

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, November 14, 1994
Volume 30—Number 45
Pages 2277–2363

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- See also Appointments and Nominations
California
National Association of Realtors Conference
in Anaheim—2300
Naval Air Station in Los Alamitos—2294
Rally in Los Angeles—2296
Delaware, rally for Democratic candidates in
Wilmington—2328
Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service
at Georgetown University—2348
Michigan, rally in Flint—2325
Minnesota, victory rally in Minneapolis—2323
Radio address—2307
Rhode Island, rally for Democratic candidates
in Providence—2285
White House volunteers, reception—2338

Appointments and Nominations

- White House Office, National AIDS Policy
Director, remarks—2356

Communications to Congress

- Cyprus, letter—2333

Executive Orders

- Amendments to the Manual for Courts-
Martial, United States, 1984—2358

Executive Orders—Continued

- Declassification of Selected Records Within
the National Archives of the United
States—2362

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchange with reporters in the Roosevelt
Room—2356
Interviews
Cheryl Jennings of KGO Television, San
Francisco, CA—2290
Cynthia Louie and Fred Wayne of KCBS
Radio, San Francisco, CA—2308
Diane Stern of WBZ Radio, Boston, MA—
2277
Janet Peckinpaugh of WFSB Television,
Hartford, CT—2282
Joe Templeton of ABC Radio—2337
John Crane and Ann Nyberg of WTNH
Television, New Haven, CT—2281
John Gambling of WOR, New York City—
2333
John Watson of WILM Radio, Wilmington,
DE—2293
Larry King in Seattle, WA—2312
Leon Gray, W.C. Brown, and J. Michael
Davis of WDIA Radio, Memphis, TN—
2279

(Continued on the inside back cover.)

Editor's Note: In order to meet publication and distribution deadlines during the Veterans Day holiday weekend, the cutoff time for this issue has been advanced to 5 p.m. on Thursday, November 10, 1994. Documents released after that time will appear in the next issue.

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

Interviews With the News Media—Continued

Luis Eschegoyan of KDTV, San Francisco,
CA—2292

Mike Siegel of KVI Radio, Seattle, WA—
2288

Paul W. Smith of WWDB Radio,
Philadelphia, PA—2335

Van Harden, Bonnie Lucas, and Bob Quinn
of WHO Radio, Des Moines, IA—2284

News conference, November 9 (No. 78)—
2339

Proclamations

National American Indian Heritage Month—
2311

National Military Families Recognition Day—
2299

Proclamations—Continued

National Women Veterans Recognition
Week—2310

Resignations and Retirements

Special Adviser to the President and Secretary
of State, letter—2339

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—2363

Checklist of White House press releases—
2363

Digest of other White House
announcements—2363

Nominations submitted to the Senate—2363

Week Ending Friday, November 11, 1994

Interview With Diane Stern of WBZ Radio, Boston, Massachusetts

November 2, 1994

Ms. Stern. The President joins me live on WBZ News Radio. And welcome, Mr. President. If we could get right to the questions, we'd appreciate it.

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

White House Attack

Ms. Stern. The man who allegedly shot at the White House was in court today, as you know. He may soon be indicted on charges that he tried to kill you. I'd like to know, how do you talk to your daughter about that?

The President. Well, I think my daughter is well aware of the requirements of the office and that a lot of it involves the Secret Service. But I have to tell you, I think they do a good job. I was not in any danger, and I think this matter is being handled in the appropriate way.

Moral Guidance for Youth

Ms. Stern. We're talking live to President Clinton on WBZ News Radio 1030. Mr. President, as a parent, I'm concerned about what seems to be a moral decline in this country. Do you share those concerns?

The President. Of course I do. I'm especially concerned that so many of our young children are being raised, in effect, in a vacuum where they're so vulnerable to gangs and guns and violence and drugs and where they don't have enough people to look up to and enough people to follow. And they're not being taught right from wrong on a daily basis. I think we have to work on all those things.

One of the things that I've tried hard to do as President is to emphasize the importance of parents and churches and community groups taking responsibility for these

children again. And one of the things that I liked about our crime bill was that we enabled church groups and others to apply for assistance to reach out to more of these young people. You know, every child is going to have somebody that he or she looks up to. It needs to be the right person; it needs to be somebody who has a sustained and caring relationship with the child over a long period of time. It ought to be the parents, but if it can't be, it has to be someone else. That's the only way to turn this around.

Midterm Elections

Ms. Stern. Mr. President, if we could get on to the campaign trail, campaign '94, as you know, you're not welcomed by some Democrats campaigning for election this year. Personally, how does that make you feel?

The President. Well, most elections are decided on the merits within each State. You know, when I was a Governor, I never had the President come and campaign for me, even when the President was a member of my own party and was popular, because I thought that the voters were discriminating about that. But I do think there are some national elements to this election. And particularly in a lot of these races for Congress and Senate, I'm pleased to go where I've been asked to go—I've been asked to go more places than I can—to try to say what the stakes are in this election. And they are national.

You know, the fact is that in the last 21 months, while we haven't solved all the problems in the country and while a lot of ordinary Americans still have difficulties, the country is in better shape than it was. We've got more jobs. The deficit is coming down. We're doing more for families and children. And educational opportunities have been increased. The tax system is fair. The nuclear threat is less. There's more trade in the world. There's more peace, more democracy

in the world. We're moving in the right direction at home and abroad. And the voters need to go forward, not back to the easy promises of the eighties.

You know, I knew when I took this job, if I really tried to change things I'd have to shake some things up; I wouldn't always be popular. I wouldn't always be popular everywhere in the country and certainly not when people didn't know what had been done. So my job is simply to go out in this last week and tell people what's been done, what the stakes are, what the challenges are ahead and let them make up their own minds.

Ms. Stern. President Clinton—we're talking live with the President on WBZ News Radio—what is your take on last week's endorsement of Mario Cuomo by New York GOP Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, and could you see yourself ever going out on a limb like that, backing a Republican?

The President. Well, I think he did it as an act of statesmanship. I think that Mayor Giuliani saw himself as an American first, a representative of the people of New York, and then a Republican. And he thought that Governor Cuomo would be better for the people of New York City than the policies advocated by Mr. Pataki and his sponsor, Senator D'Amato. I really respect what he did. I think it had to do with what was best for ordinary New Yorkers. I think that's the reason that the mayor of Los Angeles endorsed a Democratic Senator, Senator Feinstein. I think you're seeing a lot of that around the country today as people get worried about the extreme nature of a lot of the Republican campaigns and how divorced they are from the real concerns of ordinary Americans. So obviously I liked it, but I also believe it was an act of statesmanship.

Q. Could you envision yourself ever backing a Republican, especially considering the remarks today to Black Entertainment Television calling them far rightwingers, extreme?

The President. I didn't say they all were. I didn't say they all were. I said their congressional leadership had advocated principles that were extreme rightwing, and they have. Oh sure, under the right circumstances, if I were President and we had the equivalent of Oliver North running in the Democratic

Party against a responsible Republican alternative, I believe I would do just what President Reagan and Mrs. Reagan have done in Virginia. I certainly do believe that.

President's Priorities

Ms. Stern. I know we're running short on time, but Newsweek magazine, you may have seen, gathered a focus group of voters who, rather than being angry with your administration, say they are disappointed. Now, how might you change your agenda the next 2 years, based on what you have and have not accomplished so far?

The President. Well, I'm going to try to do what we haven't done yet. I'm going to try to get the Congress to pass welfare reform. I'm going to take another run at health care. We've got to find a way to protect the health insurance of people; a million more Americans lost it last year. I'm going to take another run at campaign finance reform and at lobbying reform and at some of the environmental measures that we need so badly.

But the most important thing I've got to do is to figure out a way to communicate with the American people better. I mean, all the evidence is that the American people basically do not know, for example, that the last 2 years our administration was only the third one since World War II in which Congress approved more than 80 percent of the measures that I recommended, that it included family and medical leave for working families and tax credits for working families with children who are just above the poverty line and immunization of all children under 2 by 1996 and an expansion of Head Start and a big expansion of more affordable college loans for middle class families; that if they did know these things they would have a totally different attitude. So, I really liked the Newsweek poll—focus group—because it showed what I think, which is that the American people, I think, if they knew what I had done and if they knew what we have achieved and if they knew where we were going, I think they'd feel better.

I have to do a better job of finding a way to communicate directly with people in an atmosphere which is overwhelmingly dominated by controversy, conflict, failure, combative communication, and just talk straight

to the folks. I've given a lot of thought to it; it's a great challenge. But in a democracy, even if you do something, if people don't know it, it doesn't quite register until they begin personally to benefit.

Ms. Stern. Mr. President, the campaign trail is beckoning, I'm sure. And thank you for joining us on WBZ News Radio here in Boston.

The President. Thank you. I enjoyed it.

Ms. Stern. Let's do it again.

The President. Goodbye.

Note: The interview began at 4:42 p.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Rhode Island Convention Center in Providence, RI. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Interview With WDIA Radio, Memphis, Tennessee

November 2, 1994

Q. WDIA here in Memphis, Tennessee. We have President Bill Clinton live and on the radio with you.

Good afternoon, Mr. President.

The President. Good afternoon. How are you?

Q. I'm just fine, thank you.

Q. W.C. Brown is joining me here, and we're glad that you're joining us here by phone in Memphis. And we have a few questions we'd like to ask you, but first we'd like to give you an opportunity to make a statement.

The President. Well, first, it's good to be talking with you and to have a chance to visit with you so close to this election. The message I want to get out is that with all of our challenges in America, we're in better shape than we were 21 months ago. We're rebuilding the economy. We have more jobs; we have a lower unemployment rate; we've got more high-wage jobs coming into the economy. We're doing things for ordinary American families: the Family and Medical Leave Act, tax breaks for 15 million working families to keep them out of poverty, immunization for our children, more Head Start. We're doing things to support education: expanded college loans and apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go on to college.

We've supported African-American educational programs especially strongly, and we'll continue to do that. We've supported the kinds of things that will move this country forward. We've taken steps to help communities deal with the crime problem, not just with more police and the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban but also with prevention programs for our communities so that we can help our young people live a more positive life. So we're moving in the right direction.

The Republicans offer a contract that would take us back to the trickle-down Reaganomics era of the 1980's where we explode the deficit, move our jobs overseas, and have the risk of big cuts in programs that are important to all Americans, like Medicare and Social Security. We need to keep going forward; we don't want to go back. In order to do that, in a place like Tennessee where there are so many important elections—two Senate races, all the Congress races, a big Governor's race—it's important that people go out and vote next Tuesday.

Crime Legislation

Q. That's very true, Mr. President. The crime bill is an issue that we talk here on the talk show programs and in the news all the time about. A lot of people are concerned about the amount of money that's earmarked for the Midsouth area, the Memphis Midsouth area, as well as whether or not the crime bill is really going to be something that can be effective here in the Midsouth or whether it's just another Band-Aid. What would you say to that?

The President. I think it depends upon what the people at the local community do with it.

Q. Okay.

The President. It is the best crime bill, in my judgment, that has been passed at least in my lifetime. It gives the local communities the ability to increase their police forces by about 20 percent over the course of the next 5 years. It gives local communities the ability to put more serious offenders behind bars. It gives local communities the ability to have prevention programs, education programs, recreation programs, alternatives to imprisonment for young people to give them a better chance at a better future. But all of this

depends on what local people do. The President, the Congress, we can't fight crime on the streets; all we can do is give you the tools to make the most of it. But if your churches, your community groups, your community police forces, if they make the most of this, it will lower crime and reduce violence.

White House Attacks

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. Also, there have been two attacks on the White House itself recently.

Q. You would bring that up.

Q. I would have to bring that up. I haven't heard in the media you respond to those attacks on the White House per se. How would you respond to that? Would you say that that is, as Rush Limbaugh, a friend of yours—*[laughter]*—would say, is that the American people being expressive through those people who have enough nerve to go out and do something about it? Or are these just idle terrorist acts that are being done by people who have lost it, shall we say?

The President. The first incident I think was not even an attack. I think it was a stunt that went awry. I think the man was plainly just trying to land his plane there. The second incident, we'll have to see when all the facts get in. But I believe the Secret Service do a good job protecting me and our family, and I feel great confidence in that. I just get up every morning and do my job. I think that every President knows there's always some chance that somebody will be out there thinking about something like that; but it doesn't bother me much. I don't think about it; I just try to work with the Secret Service. I think they do a good job, and I just go on with my job.

Income Taxes

Q. Mr. President, this is W.C. Brown. Would you talk just a little bit about tax breaks? We hear that tax breaks are contained in a bill that will help to benefit the poor.

The President. Yes, our budget contained tax cuts for 15 million families. And in Tennessee, there were almost 20 times as many people who got an income tax cut as who got an income tax rate increase. Three hundred and eighty-four thousand working fami-

lies in Tennessee, including a lot of them in your listening area, got a tax cut because they work full time, they have children in the home, but their incomes are still modest. We wanted to make absolutely sure that people that work full-time with kids in the house would not be in poverty. So we expanded a program called the earned-income tax credit, which not only reduces taxes but can get people a refund on their taxes if their incomes are modest enough. It was the most significant thing done in the last 20 years to make the Tax Code fairer to working people. I'm very proud of it and I think it's not very much understood, but it's very, very important to emphasize. Senator Sasser, Congressman Cooper, Congressman Ford, in your area, these people stood up for the interest of working people, and now they are being pilloried in Tennessee in this election and accused of raising taxes on average Americans when in fact they cut taxes on almost 20 times as many Tennesseans as had their tax rates raised. And they ought to be supported for it, not criticized for it.

NCAA Basketball

Q. Mr. President, on a lighter note. We here in the Midsouth area are also big fans of your favorite team, the Arkansas Razorbacks—

The President. Boy, they're good, aren't they?

Q. —the NCAA championship team. And of course, we know you're good friends with Nolan Richardson. What would you have to say about the team this year, their chances in repeating? And we have a game coming up in Memphis at the Pyramid pretty soon. Would you be thinking about visiting Memphis and probably supporting your team?

The President. Well, I'm looking at all the basketball schedules, seeing if I can make any of these games. Of course, they lost 2 of their 12 men on the team, but all the first 5 are coming back. They had a good recruiting year. He's a great coach; they're great kids. I think they've got a good chance to repeat. But it's very, very difficult to repeat. There's a lot of talent out there, and when you get to the end of the NCAA's, one game and you're out. So it's going to be tough, but

they're a great team. They've got a great chance, and obviously I'm pulling for them.

Q. Well, thank you very much. And when you're in Tennessee, certainly we'd like to invite you to WDIA and be a part, because this is Clinton country.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 4:51 p.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Rhode Island Convention Center in Providence, RI, to interviewers Leon Gray, W.C. Brown, and J. Michael Davis. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Interview With John Crane and Ann Nyberg of WTNH Television, New Haven, Connecticut

November 2, 1994

Ms. Nyberg. Mr. President, thank you for being with us tonight.

The President. Thank you.

Mr. Crane. Thank you.

Foreign Policy

Ms. Nyberg. You have just returned from an unprecedented pre-election, whirlwind Middle-Eastern trip in the name of peace. Following the trip, polls shows your popularity up. Skeptics would say the trip was planned to boost not only popularity but know-how in the area of foreign policy. Your comments, sir.

The President. Well, we worked for 2 years, very hard, on peace in the Middle East. I had no control over the timing of the Israel-Jordan peace treaty. Obviously, they made their own decision about when to sign. They asked me to come and witness it, because of the role the United States and our administration played in that. When I was there, I went to visit our troops in the Persian Gulf. I sent them there to counter Saddam Hussein's latest aggression. Clearly, I had no control over that. There was no politics in this trip. The American people know it.

But the benefits that are coming in foreign policy, the nuclear agreement with North Korea, the work in the Middle East, the success in Haiti, they are the result of 2 years of hard work that happened to coalesce at

this time. There was no politics in that, and there shouldn't be.

Midterm Elections

Mr. Crane. Mr. President, here in Connecticut and across the country, Republicans are trying to make you the symbol of all that's wrong with Government. The pictures of you appear in many GOP television ads. Do you think this midterm election is really a referendum on you?

The President. No, but I think that it is the culmination of 2 years of irresponsible conduct on their part, where they did their best to derail the Government, to put the brakes on everything, to oppose deficit reduction, to oppose our plans for economic recovery, to oppose our plans for things like family and medical leave and the crime bill. As a party, they did their best to wreck everything and then to blame us. But the American people are beginning to see through it.

After all, let me put it to you this way. If I were a Republican President and I had followed policies which reduced the deficit, shrunk the Federal Government to its smallest size since President Kennedy was in office, increased the economic prosperity of the country, reduced the nuclear threat, expanded trade, and passed the toughest crime bill in a generation, they would be running me for sainthood. But because I'm a Democrat, they're engaged in a great disinformation campaign. And they've signed this contract to take this country back to the trickle-down economics of the eighties, a decade which, I might add, was pretty rough on the State of Connecticut, along toward the end, with all the exploding deficits and other problems. So, I believe the American people will see through that. I've got a lot of faith in the people of this country to be positive, to be forward looking. And my job is simply to get out and give them the facts, and they'll make the decisions.

Child Support

Ms. Nyberg. President Clinton, we want to go to the viewers now. As you can imagine, we asked them to give us questions for you—we were having a chance to talk to the President.

The first question is from Andrea Wilson of Norwalk. Andrea wants to know, Mr. President, what you're going to do to make deadbeat moms and dads accountable and responsible for supporting their children.

The President. I sent in the springtime, a welfare reform bill to Congress, which among other things, has a much tougher mechanism of child support enforcement. I think we have to have more automatic requirements, more wage withholding, more respect for these child support orders across State lines. It has simply got to be easy to get the child support payments out there. We've got billions and billions of dollars of unpaid child support. And if we had it paid by people who can afford to pay it, the welfare problem would be much smaller, and it would be a lot easier for people who are struggling to raise their children in dignity, to do it.

Unemployment

Mr. Crane. Now for our second viewer question, Mr. President. It comes from a woman named Eva Nay, who wants to know why, if you made jobs one of your administration's top priorities, there are still lay-offs and little in the way of job creation in Connecticut?

The President. Well, let me see. I've got some figures right here; I'll check it. The national economy, since I became President, has produced 4.6 million new jobs. Now the Government didn't do all that; most of these jobs are in the private sector. But we created the environment in which the jobs could be created by bringing the deficit down, by expanding trade, by investing more in new technologies. Not every American who wants a job has one, and of course, there's nothing the National Government can do to stop some companies from laying-off. What our job is to create more jobs than are lost, and we're doing that.

But just a moment, let me check here. In Connecticut—

Mr. Crane. Take your time.

The President. Well, I'm looking here.

The unemployment rate in Connecticut has dropped more than one percentage point. We've had several hundred new jobs added since I became President. In the pre-

vious 4 years—listen to this—Connecticut lost 150,000 new jobs. So, we've got job gain now, where we had job loss before. We need to create more jobs. We have to keep working on it. The first thing I had to do was to try to stop the job loss. And I think we have done that. We're moving forward.

Ms. Nyberg. And our viewers will be happy to hear that.

President Clinton, thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to be with us tonight.

The President. Nice to do it. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 5:02 p.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Rhode Island Convention Center in Providence, RI. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Interview With Janet Peckinpaugh of WFSB Television, Hartford, Connecticut

November 2, 1994

Ms. Peckinpaugh. Mr. President, good evening. Thanks for joining us tonight.

The President. Good evening, Janet.

White House Attack

Ms. Peckinpaugh. The first thing I want to ask you is, how can you feel so secure about your security right now? Does this have you shaken up at all?

The President. No, not at all. In fact, when the incident occurred, within a matter of seconds a Secret Service agent was upstairs at the White House there with me. They have worked very hard to increase their ability to protect the President every year. And they get better at it every year. I have a high level of confidence in them.

This incident could have happened at any time, I suppose. I regret it, but I don't think the American people should worry about it. We live in a democracy. People can move around freely. The one thing I do hope people will draw from this incident is that the congressional Members who were brave enough to vote for the crime bill, to stand up to the brutal pressure the NRA put on them and the threats they leveled against them, to try to get these assault weapons off

the street were right. That man had a modified assault weapon with a magazine with at least 20 bullets. And I think it's a good thing that we're trying to move against that.

But in a free society where people have free movement and where there are lots of guns, this kind of thing can occur. I can't stop being President. This is a democracy. We have to get out here and—all of us—and be with one another and talk to one another. So I'm just going about my job and doing it with a very high level of confidence in the people whose job it is to protect the President.

Ms. Peckinpaugh. President Clinton, hearing that from you makes us feel a lot better. Thanks for telling us that.

The President. Thank you.

Midterm Elections

Ms. Peckinpaugh. We asked our viewers to call into us, to write into us, to E-mail us with their questions for you tonight, so I'd like to take some time and talk about some of their questions. Linda Parker from Hartford wants to know how you feel about colleagues who have distanced themselves from you lately. We have an example right here in Connecticut: Congressman Sam Gejdenson and Jim Maloney, who is running for Gary Franks' seat, did not show up when you appeared here a couple of weeks ago. How do you feel when your colleagues do this?

The President. Well, first of all, I can say for Sam Gejdenson that's just not an accurate characterization. I went to his district at his invitation and campaigned for him at a time when nationally I wasn't in nearly as good a shape in the polls as I am now, so I just think that's a bum rap. And Mr. Maloney, my wife has been to Connecticut campaigning for him. I took no offense at that.

I think that it was a very successful trip to Connecticut. Afterward, surveys show that the support rose for Mr. Curry, our candidate for Governor up there. And I feel very good about the State of Connecticut and the relationship I've had with the Democrats.

I also think, however, that every Member of Congress and every Senator should seek to run, to some extent, a campaign that is tied not to the President but to their constitu-

ents. What I like to hear a Member say is, "When I voted with the President, I didn't do it for him, I did it for you." That's the proper message.

Social Security

Ms. Peckinpaugh. Okay. Quickly, Mr. President, what about this very controversial Social Security issue? John Francis from Stratford wants to know your thinking on that.

The President. Well, here's what happened, and I think it's very important for the voters to listen to this. The Republicans put out this contract, and they said, "If you'll give us control of the Congress, we will take you back to what we did in the 1980's, trickle-down Reaganomics. We'll give massive tax cuts, mostly to upper income people." That must be appealing in Connecticut; you have a lot of upper income people. "We'll give massive tax cuts. We'll increase defense. We'll increase Star Wars, and we'll balance the budget in 5 years."

That costs a trillion dollars. The only way to do that is to cut everything, including Social Security, across the board 20 percent. That's \$2,000 a Social Security recipient. You say, we don't want to do that. Then you have to cut everything else in the Government across the board 30 percent. That bankrupts Medicare. If you don't do that, you're right back to where they were before, massive deficits, shipping jobs overseas. Connecticut lost 150,000 jobs in the last 4 years because of that kind of economic policy.

We need to invest and grow with discipline. We don't need a lot of easy promises. We need to embrace the challenges of the global economy, invest, and grow. That's my approach.

This Social Security threat is very real. If they carry through on their promises, they cannot keep their promise to cut the taxes and increase the spending and balance the budget without going after it.

Ms. Peckinpaugh. President Clinton, thanks for answering our viewer questions.

The President. Thank you.

Ms. Peckinpaugh. And thanks so much for taking the time to be with us.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 5:13 p.m. The President spoke via satellite from the Rhode Island Convention Center in Providence, RI. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Interview With Van Harden, Bonnie Lucas, and Bob Quinn of WHO Radio, Des Moines, Iowa

November 2, 1994

Mr. Harden. Well, we're very fortunate to have a very special guest on the phone with us here today, here on "Van and Bonnie in the Morning," President Bill Clinton. Mr. President, welcome to WHO Radio.

The President. Thanks, it's nice to be back with you. I was there once before, remember?

1993 Flood

Mr. Harden. Yes, I was just going to say, the last time we talked we—well, you were here filing up sand bags, helping us with water jugs, and all that.

The President. Yes, we had a lot of water the last time I was there. I'll never forget that.

Mr. Harden. Times are a lot better now, we're happy to report. And we want to thank you, too, for especially the moral support you lended us during that time because, as you found out, it was not very good back then.

