp David, MD.

June 27

In the late afternoon, the President traveled to New York City where he attended a Democratic National Committee Presidential Dinner at the St. Regis Hotel. He returned to Washington, DC, in the evening.

June 28

The White House announced that a Presidential delegation will travel to Vietnam on July 1 to 4, and to Laos on July 4 to 5, to press for further progress from Vietnam on unresolved POW/MIA issues.

June 29

The President announced his intention to nominate Elizabeth Anne Moler to serve as Commissioner of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

The President announced his intention to nominate Harvey G. Ryland to be Deputy Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The President announced his intention to nominate Susan Berla Perry to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board.

The President announced his intention to nominate Luise S. Jordan as Inspector General of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

The President announced his intention to nominate Cecil J. Banks as a member of the Board of Directors for the African Development Foundation.

July 1

The President attended the Presidential Scholars awards ceremony in the afternoon.

In the evening, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Camp David, MD.

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 June 27

Aileen Catherine Adams, of California, to be Director of the Office for Victims of Crime (new position).

Submitted July 1

Gilbert F. Casellas, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 1999, vice Tony E. Gallegos, term expired.

Harold Jennings Creel, Jr., of Virginia, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1999, vice Donald Robert Quartel, Jr., resigned.

Susan Berla Perry, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the term expiring December 31, 1998, vice Susan M. Coughlin, resigned.

Harvey G. Ryland, of Florida, to be Deputy Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, vice Jerry D. Jennings, resigned.

Delmond J.H. Won, of Hawaii, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1997, vice Francis J. Ivancie, 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 June 25

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the resignation of Prime Minister Hata of Japan

Released June 26

Transcript of remarks by National Security Adviser Tony Lake at the White House Conference on Africa

Transcript of remarks by Administrator Brian Atwood of the Agency for International Development at the White House Conference on Africa

Transcript of remarks by Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs George Moose at the White House Conference on Africa

Released June 27

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Andrew Young, former Ambassador to the United Nations, C. Payne Lucas, President of Africare, and Michael Clough, Council on Foreign Relations, on the White House Conference on Africa

Statement by Special Counsel to the President Lloyd Cutler on a request for documents from the House Banking Committee

Released June 28

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the Presidential delegation to Vietnam

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's meeting with President Frei of Chile

Released June 29

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Special Adviser to the President William Gray III on Haiti

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on revocation of nonimmigrant visas of Haitian nationals

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's telephone conversation with Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan

Released June 30

Transcript of a press briefing by Special Counsel to the President Lloyd Cutler on the report of Independent Counsel Robert B. Fiske, Jr.

Statement by Special Counsel to the President Lloyd Cutler on the report of Independent Counsel Robert B. Fiske, Jr.

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Tony Lake and Assistant to the President for Economic Policy Bob Rubin on the G-7 summit in Naples, Italy

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Marshals for the Northern District of Iowa and the District of Utah

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved June 28

H.R. 3676 / Public Law 103-268
To amend the District of Columbia Spouse Equity Act of 1988 to provide for coverage of the former spouses of judges of the District of Columbia courts

H.R. 4025 / Public Law 103-269
To amend title 11, D.C. Code, to clarify that blind individuals are eligible to serve as jurors in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia

Approved June 30

S. 24 / Public Law 103-270
Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994