The President. It was difficult but, you know, I was honored to be able to do it, and I'm proud of the response that we had from the Federal Emergency Management Agency and Secretary Espy and all the others. We worked very hard with the people of Iowa on that flood, and I was honored to do it.

Mr. Harden. Well, you got a chance to see from the airplane a lot of the agricultural—our crops and things that were going on. And we have Bob Quinn, our farm director, here that would like to ask you a few questions in that regard.

The President. Hello, Bob.

Ethanol

Mr. Quinn. Mr. President, when we talked in April of '93, the first time we met in New York City, we talked about your support of ethanol and the clean air bill. Well,

the clean air bill, as you well know, has kind of stalled out; it's blocked in court. What's your stance on ethanol? Still supporting ethanol?

The President. I'm still strongly for it. As you know, we stayed with our commitment, and we went forward with the ethanol policy, which was strongly supported by the farmers in the Middle West. And we've been sued in court; I think we'll win that lawsuit. I think that it is within the policy discretion of our Government to support ethanol. I think it's good for agriculture, good for the environment, and I still have the same position.

Farm Bill

Mr. Quinn. You know, we're talking about the farm bill right now, and we've heard some talk over the weekend from the Republican side that there may be some cutting of farm programs. Now, in your farm bill plan, do you hope to reduce spending or cut farm programs at all?

The President. Well, I think we need to make a distinction between what the two alternatives are here, because they are dramatic.

We've already figured into the budget and all the farm groups have supported the fact that the subsidy programs themselves will be somewhat less costly in the years ahead because of the trade agreements and especially the GATT agreement. But the reason for that is that we've got agreement from our competitors, especially in Europe, to cut their subsidies. And our products are so much more competitive, we're going to sell more on the markets around the world, and that's going to increase farm income. That's a good thing and, I think everyone would admit, an appropriate thing to do.

What they're talking about is something very different from that. They have made all these promises. They've promised to cut taxes—mostly for the rich, but they just want to throw tax cuts around; they've promised to spend more on defense and on Star Wars; and they promised to balance the budget in 5 years.

Now, the House Budget Committee did an analysis and basically says if they do that, they'll just have to cut everything across the board: \$2,000 a Social Security recipient a

year, cut Medicare, cut farm programs, cut veterans programs. If they back out of cutting Social Security, then they have to cut everything else 30 percent across the board. If they back out of that, we're right back into the trickle-down economics of the eighties, where we explode the deficit and put the economy in the ditch. So, they're in a pickle. They've made a bunch of promises that the only way they can keep their promises is to devastate the farm programs.

We've got a chance to be very creative and flexible in the '95 farm bill and do some things that help farmers without being imprudent with our tax dollars. You know, we can't do what they want; we cannot. And that's why I'm telling all the people in the farm belt, you know, you just don't need to send people to Congress that are addicted to this rather way-out contract notion that you can promise people the Moon and there are no consequences to it. It's not the way to run a country. We need to run our country with discipline and look towards the future.

Talk Radio

Mr. Harden. Mr. President, the last time you were here, you graciously did a talk show for us on WHO. We were mostly talking about the flood. But when you were done, I said, "Well, you do a pretty good talk show," and you said, well, you might like to host a show like that someday. And I just was curious as to when you think you might be available?

The President. Well, I hope it won't be quite—[laughter]—let me say this, I hope it'll be longer before I'm available than some talk show hosts hope it will be. [Laughter] But I'd like to do it because I think that radio is in some ways more intimate than television even. And I think that talk shows can be very, very helpful in furthering the national dialog. But I think that it's important that they really be conversations and not screaming matches and not just a form of attack journalism. Because when you do that, nobody learns anything, and people are liable to have their heads full of facts that aren't accurate. So, I think it's like any other weapon: The more powerful it is, the more potential you have for good; the more potential you have for harm.

White House Communications

Ms. Lucas. We want to know, Mr. President, do you really have a red telephone in your office? And if so, who calls you on it?

The President. [Laughter] No, it's not red, but I do have two sets of phones. I have my normal set of phones, and then I have a set of phones that have absolutely secure lines that are not subject to anybody tapping or intervening on. And I use it on occasions for secure conversations, normally with foreign leaders who have something very sensitive they want to discuss with me and they're worried that they don't want anybody in their country or our country to know about it. It's not red, but it is secure.

Mr. Harden. Mr. President, thank you so much for taking the time with us, and we'll see you tomorrow here in Iowa.

The President. Can't wait.

Mr. Harden. Okay.

The President. Thanks.

NOTE: The interview began at 6:05 p.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Rhode Island Convention Center in Providence, RI, for broadcast at 8 a.m. on November 3. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Rally for Democratic Candidates in Providence, Rhode Island

November 2, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you for this wonderful welcome, and thank you for being about twice as large a crowd as we thought we'd have and for being so good-humored about us losing the sound. I want to thank, first of all, the bands from Cranston East and Cranston West High School. Let's give them a hand. [Applause] You know, folks, when I ran for President, my slogan was "Don't stop thinking about tomorrow." And there are a couple of people here with signs that say that today. But one of them is right down here with a group of people who are tomorrow, from the Maryville Elementary School. Welcome. Glad to see you. I am delighted to be here today with my good friend Senator Claiborne Pell who just came back with me on our mission of peace to the Middle East.

And I thank him for his leadership for Rhode Island and for America.

I am delighted to be here and to be introduced by Myrth York. And I want you to help her win this election next week. I read in the papers that she is an underdog. Well, I was an underdog—wait a minute, that's not a bad thing. I was an underdog when I started running for President. Nobody but my mother thought I could win. And then I was underdog two more times. I got up; I went down; I got up; I went down. The only election that matters is the one that the voters in Rhode Island are going to have next Tuesday.

The thing that impresses me about Myrth York is that she understands that the first job of Governor is to prepare the State for tomorrow's economy, to have Rhode Island moving strongly into the future—[*applause*—]—commends her, and I want you to elect her on Tuesday.

I also want to say a few words about the others who are here. Linda Kushner sponsored and supported the Rhode Island family and medical leave act. I believe in that sort of policy. We need more of that in the Congress, not less. I want to say a special word of support for my friend, representative, soon-to-be Congressman, Patrick Kennedy. He has done in the legislature here what we need more of in Congress. He's been willing to stand up to vested interests and to stand up for the people of Rhode Island. I want you to help him be elected to the Congress on Tuesday. And you're going to do it, aren't you? Now I just want to say a simple but heartfelt thank you to Jack Reed. Jack Reed was there for us on the crime bill, on the Brady bill, on the family and medical leave bill, on helping to provide more affordable, easier to repay college loans to a whole new generation of American students. Jack Reed was there, and you ought to be there for him. I also want to thank all these other fine Democrats for being here with me, your State chair, Guy DeFault, who has such a good voice he could almost speak without the microphone. Your Lieutenant Governor, Bob Weygand, Jim Langevin, Sara Quinn, and Richard James. I want you to stand with all of them on Tuesday.

I love Rhode Island. I love to come here. Today I was told that today I was the first President since Andrew Jackson to go to Pawtucket. And I said, that was good because Andy Jackson and I cared as much about ordinary Americans as anybody who ever had our jobs. I was then told I was the first President in anybody's memory to come to Rhode Island twice in the same year. I'd love to come here every month. I love it here. I mean, look around. This is America, the Italians, the Irish, the French, the Portuguese, the African-Americans, the Haitian-Americans, the Hispanics. You name it; you got it. America's future here in Rhode Island. People working hard.

My fellow Americans, 21 months ago, with the help of the voters in Rhode Island, the American people hired me to be the President on a commitment to change the direction of the country, to get the economy going again, to empower ordinary Americans to compete in this economy, to make Government work for ordinary people again and not just organized interests, to make the world a more prosperous and a safer place for Americans to live and for these children to grow up.

We had this slogan, "Don't stop thinking about tomorrow," because we had always believed that. And yet we had been through years in which people only did what was easiest today, in which we had leaders who talked tough but acted soft and did not tell us the truth and did not challenge us to do what we have to do in order to get this country into the 21st century, so that these children will have a great future and so that our best days are before us. That was my commitment 21 months ago. And I have to tell you, this country still has great challenges, but we are in better shape today than we were 21 months ago.

We have more jobs, a lower deficit, a smaller Federal Government, less regulation. We've corrected abuses like the \$500 hammers and the \$50 ash trays. We are giving you a Government that gives you your money's worth. We have done things for ordinary people. The tax system is fairer; 15 million working families, including thousands and thousands in this State, got their taxes reduced because they worked full-time, they

have children in the home, they're just barely above the poverty line. And we do not believe, in our administration, that people who work hard and are trying to be good family people should be pushed into poverty by the tax system. We have done more on that than anybody has in 20 years.

The family and medical leave law protects families so that if there is a baby born or a sick parent, you can take some time off to deal with your family problems without losing your job. That's an important thing that we have done.

We're going to immunize all the children in this country under the age of 2 by 1996. We are expanding Head Start. We are establishing apprenticeship programs for young people who get out of high school, who don't go on to college but do want good jobs with growing wages and a better future. And we have dramatically, and I mean dramatically, changed the college loan program so that young people can borrow money to go to college at a lower cost and better repayment terms.

And the world is changing. The world is changing. There is more trade but a lower threat of nuclear problems. We continue to work with the Russians. We have made an agreement with the North Koreans not to become a nuclear state. We are expanding trade and job opportunities all around the world. We are promoting peace in a peaceful but strong manner from Haiti to Northern Ireland to the Middle East to the Persian Gulf.

This country is moving. We are moving. And the message must be to the voters of Rhode Island and America in the next week, we are moving in the right direction. In 21 months, a good start has been made. Have 30 years of social problems been corrected? Have 20 years of economic stagnation been totally reversed? Have 12 years of trickle-down economics been totally overcome? No. But in 21 months we've made an awfully good beginning. Let's keep going.

I thought to myself over and over and over again, what could have possessed our opponents to come out with this contract on America? What could have possessed the opponents of Congressman Reed and Representative Kennedy to sign it? It is a trillion dollars' worth of promises. Oh, it sounds so

good. Here we are on the eve of the election, and one more time, they're like the Pied Piper of Hamelin. You remember what happened to the people that followed him? [Laughter] "We'll give you a tax cut. We'll increase defense. We'll increase Star Wars. We'll balance the budget. And we'll tell you all about how we'll do it after the election."

So we're telling you how they have to do it before the election, and they're all upset about it. They wish we wouldn't tell you. But when you promise people a trillion dollars and you act like it's free, it sounds like a good time. But it's not free. To keep their promises, they would have to cut everything else that you depend upon by 20 percent across the board, Social Security, \$2,000 a person a year, Medicare, veterans programs, programs for farmers in the Heartland of America, everything. If they say they don't want to cut Social Security, then they have to cut everything else 30 percent across the board, devastating the Medicare program of this country. It is wrong. And if it is just a cheap election year promise, it is even more wrong, because that means they are going to explode the deficit, ship our jobs overseas again, and compromise the future of these children who are here. We have to say no to this. We're doing fine. We're going forward. We're not going to turn back.

It was bad enough when they were just saying no. When they tried to say no to the crime bill, no to deficit reduction, no to the college loans, no to family leave, no to the Brady bill, bad enough when they killed campaign finance reform, lobby reform, environmental legislation. Shoot, this crime bill, every law enforcement group in America was for it. I've got this watch on today that I got from the Rhode Island Police Chiefs Association when I signed the crime bill. But they were against it for political reasons, because they didn't want the Democrats to be perceived as being tough on crime. Never mind what really counted was not who got credit for the crime bill but whether the murder rate was going down, whether the rape rate and the violence rate was going down, whether we were saving more kids before they become criminals, whether elderly people felt safer in their homes and kids felt safer in their schools. That's all that matters.

If they would work with us, everybody could have credit. There's more than enough credit to go around. You ought to be in the driver's seat in this country, not a bunch of politicians in Washington trying to cause failure to make you mad, to hope you'll do the wrong thing. And that's their program. You've got to do the right thing. You've got to turn the lights on in America. You've got to say we're going in the right direction.

Let me say this. You know, I ought to quit, but I'm having a good time. I was asked the other day, and I got to thinking about it—somebody said the other day, said, "Did any job you ever had prepare you for being President?" And I said, well, I was a Governor a long time, but it really wasn't the same. For one reason, you can stay in touch with the people better. It was much more difficult for folks to get in the way of me and my constituents when I was the Governor of a small State. So I thought of all the other jobs I've had. And the one that my job is most like now is one I never made a penny doing, was when I worked with civic clubs on car washes—[laughter]—because I liked to clean the windows off. That's what we've got to do in America today. You know, if you drive your car and there's a lot of stuff on the windshield, you can think it's dark outside when the Sun's shining. You could think there are obstacles there when the way is clear. And then there could be a huge obstacle out there and you wouldn't be able to see it, and you'd run smack-dab into it. That's what they've done. They've put a lot of dirt on America's windshield. We've got to clean it off between now and Tuesday. Will you help? Will you do your part? Will you go forward?

Folks, this is an election between hope and fear, between unity and disunity but, more than anything else, between going forward and turning back. As I told the people over in Pawtucket at the Portuguese Social Club today, think about it like this: Every one of you is in the driver's seat, and on election day, just imagine that you have a remote control in your hand and what's in the movie screen or television screen is a movie about America's future. And you've got the remote control in your hand. You can push forward, you can push fast forward, or you can push reverse. Push forward, go on and push fast forward if you want to, but say no to reverse,

no, we're going forward; we're doing better; we're going to do better still; we're going forward. Forward, forward.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:56 p.m. at Rhode Island Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to James Langevin, candidate for secretary of state; Sara Quinn, candidate for attorney general; and Richard James, candidate for general treasurer. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Interview With Mike Siegel of KVI Radio, Seattle, Washington

November 3, 1994

Mr. Siegel. Very good to talk to you today. You sound a little hoarse.

The President. I'm a little hoarse, but I'm feeling great.

Q. All right. Let's go right to it then. One thing that crosses my mind is something that you were in fact one of the creators of back in the mid-eighties, Democratic Leadership Council, and talked a great deal about bringing the party back to a centrist kind of position. And now we see today that there is, according to the New York Times today, a two-to-one margin of the people in this country believe Government should be less involved in solving national problems, which would be consistent with what the Democratic Leadership Council said, as you were one of those who were the inspiration to create it.

And then there are those who now criticize what you have done because of the health care and the crime bill and the environmental proposals and the very large budget proposals that you've made. Are you creating big Government again, in contradiction to what you wanted to do at the Democratic Leadership Council?

The President. Absolutely not. The people wouldn't feel that way if they were given the facts. This year, for the first time in 25 years, the Congress adopted a budget that I recommended that reduced both defense and domestic spending—this year, first time in 25 years.

The only thing that increased this year was health care costs, because we refused to act, Medicare and Medicaid. We reduced domestic spending. We reduced defense spending. We have reduced the size of the Federal Government. There are 70,000 fewer people working for the Government than there were on the day I was elected. There will be a reduction of 270,000 people in the life of my budgets. And the crime bill was a bill that empowered local governments.

I don't understand where people get off saying that's the National Government interfering in crime. What we did with the crime bill was to reduce the size of the Federal Government by 270,000 and give it to local communities to hire police, to build prisons, to have the resources in the courts for tougher punishment and alternatives to imprisonment for first offenders, and to have prevention programs. That's what we did with the money.

So the crime bill is evidence of reducing the size of the Federal Government to empower people at the local level to reduce the crime rate. If you look at the initiatives we have taken, basically all the major initiatives we have taken are designed to empower individuals to assume greater responsibility for themselves: the Family and Medical Leave Act, the expansion of Head Start, the apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go to college, the better repayment terms for college loans. Basically, I have implemented chapter and verse the agenda of the Democratic Leadership Council.

Now what is the problem? There are three problems. One is that Republicans tried to kill all the major initiatives that we passed. They were against deficit reduction, against the middle class college loans, against the crime bill, against everything. And they characterized it as big Government and taxes because they had to find some way to cover up their opposition.

And secondly, on the health care debate, I was not for a big Government health care plan. My plan provided private health insurance for small business people and self-employed people on the same terms that those of us who work for Government and big companies got it. It wasn't presented to the American people that way because the spe-

cial interest groups who were going to lose money in it spent \$200 million or more to tell the American people something different.

And one of the things that we have learned in this information age is if you have enough money, you can just buy your message, and it's very hard for people to know whether it's accurate or not. But if you look at where we are today compared to where we were when I took office, we've got more jobs, we've got a lower deficit. We've got more high-wage jobs. We've got a smaller Federal Government. We've taken a serious approach to crime. We've done things to help working families, to expand education, to have more trade, and a smaller threat to our national security abroad. The country is in better shape than it was 21 months ago. We've moving in the right direction.

Mr. Siegel. Let me give you a couple of other quick questions because your time is short; your office is telling us that. In the poll that came out in the Times, CBS-New York Times poll, 27 percent of the people believe the country is going in the right direction, and 56 percent disapprove of your handling of the economy. There's something in the perception of the American people that says we're not doing the right thing. You're the CEO of the country, why do the people feel that way?

The President. Well, I have very little control from time to time over how they feel. What is the information they get? What are the facts? I deal in the facts. The facts are: job growth is very fast in the first 2 years of my administration, after the worst job growth since the Depression, under the Bush administration. The fact is that the deficit went up under the previous administrations until they quadrupled the debt. We're bringing it down. The fact is we're getting more high-wage jobs into the country. If the American people don't know it, they obviously can't act on it.

Now, what are the problems the American people have? We have 20 years of accumulated insecurity in our work force, people not getting a wage increase, people losing their health insurance, people changing jobs rapidly. I can't stop them from having to change

jobs rapidly, so I'm trying to institute a system of lifetime education and training.

I tried to make sure that working people wouldn't lose their health insurance. The Republicans and the special interest groups stopped me. But I tried to deal with that. But by every objective measure, the economy is in better shape and the country is in better shape.

I would also have to say, as you well know and as studies have documented, the way people get their information today in America is overwhelmingly skewed to negative information, to conflict, to failure, to negativism. And that's just a matter of fact. I am doing my best to shed some light on this, to get the truth out to the American people. But every day, they're told bad things, bad things, bad things. The truth is very different.

When I travel abroad on behalf of our country, world leaders ask me what is going on in the United States? How could people possibly be pessimistic when our economy is so much stronger than theirs, when we are doing so much better, when we are doing so much better than we were? The answer is, the people don't know. I am doing my very best to cut through the fog and shine some daylight and tell the truth. It's a daunting challenge, but I'm doing the best I can.

Mr. Siegel. Mr. President, I don't mean to interrupt you, I want to keep you, but your office is telling us you have to go. I'm going to be in DC November 14th for that week, broadcasting this program. I hope we can get more time to talk during that week.

The President. Well, I hope we can. And I'm looking forward to being there on Sunday. I'm going to do a rally there on Sunday at 12:30 p.m. at the Pikes Peak—

Mr. Siegel. Pike Place Market, yes. You'll have a lot of people out here then.

The President. I hope they will. And I'm going to be putting this message out there. You can't blame the people for this; they can only act on what they know. But if they had—it's a very strange situation. We have never had an election in which the information the people had was so at variance with the facts. And if they have the facts, they're going to vote to keep on going the way we are.

It's an amazing thing where the 1980's and trickle-down economics and explosion of the debt and shifting our jobs overseas—that's what got us in the trouble we're in.

Look at Washington State. Since I've been President, we're selling Washington apples in Asia for the first time. We're selling these Boeing airplanes around the world and doing everything we can to keep those jobs at Boeing. The economy has done much, much better.

And you started with this DLC thing. I have absolutely kept the commitments I made in the DLC credo, to move this country to the center and push it forward. The people just need to have the evidence and the facts; then they need to feel it.

Mr. Siegel. Well, Mr. President, I thank you again. I'm sorry we don't have more time, but I hope we will get time during that week I'm in DC in November.

The President. Yes, well, check in with us. I'd love to do the interview.

Mr. Siegel. Thank you very much. Good to talk to you, and have a good week if you would.

The President. Goodbye.

NOTE: The interview began at 5:25 p.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Savery Hotel in Des Moines, IA. This item was not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.

Interview With Cheryl Jennings of KGO Television, San Francisco, California

November 4, 1994

Midterm Elections

Ms. Jennings. Mr. President, you are coming to California just before the November elections. Why are you choosing this State in particular?

The President. Well, I, first of all, try to come often to California. As you know, I've done a lot of work to try to bring back the California economy, to try to help deal with the immigration problems, to try to help deal with the problems of defense conversion. And I feel that I have a big stake out there

in the success of California because the success of California determines, in some measure, the success of America.

And there are important races there, Senator Feinstein's race, Kathleen Brown's race for Governor. Many of our Members of Congress are in tough races for re-election. And I want to do what I can to be as supportive of those who have supported the approach we've taken. We're moving America in the right direction. In 21 months we've gone a considerable way toward reversing the problems that brought us the economic difficulties of the last 12 years. And I want the voters of California to give us a chance to keep on moving into the future.

Defense Conversion

Ms. Jennings. Two issues you brought up: military conversion, the defense issue, of course, and immigration. Let's start with military conversion. You're coming to an area in Alameda County first that's very heavily hit by that. What can you tell those folks? What can you offer them?

The President. Well, I think most of the people there know that we have worked very hard, first of all, to invest significant sums of money in trying to help the places where bases have closed, in trying to put out new technology projects for the companies who have lost defense contracts. In the case of Alameda, we're doing what we can to move the port facilities over to the local community so they can be developed for commercial purposes.

Midterm Elections

Ms. Jennings. You also talked—I heard you earlier on the radio today—about cutbacks, Social Security, for example, veterans benefits. And of course, since there are so many military bases in California, a lot of veterans are saying, "Hey, the Government lied to me. I made a contract to serve my country, and now they're not going to support me or pay for my benefits for the rest of my life."

The President. Well, we are; the Democrats are. But the Republicans are running for Congress, trying to get control of the Senate and the House, based on a commitment to a contract which says they're going to give huge tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans;

they're going to increase defense spending and bring back Star Wars; they're going to balance the budget in 5 years. That costs \$1 trillion. The only way they can keep that promise is to cut Government spending across the board, 20 percent cut in Social Security, veterans benefits, Medicare, everything. If they take Social Security out, then they have to cut everything else 30 percent, Medicare, veterans benefits, all those things. There is no other way they can keep that promise.

If they're kidding, if they have no intention of keeping the promise and they're just going to do the easy things, the tax cuts, the spending increases, then we're looking at an explosion in Government debt, shipping our jobs overseas, putting our economy in deep trouble, just as it was when I took office.

So I hope that the American people, and particularly the people in California and those retired military folks, will see this contract for what it is, a bogus set of promises. I hope they'll reject it and vote for the people who are committed to continuing to move this country forward and to honoring our commitments to our veterans and to the Social Security recipients.

Immigration

Ms. Jennings. Mr. President, before I lose you on the satellite, what about Proposition 187; that is the anti-illegal immigration issue.

The President. Yes, I'm familiar with it. I have two things to say about it. First of all, I sympathize with the people of California. They have a problem. The Federal Government should do more to help to stop illegal immigration and to help California bear the cost of the illegal immigrants who are there. But secondly, I don't think Proposition 187 is the way to do it. It seems to be clearly unconstitutional. And if put into effect, its primary impact would be on children: keeping children out of health clinics, which could cause public health problems in the general population; kicking children out of schools, which could turn teachers into police officers and put kids on the street where they could get in trouble and cause trouble for others, rather than in school. We already have too many kids on the street in this country.

So I think what we ought to do is to keep working on what we're doing, stiffening the Border Patrol, stiffening the sanctions on employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants, stiffening our ability to get illegal immigrants out of the work force, increasing our ability to deport people who have committed crimes who are illegal immigrants. And then the Federal Government simply must continue to do more to help California and other States deal with the corrections, the health, and the education costs of illegal immigration. I am committed to doing that. I don't think 187 is the way to do it.

Ms. Jennings. All right. Mr. President, thank you so much for giving us some your time this morning.

The President. Thank you, Cheryl.

NOTE: The interview began at 9:59 a.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Holiday Inn in Duluth, MN. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Interview With Luis Eschegoyan of KDTV, San Francisco

November 4, 1994

The President. Hello, Luis, can you hear me?

Mr. Eschegoyan. Yes, Mr. President. Good afternoon.

The President. Good afternoon.

Immigration

Mr. Eschegoyan. Thank you, Mr. President, for giving us the opportunity to talk to you. What is your impression of Proposition 187, included in the California ballot?

The President. I'm opposed to it. I do believe that the Federal Government has an obligation to do more to try to help California deal with the problems of illegal immigration. And I have worked hard on that, along with Senator Feinstein and Senator Boxer. We've almost doubled the border guards in southern California; we have increased our sending the illegal immigrants who have been convicted of crimes back home. We've given money to California for the very first time to deal with the costs of imprisonment.

I've tried to get much more money for education and health care costs of immigra-

tion to California. But 187 operates primarily against children. It says, kick the children out of the health clinics. That could cause health problems for the general population. It says, kick the children out of the schools, which means teachers are turned into police officers. It means that the kids can be on the street causing problems for themselves and for others. We've already got too many children on the street.

So I believe we have to do more. I'm working hard. I found a big immigration mess when I became President 21 months ago. But this is not the answer, in my opinion, and I hope the voters will turn out and vote and reject 187. It's a way of dividing our people, it's clearly unconstitutional, and it's looking for easy answers to a tough problem. After all, some of the people that are for 187 are part of the problem. When Governor Wilson was Senator Wilson, he responded to the powerful forces in California that wanted more illegal immigrants in California to do work. He sponsored legislation to make it more difficult to remove illegal immigrants from the workplace by going easier on the employers. Now he, all of a sudden, has turned 180 degrees on this issue. But this is a complicated issue without a simple solution. I'm committed to working with you to find a solution. I don't think 187 is the answer.

I hope that our listeners, our viewers, will turn out and vote on Tuesday and vote against 187, and I hope they'll come to the Kaiser Center in Oakland tomorrow where I'm going to have a rally at 2 o'clock.

Mr. Eschegoyan. Mr. President, if 187 is approved, do you think it will affect the NAFTA treaty with Mexico?

The President. I don't know that it will affect NAFTA, but it will certainly affect our relations with Mexico. You know, in the long run, the best way to reduce illegal immigration is for more people in Mexico and these other countries to have good jobs in their own countries, to trade with us, to sell to us and buy from us, and live in stable societies.

California has benefited more from NAFTA than any other State, with the possible exception of Texas. It has brought us

increased numbers of new jobs and new opportunities, and as it raises incomes in Mexico, clearly, illegal immigration will slow, because there will be more job opportunities at home. People like to stay with their families and where they grew up, if they can make a living.

Mr. Eschegoyan. Thank you, Mr. President, to talk to us here at KDTV, Channel 14, San Francisco.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The interview began at 10:25 a.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Holiday Inn in Duluth, MN. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Interview With John Watson of WILM Radio, Wilmington, Delaware November 4, 1994

Mr. Watson. Good morning, Mr. President, how are you?

The President. I'm fine. How are you?

Mr. Watson. Thanks for being with us. You've been very busy these days; not much time for the saxophone, I guess, which happens to be my favorite instrument, by the way.

The President. Oh, thank you. I love it myself. I'm not playing too much. I did get a chance to play a couple of weeks ago with a group that was in the White House, but I don't play enough. My lip is getting weak; I've got to practice.

Midterm Elections

Mr. Watson. Well, your message seems to be getting pretty strong, seems to be playing pretty well with the American people. I see where your personal approval rating is up quite a bit, and Democrats in general seem to be a bit more secure for reelection.

The President. Well, I hope so, not for partisan reasons but because I think it's good for the country. You know, I came in with a commitment to try to make this country stronger, with more jobs and stronger families and safer streets and to make us stronger abroad.

And we've still got some problems in this country, but we're plainly moving in the right direction. If you just take Delaware, for ex-

ample, there have been 5 times as many new jobs coming to Delaware in 20 months of our Presidency as during the previous 4 years. And we were able to pass the family and medical leave law, which protected 147,000 families in Delaware, if a worker needs to take a little time off when there's a baby born or a parent sick. We've reorganized the student loan program to provide more affordable college loans to more middle class students. It made almost 42,000 students and former students in Delaware eligible for lower costs on their loans. So we're making progress. We passed the crime bill, thanks to Joe Biden's unbelievable leadership. And I have to say, that was an example of bipartisanship. You had Congressman Castle there coming in at the end and trying to help us to get through the crime bill. It's going to make a difference. It's going to empower local communities to reduce crime and violence.

So we're moving in the right direction. We're moving forward. And I don't want to see the country go backward in this election, even though there are a lot of people who are upset.

Mr. Watson. [*Inaudible*—I suppose you'll be here to campaign for Attorney General Charles Oberly, trying to unseat Republican Senator Bill Roth. But Oberly is seen as something of an independent Democrat. Is that going to be a problem?

The President. No, I like Oberly. I think—he's an exciting character to me. You know, the Democrats are not like the Republicans; we don't mind a little independence in our party. I think it's good for people to exercise independent judgment.

I've just come from Iowa where a retiring Congressman, Republican Congressman Fred Grandy, was complaining about how the Republicans didn't want any independence and that—he pointed out how they were ordered not to work with me on health care. So I think Oberly has the kind of characteristics and character and ability and energy that would be very good at this time.

Mr. Watson. Sir, what is your game plan, just in case the Republicans are successful, as they think they'll be, and win control of the House? Could this work in your favor at all?

The President. Well, I don't know. Some people think it could work politically for me personally, but I'm not interested in that. I'm interested in moving our country forward. And the thing that bothers me is that the Republicans have committed to a program which would take us right back to the 1980's and what got us in trouble in the first place. I mean, their contract says that if they win control of the House and the Senate, they're going to—they want to promise huge tax increases, almost all of it to wealthy individuals. They want to have an increase in defense again, and they want to bring back Star Wars. They promise to balance the budget. Now, one of two things—that costs a trillion dollars. So if the Republicans get a hold of the Congress, one of two things is going to happen. They're going to do what they say, which means they'll have to cut everything in the Federal Government besides defense and Star Wars by 20 percent, including Social Security—

Mr. Watson. We're almost out of time—

The President. All right, well, listen—but that's \$2,000 a person. And on Social Security that's a lot. If they don't do that, they're going to explode the deficit, start shipping our jobs overseas again, like they did in the eighties, and we'll be in big trouble.

So I hope the American people will take a look at people like Oberly. He's an aggressive, independent, progressive person, the kind of person I think that can bring new ideas, new energy, and keep this country going forward, which is what I think we need to do.

Mr. Watson. One final question, Mr. President. You're just about out of time, but you mentioned Congressman Castle is helping you. So how do you see the Republican Castle versus Democrat Cari DeSantis?

The President. Well, I mentioned that Castle helped on the crime bill because I think it's important for me not to be as partisan as they have been, and I want to give him credit for that.

But the reason that I'm supporting the Democrats in these races is that even Mike Castle voted against our economic plan. And our economic program for America is working. Just look at Delaware. You've had 5

times the job growth since our administration has been there as you did in the previous 4 years, that is, in 20 months, 5 times as many jobs in the previous 4 years. The economic approach we have taken, bring the deficit down, invest in education and training, expand trade, invest in new technologies, these things will grow the American economy. And the figures that came out today show that we have now had 5 times as many high-wage jobs coming into this economy in this year than in the previous 5 years.

Mr. Watson. There are many more things that we could talk about, Mr. President, but you're out of time. And I appreciate very much you calling in. Thank you very much.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The interview began at 10:51 a.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Holiday Inn in Duluth, MN. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at the Los Alamitos Naval Air Station in Los Alamitos, California

November 4, 1994

Thank you very much. First I want to thank Julia. You know, I was looking at her make that talk and thinking a couple of things. One is, she's the sort of person that makes this country great. And the second thing is, as long as we've got people like her and people like you, we're going to be all right, and don't you let anybody tell you any different. I am delighted to be here with Bob Hood. You already heard him talk about the trip that he made to China with the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown. I'm delighted to be here with Congresswoman Harmon, Senator Boxer, and of course with Senator Feinstein. I appreciate the comments that Senator Feinstein made on behalf of all of us about the importance of this agreement.

This agreement was signed just a couple of hours ago by John McDonnell, your chairman, and Li Lanqing, the Vice Premier of China, with whom I met yesterday at the White House. It is a part of our ongoing efforts to expand trade in ways that maintain high-wage jobs in the United States, increase jobs in the United States, and help other

countries to grow so that they can buy more and more of our products and provide better lives for their people as well. I am delighted by the fact that these jobs will be preserved in California and that others in Connecticut and other States will benefit.

It would not have been possible, notwithstanding the trip to China by Secretary Brown and by Bob Hood, but for the work of the McDonnell Douglas employees and the continued commitment of all of you to become more and more competitive, more and more productive, more and more successful.

I want to take just a minute—we've already celebrated, and I want us to celebrate, but I want you to understand from my point of view how this fits into America's future and to your future. Twenty-one months ago when I went to Washington to try to turn this economy around and rebuild our country, the unemployment rate here in California was 9.4 percent. You had suffered because of the national recession, but you had also suffered because with only 12 percent of America's population, you had 21 percent of our defense sector, and you had taken a disproportionate hit, about 40 percent of the impact of the base closures to date, as Senator Feinstein had said.

It was obvious to me that we had to do something to turn this situation around. And we began the implementation of a comprehensive, long-term economic strategy that was very different from what had been pursued in previous years. First we decided we needed to reduce the deficit of the United States, to free up more money to invest in the private sector to create jobs in the private sector and to drive interest rates down. Then we decided we had to remove controls on American exports, especially of high-tech products which are disproportionately produced in California. Then we decided we had to increase our number of trade agreements, like NAFTA and the GATT world trade agreement, to open up new markets. We decided we needed to make a special effort to invest in new technologies and to invest in defense conversion, which obviously had a big impact here.

Now in California that meant that one-third of all the funds we've invested to try

to help defense contractors move from defense to domestic production or to commercial production for the United States and the world, one-third of all that money was spent in investments here in California. We also decided that we needed a clear, sharp view about what kind of defense posture we needed to take ourselves into the 21st century with the strongest military in the world.

I want to mention just a word about the C-17 contract because it's been mentioned by others. We had to fight like crazy to preserve the C-17. And I hope we won't ever have to fight like that again, because the C-17 is important not to your jobs, your jobs are incidental to the fact that it's important to the national security of the United States of America.

And I just want to mention one thing. I think all Americans were filled with pride when they saw the comprehensive United States operation that brought President Aristide back and democracy back to Haiti with no casualties. I think they were filled with pride when they saw the lightning-like response of the United States to Saddam Hussein's aggression in the Persian Gulf. Others were amazed that we moved as quickly as we did. Why is that? Because we learned after the Gulf war, in which the United States took 4½ months to position our soldiers, our airmen, our marines, our naval personnel, and all of our equipment that we had to move more quickly. And one of the things we have to have is much more enhanced airlift and sealift capacity. That is what the C-17 means. That is what we are developing.

So if you like what you saw in Haiti, if you like what you saw in the Persian Gulf, then continue to support the C-17, not only because of the jobs in California but because of the job it allows the finest military in the entire world to do for the United States of America.

We have a long way to go in California. But the unemployment rate has dropped, as Senator Boxer said, from 9.4 percent to 7.7 percent. The unemployment rate in America is at a 4-year low. Jobs are growing at 5 times the rate they did in the previous 4 years. The United States has just been voted at the annual panel of international economists as the most productive economy in the world for

the first time in 9 years. For the first time in 15 years, America's auto workers will make and sell more cars around the world than their Japanese competitors. We are moving in the right direction.

Here in California, in addition to the C-17 and this contract, I want to point out again the work that's being done in defense conversion. We are turning Norton Air Force Base over to the community. The Presidio has been turned into a national park. Up in northern California, the Alameda Naval Station will be turned over to the Port of Oakland. We are moving on a massive attempt to revive the capacity of Americans to build ships, which is benefiting the shipbuilding industry in San Diego that I'm sure all of you are familiar with.

These are the kinds of things we need to continue to push ahead with. And there are high-technology investments from the physics experiment at Stanford, to the work that's just been contracted and Livermore Labs, to the continuing effort of our administration to promote the space station, something that also benefits the workers of California, that will take us into the 21st century with a defense that is smaller but still adequate to our responsibilities in the world and with a job base that is preserved.

If you look around this crowd today, you will see everything that is best about America. What makes a country strong? Abroad, it's strong security, more trade, standing up for freedom and peace. At home, it's strong families. It's strong education systems. It's safe streets. It's good jobs. That is the true strength of America. That is what we are here to celebrate today.

And I want to tell you that the economic strategy that we have pursued that is making a difference in this country would simply not have been possible without the support of your Congresswoman Jane Harmon and your Senators Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer. It is a partnership. And the partnership we have with the private sector is in many ways, as I'm sure Bob Hood will tell you, virtually unprecedented. Abroad, we are working hard without relief, and we will continue to work until we have this economy turned around again and until every Julia Clayton in the United States can not only

be a great grandmother but can also look forward to an American economy for her great grandchildren that will be the envy of the world.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:45 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to McDonnell Douglas employer Julia Clayton and Bob Hood, president, Douglas Aircraft. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Rally in Los Angeles, California

November 4, 1994

Thank you very much. Senator Feinstein, Senator Boxer, Kathleen Brown, distinguished Members of Congress and candidates on our State Democratic ticket, to all of you who are here, thank you for making me feel, as always, so very welcome in Los Angeles and California. I want to say a special word of thanks to the gospel group, Charity, that entertained us so well. They were great. Thank you. I want to thank Marlee Matlin for her fine comments before; thank you for being here with us. Again let me say, there are very few States who could boast a slate of candidates for State office and for the Congress as outstanding as those who have already been introduced here tonight. But I just want you to know, I am proud to be here with all these nominees of my party and your party that you will elect on Tuesday. I thank them, and I thank you.

I want to talk tonight just for a minute about what's really at stake in this election. And I want you to think about why—I was looking at Dianne Feinstein tonight, and I was thinking, I have been following public life in America for a long time now. I never lived in Washington as an elected official until 21 months ago, but I've kind of kept up, like most of you. In my lifetime, there has never been, ever, not one time, a United States Senator who, in his or her first 2 years in office, sponsored three major legislative initiatives that will change the life of America for the better, the assault weapons ban, the zero tolerance for guns in schools, and the largest wilderness bill in the history of the United States, the California desert bill.

Now how could we not give her a 6-year renewal? We have to do it. What is the argument of her opponent? It is the argument they're all making, really. It is that Government is inherently bad, it's inherently irrelevant, it doesn't make any difference, "Who cares what I say or do, it doesn't make any difference." You look at these children behind me and the children in this crowd; it does make a difference to their future, and Dianne Feinstein will make a difference. He said, "What difference does it make if we pass any laws in Washington; they've been up there passing laws for 200 years." He's the first person ever to seek the United States Senate to run not only against Washington, he's now running against George Washington. [Laughter] Folks, I don't know about you, but I think what Abraham Lincoln did in the Emancipation Proclamation and the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments made a pretty big difference in the life of this country. I don't know about you, but I think when we had one in four Americans out of work and President Roosevelt came in and lifted us up out of the dumps and got us going forward, it made a difference in this country. It's not a partisan thing. When President Eisenhower signed the bill for the interstate highway system or President Nixon signed the bill for the Environmental Protection Agency, it made a difference in this country. This guy is the only person who thinks that none of this matters. You have to say no to people who say it doesn't matter, yes to Dianne Feinstein. It does matter. California matters. She matters. Reelect her on Tuesday.

Look at—consider the candidacy of Kathleen Brown. I don't want to be presumptuous, but I know something about being a Governor; I used to be one. And on the tough days in Washington, I think it's the best job I ever had. [Laughter] It is a joy. But it is only a joy if every day you get up and you try to build. The Governor's office is not a place for blamers; it's a place for builders. It's a place for people who take responsibility and bring out the best in us and bring us together and move forward.

When I think of what you have been through in this State, with the recession, with the defense cutbacks. The unemployment

rate in California when I took office was 9.4 percent. I have done everything I could do to bring it down to 7.7 percent, to get those 400,000 jobs, to get this State going again. But I need a partner here, someone who wants to work for California, not point the finger of blame.

You know, I want to say two things about your slogan here. The one is, I want to talk about 187. But the first thing I want to do—I've got plenty to say about that, but the first thing I want to do is to ask you this: You're going to vote on 187, and I hope to goodness you're going to beat 187. But after the election somebody is going to be Governor with 4 years of hard work to do. Will you have a job? Will your schools get better? Will your streets get safer? Will your air get cleaner? Will your State move forward? That is the question.

We don't know what the incumbent wants to do, but we know Kathleen Brown has a plan, a good plan, that will make California a better place, a building place. How did California become the symbol of America's future? By building, not by blaming, by bringing together, not by tearing apart. Why does California have a chance to lead our country into the 21st century? Because of our diversity, not in spite of it, because our diversity opens the world to us.

Now let me say this to people who disagree with us on 187. Let me say this: It is true that the State of California has borne an unfair burden in the cost of illegal immigration. That is true. And it is true that in tough times, that burden is hard to bear. But what I want to tell you is, from the day I became President, because I had served with Governors in California, in Florida, in Texas and other States, I started to do something about it. I worked with Senator Feinstein; I worked with Senator Boxer; I worked with your congressional delegation. I tried to work with your Governor. I didn't think it was a partisan issue. We have almost doubled the border guards in San Diego. We have provided funds for the first time for the cost of incarceration. When I have been reducing the Government deficit, we have increased by one-third the amount of money coming to California to deal with the cost of illegal immigration. We haven't been laying down,

folks, we've been answering the call to do something about it.

Do we need to do more? Yes, we do. But this is not the answer. Look at 187; what does it say? It says that the adults of this country and the authorities are not able to keep illegal immigrants out of California, so we will punish their children. That's what it says. It says, close the health clinics to them, even if it creates a public health problem for everybody else. It says, turn the teachers into police officers and kick the kids out on the street. Let me ask the children here, don't you think we've got enough kids on the street already? We need more kids in school, making this State a better place.

Folks, the whole immigration system was a mess when I took office 21 months ago. I am trying to fix it. It is better than it was; it will get better still. Now, a lot of the people who are pointing the finger of blame at this election, who are trying to make you mad, you angry, you lash out, you vote for this, they helped to create the problem. When the Governor was a Senator, he voted for a bill to make it easier for illegal immigrants to be in California, because powerful interests wanted them to work for low wages. You know it as well as I do.

And then, when he became the Governor, and a President of his party was in Washington, his friend, his ally, he never raised a peep about this to put any heat on him, and they did nothing. Then when Senator Feinstein and Senator Boxer and President Clinton showed up, we did not say this about the Governor. We said nothing bad. We opened our hands. We said, "Let's roll up our sleeves; let's take responsibility; let's face this problem in a way that brings California together, not drives California apart." And that is what I have tried to do. Get me a partner in the Governor's office who will do the same thing.

Let me say again—let me say again, folks. Why are they doing well? Because they say "If we can just make the American people—this is nationally and in California—if we can make people mad enough, they will vote without thinking. If we can make them cynical enough, the Democrats will stay home. And if we can make them believe that Government is bad, that it always makes things

worse, then we win all the way around because when the economy gets better, we can say, well, that happened in spite of the President and the Congress. If things get better, we'll say, Government had nothing to do with it. If it gets worse, we'll blame Government and we can say any kind of outrageous thing we want to appeal to extremists and mean elements in our country, and we can still get elected." That is their strategy.

Well, let me ask you something. I don't know about you, but I think it mattered when you had that earthquake and we produced \$11.5 billion in record time. I think it mattered when we fixed I-5 and all the other roads in record time, something never before done in the United States of America. Do you know, today we reopened the last earthquake-damaged freeway, the Route 14 connector on I-5? I think that matters, and I think you think it matters.

I think it matters that 4.9 million families in California are protected by the family leave bill, so they can take a little time off when a child is born or a parent sick without losing a job. I think it matters. I think it matters when 2.1 million families in this State get an income tax cut so they can raise their children and work and not be in poverty. I think that matters.

After all you've been through with the cost of higher education going through the roof, I think it matters that our student loan reform makes 1.6 million Californians eligible for lower cost college loans. And when we put hundreds of millions of dollars into defense conversion and give a third of it to people out here struggling to get off of the terrible recession you've been through, that matters. When we invest in scientific research at your laboratories and create jobs, it matters. When we revitalize the shipbuilding industry in San Diego, it matters. When we do these things, it matters.

When we do things that build the future, it counts. That's why today we had this wonderful news that unemployment is at a 4-year low, that over 5 million new jobs have now been created. That matters. That makes a difference.

Folks, you have to decide what sort of future you want. I want a strong America. And what makes us strong? What makes us strong

is strength abroad and strength at home. We cannot be strong abroad even though we have the strongest military unless we have strong families and strong education system and safe streets and good jobs. That is the strength we are bringing to America, and we need to keep right on doing it. We don't need to turn back now.

And this whole thing comes down to the state of mind of the people of California on Election Day, because if people are cynical and angry, they either won't vote or they will vote against their own interests. You know, as a parent, one of the first things I tried to do, like most parents, as soon as my child was old enough to understand it, was to say, never, never make an important decision when you are mad. When you are mad, count to 10 before you say something. And every time I only got to two, I wound up in a lot of trouble. [*Laughter*]

Now that is exactly what the Republicans are trying to get you to do in this election. You look at the Wilson ads; you look at the Huffington ads; you listen to them. What they want you to do is not to take time to count to 10, not to remember that this State is the hope of America, not to remember what we can do when we're at our best. They want you to lash out, or they want you to give up. They want you to stay home or come out and vote for not the future but the past. That is what is going on in this election. If you say no thank you, we are going forward in jobs, forward in bringing our deficit down, forward in investing in our future, forward in education, forward in building strong families, we will win. We will win because you will win. You will win. We'll win.

Now I just want you to think about this. I know you think I'm beating a dead horse, but I've been all over this country and I know what I'm talking about. We will win if people think and feel their best and look at the record and look at the positions. And if that happens, Dianne Feinstein will be reelected. It is unbelievable that anybody with her record should even have a close race. You need to send her back there with an enormous, enormous ovation of support. And Kathleen Brown will be elected because she represents the future, not the past, for California.

Folks, I have done everything I know to do to be a good partner to the people of California. I have done everything I know to do. I have tried to take this immigration issue on. I've tried to bring this economy back. I've tried to help you with defense conversion. I've tried to help you build your high-tech base. I've tried to help you sell your products all over the world. I have tried to do things that no President has ever done. The farmers in the valley are selling California rice to Japan for the first time under this administration. And we did not do any of that by going to work in a cynical, negative frame of mind, saying that we're never going to make anything good happen.

My fellow Americans, your Government is neither good, nor bad, inherently. It is our tool. It is a reflection of us, whether it is good or bad, what it does, how much it costs, how well we do it is a function of what we believe and where we are going. Let's go into the future. Let's don't go back. Let's don't go back. Let's don't go back.

Every one of you, promise yourselves, you're going to ask somebody to vote for Dianne Feinstein, vote for Kathleen Brown, vote no on 187. Go see your neighbors, and turn it around. Go forward. Yes to the future.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:01 p.m. at City Hall. In his remarks, he referred to actress Marlee Matlin. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 6754—National Military Families Recognition Day, 1994

November 4, 1994

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

Military families play an integral role in ensuring the effectiveness of America's Armed Forces. Without fanfare, they selflessly provide behind-the-scenes support to service members, their units, and commands worldwide. Their devotion to their loved ones, to the military, and to their country is unflinching.

Time and again, military families bravely bid farewell as wives and husbands, children and parents depart for missions in far-off, often hostile areas. Committed to preserving freedom and democracy for all of us, these families provide the continuity and stability essential to the well-being of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and the members of our Coast Guard, National Guard, and Reserves.

Military families face abrupt separations, moves to foreign soil, and tours in isolated locations away from friends. As they adjust to conditions around the world, they learn to do without many of the conveniences that most Americans view as basics. They quickly and adeptly transform unfamiliar quarters into welcoming homes, forming bonds of friendship with others in the unit, sharing in their hopes, dreams, and aspirations.

Commanders and other Department of Defense leaders have long recognized the paramount importance of families in the retention and readiness of military members. Indeed, America reaps invaluable benefits from the dedication of military families as they support America's mission to promote democracy and to secure peace.

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 November 21, 1994, as "National Military Families Recognition Day." I call upon all Americans to join in honoring military families throughout the world and in recognizing their integral role in supporting the men and women who defend the cause of freedom at home and abroad. I ask Federal, State, and local officials and private organizations to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourth day of November, 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 nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:18 a.m., November 7, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on November 8. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at the National Association of Realtors Conference in Anaheim, California

November 5, 1994

Thank you very much, Bob Elrod, for those kind remarks. Gil Woods, Secretary Cisneros, I'm delighted to have you with me here today, and I thank you for your outstanding work in the area of housing, for all the things you are doing to make our country a better place. I'd also like to thank the United States Marine Corps Band from El Toro who played before I came. I thank them.

I am delighted to be here with all of you, including, I understand, hundreds of you from 36 nations, including some newly emerging economies, who have traveled here for this convention.

I was kind of looking forward to coming here today. You know, Saturday is traditionally moving day in America, and families think about moving toward new homes. For me, it was just another opportunity to move out of Washington and come see you. [Laughter]

This has been an interesting 2 years for me. There have been some great times and some not-so-great times, some that were exhilarating and some that were nearly bizarre. Some days I feel like the boy who told his mother that he really didn't feel like going to school, and his mother said, "But Son, you have to go to school. I raised you to do the right thing." He said, "But it's not fun for me at school anymore, Mother. I mean, the students don't like me. The teachers don't like me. The coaches groan when I walk by. Even the custodial workers don't like me." She said, "Son, you have got to go to school. You're intelligent; you're healthy. You don't have a good excuse. Besides, you're 45 years old, and you're the principal." [Laughter] So I try to show up, regardless. And I'm glad to show up here today.

Today I want to talk with you about the dream of homeownership and the larger American dream of which it is a part and

what we can do together to keep the economic renewal that began 21 months ago going. I ran for President of this great land of ours because I felt that for too long our National Government had neglected issues that are fundamental to our national strength, our security, and our future: good jobs, strong families, better schools, safe streets, and a world more full of security, trade, freedom, and peace.

In this country, when I took office, we had already been grappling for 30 years with profound social problems that have disturbed every person in this great hall today, affecting the breakdown of our families, our communities, the rise of crime and drugs and gangs and guns.

We have lived, and certainly you have lived, with about 20 years of economic stagnation for many ordinary Americans who are the bulk, the heart and soul of the home-buying public, people who work year in and year out for wages that have barely kept up and often have not kept up with inflation. And we have had—we had had 12 years of a policy which became loosely known as trickle-down economics, with which I deeply disagreed and with which you as an association at least disagreed with specific parts of, as I heard in my introduction, the things that we reversed from the '86 tax act.

When I became President, we put together an economic strategy that was comprehensive in approach, long-term in vision, but quite basic: reduce the deficit; change the way Government works; make it smaller with less regulation, more efficiency; a greater emphasis on partnership and increase the impact of the things that you should do; ease the credit crunch; help small business; invest more in the security of our families and the skills of our people; invest in new technologies and defense conversions; increase trade.

We have pursued this strategy with discipline and persistence and success. The deficit includes a spending cut of \$255 billion. This year alone, it is \$100 billion less than it was projected to be when I took office. We are looking at 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States.

In changing the way Government works in this country, we have adopted now two budgets covering 6 years, which will reduce the size of the Federal Government by 272,000, to its smallest size since John Kennedy was the President of the United States. Already there are 70,000 fewer workers working for the Federal Government than there were on the day I was inaugurated President.

We have deregulated banking, deregulated trucking. We have gone a long way to deregulate Federal rules and regulations on States, giving 20 States permission to try their own ideas to move people from welfare to work, giving nine States permission to try their own ideas to find ways to increase the number of working people who have health insurance in this country.

We are working hard to change the way our Federal Government relates to our schools with very strong national standards of excellence in education but deregulating the way the schools meet those standards, instead emphasizing local reforms, grassroots initiatives, all kinds of changes initiated by people at the local level to help achieve the kind of learning that we simply have to have if our people are going to compete and win in the 21st century.

And inasmuch as I am here in Orange County, I have to say a special word of thanks to a member of my administration who happens to be an Orange County Republican. Roger Johnson, who runs the General Services Administration, has helped to spearhead our reinventing Government initiative to make sure that we not only downsize the Government, that we also make the Government work better. If you ask the people in California, for example, we rebuilt all the highways out here that were damaged by the earthquake in about half the time that people said we could do it if we worked flat out. We did it not by Government mandate but by simply saying we would pay you more if you finished quicker. *[Laughter]* A novel idea—long discarded by the Government, revised for the California earthquake rebuilding effort.

We finally adopted a bill to change the way the Government buys \$200 billion worth of goods and services with your tax money every

year. And in so doing, by stripping away rules and regulations, we are saving \$50 on every single Federal Government purchase, under \$2,500, a year. No more \$500 hammers. No more \$50 ashtrays. We have opened the markets to the kind of competitive pressures all of you observe.

This year, even though we reduced defense and domestic discretionary spending for the first time in 25 years, we are investing more in Head Start, in more affordable loans for middle class students, in national service to allow young people to earn money for their college education by serving their communities at the grassroots level, in apprenticeship programs for people who don't go to college but do want good training and good jobs for the future.

And we are taking all the money that we are saving by reducing the Federal bureaucracy by 272,000 and putting it into financing the crime bill, giving the money right back to grassroots communities to hire police officers, to institute the prevention and the punishment programs that I believe can lower crime and violence in this country if people at the community level will spend the money in the proper way. We took the money from the Washington bureaucracy and gave it to every community represented by every person in real estate in this entire hall. I think it was a good switch. It will make our country safer.

We have also increased our investment in new technologies and defense conversions to help communities that have been hurt by base closings or by their big industries losing defense contracts. And we have dramatically expanded trade with NAFTA, with the GATT world trade agreement. As soon as the election is over, literally a couple of days after that, I have to go all the way to Indonesia for the second annual meeting of the leaders of the Asian-Pacific economic group. It's a leadership organization that I really got to meet for the first time as leaders in Seattle last year. Why am I doing this? Not because I want to take another trip 2 days after the election but because Asia is the fastest growing part of the world economy, and the United States needs to be in those markets. It's high-wage jobs for us. We have to continue to push that approach.

Let me say that just this year, our exports to Mexico since we adopted NAFTA are up by 18 or 19 percent, 3 times the overall growth in our trade. Auto exports to Mexico are up 500 percent. I just came back from Michigan, where the biggest complaint is the amount of overtime the autoworkers are having to work. That, folks, is a high-class problem.

Now, this is the strategy of which you were a part when your organization supported our efforts last year. What I want you to know is it is working. Just yesterday we learned that unemployment in the United States had dropped to 5.8 percent, a 4-year low, and that unemployment in California had dropped to a 3-year low at 7.7 percent.

For those of you who aren't from here, let me tell you what happened to California. They not only went through the national recession, but California, with 12 percent of the population, had 21 percent of defense expenditures and suffered the impact of 40 percent of the base closings. So they're lagging a little behind the national recovery, but they are coming, too. They had a substantial drop in unemployment last month; now they're at a 3-year low.

Overall, the economy of our country has produced more than 5 million new jobs in the last 21 months, 91 percent of them in the private sector. In this year, the best news may be that about half the new jobs are high-wage jobs, that more high-wage jobs have come into the American economy in 1994 than in the previous 5 years combined. That's good news for homeownership. It's good news for the American middle class. It may mean that after a very long period of time, we are turning around average wage levels by changing the job mix in America.

I mention the auto industry to you; there are more people working in the auto industry now than in any year since 1979, even though they are much more productive and it takes far fewer workers to produce a car than it did in 1979. For the first time since 1979, automakers in the United States have produced worldwide and sold more cars worldwide than their Japanese competitors, for the first time in 15 years. And in the annual vote that occurs every year of international economists, for the first time in 9 years the United

States was voted the most productive economy in the world. We are moving in the right direction.

I have to say, as has already been noted, that we have focused intensely on the real estate industry as a part of all of this, because you are one-fifth of our gross domestic product, because we need a healthy real estate sector. And in the economic program last year, when you asked for passive losses to be restored for real estate professionals, when you asked for FHA limits that moved with the markets, when you asked for mortgage revenue bonds to be extended permanently, when you asked for a secondary market for commercial real estate loans, you got those things in our economic program because they were good for the United States and for our economy.

Housing starts are up 30 percent since January of '93. And after declining by 664,000 the previous 4 years, construction jobs have increased by 436,000 since those changes were made and since we have begun to move this economy forward in the last 21 months. And I thank you for your contribution to the economic progress of the United States.

I want to talk now about where we go. But I have to say, just for a moment, if you will indulge me, since I know I have a good bipartisan crowd here. There may be more, indeed, Republicans than Democrats in this audience. This is a rather curious election season. I mean, after all, if I were a Republican President who said to you, "Look, we've reduced the deficit, reduced the size of Government, gotten the economy going again, adopted the toughest crime bill in history, promoted peace, and reduced the nuclear threat and increased trade all around the world," the Republicans would say it would be unpatriotic to campaign against the people who voted for those policies in their races for Congress. I think that's right.

And yet, we are living in a time of such cynicism that a lot of these races all around the country are being dominated by people who say, "Vote for me because I know that the Government is inherently bad, that everything they do is wrong, that anything they do will make the problem worse, that if anything good happens in this country while Mr. Clinton is in office, it's either in spite of him

or unrelated to the fact that like the principal, he shows up for work every day. [Laughter]

Now imagine this—suppose your office worked that way. And some guy comes in, and he says, "Hire me to work in your real estate office because the real estate industry is inherently sick, and you couldn't do anything right if you wanted to. And if you hire me, I'll sit in the office all day, and I won't try to sell a house." [Laughter] If half the people who came to work in your place every day said, "I'm showing up for work, but really we're going in the wrong direction, and we can't make anything good happen, and that glass is half empty," you would all be broke. And we are seriously entertaining giving our votes to people who tell us these things.

Folks, the Government is neither inherently good or bad. It is our tool. It is the instrument that reflects us. It is what we can make of it. It can do wrong; it can do right. It can be good; it can be bad.

My view has been that we have tended to see Government in too much black or white terms, as we'd looked to Government as a savior when we're in trouble, and the rest of the time we say that we ought to junk it. It's either our savior, or we want it on the sidelines. The truth is, in my opinion, as we move toward the 21st century, Government should be seen as an instrument that seeks to create opportunity in the private sector. It seeks to empower people and then challenges people to assume both individual and community responsibility, because that's where most of the action is in America today.

The Government cannot do as many things directly, and should not try, but without a sensible, aggressive, focused Government, working in partnership and challenging people to assume responsibility for their own lives, this country cannot live up to its potential. Many of the things that we do actually matter. The family and medical leave law made a difference in the lives of millions of Americans who wanted to be successful parents and workers, who wanted to be able to take a little time off when they had a baby born or a sick parent without losing their jobs.

Our expansion of Head Start made a difference. That program works. A lot of kids are going to wind up being good students

and good citizens now who might have taken a different path in life. Those things make a difference.

The changes we made in the real estate laws, reversing the mistakes that were made in 1986, made a difference to you. It makes a difference whether we do the right thing or the wrong thing.

So the only thing I ask you to do without regard to your party or your philosophy is to remember what we did here has made a difference. As they say back in Arkansas, where I come from, if you find a turtle on a fence post, chances are it didn't get there by accident. [*Laughter*] And I think you ought to think about that.

And what we need in this country so much is to get away from this whole kind of negative-dominated way of talking, where we scream at each other instead of visit with each other. Believe me, I don't have all the answers. And if you try to do as many things as I've tried to do, you'll make a mistake or two, and I acknowledge that. But what we need in this country is people in public life who do what you expect when you're trying to get to sell real estate: You've got to show up every day with a positive attitude and a willingness to look at the facts and a willingness to learn and a determination to make progress. That's what we need. We need to discuss these things with one another.

These social problems we've got in this country, I say again, have been developing for 30 years, but they are of profound importance. We can fix the economy. And if we lose millions of our kids, like those kids that dropped that 5-year-old out of that high rise in Chicago, well, it's going to be hard for America to be what it ought to be. And these economic problems are of profound complexity. When people work harder and they get more productive and they make the economy grow with no inflation, then the first thing they're told is, the economy is growing with no inflation, but we might have inflation, so we're going to raise interest rates so you won't get an increase in your income. These are frustrating, complex problems.

On the other hand, we don't want inflation. You look at these countries that are gripped with inflation. It will kill your economy. These are complicated problems. But

what we need in America today is a country that should be full of optimism and hope and a conviction that we can all make a difference.

When I came back from the Middle East, I was so impressed by that. I looked at the faces of our young men and women in uniform in the Persian Gulf who moved so quickly against Saddam Hussein's aggression. I looked at the people who were there at the peace signing between Jordan and Israel and how grateful they were for the role of the United States in that peace. And I thought to myself, around the world, nobody is cynical about the United States; they know this is a very great country. All I ask you to do is to bring your differences into the framework that this is a very great country, moving in the right direction, leading the world. And we can solve our problems but only if we speak with one another and listen to one another and stop just throwing these verbal bombs across the fences that divide us and turn us into cynical and negative people. We're not going to get anywhere doing that. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I'd like to take the remainder of my time to talk a little about what you came here to discuss and that is homeownership and whether, as partners, we can do anything to increase it. If you think about it, the idea of having your own home is the ultimate expression of optimism. Homes are for families. They make for a more secure environment for our children. They create pride and self-esteem. They are the extension of our personality, our hopes, our dreams. For most of us, they're the main harbor of all of our collected memories. They are the most important investment in financial security that most Americans ever make. And most people who own homes care more about their own communities and have a bigger stake in solving the kind of problems that we've been here talking about today.

You know, I was thinking this morning as I flew over here, I have very vivid memories of every home I ever lived in, even when I was just 3 or 4 years old. And I bet all of you do, too. I can hardly remember anything about my very early childhood, but I remember the feel, the look, the atmosphere of the first home I ever lived in. I think we

all agree that more Americans should own their own homes, for reasons that are economic and tangible and reasons that are emotional and intangible but go to the heart of what it means to harbor, to nourish, to expand the American dream.

A national survey recently found that most people won't start saving for a home until they believe that they can actually buy a home. And I want to say to the American people, and especially to young families, if that's what you think, you ought to start saving now, because I am determined to see that you have the opportunity and together we can make that opportunity for the young families of our country.

I am committed to a new and unprecedented partnership between industry leaders and community leaders and Government to recommit our Nation to the idea of homeownership and to create more homeowners than ever before. I heard the kind introduction—well, of course the home mortgage deduction helps millions of ordinary citizens to achieve the dream of homeownership. Of course, it does. but I believe we can do even more.

As the economy recovers, we know that we're going to make progress anyway. There are 1.5 million more homeowners in America today than there were 22 months ago. Housing starts are up and sales and profits are up. Here in California, where, as I said, the economy has been in difficulty, the pace of home sales for the first 9 months of this year is the highest in 5 years.

But still we face serious problems. Troubling changes occurred in the housing sector after 1980. After 46 years of steady growth, homeownership expansion began to head downward. Inflation, recession, stagnant incomes, the failure to enforce laws prohibiting discrimination in housing and lending, high costs and a reduced role for FHA perhaps all played a role. But by 1992, the national rate of homeownership had slipped dramatically. Homeownership for young families fell from 44.5 percent in 1980 to 37.6 percent by 1992. In 1980, more than 70 percent of our children lived in homes owned by families. In 1991, that had fallen to less than 63 percent. By 1990, 2 million young American families who would have become home-

owners if the upward trend had continued, did not have the chance to own their own home. We have got to turn this around. We have to move this measure or our national prosperity forward as well. And I am convinced that we can do it.

Therefore, today, I am directing HUD Secretary Cisneros to develop, in cooperation with the most significant members of the housing industry and government at all levels, a plan to boost homeownership to an all-time high in the United States before the century is out.

This initiative will draw heavily on the expertise of those of you in real estate, financing, and building. Representatives of State and local governments and nonprofit community-based groups will join in. Participants from our administration will include the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. I want them to write and send me, within 6 months, a detailed strategy that recommits America to homeownership, that will add millions of new homeowners by the end of this century.

I can assure you—just don't forget, the end of this century is just a couple of years away—I can assure you that this is not a report that will sit on a shelf. It is one that will be implemented. And let me be clear, this is not a Government program. I have asked for the involvement of realtors, homebuilders, mortgage bankers, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, insurers, the Habitat for Humanity, bankers groups, nonprofits, 40 other groups already on board to do their part. This is an initiative based on cooperation, not a Government program.

We can achieve the results we seek for America's homeowners if we take seriously the lessons I mentioned earlier about the way we reinvent and change the role of Government, not what Government can provide but what Government can help make it possible for you to provide. Specifically, I've asked the Secretary to focus, in the beginning, on at least three areas. First, I directed this group to find ways to cut the costs and the regulations involved in buying a home. I want it to be simpler, less costly.

Second, I want to target new markets, underserved populations, tear down the barriers of discrimination wherever they are found. Let me just make this point—[*ap-
plause.*] Thank you. Look at our trade policy. What are we trying to do? We tore down barriers to trade with Mexico because we knew they'd buy more of our products. We would buy more of theirs, they would buy more of ours. It would change the job mix in America for more high-wage jobs. The biggest untapped market in America for many of us are the millions and millions and millions of people that the economy of the 1980's left behind, people who live in our cities, people who live in our isolated rural areas, people with productive capacities who, if they can become consumers, can explode the American economic growth rate well into the next century. That is what this is all about, and we should all focus on it.

Third, I want to develop new strategies for educating those who haven't considered becoming homeowners because they don't have an adequate comfort level or enough information to act. And believe it or not, at least our research indicates it's a much bigger problem than I would have thought when we began to look into it. Let me go through these issues briefly one at a time.

A modest starter home today costs about \$94,000 in many parts of the country, even more here in California. With only a 5 percent down payment and closing costs, that's about \$9,000 up front. Half the young families in this country make about \$25,000 a year. Well, it's hard to save \$9,000 when you're raising children on less than \$25,000 a year. Many families are paying more in rent than it would cost them to own a home and to build equity, but they can't come up with the front-end money. We have to do better.

Secretary Cisneros has taught me the term *lifer*. As an old attorney general, I thought that had to do with the criminal justice system. But today, more and more, it refers to people who are renters for life, middle class Americans who have no hope of becoming homeowners. We can do better than that, and we will.

We have to do a better job of reaching the underserved, of eradicating discriminatory practices that prevent minority families

from finding, financing, or buying the home of their choice. It's wrong for anybody with a solid work history to be denied a home. And as so often is the case in the United States, if we do the right thing, it will be good business. It will be more money for all Americans and a greater rate of economic growth.

The third and final element of the plan will involve improving our efforts at education and outreach. According to one national survey, fewer than half of all American adults know what they need to know to navigate the real estate market successfully. Surely with all the communications technology available today, we can do better than that in America. Every day you counsel, you educate, you elevate the comfort levels of potential homeowners. We need your help in learning how to do this better for people throughout the United States.

If we do these three things—and perhaps this group, which will include representatives of your industry, will come up with others—we can widen the circle of home ownership beyond anything we have ever seen. And in so doing, we can slowly begin to restore the confidence of battered middle class American families who fear that even in times of economic recovery, their own family security will not be enhanced. That is the key to restoring the American dream, having working people believe that they can live in the turbulent, fast-changing times of the 21st century and still come out winners if they work hard, become lifetime learners, play by the rules, and raise their kids well. And finding a way for these people to own their own homes is a critical part of restoring the sense of American security and the reality of the American dream. I want you to help me do that.

My fellow Americans, through Presidents and administrations of both parties, the American people have been committed across party lines to the idea of homeownership. We have shown through things like the FHA and the GI bill that we can work in partnership to empower people who will take responsibility for their own lives. I am trying to do that now in many, many other areas of our national life. We are trying, all of us, to face problems we have ignored too long.

We are trying to deal with the challenges and seize the opportunities that await us.

I just want to say this last thing in closing: I am convinced that the best days of this country are ahead of us, if we will only seize these challenges, seize these opportunities, and maintain the attitude that all of you inculcate into everybody who works with you every day. I am telling you this is still the strongest country in the world, the greatest peacemaker in the world, the most powerful economy in the world. The only thing that can get in our way is our failure to believe in ourselves and our unwillingness to work together to face the challenges before us. If we can get rid of that, there is no limit to America's future.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:40 a.m. at the Anaheim Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Bob Elrod, president, and Gil Woods, president-elect, National Association of Realtors.

The President's Radio Address

November 5, 1994

Good morning. I'm speaking to you today from Los Angeles. In many ways, California is the cutting edge for a nation always on the move, always seeking new challenges. And I want to talk to you today about those challenges, about the choice we face between continuing to go forward on the path to a better future or going back to policies that failed America in the past.

Just yesterday, Friday, we learned that the economy is continuing to move forward. The Labor Department reported that the unemployment rate has fallen to 5.8 percent, its lowest level in 4 years. In the 21 months since I took office, over 5 million jobs have come into our economy, and the jobs are getting better. In 1994, more high-wage jobs came into our economy than in the previous 5 years combined.

Our strategy is beginning to work: reduce the deficit; increase investment in education, training, and defense conversion; increase trade. We passed an economic plan that is cutting spending by \$255 billion and cutting the Federal bureaucracy by 272,000 positions. We slashed regulations and saved bil-

ions. We're also investing in new technology and defense conversion. We're expanding trade dramatically. In Mexico alone this year, the sales of American automobiles increased 500 percent.

We're also increasing our investments in education and training, even as we reduce overall spending. This will help our people to compete and win in the tough global economy, increasing Head Start; apprenticeships for young people who don't go to college but do want good jobs; a dramatic increase in affordable college loans, making 20 million Americans eligible for lower cost loans on better repayment terms; and national service, the opportunity for people to serve their communities in solving problems person to person and earn money for their college education.

To rebuild America, we have to keep working for good jobs and better education. But to be strong, we also need strong families and safe streets. That's why we've worked hard for the family and medical leave law that's protecting millions and millions of American workers who don't lose their jobs now if they take a little time off when a child is born or a parent is sick, why we're immunizing 2 million American children under the age of 2 by 1996, why we've provided tax decreases, tax cuts, to 15 million working families with children because they work full time with children in the home and they're hovering above the poverty line. We want to lift them out of poverty, not put them in. We're working to make our streets safer with the Brady bill and the crime bill. Already extra police are appearing on streets and cities all across America.

Of course, we've got a long way to go until everybody in this country who wants a job has one, until people who work hard and deserve a raise get that raise, until people who have coverage don't lose their health care insurance. But America is clearly moving forward.

The new economic statistics are real. There really are more than 5 million jobs in the last 21 months and more than 5 times as many per month are coming into our economy as was the case in the previous administration.

As I traveled our country this last week, I met some of the men and women who are the real heroes of this economic recovery and whose futures will be shaped by the results of the election this Tuesday, in Michigan, where our auto industry is roaring back with more workers than they've had since 1979 and where for the first time in 15 years American auto companies are outselling their Japanese competitors all around the world. At State universities in Michigan and New York, I met young people who are preparing for a high-skill, high-tech, high-wage future. I've also met older workers who are learning new skills for new careers.

Recently I received a letter from Antonio Doderio of Cerritos, California, who lost his job in the aerospace industry 2 years ago. He enrolled in a retraining program our administration has worked to expand, and he wrote just to thank me because that training helped him find new work as an air conditioning and heating technician. Mr. Doderio, thank you for having the courage to learn those new skills and to face the future with confidence.

Despite the progress we're making and the fact that the direction we're pursuing is clearly correct, there are forces in this country who are not looking forward, who don't want to invest in people like Mr. Doderio and those college students. Instead of building the future, they're making a trillion dollars' worth of easy promises: big tax breaks, mostly for the wealthy; big increases in spending for defense and Star Wars; and a promise to balance the budget.

A trillion dollars in promises? How will they be paid for? There are just two alternatives: It would require a 20-percent cut across the board in every other part of Government. That's cuts in Social Security, Medicare, student loans, assistance to farmers, veterans benefits, the crime bill, the things that make us stronger, smarter, more secure.

If you take out Social Security, it would require a 30-percent cut in Medicare and student loans and all those other things. Of course, there's always the possibility they're kidding, that they're just going to give us the goodies without the cuts. What does that mean? An explosion in the deficit, sending our jobs overseas, putting our economy in

the same deep trouble we had in the years of the eighties. This is not the time for America to turn away from the future, to turn back to the easy promises of the past.

We're helping brave people all around the world move toward their own freedom and democracy, their own peace and prosperity, whether it's Israel and her Arab neighbors; the people in the Persian Gulf or Haiti, where our brave soldiers are serving; the people in Korea who are building a nonnuclear peninsula; the people in Northern Ireland trying to bury hundreds of years of hate; or people in South Africa trying to build their democracy.

Their hearts and minds are open to our ideas. Their markets are opening up to our goods and services. They admire our values, our strength, our willingness to change. They believe in our country. And at this hopeful and historic moment, when America and the world are moving forward to the future, we must believe in our country, too. Why would we ever want to turn back to policies that failed us? When we can be strong, why would we ever want to be weak? The future of our children and our country are at stake.

With all of my heart and soul, I believe America will continue to make the choice to keep moving forward, to be strong, to seize the future.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at approximately 8:05 p.m. on November 4 at the Beverly Hilton Hotel in Los Angeles, CA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on November 5.

Interview With Cynthia Louie and Fred Wayne of KCBS Radio, San Francisco, California

November 5, 1994

Midterm Elections

Ms. Louie. Mr. President, thank you very much for your time, and welcome to KCBS.

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

Ms. Louie. There is a new poll out today from Newsweek, and I'm sorry to give you this bad news, but there is a new poll out today from Newsweek showing that your approval rating has dropped to 40 percent. And

these polls seem to come out fairly frequently with results up and down. Why do you suppose you're down now, and do you pay much attention to these surveys?

The President. No, because, first of all, the polls are directly related to how much people know about the record of the administration. And all the surveys show that about—over 60 percent of the American people approve of the work of this administration if they know the facts. The frustrating thing is, and the frustrating thing in all these elections, is that people have so little way of getting the facts.

If you look at this California election, it's a classic example. I mean, look at the Senate race. Dianne Feinstein has done things in the United States Senate in only 2 years that no Senator in our lifetime has ever accomplished: the assault weapons ban, a law requiring no tolerance for gun ownership—possession for children in school, the California desert bill. And she's being opposed by Michael Huffington, who never even lived in California until 1991; who bought a race in the Congress with his fortune; and then when he ran for the Senate, lost his own congressional district in the Republican primary; and still looks like he has a chance to win because he can spend money to put things on the television that aren't true.

This is a very negative, confused, difficult time. And the truth is, in a lot of these polls it depends on what information the voters have and how you ask the question. The only things that really count are these elections, but it's getting harder and harder and harder for voters to make good decisions if all they get is a constant barrage of negative information and they never get the facts.

The truth is, we've got a 4-year low in unemployment; jobs are growing 5 times as fast under our administration as they did under the Bush administration. We're doing things for working people like the family leave law, immunizing all of our children under 2, expanding Head Start, lower cost college loans. We're moving this country in the right direction. And we are leading the world in moving toward peace and freedom and democracy.

If people think about the record and understand the direction, they give us a lot of

support. But you can't blame people for not voting on what they don't know.

Immigration

Mr. Wayne. Mr. President, let's get on to the subject of illegal immigration. We of course know that you are on record against Proposition 187 in this State. That whole issue is causing so many ill feelings; there's anger on both sides. What can you tell us about the threat that California could lose Federal funding if that initiative passes, one, and as a second part, what commitment can you make to our listeners about what the Federal Government might be able to do to help with the problem of illegal immigration?

The President. Well, first of all, let's try to—let me try to talk some sense about this issue. The people of California do have a problem with illegal immigration, which is more severe when the economy is in trouble. But since I became President, I have been trying to help you solve it. I mean, from the day I got in office I knew I had a mess in immigration on my hands, and I started trying to fix it 21 months ago.

What have we done? We have almost doubled the border guards in San Diego, along the border down there. We have almost doubled the number of illegal aliens who have been convicted of crimes we're sending back out of the country. We're giving money to California for the first time to help deal with the cost of imprisonment. I've asked Congress to appropriate literally hundreds of millions of dollars to help you deal with the cost of education and health care. We have increased funding to California to deal with immigration by one-third, even though we are reducing Federal spending overall for the first time in 25 years. So we are moving to deal with this problem. We are also looking at ways that we can be tougher on incentives for employers not to hire illegal aliens and how we can keep up with the records.

So I think the people of California should want more done. I think the Federal Government should do more. I have been in the forefront of doing that, working with Senator Feinstein, Senator Boxer, and others.

I simply don't agree that 187 is the right way to go because, first of all, nearly everybody thinks it's unconstitutional. Secondly, it

will be directed primarily against children. If you kick children out of the health clinics, you may run the risk of causing health problems for the general California population. If you say kids have got to be kicked out of school, you turn the teachers into police officers and you say, "We're going to put more kids on the street." Well, we've got too many kids on the street in America and California today already. It's liable to raise the crime rate and cause all kinds of problems.

So my view is that 187 is not the right way to do this, and it could cause California a lot of problems. You know, California is coming back economically. You've got the lowest unemployment rate in 3 years here. I have worked as hard as I know how to get investment back into California, to sell California high-tech products around the world, to sell California agricultural products around the world. We're even selling California rice in Japan for the first time.

The strength of California is in its diversity. So the issue is how can we enforce the immigration laws and still build on our diversity. And I don't think 187 is the way to go.

Ms. Louie. Mr. President, we have so many more questions for you. Unfortunately, your people are telling us that you are out of time, your time is limited, and you have to go. So thank you very much for joining us today on KCBS.

The President. Thank you. I'm on my way up to the Kaiser Center in Oakland at 2:30, and I hope I see some people up there, too. Thanks.

Mr. Wayne. Mr. President, you'll see us there. Thank you very much.

The President. Great.

NOTE: The interview began at 12:45 p.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Anaheim Convention Center in Anaheim, CA.

Proclamation 6755—National Women Veterans Recognition Week, 1994

November 5, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

During the American Civil War, both Union and Confederate forces relied on the skill and courage of women. Thousands volunteered as nurses; others spied on the enemy; many disguised themselves as men and stood to fight in battle. As our Nation has grown, so too has the number of women veterans. From Europe to Korea to the Persian Gulf, their knowledge and leadership have been essential in maintaining the unparalleled effectiveness of every branch of the United States Armed Forces.

Today, American women share the responsibility of defending the cause of freedom around the world. Time and again, women have demonstrated their professionalism in peacetime and have proven their mettle in combat. Their heroism, their bravery, and their tireless devotion to duty have helped to ensure all Americans the protection of the greatest fighting force the world has ever known.

America is blessed with more than 1 million living women veterans. In myriad different roles, they have brought honor to our country and strength to our cause. As more and more women answer the call to military service, we salute the many proud veterans who served before them and paved the way. Our veterans exemplify the spirit of patriotism and service that has characterized American women in uniform throughout our Nation's history.

In respect for and recognition of these distinguished citizens, the Congress, by Public Law 103-148, has designated the week of November 6, 1994, through November 12,

1994, as “National Women Veterans Recognition Week” and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of November 6, 1994, through November 12, 1994, as National Women Veterans Recognition Week. I encourage all Americans to join in acknowledging the tremendous contributions and sacrifices of these noble veterans with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of November, 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 nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 9:35 a.m., November 8, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on November 9.

Proclamation 6756—National American Indian Heritage Month, 1994

November 5, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

There is a yearning among American people for a sense of community, a sense of belonging, a sense of shared beliefs and common goals. Today, across the country, we are searching for ways to come together in friendship and mutual respect. As we look toward the promise of the 21st century, it is important that we reflect on our shared heritage and on the valuable lessons history teaches.

At this momentous time, we pay tribute to this country’s first peoples—the American Indians. We celebrate the innumerable contributions that generations of American Indians and Alaska Natives have made to our country and to our world. Before there were colonists on these shores, long before our

Nation’s founders drafted the U.S. Constitution, American Indians had established powerful civilizations and rich and thriving cultures. Government, art, music, spirituality, and a deep and abiding respect for the natural environment—all of these are enduring traditions of the American Indians.

Native peoples were the first environmentalists, understanding that air, water, plants, and animals must be treated with respect if they are to remain available for generations to come. American Indians taught the first European settlers how to survive in new surroundings and helped them to explore uncharted wilderness. Native peoples have represented this country in every war, from the American Revolution to the Persian Gulf, and are proud members of every branch of the U.S. Armed Forces. Artists such as R. C. Gorman and Fritz Scholder and writers such as Louise Erdrich and N. Scott Momaday have made remarkable contributions to art and literature.

The relationship between the U.S. Government and the American Indians has not been without controversy. As we look back on our history, we must acknowledge often profound mistakes. But we also must look to and plan for a future of cooperation and respect. With the recent passage of the Indian self-governance and self-determination amendments of 1994, we celebrate the government-to-government relationship that exists between the Indian tribes and the United States. This legislation reaffirms and strengthens the political ties between all of the nations of this land.

To acknowledge the varied and inestimable contributions of the native peoples and to celebrate this proud legacy, the Congress, by House Joint Resolution 271, has designated November 1994 as “National American Indian Heritage Month” and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this month.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim November 1994 as National American Indian Heritage Month. I urge all Americans, as well as their elected representatives at the Federal, State, and

local levels, to observe this month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of November, 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 nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 9:36 a.m., November 8, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on November 9.

Interview With Larry King in Seattle, Washington

November 6, 1994

Mr. King. Welcome to a special Sunday night edition of "Larry King Live." Our special guest is the President of the United States. A beautiful day here in Seattle; it rained earlier this morning, but there's no city like this. You seemed revved up here today.

The President. It's a wonderful city. They've been very good to me. But it's just an exciting place. It's a real future-oriented place with a lot of different kinds of folks. They get together. They work together. It's a real upbeat, positive city.

Midterm Elections

Mr. King. Do you like campaigning again?

The President. I do.

Mr. King. It seemed like you were just campaigning.

The President. I know.

Mr. King. Do you like this?

The President. I do like it. In large measure I like it because it's one of the few times I get to really go out and put out our record, my message. And I also just like to see the American people. You know, I like to see them excited and energized again.

Mr. King. I remember when you were running. We were in Ocala, and you said to me, "God, I love this."

The President. It was wonderful. Remember that we were in that rodeo arena? Remember that?

Mr. King. Where Elvis Presley once sang.

The President. Yes, that's right.

Mr. King. You were revved up, and you seem the same way now. It would seem that after this time you've been President for 2 years that it's old hat by now.

The President. But these are the people I work for. And perhaps the most frustrating part of being President is how hard it is to stay in touch with them, to stay connected to them, for them to really know what you do on a daily basis. And so to be able to come back out here with someone like Ron Simms, whom I admire so much, that represents what's best in this country, that's cutting against all this cynicism and negativism that is blanketing the airwaves, it's really just a great thing to do.

Negativism in Politics

Mr. King. What do you make of that? We'll start there. And there's lots of bases we're going to cover, of these—lots of radio talk shows, other areas of negativism, that's more than just criticism. It's anger. What do you make of it?

The President. Well, it's almost like an institutionalized approach to life, you know, that everything is given the most negative possible spin, information is presented in attack mode. The American people hate it, but they react to it.

Mr. King. But portions of them listen to it.

The President. Portions of them listen to it, of course. And even if they listen for entertainment, the surveys show in these elections that they react to it, which is, of course, why the politicians do it.

Mr. King. So what does it mean to you when you see it, hear it, about you, about people you like, about anyone?

The President. Well, it—what I think is it's not very good for America. It's not good for our people. It makes it harder for people to take a deep breath and face their problems and seize their opportunities and move forward.

I mean, this is a very, very great country. And as I have a chance, for example, to go

to the Middle East to participate in that peace signing, other leaders are bewildered at the negative attitudes in America. They say, "Gosh, you know, your economy is coming back; your deficit's going down; things are happening in your country. You're leading the way to peace around the world. Why would the American people be in a negative frame of mind?" And I always say, well, first of all, a lot of Americans have personal insecurity in their lives. I mean, let's face it, there's some reality out there. There are a lot of people who are afraid they're going to lose their jobs. They haven't gotten a raise in a long time. They may lose their health care or their retirement. They're living in a neighborhood where they feel personally insecure. They see things like these children killing children. It violates their sense of—

Mr. King. So they have a right to that feeling?

The President. Well, no, there's some insecurity there. In other words, the picture is not all positive. But I think the direction is positive, and the future is more positive than negative. But I think the other thing is, the overwhelming way that most Americans get their information tends to be both negative and combative and assaultive, almost. And what I tried to do in the Presidential campaign in '92 with all those town meetings, starting way back in '91, where I listened to people and they talked to me, with insisting on three debates and having one debate with the public there asking questions of the candidates for President, with the bus tours we did was all designed to get people involved, let them vent their frustrations, and then focus on what we were going to do.

And that's very important. And that's the thing that has been missing too much in this election. And of course, the Republicans like that because if people are mad, then they think the Democrats don't vote and the extremists on the right in their party do vote, they get a big advantage and it helps them get into power. But it doesn't do anything to help America solve their problems.

Mr. King. How do you deal with it personally, I mean, the carping, the anger, the up and down in the polls, personally?

The President. Well, on the up and down in the polls, I basically try to ignore it.

Mr. King. Ignore it?

The President. Not because—I care what people think about the issues, but I knew when I started this job that while everybody said they wanted us to change, if it were easy to do it, someone else would have done it. So to get the deficit down, we had to make some tough decisions.

If you're going to make college loans more affordable to Americans within the budgetary constraints we had, we had to make some tough decisions, take on some interest groups. If you want to pass the Brady bill and the crime bill, you've got to make some tough decisions. The NRA got real mad at us, and now they're trying to take it out on every candidate in the country that stood up for safer streets.

So anybody who ever fights for change is going to have to be willing to risk going down in the polls some. What bothers me more is the general atmosphere where people tend to believe the worst about people in public life, rather than the best, and tend to have a negative view, generally. Because the truth is that this country is in better shape than it was 21 months ago. Unemployment is down. Jobs are up. The deficit's down. The Government is smaller, but it's doing more for ordinary working people. The streets are going to be safer because of the crime bill. And we're a lot closer toward having a safer, more democratic, more free world. The Russian missiles aren't pointing at us. The North Korean nuclear agreement means they won't present a threat to us in terms of nuclear weapons, if we go through with that. We have the progress in Haiti and in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East and Northern Ireland. We are moving in the right direction at home and abroad. We have a lot of problems, but we're moving in the right direction.

And for people to be kept in a constant turmoil all the time, where they don't listen to one another, they don't talk to one another, they just are bombarded by these negative ads on television, I think is not good for our democracy. And it is, frankly, not realistic. If you could see the way other people look at us, they know this is a very great country. And we should feel that way, too.

Mr. King. When there's extreme negativism, do you condemn it on both sides?

The President. Sure.

Mr. King. When Democrats do it and Republicans do it?

The President. Absolutely. Particularly if it is unrelated to the work of the job, you know. But let's be realistic, now. This whole thing started from the get-go with the determination of the congressional leadership in the Republican Party not to work with us on the economic program.

Mr. King. Deliberate?

The President. Oh, absolutely. They were very forthright about it: You're not going to get any votes out of us no matter how you change this program. That's how it started.

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

Tragedy in Union, SC

The President. —were abducted. And there was this little town in South Carolina where there apparently had been maybe some division or something in the past, but they were all coming together. You saw those gripping pictures of the school children praying. You saw blacks and whites going out together to look for the kids. People really were trying to do their best to do a good and noble thing.

And then they found out that the mother had done it. And unlike previous cases—we've had some other cases, horrible cases, where parents kill their children. But this was—it stood in such stark contrast to those people praying, working, desperately trying to find those children. I think they had a sense of betrayal, of outrage, of bewilderment, of pain. And I think the experience the people in the community felt riveted all across our country, indeed, across the world. I think every parent was just sickened by it.

Racial Issues

Mr. King. The fact that—and remember the case in Boston with the call to 911—that she drew the picture of a black man tells us what about racism in America?

The President. I think it tells us that we have at least some assumptions about race that still color our thinking, our talking, sometimes our voting. The people in that community, without regard to race, were out there looking for those boys. And most Afri-

can-Americans in this country get up every day and go to work, work their hearts out, pay their taxes, raise their kids, obey the law. And while the crime rate is higher among African-Americans, they're also more likely to be victims of crime. And it's all really—it's a complicated thing, but it's plainly related to the combined impact of the breakdown of family and community and the loss of economic opportunity working together.

I saw a poll in the Wall Street Journal the other day, a fascinating poll, which said that both African-Americans and white Americans agreed that this breakdown of social order in the family, the community, the rise of crime, violence, drugs and gangs and guns was the biggest problem in our country. They agreed with that. They all supported welfare reform—I mean, not all, 85 percent of both races. But there was a huge difference in attitude between blacks and the whites about what caused it, where the whites were more likely to say it's just all personal misconduct, and the blacks were more likely to say it was the breakdown of economic order and opportunity that holds families together and gives people—

Mr. King. The classic American clash.

The President. Yes. And the truth is, in my judgment, they're both right, and they're both wrong. That is, you need a combined approach to it. We have to rebuild these communities. It's hard to have an orderly society without work. It's hard to have a coherent family without work. It's hard for parents to have all the self-respect they want if they know they'll never have a chance to go to work.

But on the other hand, we simply cannot tolerate the behavior that has become all too commonplace. I mean, what is it that turns the heart of a 10-year-old to stone in Chicago and makes it possible for them to let go of a 5-year-old boy? These are big, deep questions. And again I say, the thing that is so wrong about so much of the political dialog in this election or political ads, is there's no dialog. There's no honest talk. People aren't reaching out across racial lines and trying to figure out how to affirm what is best in this country, how to support the lives and the futures of these kids.

Mr. King. Are you saying they're playing to the worst in us, the racist in us?

The President. I think they're playing to the—they're playing to the lowest common denominator, to the fear, to the division, to the anxiety. I believe that it's better to play to the best in us, to address fear, to address anxiety, to admit it, to say it's legitimate, say, okay, what are you going to do about it?

Midterm Elections

Mr. King. Is this the ugliest off-year elections, politically advertising-wise you've seen?

The President. Well, certainly the most expensive and probably the most negative certainly in a very long time. And it's very troubling. You know, I tried to get this campaign finance bill passed. And it was delayed to death at the end of the session by our opponents, like a lot of other bills were. But we don't need that. We need to reform the campaign finance system.

In every one of these races of major importance, there ought to be two or three debates. There ought to be town hall meetings. There ought to be things that involve people, that let them express their anger and frustration and then say, "Okay, now, what are you going to do about it?" Because what we run the risk of doing in this election—which is why I've been out here working like crazy since I got home from the Middle East—is we run the risk of seeing people vote for candidates whose platforms and positions they absolutely disagree with just because they say, "I'm out; put me in. I'm mad, too."

Mr. King. "Throw the rascals out."

The President. "Government's bad; put me in." Yes.

O.J. Simpson Trial

Mr. King. I haven't seen you quoted on it, and every American has talked about it and they all want to know what their President thinks. You were an attorney general in your State, a prosecutor, so it's a twofold question: Can there be a fair trial in the O.J. Simpson case? And two, should television cameras be allowed?

The President. Well, the answer to the first question is, I think there can be a fair

trial, but it is much more difficult to empanel a jury that has no opinion.

Mr. King. There's never been anything like this.

The President. No, there has never been anything like it. Secondly, I'm not so troubled about the trial itself being televised. What bothers me is that all the previous proceedings have been televised, all the preliminary things, all the back-and-forth arguments. And I know there are arguments pro and con. But on balance, I think it would have been better if they hadn't been, because I think it would have been easier to empanel a jury that had no fixed views, no—at least predisposition to believe it. Now, what these folks have to say and what they had to convince the judge of was that whatever they had heard in the past, they could put aside and be fair.

But I just think all of us, we can't help being affected by the things we know. And the wrenching pretrial publicity I think is more damaging than whatever publicity might have come in the trial itself.

Mr. King. Are you impressed with Judge Ito?

The President. Very much.

Mr. King. And the prosecution and defense?

The President. They all strike me as competent and committed. And the judge strikes me as someone who has been firm and fair. He's trying very hard, and he has an enormously difficult task.

Mr. King. Is this the kind of case, when you were prosecuting, you would have liked to prosecute or not like to prosecute?

The President. Well, of course, any—I think most prosecutors would, at a kind of a personal, professional level, welcome the chance to be in a big case like this. But it's a very sad case. It's the sort of thing that brings great pain to a country.

Mr. King. No winners.

The President. No. I mean, there are—people are dead. The feelings that we all had about O.J. Simpson and everything—it's a very sad case. So it's not something I can say I would relish doing because the whole thing is enormously tragic.

Mr. King. We'll be back with the President of the United States. We'll get into issues and some thoughts on the elections Tuesday right after this.

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

Midterm Elections

Mr. King. Beautiful downtown Seattle on a beautiful Sunday afternoon in the American-Pacific Northwest with President Bill Clinton, 2 days away from the election. Friday night on this program, Bob Dole said that on Tuesday night, when the Republicans take the Senate—if they take the Senate and the House, the first person he calls will be you. He will ask to meet with you Wednesday morning. Win or lose, whatever happens, they're ready to cooperate. Comment.

The President. I don't think they're going to win the House and the Senate. But whatever happens, I hope he'll call me Tuesday night, and I hope he'll be willing to cooperate.

Mr. King. Hope, but don't think?

The President. Well, I don't know yet. All I can tell you is that we had bipartisan support for that crime bill, and it turned into naked politics. And the Republicans that did stick with us were lacerated by their leadership.

I hope they don't really, seriously believe that we can go back and do what they did in the eighties and have all these massive tax cuts for upper-income people and pay for big defense increases and bring back Star Wars and balance the budget in 5 years and not tell anybody how to do it. There is no way to do it without massive, massive cuts in Social Security, Medicare, college loans. If you take Social Security off, you have to cut everything else in the budget 30 percent.

So all I'm saying is, I want to cooperate. I always wanted to cooperate. My door has always been open. I tried to cooperate in the health care debate. When we started the health care debate—

Mr. King. They said you didn't. They said it was secretive.

The President. No, that's not true. We met with them in advance. We even offered to work with them on drafting a bill. We were told, "No, you go ahead and put your bill

in; then we'll put our bill in and then we'll work." They announced an approach where more than half the Republican Senators supported universal coverage. The bill never came. By the time it came to talk about the bill, there were zero Senators from the Republican Party on that.

So—and by the way, then they released the memo of their strategist, Bill Kristol, who wasn't even ashamed to release the memo and say, "You must not cooperate on health care because if the middle class ever gets security about health care, they'll probably support the Democrats again. Whereas, if we keep them all torn up and upset and angry, we can either keep them home or get them to vote for us."

So I want—let me just say this—I want more than anything to have a bipartisan effort. I want more than anything to move this country forward, not see it go back. But I have not obstructed that bipartisan effort. My door has been open. I have wanted to work together. And I have seen a level of intense obstructionism that I never thought I'd ever see.

So what the American people have to say is—first of all, I think we're going to do better than everybody thinks because jobs are up, unemployment is down, the deficit is down, the Government is smaller, all these things are different from the way it was before. We are doing things for ordinary Americans like middle class college loans, national service, tax cuts for low-income working people, the Family and Medical Leave Act. When people know this, I think we're going to do much better than the experts think, because I think people want to keep going forward, they don't want to go back.

But whatever happens, I hope we talk. I have always wanted to talk; I have always been willing to meet. And I hope we work together.

Mr. King. Worse-case scenario—they take the House. Could you work with Newt Gingrich?

The President. I can work with anybody who will work with me. But I do not believe the American people really want us to go back—

Mr. King. I meant worst-case scenario for you. I'm not taking a stand. For you, worst-case scenario.

The President. I can work—the American people are the bosses of this country. They run this country. They decide who's in the Congress, and they decide who's President.

Mr. King. You work for them.

The President. I work for them. And so does the Congress. So we will do what we are told to do by the American people. They are the bosses. But I will say again, I have worked very hard to get this economy going, to bring the deficit down, to get investment back in education and training, to pass that crime bill—and now we have to implement it so we make our streets safer—to make our country stronger. What I think is going to happen is the American people are going to think about, in the next couple of days, do we want to keep going forward, or do we really want to go back to trickle-down economics? Do we want to go back to exploding the deficit, shipping the jobs overseas, causing the country trouble, or do we want to keep working forward?

A lot of Republicans did work with me. But without exception, when they work with me on anything tough, except for the trade bill, except for NAFTA, and except for some education legislation, in a lot of these other areas, they were subject to withering, withering pressure and attack from the leaders of their own party. So I want to work with them, however these elections come out. I think we'll probably see the Democrats keep control of the Senate and the House because we are changing things for the better, and the American people now are seeing what the record is.

Mr. King. But you'll take that call, and you'll meet with whoever it is you have to meet with?

The President. Absolutely. That's right. You bet I would. I would have always taken it. I want it to be that way. When I ran for President, I ran as a former Governor—I was a Governor. I never shut the Republicans out of my office. I always thought my job was to work with anybody the people elected. That's the right thing to do.

Mr. King. I've got to get a break. We'll be right back with President Clinton. Don't go away.

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

Mr. King. Sunday evening in Seattle with the President of the United States Bill Clinton. A lot of bases to touch. And later we'll get some predictions on some individual races that the President is very aware of.

A couple of other things in the news. Johnny Apple today in the New York Times says that the administration is starting to take on a Truman-esque approach already: They're the bad guys. And that's the way Harry Truman won in '48 by knocking the no-good, do-nothing Congress. Are we adopting that mode?

The President. No. For one thing, I don't believe we're going to lose the Congress if the American people know what has been done.

Mr. King. So you'll have no Congress to knock in '96.

The President. There is—well, whether the Democrats or the Republicans are in the majority, a minority can frustrate the will of the majority just with the filibuster in the Senate, if for nothing else, which killed the campaign finance reform, lobby reform, environmental reform, and a number of other things last year.

My instinct is to get something done. But this Congress that we just finished was only the third one since World War II that cooperated with the President in over 80 percent of the President's initiatives in both years. That only happened three times since World War II, once for President Eisenhower, once for President Johnson, and then this one.

Mr. King. So there's no Truman plan.

The President. No. I'll say again, it depends on who the American people send to Congress and what their attitude is. I will work with anybody who will work with me to move the country forward. When I ran for President in '92, I said I thought the Democratic Party had to change. We had to do something about getting the economy going again, bringing the deficit down, shrinking the Government, being tougher on

crime, all things the Republicans had previously said they were for, although the deficit went up, the economy was in trouble, and they just talked about crime for 6 years.

All right, now we have reduced the deficit, reduced the size of the Government, passed a good crime bill, which now will have to be implemented at the grassroots level. Even as we speak, we've got police officers being hired all over the country because of this crime bill.

What are we going to do? My door is open. My hand is outstretched. I am a builder, not a blamer. I'm not like that.

Mr. King. This ain't going to be a Truman "give 'em-hell, Bill," campaign?

The President. It depends on what they do. It depends on what they do. If they want to work with me, then we will work together. I do believe that we're going to—that the people who gum up the works need to be held more accountable.

Mr. King. You're optimistic.

The President. I am optimistic.

Administration Accomplishments

Mr. King. Reports in recent books of disorganization in the Presidency, 2 years of unwieldiness, I'm sure you've heard about this, if you haven't read the books. Comment?

The President. Well, my comment is, if we were all that disorganized, how do we have the third most successful record in success with Congress, one of only three with over 80 percent of our initiatives passing, including major advances in bringing the deficit down, education reform, trade expansion, crime, and a number of other things, first of all? Secondly, we've done pretty well in foreign policy: no Russian missiles pointed at the United States, North Korea, Haiti, Northern Ireland, the Persian Gulf, the Middle East.

Mr. King. Are you saying we're looking at the process, not the result?

The President. But I'm saying the process is more open than perhaps in previous administrations because we are going through a period of historic change. And when—for example, when I tried to get my economic program together, after I was elected, but before I took office, we all agreed we had to bring the deficit down; we still had to in-

vest more in education and defense conversion and new technologies. And we had to do things that would expand the economy. We wanted to help low-income working families. And we wanted some other incentives to spur economic growth that cost money, some tax incentives. But there were all kinds of differences on the details.

So we got a lot of people in from different points of view, and we talked it through. And it was a lively process. Now some people wanted to have the image that somebody brings a President a little one-page memo with two options, and you just check off and say that's the way it is, and it's all neat. This is a complicated world with a lot of variables.

Mr. King. Is yours too open?

The President. I don't think so. It may be unsettling to people that we have honest debates in the White House. But you know, when I think about some of the major mistakes that my predecessors have made, I think the absence of honest debate may have caused some of that.

So, can we get the process better? Can we get better organized? I think so. I think that the White House today is much better organized than it was 30 days after I took office. I think it's more orderly; it's running more smoothly, decisions are made in a more disciplined fashion. I think a lot of people have learned to do their jobs better and better and better.

But again, I say the—a lot of the best companies I know of in America have very lively, open discussions on important issues. They take real time on important issues because then that shapes what the future is. And so far, I say, if you judge us on our results, we're making pretty good decisions.

Health Care Reform

Mr. King. Critics have said now that you fired your wife from health care. I haven't seen you comment. What caused this change, and who's running the health care battle?

The President. Oh, I didn't do that.

Mr. King. She has not been fired?

The President. No. But she was never hired. She was a volunteer.

Mr. King. I know, but critics are saying—what happened in that change?

The President. For one thing, there's no process to manage now. She never did—she never signed on to, agreed to, or was willing to manage the congressional process. What she did—

Mr. King. She took the ball, though.

The President. She took the ball, but what she did was to put hundreds and hundreds of people together to go out and consult all the Members of Congress, to run a 2-day seminar on health care for Republicans and Democrats in Congress, and to try to get the work product up and then be the spokesperson. Now whatever we wind up doing on health care, she will be still speaking out on that and doing a number of other things.

Mr. King. Then what was the announcement?

The President. But the—what we were saying is that she wouldn't have primary responsibility for actually deciding what move next to make in Congress and lobbying that. That's not a good thing for the First Lady to have to do and not anything she signed on to do the first time around.

Mr. King. Did she dislike doing it?

The President. No, I think she liked it, but she didn't want to be in a position where that's all she would do. And that's the only issue she could be involved in, and she didn't want to be in a position where—she got caught up—

Mr. King. She became the focus.

The President. It's where she got caught up in the process of—the lobbying of the Congress process. She wants to be a spokesperson for health care, for solving a problem, not the person who has to manage the process in Congress. And I don't think she should be.

Mr. King. So we will be hearing a lot from Hillary in the next 2 years.

The President. Yes, she—you know, she's invested a lot in this. She's done a wonderful job. And she's—what we think about the health care deal is that, first of all, keep in mind how long it takes to get things done in Washington. Family leave took 7 years. The Brady bill took 7 years. The crime bill took 6 years. Banking reform took 7 years. I mean, we've gotten things done that took years that other people couldn't do. But it was probably unrealistic to think you could

get health care reform in a year and a half, given the fact that it's bigger than all those other things.

Mr. King. When we come back, we'll talk about some individual races and the President's thoughts, as we converge on Tuesday. Don't go away.

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

California Senatorial Campaign

Mr. King. —on this beautiful Sunday in Seattle. A little off-the-cuff joke there, folks, best left unsaid. With the President of the United States, Bill Clinton. By the way, this is the President's seventh appearance, all together, running and as President, on this program. It's always great to have him with us. We're touching a lot of bases. Now some election bases. Going to win the Senate in California?

The President. I think Senator Feinstein will win. If there was a ever a case for campaign finance reform, it's this. The Republican candidate moves to California in '91 from Texas, essentially buys a Congress race, announces 8 months later for the Senate, loses his own congressional district in the Republican Senate campaign but spends, it looks like, \$35 million or something, some enormous amount of money, just to run negative ads against Feinstein.

She, by contrast, in only 2 years, passes the assault weapons ban, a law that requires zero tolerance for handgun possessions in schools by students, and the biggest protection act, natural protection act in history, the California desert bill.

Mr. King. It's his money, though.

The President. It's his money, but it shows you why we need some sort of campaign finance reform. No Senator in my lifetime has gotten as much done in as short a period of time as Dianne Feinstein. And those three things may not be popular everywhere, but they are supported by a majority of the people of California.

Seattle Congressional Campaign

Mr. King. Three hundred miles from here, over the hills in Spokane—Mr. Foley, Speaker of the House—what's going to happen there?

The President. Well, you know, he was way behind. He's fought himself back to where he's even, some say a little ahead. I think the people of every—every time there's a Speaker who comes from a rural district, there's always the problem of the people in the district thinking that the Speaker is more interested in the national job than the grass-roots job.

All I can say is that of all the leaders of Congress I've ever known in both Houses and in both parties, Tom Foley is the one who speaks most often about his constituency and is most in contact with what he thinks they're thinking about. He's the one who talks to me all the time. It's amazing. And I think that if—my feeling is that the people have seen him back there working, defending his positions, defending his record, defending his service for the district. If it's just a question of who can do more for the people of that district to build their economic future and to meet their needs, I don't think there's much question. I think he wins in a walk, but it's a tough race.

Ross Perot and the 1996 Campaign

Mr. King. Our old friend Ross Perot's entrance into the race, endorsing some Republicans, some Democrats, Independents and calling for basically a Republican victory.

The President. Well, it's curious to me because if you look at what I've done as compared with what Ross Perot advocated, I disagree with him on GATT and NAFTA, but so does the Republican congressional leadership. So both sides disagree with him on trade. So what else was his campaign about? It was about reducing the deficit, reducing regulation of the size of Government, and getting political reform, campaign finance reform, lobby reform, line-item veto.

Okay, we reduced the deficit without any Republican votes. We reduced the size of Government without any Republican support. We've deregulated the—in banking and trucking. We deregulated a lot of the Federal rules on welfare reform, giving 20 States the right to move people from welfare to work. We've done things that he said he was for.

I supported and most Democrats supported, most Democrats supported, campaign finance reform, lobby reform, a bill to

make Congress live under the same laws it imposes on private business. These are things we did. Their leadership opposed it. So what we are doing and where we stand and what we want to do in the future is much more consistent with what Ross Perot said he wanted to do if he were President.

Mr. King. Then what do you make of this?

The President. I don't know. I'll leave that to you to make of it. All I can tell you is, we have really faithfully pursued the reform agenda that he and I shared in common when we both ran for President. So the truth is, he'd come a lot nearer getting what he said he wanted done in '92 in fact done in '95 if we kept the Democrats in the Congress who are committed to change.

Mr. King. Do you expect him to run again?

The President. I don't have any idea.

Mr. King. Do you expect Democrats to oppose you?

The President. I don't have any idea.

Mr. King. Do you have a Republican favorite you'd like to run against?

The President. No, I'm going to leave that up to them. I'll say this, sooner or later, we'll have a debate and a discussion in this country about what, in fact, has been done and what has not been done.

Mr. King. And it will have to be one person.

The President. We'll have to get over being mad and being negative and talk about what we're going to do to build this country. We cannot for long afford to give in to the blamers instead of the builders. I mean, this is a country—you look—we've got a lot of challenges we have to work through to get this country into the 21st century as the strongest country in the world, with the American dream alive and well.

Right now, we are strongest militarily. We're strongest again economically, according to the annual vote of international economists, for the first time in 9 years. We're out-selling all other auto companies, Americans are for the first time in 15 years. We are moving in the right direction.

At some point, people who tempt our anger and our frustration but promise to reverse the progress we have made and put us back in the economic trouble we were in

just a couple of years ago, are going to have to be held accountable. That's what this election ought to be about. And if it is, the Democrats who represent hope, the future, and the progress that's been made in the last 21 months ought to have a chance. Why should we give up the progress of the last 21 months and not give me a chance to finish and go back to what failed us for 12 years?

Mr. King. But can we also say, therefore, can I trace in what you said in the beginning that if you do run for reelection, you will debate your opponent or opponents?

The President. Yes.

Mr. King. There will be no backing off debates.

The President. No, not once, but several times.

Mr. King. We'll be right back with President Bill Clinton. Don't go away.

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

Legal Defense Fund

Mr. King. We're back with President Bill Clinton, touching a lot of bases. The legal defense fund, are there any second thoughts about that, or was it necessary or—do you have second thoughts?

The President. No. I think with a strict limit on contributions, there's no possibility of any conflict of interest there. And, you know, I have the lowest net worth, I guess, of any person to be President in a very long time. And all these things are—like the Whitewater thing, it's—these things come up. If we're going to—

Mr. King. They have been embarrassing, though.

The President. If we're going to make Presidents a subject for the first time in history—this has never been done to anybody before—to things like special counsels looking into things that happened long before the President became President, that were fully aired in the Presidential campaign—I don't think Presidents should make money being President, but I don't think they should be bankrupt when they leave because of legal fees. Nor do I think that Presidents should expect lawyers to work for nothing.

So, once again, we're in a situation here where—do you really want to say that unless

you're fabulously wealthy you shouldn't be able to be President? You shouldn't be able to run for an office because you can't buy enough negative television ads to trash your opponent? I think what we did was appropriate, legal, proper, and restrained.

Former President Ronald Reagan

Mr. King. A couple of other things. Ronald Reagan's announcement, and I know you commented that you'd—

The President. I did.

Mr. King. —spoken to him awhile back and that he, in the middle of a sentence, got angry that he had forgotten what he had been talking about.

The President. Yes, he just said once, he said, "I forgot." He said, "I lost my memory on that, and it really makes me mad."

Mr. King. Did you then think that this might have been Alzheimer's, a common thing to think in people over 80? Did you think it?

The President. I didn't know. I don't know that I know the difference between the manifestations of Alzheimer's for someone who's 80 and just not remembering things as well. But he and I have always had a very cordial personal relationship. When I was a Governor, I supported and worked with the White House when we got the first big welfare reform legislation through back in '88. And even though we've had our differences, I always liked the fact that he was positive about America, that he was an upbeat person, that he—at moments he was capable of going beyond partisanship, as he has since he's left office. You know, he supported NAFTA and the Brady bill and the crime bill with the assault weapons ban in it, because, I think, of the experience he had with Jim Brady and the terrible scars it left on everyone.

So I just—I wanted to say that. I was probably in the most Democratic congressional district in America yesterday. And when I asked them, they all just applauded and they gave him a big cheer.

Mr. King. Do you think it will help focus emphasis on Alzheimer's? Do you think he was right to do it, to make the announcement?

The President. First of all, I think he was very right to do it. I think it was a brave

thing to do. And he sat down and wrote the letter himself—

Mr. King. I know.

The President. —in his own words. And it was vintage Ronald Reagan. I think it will help to focus attention on Alzheimer's. I personally appreciated it, because I lost both an uncle and an aunt to Alzheimer's. And so I think it's one more thing that the American people have to be appreciative to him about.

Mr. King. We'll be back with our remaining moments on this special Sunday night edition of "Larry King Live" with President Bill Clinton. Don't go away.

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

Secretary of State Warren Christopher

Mr. King. We're back with Bill Clinton. Our remaining moments, some other quick bases to cover—Senator Dole the other night said he likes Warren Christopher, thinks he's done a great job. Is Warren Christopher staying at State?

The President. He's done a good job, and as far as I'm concerned, he's the Secretary of State.

Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Mr. King. Dee Dee Myers is sitting here, looks very strong, very active.

The President. She looks pretty good, doesn't she?

Mr. King. There was rumors that she was going to be leaving that post, and she seemed to have strengthened it. Is she here?

The President. She's doing a good job.

Mr. King. Will she be here through the next 2 years?

The President. She hasn't told me yet.

Mr. King. Do you want her to stay?

The President. She looks pretty good.

Mr. King. Yes, she does. Do you want her to stay?

The President. She's doing a good job, and she's going to stay as long as we decide she's going to stay, she and I together.

Mr. King. First time the whole night you've been a little—

The President. I've been a little evasive on all personnel questions.

Mr. King. You don't want to discuss personnel?

The President. I think Presidents should always be slightly evasive on personnel questions unless there's some great policy issue involved.

Heavyweight Champion George Foreman

Mr. King. George Foreman. Comment.

The President. George Foreman, I like because I identify with him. He's not as young as he used to be, not as fast as he used to be, not as thin as he used to be. He's still got a terrific punch. I'd like to think that there are a lot of us who could identify with that.

And he doesn't quit. You know what he said yesterday? He said he was really grateful to America for giving him the chance to fight. That's the way I feel. I'm grateful to America for giving me the chance to fight.

Mr. King. So you felt an association with him. You're only a little older than he is.

The President. Yes, I know.

Mr. King. You have the same kind of midriff, and he eats like you, fast foods.

The President. He does. I don't really eat fast foods anymore. That's a big myth.

Mr. King. Well, you don't?

The President. No. It's part of Dee Dee's counseling to me. [Laughter] She won't let me—no, we don't do that much anymore.

Midterm Elections

Mr. King. We're under a minute. Virginia—Senate.

The President. Senator Robb's doing well there.

Mr. King. Cuomo in New York.

The President. He's come back; he's been heroic.

Mr. King. Senate in—Governorship, Texas.

The President. Well, I haven't been there, but Ann Richards is supported in her job by over 60 percent of the people. So if they support the work she's done for Texas, you would think they would renew her contract.

Mr. King. Were you asked to go there at all?

The President. No.

Mr. King. And—

The President. Oh, I was at the beginning. I was asked to go, actually, to El Paso, but we couldn't do it.

Mr. King. We're out of time. Thanks.

The President. Thank you. You've been great.

Mr. King. Are you predicting victory in the Senate and the House? You will retain control of both?

The President. I think we're moving in the right direction, and I think we'll have them both on Wednesday morning when we wake up, because I think the American people want to keep going forward, not going back.

NOTE: The interview was recorded at 3:30 p.m. at the Columbia DuBrin Realty Advisors Building for broadcast at 9 p.m.

Remarks at the Minnesota Victory Rally in Minneapolis, Minnesota *November 7, 1994*

Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you Pam Pearson. Sounds good, doesn't it, Madam President? Out of my own past I feel compelled to say someone ought to thank the band for being here to play with us today. Thank you for dressing up. Thank you, Senator Wellstone. Poor Senator Wellstone has no energy, no conviction. [Laughter] He's a walking fireplug for Minnesota. There are many public officials here. I don't want to introduce them all, but I would be remiss if I did not thank Congressman Martin Sabo, Congressman Bruce Vento, and the distinguished retiring Congressman from Minnesota, someone who knows the difference between talk and action on the deficit, the economy and a lot of other things, Congressman Tim Penny. Thank you all for being here.

Most of what needs to be said about this race has already been said here today. But I want you to focus on what you could do between now and tomorrow, to talk to other people—there's a high rate of undecided in all these surveys—to make sure that Ann Wynia wins. And I have given a great deal of thought to this. This really is a contest between whether we will continue going into a future that is full of opportunity and chal-

lenge or go back to the easy answers of the past. It really is, as the First Lady said, a contest between the doers and the talkers or the builders and the blamers.

You know, for all of our problems, and we do have profound problems, 30 years of accumulated social problems, 20 years of basically stagnant wages and working people being at greater and greater risk of losing their health care or not getting a raise or having to change jobs, for all of these problems, we had 12 years of their side's approach. They had 12 whole years of trickle-down economics. We've had 21 months, and this country is in better shape than it was 21 months ago. Jobs are up. The deficit is down. The Federal Government is smaller, but it's providing more opportunity for working families, for education, for family leave and in so many other ways. The country is getting stronger. I want America to be strong. What makes a country strong? Strong families, strong education systems, safe streets, good jobs, a strong foreign policy that promotes peace and prosperity for Americans in the world. On all these counts, this country is in better shape than it was 21 months ago.

Just last week we got the news that we had now over 5 million new jobs coming into this economy. The Minnesota unemployment rate has dropped about 1½ percent. We're at a 4-year low in unemployment in the United States as a whole. For the first time in 15 years, American auto companies are number one in the world in all of their sales. For the first time in 9 years, we've been voted again, finally, after 9 years, the most productive economy in the world. Why would we want to give the Congress to people who want to take us back to what almost wrecked us in the 1980's? Say no to them; say yes to our people.

There is always a little lag time between things that you do being done and things that you do being felt by voters. I understand that. And there are real frustrations and anxieties that the American people feel about their future that go way beyond normal politics. But what is the argument of our opponents, of Ann Wynia's opponent, of the Republican majority leader? They had a very clever strategy from the beginning; they have pursued it with a vengeance. Their strategy was, "The

electorate is frustrated about the mess in Washington; let's keep them frustrated." Their strategy was, "Let's stop whatever we can. We can kill health care reform, lobby reform, campaign finance reform, important environmental legislation. And when we can't stop something, let's at least deny that it happened or deny that it did any good." So they say, "If anything good happened in the last 21 months, it was either in spite of or irrelevant to the work the rest of us did in Washington."

Well, you know folks, where I come from, we say, if you're walking down a road and you find a turtle on a fencepost, chances are it didn't get there by accident. Now, you think about that. [*Laughter*] Here is what—when we were voting last year and Tim Penny was working his heart out last year on a plan to reduce the Federal deficit after the debt had exploded, had quadrupled in the 1980's, threatening the future of our children, taking up all the money that needed to be invested in the private sector to create jobs; keeping interest rates high, even in a recession, and the future of the country was on the line, the two people who are on the other side of town speaking today, here's what they said. The minority leader, Mr. Dole from Kansas, said, this is not real deficit reduction. And Ann Wynn's opponent said that this economic plan has ominous implications for the American economy and the American jobs. That's what they said.

Now they want to hold us accountable for all the messes that we inherited from them. At least we can hold them accountable for the decisions they've taken in the last 21 months. They were wrong. They were wrong on the deficit; they were wrong on the economy; they were wrong on the future of this country. Surely, even in this age of 30-second ads and negative sound bites and lobbing verbal bombs across the wall, surely someone, somewhere today will ask them, "Weren't you wrong about the deficit? Weren't you wrong about the economy? Why should we give you our future? You were wrong; all you did was try to stop progress for the last 21 months, and you were wrong." Somebody ought to say that to them and say, let's keep going forward.

They say the American people are so cynical, it is irrelevant what I do anymore, because everything the Government does makes no difference to you and can't make your life better. Well, I don't know about you, but I think it makes a difference that 845,000 families in Minnesota are now protected by the family leave law so they can be good workers and good parents when their children are sick or born. And I think it made a difference that 155,000 families in Minnesota had their income tax rates cut because they worked for modest wages. And we don't think people who work full-time and raise children should be in poverty, we think they should be rewarded for what they do.

I think it's making a difference that we're going to immunize all the kids in this country under the age of 2, so we'll have more little kids that look like these do in the future, without regard to their race, their income, or where they live. I think that matters. I think it matters that we're making 20 million Americans, including over 400,000 people right here in Minnesota, eligible for lower cost, more affordable college loans, so that every person in the country who wants to go to college can go.

Now someone ought to say today, if you have a clear choice between someone who supports those policies and someone who opposes those policies, shouldn't we vote for the person who is for building the ability of the people of Minnesota to compete and win, to make the most of their God-given abilities? I think the answer is yes.

Make no mistake about it, my fellow Americans, what they say is there is gridlock in Washington, you're frustrated with Washington; give us control. Well, if they had had control, there would have been no family leave law, no student loan reform, no immunization of all the kids under 2, no expansion of Head Start, no deficit reduction, no economic expansion. That is what they would have done if they had been in control.

Look at how they voted: no Brady bill, no crime bill. That is how they voted. So I say, think, folks. Look at the record. Hold them as accountable as they seek to hold us. I would gladly take a simple even standard: hold me accountable; hold them accountable for what we said and what we did. If that

happens, Ann Wymia is going to the United States Senate tomorrow.

You know, one of their greatest Presidents was Theodore Roosevelt. He was a great fellow. I would have been sorely tempted to vote for him if I'd been around. [Laughter] And one of the things I liked about Roosevelt was Teddy Roosevelt said the credit belonged to the person who is in the arena who is trying. These folks say, "Punish the people who have tried and reward the people who sit on the sidelines and whine and belly-ache and complain and point the finger and run for cover every time it's time to take responsibility for the future." Vote for the party of Teddy Roosevelt; that's now us and Ann Wymia. That's right.

Their greatest President was Abraham Lincoln. He is all of our President. Do you hear his words in their campaigns? Remember what Abraham Lincoln said? "With malice toward none." Can you imagine him saying that today? "With charity for all. Let us press on in the work we are in, driven by the better angels of our nature, because this is a Government of, by, and for the people." They do not use those words. They seek to use malice and cynicism, our least charitable impulses, the lowest common denominator. That is not the Minnesota way.

I got really tickled—it would be laughable if it didn't work from time to time, that now Ann Wymia's opponent, who voted no on all those things I just said, is trying to convince the senior citizens of this State at the last minute that she is their enemy. [Laughter] Ann Wymia is a friend of children, a friend of working families, a friend of the elderly.

Her opponent wants to go to Washington to implement what they said they would do, cut taxes, increase spending, and balance the budget. Does that sound familiar? [Laughter] Folks, let me tell you something, and this is the last thing I want to say. I wasn't going to bring this up, but I heard that he was attacking her for being the enemy of senior citizens. If you promise to increase defense, bring back Star Wars, give the wealthy a tax cut, and balance the budget, there are only two possibilities. One is you're serious; and the other is you're kidding. [Laughter] And when I finish, don't take my word for it; go ask Mr. Penny, he's the budget expert, and

he's not running. But we fool with these budgets. If they are serious in doing what they say, here are their options. You've got to cut everything else in the Government 20 percent across the board, including Social Security and Medicare. That is the enemy of seniors. That's \$2,000 a person, Social Security.

If you say, oh, no, we won't cut Social Security, because they'll always say—they'll probably say that here today: "We didn't say we'd cut Social Security." They didn't say they wouldn't. [Laughter] Then you have to cut everything else 30 percent across the board. That devastates the student loan program. That devastates the Head Start program. That devastates the crime bill and putting police on our streets, ask the mayors. In other words, they are the enemy of the solemn contract we had with the elderly people of this country. Unless, of course, they're kidding. [Laughter]

Now the last time they had power they were kidding. [Laughter] So what did they do? They talked so tough; they say, "We are strong; we are tough." But they acted so weak. And so what happened? They exploded the deficit. They sent our jobs overseas. They put our economy in the drink.

Let us say: Sorry, we've been there, we tried that, we didn't like it. We like the unemployment rate going down, the deficit going down, jobs going up, more investment in education, a better future for our kids. We like Ann Wymia. We like hope, not fear. We like the future, not the past. Lift her up. Let's go on. Let's win on Tuesday. We can do it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:25 a.m. at North Hennepin Community College. In his remarks, he referred to Kathrine Sloan, president, North Hennepin Community College, and Pam Pearson former student of Democratic candidate Ann Wymia at North Hennepin Community College.

Remarks at a Rally in Flint, Michigan November 7, 1994

Thank you. I'm glad to be back in Flint, glad to be back in Michigan, glad to be here for Bob Carr.

Ladies and gentlemen, Hillary and I are delighted to be here today with all of you. I want to begin by thanking the nominees who are here behind me, the wonderful members of the labor movement, the educators who are here, and others who are doing their best to see that Michigan makes a good decision for the future tomorrow. I also want to say a special word of thanks out of my own history to the Davison High School Band over here for playing for us. Thank you very much. You know, the chancellor at this distinguished institution, Dr. Charlie Nelms—we've got another band up there? What? Northern High School up here. Give them a hand. [*Applause*]

Folks, the chancellor of this fine institution, Dr. Charlie Nelms, grew up in my home State. And he just got back from his college reunion. I won't tell you which one. [*Laughter*] He was one of 11 children. And I say this not to embarrass him but to tell you that right before we came out here he said, "I want you to know something, Mr. President. If it hadn't been for people believing in me, giving me a chance, and providing programs like these college loans that get so many students into this institution, I wouldn't be here today. I want to stick with the people who believe in education, who believe in ordinary citizens, who believe in the future of this country."

I want to thank Mayor Woodrow Stanley for being my friend and my supporter and your great leader. They used to call me the Comeback Kid. You ought to call Flint the comeback city under Woodrow Stanley. And the thing I like about Woodrow Stanley—I want to say more about this in a minute, because it goes to your choice in this election—is that he is a builder, not a blamer. I want to thank your Senators, Senator Carl Levin and Senator Don Riegle—we wish you well in your retirement, and we thank you for representing Flint, Michigan, and the United States. I want to welcome the Democratic nominees for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, Howard Wolpe and Debbie Stabenow, and ask you to help them tomorrow and support them.

I just have to say this: The unemployment figures came out last week, and we had a 4-year low in unemployment. And the Gov-

ernor here always says, "Well, the Michigan economy is getting better." That's true, but did you ever notice that it didn't get very much better when the Republicans had the White House and the economic policy? And even though I think an enormous amount of credit goes to the automobile industry for their incredible efforts at partnership, labor and management, bringing us back to number one in automobiles in the entire world, the rest of the States are doing pretty well, too. We're going up or down together; that is my message.

I want you to help these people and especially I want you to help Bob Carr because if nothing else you know, if you look at this fine institution of higher education, if you look at this city, if you look at this State, if you think of our country, we are going up or down together. And you only have one choice who is clearly 100 percent on your side. Bob Carr is 100 percent on your side.

I also want to echo what Hillary said about Congressman Dale Kildee. I want to say a special word of thanks to him for his leadership in the most productive congressional session for education in 30 years. We expanded Head Start. We changed the Federal law on aid to our public schools so that we will emphasize grassroots reform and get rid of this ridiculous assumption that just because kids are poor, from disadvantaged backgrounds, they can't learn—from now on, the same expectations, the same opportunity, the same achievement for children without regard to their background. And you heard him talking about the School-to-Work Opportunity Act I signed. That's a bill for young people who don't go on to college but don't want to be in dead-end jobs, who want good training and are willing to engage in a lifetime of learning. And I did sign that bill on a desk built by the students at the manufacturing technology project right here in Flint, Michigan, who will benefit from that sort of effort.

I also want to thank Congressman Jim Barcia and our candidate, Bob Mitchell, for being here. Send them back to Washington so we'll have partners for progress.

You know, folks, this has really turned out to be an amazing election in ways that are both wonderful and troubling. The American

people know that there are still things that need fixing in Washington, and they know there are things that need fixing back here at home. They know that, in spite of the fact that we've got an enormous amount of job growth—over 5 million jobs in the last 21 months—in spite of the fact that we've got more high-wage jobs coming back into America this year than in the previous 5 years combined, in spite of the fact that the biggest problem in the auto industry is not no time, it's now overtime—a high-class problem—they know that there are still a lot of people who are worried about losing their jobs; a lot of people who are afraid they'll never get a raise; a lot of people who are worried about losing their health insurance, as one million people in working families did last year; a lot of people who still want work in some of our cities and isolated rural areas who don't have jobs. This country has problems. They know that we've still got too much crime and violence and too much disintegration of our families and our communities that make people feel personally insecure or at least violate their sense of values. That's all true.

Now the question is, what are we going to do about it? And what these guys say is, our opponents, they say, "Be mad about it, be frustrated about it, be cynical about it, and put us in because we are going to play on your fears, your frustrations, and your cynicism." That's their argument; their argument is, "Look, nothing good has happened, and if you find something good that happened, it did not happen because the President was there. It did not happen because he had partners in the Congress. It happened in spite of that. It was irrelevant to that." That's their argument; you listen to them.

Well, you know what, folks? Where I come from, people say if you find a turtle on the fencepost, it did not get there by accident. And so I say to you, don't let a frustrated electorate wind up voting for what you're against and against what you're for. That's what they want.

Look what they say they're for. They say they are for a new plan that will give a huge tax cut to the wealthy, that will bring back big increases in defense and revive Star Wars and will balance the budget. Does that sound

familiar to you? They say, "Ignore what happened in the last 21 months; it doesn't matter. Ignore the jobs, the growth, the help for ordinary working Americans, the fact that the world is growing more prosperous and more peaceful. Ignore all that; take our new set of promises."

Now, I want you to think about this. There are really only two possibilities, with these Republican promises: they're either serious, or they're kidding. Now listen to me. If they're serious, they have made you \$1 trillion worth of promises: "We're going to cut taxes on the wealthy, bring back defense and Star Wars, and balance the budget." What does it cost? "A trillion dollars." When you ask them, "How will you pay for it?" they say, "We'll tell you after the election."

Do you know why? Because the only way to pay for it is to cut everything else in the budget 20 percent across the board: \$2,000 a person in Social Security, cut Medicare 20 percent, cut the student loans 20 percent, cut the AIDS prevention 20 percent, cut the Head Start 20 percent. That is their program. Then they say, "Well, we didn't say we would cut Social Security." They didn't say they wouldn't. But if you take out Social Security, then our opponents in the Senate and the House have committed to a set of promises that mean 30 percent cuts across the board in all those things.

Of course, there's always the chance that they didn't mean it, they're kidding. If they're kidding, what does it mean? "We will give you the goodies without the price." And what does that mean? We're going to explode the deficit. We're going to ship our jobs overseas. We're going to put our economy back in the same mess that this same crowd, with these same policies, put it in in the trickle-down economics years of the 1980's.

Tell them no. We want Bob Carr. We want Dale Kildee. We want Jim Barcia. We want Bob Mitchell. Those are the people we want. Tell them no. Tell them no.

You know, folks, one of the most amazing things to me is this effort that they are making to take a frustrated electorate and say, "It does not matter what we say. It does not matter what we do. Anything the Government does is either irrelevant or makes it

worse.” Can you imagine, can you imagine entering into any other human endeavor with that attitude? Can you imagine going to school with that attitude? Can you imagine building a business with that attitude? Can you imagine going to work with that attitude? Can you imagine building a house with that attitude? Can you imagine building a family with that attitude? No! Well, why would we want to build a Congress with that attitude?

You know, folks, I don’t know about you, but when I showed up in Washington I wanted to rebuild the American dream; I wanted to bring this country together; I wanted to make America strong. I don’t mean I wanted to talk strong; I wanted to be strong. And to be strong you need stronger families, better schools, safer streets, more jobs, a safer and more prosperous world.

Well, I don’t know about you, but I believe it made a difference when we gave 1½ million Michigan families the protection of the Family and Medical Leave Act so they could take a little time off from work and keep their jobs. And I believe it made a difference when almost 400,000 Michigan families that work full-time with kids in the house and are hovering above the poverty line got an income tax cut under our administration, so you could succeed at work and at home, being a parent and a worker. I think it made a difference. I think it made a difference when we made almost 600,000 people in Michigan eligible for lower cost and better repayment college loans, so more people could go to college and no one need ever turn away. I think that makes a difference. And I think it made a difference when we lowered the deficit and increased our investment in our future and got this economy going again. And that’s why the unemployment rate in America is at a 4 year low and it’s dropped 2 percent in Michigan in the last 21 months. I think that matters, and I think you think it matters.

So I think it matters that for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointing at these children here. I think it matters that North Korea has agreed not to become a nuclear power. I think it matters that the United States is expanding trade and opportunity for high-wage jobs. I think it matters that we are making

peace and helping peace come about and standing up for freedom from the Persian Gulf to Northern Ireland, to Haiti, to the Middle East. I think that matters. I think that matters. And so I ask you, my fellow Americans, why would we want to go back?

This election is, more than anything else, an election about the state of mind of our voters. If people are thinking about the issues and what’s in their issues and who’s on their side and what’s best for our future, they will have to vote for Bob Carr over his opponent. Their great hope is that everybody wakes up tomorrow mad, the Democrats stay home, the extremists go vote—the people who want a bunch of easy promises, the people who want a lot of tough talk that will lead not to strength but to weakness for most of us—that that will prevail. My great belief is that tomorrow, whatever the weather, you’re going to wake up with the Sun shining in your mind, seeing clearly, thinking about tomorrow, thinking about tomorrow.

Folks, you just think about this. You think about what really counts when you go to work, when you build a business, when you get an education, when you rear a family. It is a positive, building, unifying, compassionate idea of what you are as a person and what you can become. That is what we represent. We’ve still got a lot of problems in this country, folks, but this country is in better shape than it was 21 months ago. We are stronger than we were 21 months ago. We are moving forward.

Don’t turn back; go forward. Elect Bob Carr and Dale Kildee and Jim Barcia and Bob Mitchell and Howard Wolpe and Debbie Stabenow. Help these people. Lift Michigan; go forward. Come on, we can do it. Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:57 p.m. at the University of Michigan.

Remarks at a Rally for Democratic Candidates in Wilmington, Delaware November 7, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, Charlie Oberly. Thank you, Mayor Sills. It is great to be back in Wilmington again. I thank Cari

DeSantis and all the other Democratic candidates who are here with us.

I thank Governor Carper for his longtime friendship and his stirring defense of our record. I was thinking to myself, if I could clone Tom Carper and have that speech given in every country crossroads in America, the political future of our administration and our party would be secure. Didn't he do a fine job?

And Hillary and I both feel a special indebtedness for the friendship and the leadership of Joe Biden, without whom there would have been no crime bill this year and because of whom lives will be saved and children will grow up safer and this country will be a less violent place in the years ahead. We are in his great and abiding debt.

You know, the last time I did a rally here a couple of years ago, I had just about lost my voice. Well, I've been a little hoarse, and some things don't change, but I kind of got pumped up tonight, and my voice is coming back, and I want your voice to be heard tomorrow.

You know, the last time I came to Delaware, my first trip as President, I met with students from Sussex County who were training to enter the aerospace industry. They were working people, good young people from all different kinds of backgrounds who just wanted to get a good education so that they could compete and do well, so that they could earn a decent living, have some security, have a good marriage, raise children, and make a good life here in this wonderful State. The struggles that they faced, the opportunities that they have, the changes we all have to make—those young people from Sussex County, they are the symbol of why we do not need to turn back tomorrow, why we need to go forward, and why we need Charlie Oberly in the United States Senate.

You know, I ran for President from another small State that raises a lot of chickens—[laughter]—because I did not want my daughter or our children to grow up to be the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents. I did not want our country to come apart by race, by region, by income when if we will just celebrate our diversity and learn to live and work together, there is nothing we cannot do as a nation.

And we have been hard at work at that. Now all the pundits tell us that the voters are still hungry for change. Well, we do need some changes, all right, but those changes won't come overnight. The problems of crime and violence, of family and community breakdown, of guns and gangs and drugs—those things didn't come up overnight. They've been building for 30 years. The economic problems of increasing insecurity of our working people, people working harder and not getting a raise, worried about losing their health insurance or their retirement, having to change jobs so many times—those things didn't come up overnight. They've been developing for 20 years. And 21 months ago when I took office, we'd had 12 years of trickle-down economics which was culminated by 4 years of the slowest job growth since the Great Depression. Folks, we hadn't been there long, but this country is in better shape than it was 21 months ago.

Yes, there are things we have to do. Another million Americans in working families lost their health insurance last year. I don't believe we're the only big country in the world that can't figure out how to keep people with their health insurance, give people in small businesses and self-employed people the same prices as people in big business and Government get. I don't believe we can't afford to figure out how to give it to our kids, and I don't think that we have to tolerate a situation where elderly people on Medicare choose every week between their medicine and their meals. I believe we can do better. I know we have changes to make.

I know there is still work to be done on welfare reform. Tom Carper and I have been working on it for 7 years now. I know we still need to pass political reform, campaign finance reform. There's a Senate race in California where the Republican challenger moved to the State 3 years ago, bought a congressional seat, stayed 8 months, declared for the Senate, ran, lost in his own district in his own primary, and is still in the race because he spent \$30 million of his own money. We sure do need that.

We need lobby reform, and we need a law out of Congress that requires the Congress and the Federal Government to live under the same laws we impose on people in the

private sector. We need a lot of things to change in this country.

The question is, how do you get that change? Tonight, folks, I want to make the case for Charlie Oberly by asking you and asking the American people in this last speech to look at what the record of the two parties has been in the last 2 years, and what the program of our parties for the years ahead is. That is how you tell how you get the change you want, not by being mad.

One of the reasons that I like Delaware is that I think you folks are a little more immune than sometimes people in bigger places are to all this negative, cynical, destructive stuff that they keep trying to put on us to take our citizenship and our good sense away from us. The kind of Democrats you elect here don't believe that Government can solve all the problems, but they don't think Government can sit on the sideline either.

Our Government is not inherently bad or inherently good. It is what we make of it. And what I think the people of Delaware want is a Government that creates opportunity so we can say, "Okay, the opportunity is there. Now you have the power to assume the responsibility to make the most of your own lives and your community." That's what I think the people want out of Government in this country and in this State.

I want a strong America. But very often, what politicians give us is strong talk and weak action. What makes a strong America? Strong families; better education; safer streets; more jobs; a more peaceful, more prosperous world. That's real strength, folks, not all that tough talk, not all those negative ads. That's real strength, something you can build a life on, raise a child on, and be proud in your old age of. That is the kind of America that I want to build.

Now, that's what we've been working for. What have they done? Our opponents have fought us every step of the way. They have had a simple, clear, unwavering strategy, and give them credit, folks, they stick to it. They don't even get embarrassed when you catch them at it. [Laughter] Their whole deal is, "Fight them every step of the way. Do everything you can to derail them. And if they win anyway, then deny that it makes any dif-

ference." [Laughter] Say if anything, their theory is, kill it if you can, and if you can't kill it and something good happens, say, "It happened in spite of the Democrats; it happened in spite of the President. They didn't have anything to do with it." And they're good at it. They're good at it.

Well, I have this to say to the Republicans. The same kind of people that say don't count your chickens before they hatch will understand the saying that is pretty prominent where I come from. They say, if you're walking down a road and you see a turtle on a fencepost, the chances are it didn't get there by accident. [Laughter] You know, they say, "Well, these things don't make any difference," or they try to kill them. Well, let me ask you this—you heard what Tom Carper said—I think it makes a difference that 147,000 families right here in Delaware are protected by the family leave law, so they can take a little time off if there's a baby born or a sick parent without losing their jobs. I believe it makes a difference that 36,000 working families in the State of Delaware, working full-time, barely hovering above the poverty line, got an income tax cut under this administration, so they can succeed as parents and workers.

I think it makes a difference that we've increased child support enforcement, that we're pushing for welfare reform, that we've given 20 States the permission to slash through rules and regulations to figure out how to move folks from welfare to work in dignity that enables them to support their children and be self-respecting citizens.

I think it makes a difference that in Delaware 41,700 people are eligible for lower cost, better repayment, more affordable college loans, so that everybody can afford to go to college in this country and not drop out. I think that makes a difference.

I think it makes a difference that we expanded Head Start, that we support apprenticeship programs. I think it makes a difference that the job growth rate in Delaware is now—listen to this—14 times as fast as it was before this administration took office. I think that makes a difference.

I think it makes a difference that the crime bill passed and that Delaware will get 650 more police officers to walk the streets and

prevent crime and be a good role model for our children—I think that matters—that we’re going to have funds for drug education and drug courts and boot camps and things that give our kids a chance to avoid spending their lives in prison and give them a chance to spend their lives at work and in school. I think it makes a difference.

What I want you to know is—I’ll say it again—Charlie Oberly mobilized the attorneys general; Joe Biden saved the crime bill in its darkest hour. Do not take my word for it; you ask Joe Biden. When you think about this tomorrow—[laughter]—no, no, not this. Listen to me. When we were in our darkest hour, we couldn’t figure out what is going on: Why did the Republicans, when they all voted for the crime bill the first time it came up, why were they all being pressured to vote against the crime bill? They said, “Oh, it had so much money in it.” On an annual basis it had slightly less money in it than it did the first time they voted for it. They said, “These prevention programs are no good.” We found that a whole bunch of them had been sponsored by Republicans. You’ve got to give them credit. They have no shame. They’re not embarrassed about this. [Laughter] They’re not—I’ll tell you what, you ask Senator Biden. It’s because their leader told them that their job was not to lower the rate of crime, their job was to defeat the Democrats, never mind the rate of crime.

Joe Biden said, “No, thank you, I’d rather have America safe. I’m interested in the children, not in the politics of this.” And I thank, I thank Charlie Oberly and Joe Biden for what they did on the crime bill. I also want to say about Charlie Butler—don’t you forget this—he’s running to be the top law enforcement officer in your State against someone who opposed the crime bill. Vote for somebody who wants to keep you safe. Vote for Charlie Butler.

Let me say this: I think it makes a difference that we have a more peaceful and prosperous world, that there’s more trade, that there are no Russian missiles pointed at these children for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, that we are a force for peace and freedom in the Persian Gulf, in the Middle East, in Northern Ireland, in

Haiti. I think that makes a difference. It makes us all better and stronger.

So don’t let them say it doesn’t make a difference what we have done. If it had been up to them, as a group, if they were in charge—and that’s what they’re asking you tomorrow—they say, “Every vote for every Republican Senator, every vote for every Republican Congressman is a vote to put us in charge, to put Mr. Dole and Mr. Gingrich in charge.” Let me tell you something, folks, if they had been in charge—listen now—if they had been in charge, no family leave law, no Brady bill, no crime bill, no deficit reduction, no middle class college loans, no tax cuts for working people, no economic recovery. I think that’s one issue we can say no to, thank you very much, no.

It kind of tickles me. We’re giving them 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Truman. When we get done, we’ll have the smallest Federal Government since Kennedy. We’ve got the toughest crime bill in history and an economic recovery. A self-respecting mainstream Republican would support that. But they have no shame. Let’s take credit for it for them and take care of it for them and keep this country going forward.

Now, so people say, “Well, that’s okay, but I still don’t feel so good.” So look at the future. I told you what our future is. Our future is, implement the crime bill, keep the recovery going, keep a steady hand on the spending, implement welfare reform, go back until we solve the health care problem, implement political reform and environmental legislation.

What is their future? Their future is, “I got a promise to make you. I got a contract to make with you. We’re going to cut taxes, especially for the wealthiest 2 percent. We’re going to increase spending on defense and Star Wars, and we’re going to balance the budget.” Well, how much does it cost? “A trillion dollars.” And how are you going to pay for it? “We’ll tell you after the election.” [Laughter] Oh, they have no shame. [Laughter] “We’ll tell you after”—so I will tell you how they have to pay for it. We’ve made a study of it. Since we reduced the deficit and they didn’t, we know something about that.

Here’s how you have to pay for it. There are only two possibilities, folks, with this

promise of theirs: Either they mean it, or they're kidding. Now, if they mean it, they have to cut everything in this Government 20 percent: \$2,000 a year in Social Security, 20 percent on Medicare, 20 percent on Head Start, 20 percent on college loans. If they say, "Well, we never said we'd cut Social Security," we say, "Well, you never said you wouldn't." But let's say they don't. Then they have to cut everything 30 percent: Medicare, college loans, Head Start, break the Government down, break the support of the middle class down.

Then there's always the chance that they were kidding. That's what they did to us in the eighties. They gave us the goodies and didn't pay the bill. What does that mean? Explode the deficit, send our jobs overseas, and put this economy in the ditch. We tried it that way. We've been there. No, thank you. We'll go forward, we don't want to go back. We don't want to go back.

My fellow Americans, our children deserve better than that. They deserve vigorous, cooperative, positive leadership. They do not deserve to be caught up in this whirlwind of negative, cynical stuff. Our kids deserve better.

And let me ask you this: All the papers and the pundits say, "Well, people are so mad they're just going to vote against who's in, and they're going to vote against the Democrats because the Democrats have both Houses of the Congress, even though the Republicans through the filibuster have frustrated most of the progress. They're just going to vote no because they're mad."

You know, we ought to be ashamed of ourselves if we just vote no because we're mad. Those of us who are parents know that the first thing we try to teach our kids, as quick as they're old enough to understand it, is what we've been taught by our parents: Never make a decision when you're mad. Count to 10. How many times did my mama say, "Count to 10"? And how many times did I get to two or three and say it anyway and live to regret it? *[Laughter]* That's what will happen to America unless we wake up with the sunshine and a clear head and vote for Charlie Oberly and vote for progress in this country, and vote to keep going forward.

Listen to what these folks say. They say we've got people out there running saying, "We promise to do nothing except give you the goodies. And everything about Government is bad, but we want to go draw a Government check for 6 years." That's what they're saying. You would not hire somebody to build a house, do a job, start a business, you certainly wouldn't make a marriage with somebody that had that kind of attitude. But they want you to send a whole boatload of folks to Congress on that kind of negativism. Tell them no. Tell them no.

You know, we ought to keep going forward. We shouldn't give in to our fears. Franklin Roosevelt said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." They say, "Vote your fears." Look at the Republican Presidents you all admire: Teddy Roosevelt, "The credit belongs to the person who is in the arena who is trying." They say, "Punish the people who've tried, and give it to us. We just pointed the finger of blame; we wouldn't take any responsibility for anything. We made you mad because we gummed up the works. Now reward us because you're mad." Teddy Roosevelt must be shaking his head in shame at them tonight.

What about their greatest Republican President, Abraham Lincoln. He said, "With malice toward none," not how much malice can you stir up in the electorate to turn people off. He said, "with charity for all," not how much meanness and division can you stir up to keep some folks home and other folks mad. He said, "We should govern by the better angels of our nature," not the lowest common denominator of our darkest fear. That's what he said.

Folks, tomorrow, this election is going to be decided throughout this country by whether people wake up and act in the voting booth the way they want to act as parents, as workers, as business people, in their clubs, in their churches, in every other area of their lives. We know it is wrong to be negative, it is right to be positive; it is wrong to blame, it is right to build; it is wrong to be guided by fear, it is right to be animated by hope. We know we ought to be fighting for the future.

If the American people wake up in that frame of mind tomorrow, you will send Charlie Oberly to the Senate in Delaware; we will keep moving toward the future throughout this country. We will do it for our children because it is right. You can do it here. We need you.

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

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:07 p.m. in Rodney Square. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor James Sills of Wilmington and congressional candidate Cari DeSantis.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Cyprus

November 7, 1994

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

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I am submitting to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered progress through July 31, 1994. The current report covers the period August 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994.

During this time frame U.S. Ambassador Richard Boucher met regularly with the leaders of the two communities. He is working closely with the United Nations in an effort to bring Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash together for face-to-face meetings. I am very concerned with the lack of progress during this period and believe direct meetings between the two leaders are crucial to avoid an impasse.

James Williams was appointed on October 21 as U.S. Special Coordinator for Cyprus. He will travel shortly to Athens, Ankara, and Nicosia to consult with the parties.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

Interview With John Gambling of WOR Radio, New York City

November 8, 1994

Midterm Elections

Mr. Gambling. Mr. President, good morning.

The President. Good morning. Good morning, John.

Mr. Gambling. Important day for you, the Democrats, Republicans, and independents. It's election day, and you know, they give frequent flyer miles on Air Force One, you're going to get a free trip to anywhere. You have been busy.

The President. Well, it's been a busy week. But you know, I had to take that very important trip to the Middle East, and when I came back, a lot of our candidates asked me to get out there and campaign, including Governor Cuomo, so I tried to do all I could to make the best argument for why we're moving our country in the right direction and we don't want to go back to the policies that failed us before in the eighties. So this morning I'm just taking a last opportunity to encourage the American people to go out and vote, to make their voices heard today. The stakes in this election are quite high, as they always are in any midterm election, but especially in this one. So I hope the people within the sound of my voice will exercise their citizenship today and get out there and vote.

Mr. Gambling. Interesting contrast for you; maybe you can talk about it for just a second, between the events of the Middle East and our political system and the fact that the peace treaty signing—coming so close to our election.

The President. Well, of course, we've been working on that very hard for a couple of years. It's just a coincidence that it came as close as it did to our election. But I would hope that it would remind the American people of the great potential of this country and the greatness of this country. And I hope it would keep our people in a positive frame of mind. One of the unfortunate aspects of so much of modern campaigning is that the negative tends to outweigh the positive, and the negative television ads, the whole business about the tone and tenor of our elections. This is actually quite a great country

with a great past and an even greater future if the people who are going to be affected by it will invest in it and vote for it and vote for people who will build the country, not just place blame, vote for people who will keep moving us into the future.

That's really the lesson of the Middle East, that people want the United States involved in the peacemaking and the problemsolving of the world, whether in the Middle East or in Haiti or Northern Ireland, just to name three, because they think we have a good system and that we are a good people. And sometimes I think we forget it, and we need to remember it. This is election day. We can go out, be heard, and make a difference.

Mr. Gambling. As a man that has spent his entire life in politics, how do you define politics? Is it program or is it more the essence and the basics of hope, security, fulfillment?

The President. Well, I think the programs matter, but I also think the principles matter. I think giving voice to people's hopes to getting people together, giving energy to other people is very important. So much of what we do down here in Washington basically is an effort to empower people to take responsibility for their own lives. There aren't so many things that the Government does directly. I mean, we pay for medical care for the elderly through Medicare. We finance the Social Security system. We run a wonderful national park system. We do a number of other things directly, but a lot of what we do is to empower people: the student loan program, the Head Start program, the crime bill which enables the city of New York to hire more police officers and have programs for kids to keep them out of trouble.

All these things basically give people in their individual, family, or community lives the ability to take responsibility for themselves. So part of it's programs, but a lot of it is setting the right tone and the right direction, looking to the future all the time. This country is always at its best when it's coming together and moving to the future.

Mr. Gambling. I hear a frustration in your voice about the mood of the country, the cynicism, the negative advertising that's taking place on all sides in the past weeks.

The President. Well, I don't know that I'm frustrated. I think it has too much sway over our national life, but I think our communications in general with one another are too negative these days. We ought to be having more honest conversations with one another and doing less verbal bomb-throwing. I think the American people are frustrated by it, and that's why I hope that there will be a good turnout today for candidates like Mario Cuomo who have essentially been a positive force throughout their public careers. Because it's just so easy to give in to the kind of pounding-attack communications that tend to dominate not just the elections but often the daily communication of our public life. And it's not a very good way to run a railroad or a country, and we're better than that. And whatever happens today in these elections, I'm going to be determined over the next few years to try to lift our country out of that.

Mr. Gambling. President Bill Clinton on the "Rambling with Gambling" phone this morning. Along those lines, if, as predicted by some, the Republicans gain control of the Senate, will your agenda for the next couple of years have to change?

The President. No, but I will have to have more responsible bipartisan efforts on all parts. I will make my effort, and we'll see others make theirs, I hope.

On the other hand, if the American people turn out in equal numbers, if the Democrats turn out as well as the Republicans do at the polls today, I don't think that'll happen. It's really, in so much measure, a question of who cares enough to go and vote and whether the spirits of a lot of normally Democratic voters are dampened by the negative atmosphere of the moment.

You know, the country's economy is coming back, we're tackling our problems like crime, we're facing things long ignored, and this is a time to keep going forward.

Mr. Gambling. Where do you vote today? Do you vote in Arkansas by—

The President. Yes. I voted absentee in Arkansas. I voted for my Governor, and I called him last night and told him I did. [Laughter]

President's Security

Mr. Gambling. Well, that's good. The security question—the events of the last couple of weeks—I understand, and I'm not looking for specifics here, but just generalities—I understand your routine has changed a little bit.

The President. Well, we've asked the Secret Service to take a look at all the procedures and everything, as they periodically do. Every year, I think for quite a long while now, Secret Service has increased its ability to protect the President, and I think they are continuing to do it. I have a lot of confidence in them, and the trick is to permit them to do that without having the President completely cut off from the public at large, because this is a great, free society, and one of the problems the President always has is trying to avoid losing touch.

Mr. Gambling. Exactly. Probably the most difficult thing, you've got to keep in touch with the folks. I want to thank you very much, Mr. President, for choosing us this morning to talk about politics on election day 1994.

Thank you very much.

The President. Thanks again. I want to urge all your listeners to go on and vote today.

Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 7:12 a.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Oval Office at the White House.

**Interview With Paul W. Smith of
WWDB Radio, Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania**

November 8, 1994

Mr. Smith. What a pleasure, indeed, it is to welcome back to the program, in an exclusive Philadelphia interview, live from the White House, ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

Mr. President, good morning to you. Happy election day.

The President. Thank you, Paul W. It's nice to hear your voice again.

Midterm Elections

Mr. Smith. Well, it's nice to have you back. It indicates to me how important you

feel the voters of Pennsylvania and New Jersey are and Delaware are in this election year, because you have been all over the place. I recall several weeks ago, the Washington press corps alleging that there weren't a lot of people who wanted the President to come out and campaign for them. But as Dee Dee Myers pointed out then, and as you certainly have seemed to prove over the last several days, you couldn't possibly get to all the places where people wanted you. You and Mrs. Clinton have been all over the country campaigning.

The President. Well, we have, and the Vice President and Mrs. Gore have also been out there a lot. Leon Panetta's been out there a lot, and our Cabinet has.

But we have been confronted with quite a challenge just in the generally negative tone of the atmosphere that has concerned me some about the turnout. You know, I had to take a few days to go to the Middle East on what was a truly historic mission for our country and for the cause of peace in the world. And when I was there and when I was coming back, I was struck by how strongly and how positively the rest of the world looks at the United States, at our system, at the strength of our economic recovery, at the fact that we seem to be facing problems that we ignored for a long time. And they are often asking me questions—world leaders in other places—about how this negative feeling creeps over our people and why it has such a hold at election time.

So I wanted to do these election morning interviews more than anything else just to encourage our citizens to get out and vote, to make their voices heard, not to sit this election out simply because they feel negatively about perhaps some of the ads or some of the tone of the campaign. Because our country is facing our problems, we're moving into the future, and we need the American people to be engaged in this process. And we need all kinds of people to be engaged in the process, just ordinary mainstream Americans showing up to vote and to try to have their interests and their values advanced in this election.

Mr. Smith. Why do you think, Mr. President, this has appeared to be the sleaziest, dirtiest, worst campaign yet? And if, in fact,

it works for some candidates, one wonders just how bad it will get the next time around.

The President. Well, of course, that's the whole point I'm trying to make. I'm afraid it's been that way because this is a place where the people rule, and a lot of the polling data indicates that sometimes these negative campaigns work, that when people get down on the political system and down on politicians, they're a little more prone to believe the worst as opposed to the best.

And actually, if you look at the history of this country, the rich and strong and long history, we have often had our difficulties in the political system. And we've had a scoundrel or two in the history of America, but most of our public officials have been honest and straightforward people. And most of the time the differences have been over what direction we should take. And when we get into voting about who is the worst, as opposed to what do these people believe and what are they going to do, I think that puts us at some risk of making bad decisions.

And that's what I've been trying to do traveling around the country since I've come back from the Middle East, is to say to the American people, you know, whatever you do, let's look at this in a forward-looking way. How are we going to go forward? How are we going to work together and move this country forward? We don't want to go back, and we don't want to be divided, and we don't want to think less of ourselves as a result of this election, because we have a very great country. And others who maybe sometimes see us more clearly than we even see ourselves know that for all of our problems, we're facing them, we're moving forward, and we have enormous potential. Our best days are still ahead of us. And every election is an obligation of those of us who are citizens to kind of keep this ball moving forward.

Mr. Smith. Mr. Clinton—Mr. President, you have extended, kind of in advance, an olive branch saying that you will work with everyone and that you can, your administration can work with everyone. How do you feel this election morning in terms of the chances that there will be more Republicans? Republicans have not held majorities in both Houses of Congress simultaneously since 1954. There is a very good chance you're

going to have many more Republicans there on the Hill than we've had in a number of years. Do you sense this morning that that will be the case, or would you rather wait until the polls close?

The President. I think it depends entirely on the turnout, really. I think they have some things going for them: the fact that in every election in the 20th century but one the party opposite the President has made gains in at least one House at midterm, and I think all elections but three they made gains in both Houses; the fact that we've had for most of the last 30 years a divided Government—some people are used to that—that is, the President in one party, the Congress of another.

I think there are some things working against that: the fact that we have been able to accomplish quite a bit, that in the atmosphere in which we were operating in, almost no one knew until about 3 weeks ago—we finally being able to get a little bit of information out about how much the President and the Congress accomplished working together. And I think we have to just keep working on that and keep going forward.

Mr. Smith. Mr. President, thank you for being with us. We do appreciate it again—

The President. Thank you.

Mr. Smith.—and it's quite an honor to have the President of the United States twice in one week.

The President. Well, it's great to hear your voice. And of course, you know I think the world of Senator Wofford; I hope he'll be reelected today. And I hope that your listeners in these other States will go out and vote, and I hope their voices will be heard. And I hope they will do it in a good spirit, believing in our country, believing in our future. This is not the time for negativism. This is a time to be upbeat but aggressive in tackling our problems and seizing our opportunities.

And I thank you for talking to me today.

Mr. Smith. By the way, President Clinton, thank you for the kind words about President Reagan's revelation over the weekend. It was most appreciated around the country, I think.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 7:21 a.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Oval Office at the White House.

Interview With Joe Templeton of ABC Radio

November 8, 1994

Midterm Elections

Mr. Templeton. Good morning, Mr. President. After 8 days on the campaign trail, how do you see this midterm election shaping up?

The President. Well, Joe, I don't know. You know, I must say, there are a lot of these races that are very, very tight. And the thing I want to say to the American people today is that it's important for us not to go to the polls in a negative frame of mind. There's been a little too much negativism, some places a lot too much, in this election.

This is a very great country. I just got back from the Middle East peace signing. I am, again, captured by the idea that others know what a great country we have, that we have the capacity to seize our opportunities and to face our problems. We're trying to do that here; we just need to keep going forward. And we need to get out there, all of us, and vote today but to do it with a belief in our country, a belief in our future, a belief in our possibilities to make life better.

Mr. Templeton. Now, if Republicans win the House and Senate, and many pollsters are saying that's a very good possibility, what does this do to your prestige in the rest of the term?

The President. Well, I don't know. That'll be up to the American people to decide. But for most of the last 40 years, we've had divided Government. We've had the Congress in one hand and the Presidency in the other. The American people have kind of gotten used to that. So I don't know that it will make a great deal of difference in that sense.

I hope that the Democrats who have taken courageous decisions to bring the deficit down and to get the economy going again and to try to improve education and make the streets safer, who have taken the tough decisions, will be rewarded for their courage and not punished for it. Because you know, we always say we want people to be brave,

to ignore the polls of the moment, and to take the tough decisions that will get us into the future. I think it's important when those folks come up for election that we reward them for that and not punish them for it because of the barrage of negativism that seems to characterize so many of our campaigns.

So again, I would just urge all the people who are listening to us to vote but also to do it in a positive frame of mind. Our country is moving forward economically, we are addressing the crime problem, we're addressing some of these terrible social problems that we've ignored for too long, and we're taking up issues that have to be taken up. They don't have simple and easy answers, and I think it's important that we don't give in to simplistic and essentially negative messages about them. We are a great country; we can do what we have to do, and we ought to try to do it together across party lines.

Mr. Templeton. Now, you have been out there stumping for the Democrats for 8 days or so. Do you feel you've really made any headway?

The President. Well, you know, you never know. When I was a Governor, I was never sure that the President did any help or damage to anybody in my home State. And I never thought, really, people would listen to me in terms of telling them for whom to vote.

What I tried to do was to clarify the issues. I tried to put the record of our administration that the candidates I campaigned for supported; I tried to clarify the stakes and say from my point of view what our position toward the future was, what their position was. I did the best I could to do that.

I think people are capable of making up their minds on their own about candidates. Every race is different; every State is different. But I hope I was able, at least, to focus the attention of the public in a more positive way on the choices before us.

Mr. Templeton. Well, now they're talking about 70 million voters or so turning out today. I wonder if you voted?

The President. Oh, yes, I did. I voted early. I voted absentee back home in Arkansas.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President, for being with us this morning.

NOTE: The interview began at 7:29 a.m. The President spoke by telephone from the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks at a Reception Honoring White House Volunteers

November 8, 1994

Thank you so very much. Thank you. It is great to be with all of you. It's especially great to be with you on election day. I hope all of you have had a chance to go to the polls, and if you haven't, I hope you'll go before they close tonight. This is a fitting time for the event honoring the White House volunteers because as people all around our country go out and exercise their right to vote, they're exercising their full right and their full responsibility as an American, just as all of you do through your service in the White House.

At these midterm elections, it is critical that people understand that there are clear choices between going forward and going back, between a Government that works for ordinary families and one that works for organized interests, between a Government that does something about our great national problems like crime and one that just tries to talk them to death.

It is very important in this election season that the American people not vote in anger or cynicism. You know, these last 8 days I've had the opportunity to go out and make our case to the American people have been bracketed by two events that ought to deny that: first, the opportunity I had to represent you in the Middle East, seeing our young men and women in uniform in the Gulf, going to the signing of the peace treaty. I looked into the eyes of millions of people. I saw how they viewed our country. They know this is a great country. They know we have a strong defense, a strong economy, and we are now also number one in making peace around the world. They think this is a good country, and so should we.

And now, at the end of this season, I look at you and I think of the hours you have worked, how you have made even more sacrifices this year than last. I do not know how the American people could say anybody, just because we've got some difficult problems

and some unresolved challenges, which we have always had and we always will have, that there is something inherently wrong with America's Government. If they could see you, they would know that we are a good people with a good Government, working hard to help the American people realize their dreams and to respond to their hopes and their needs.

I just want to say, for the benefit of all of you and, of course, our friends who are covering this event, I wish I could thank all of you by name, but I don't want to keep you here all day and into the night. [*Laughter*] I do want to say that I think I should represent—name a few representative people we are fortunate to call White House volunteers.

Jeffrey Cohelan, a former Member of the House of Representatives, and his wife, Evelyn, are loyal volunteers in Hillary's correspondence office. We thank you for continuing to serve the United States.

Jenny Lou Dodson lives in Charlotte, North Carolina. She works for an airline, and she flies to Washington every Wednesday to work in the White House Personnel Office. Let's give her a hand.

Al Carpenter worked at the White House from 1947 to 1950. Now he's volunteering his time to take calls on the comment line. He used to work on the Presidential yacht; for the voters who haven't voted, we don't have one anymore. [*Laughter*] He traveled to Key West and the Caribbean with President Truman. Now he travels to the White House to talk to people over the phone all over the United States.

Eddymarie McCoy worked on Capitol Hill and has been part of several campaigns, like the one that's culminating today. Now she's sharing her experience with the Office of Legislative Affairs.

Some of you have been through several administrations. Evelyn and Ward Russell first volunteered at the White House in 1953. We also have dedicated volunteers from many universities and local colleges like Georgetown, American, George Washington, Howard, and George Mason. We thank you all. We have members of the Shiloh Baptist Church here. We have students from Stone Ridge School of the Sacred Heart. And last

but not least, we have the hardworking, ever-faithful residents of the U.S. Soldiers and Servicemen's Home. We thank all of you for being here.

If it weren't for you, we literally couldn't do the job we were sent here to do. But with your help, we can not only continue to make progress for our country, continue to keep moving forward with confidence into the future but we can do it in a way that responds to the hopes and the dreams and the real problems of the thousands and thousands and thousands of Americans who write this White House, who call us and ask for help, who send a gesture of their concern, a gesture of their friendship, a gesture of their hope to this White House. All of them deserve to be recognized. All of them deserve to be heard. All of them deserve to be treated with courtesy, with respect, and with dignity.

You have permitted the United States, in this administration to do that. We could not do it without you. And I only hope America knows that the White House, like so much of America, runs not on requirements but on the volunteer spirit that is represented in this great audience today.

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

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:25 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Letter Accepting the Resignation of David R. Gergen as Special Adviser to the President and Secretary of State

November 8, 1994

Dear David:

As you indicated, when I asked you to concentrate on foreign-policy last June, we agreed on a six-month assignment. Foreknowledge, however, does not lessen the regret with which I accept your resignation as Special Adviser to the President and Secretary of State, effective December 31, 1994.

You have made a remarkable contribution to our Administration over the last eighteen months. Your wise counsel helped us dramatically improve public understanding of our economic plan, and its resulting passage restored fiscal responsibility to our govern-

ment while helping to create an economic climate that has produced millions of new jobs.

Your life's example sent a powerful signal about the value of bipartisanship, and commitment to public service over partisan gain. That example, and your unflagging determination to build coalitions across the partisan divide, helped us to achieve many non-partisan victories, including passage of NAFTA, the Brady Bill, National Service, and Goals 2000.

And finally, your insightful analysis and thoughtful recommendations about America's relationships with the rest of the world have helped us to ensure that democracy flourishes and peace extends around the globe—in the former republics of the Soviet Union, in the Middle East, in Haiti, and elsewhere.

When you joined our Administration last year, you reaffirmed your allegiance to the noblest aims of public service in America: to work long and hard for the people that hired us, in order to ensure that each of them has a chance to live the American Dream, and to guarantee that the greatest nation in history stands forever tall.

That is exactly what you have done. Thank you for your dedication, for your counsel, and for your friendship. I hope that I have reserved the right to call on each in the years to come.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: The Office of the Press Secretary also made available the letter of resignation from David R. Gergen.

The President's News Conference

November 9, 1994

The President. Good afternoon.

Ladies and gentlemen, last night and again this morning I spoke with both Republicans and Democrats to congratulate those who won and console those who lost their elections. I also called the leaders of the next Congress, Senator Dole and Congressman Gingrich, to tell them after this hard-fought campaign that we are ready to work together

to serve all the American people in a non-partisan manner.

The American people sent us here to rebuild the American dream, to change the way Washington does business, to make our country work for ordinary citizens again. We've made a good start by cutting the deficit, by reducing the size of the Federal Government, by reinventing much of our Government to do more with less. We have increased our investment in education and expanded trade, and our economy has created more than 5 million jobs. We've also made a serious start in the fight against the terrible plague of crime and violence in this country. I remain committed to completing the work we have done.

Still, in the course of this work, there has been too much politics-as-usual in Washington, too much partisan conflict, too little reform of Congress and the political process. And though we have made progress, not enough people have felt more prosperous and more secure or believe we were meeting their desires for fundamental change in the role of Government in their lives.

With the Democrats in control of both the White House and the Congress, we were held accountable yesterday. And I accept my share of the responsibility in the result of the elections.

When the Republican Party assumes leadership in the House and in the Senate, they will also have a larger responsibility for acting in the best interest of the American people. I reach out to them today, and I ask them to join me in the center of the public debate where the best ideas for the next generation of American progress must come.

Democrats and Republicans have often joined together when it was clearly in the national interest. For example, they have often chosen to put international affairs above politics. I urge them to do so again by passing the GATT agreement this year. Our prosperity depends upon it, and there can be no compromise when the national interest and the livelihood of American households are at stake.

Last night the voters not only voted for sweeping changes, they demanded that a more equally divided Congress work more closely together with the President for the

interest of all the American people. So I hope that we can do that on GATT and that by doing so, we will pave the way for further cooperation on welfare reform and on health care reform, on a continued investment in our people's educational opportunities and the continued strength of our economy.

We must also take more steps to restore the people's faith in our political institutions and agree that, further, in the best tradition of our own foreign policy, that politics will continue to stop at the water's edge.

To those who believe we must keep moving forward, I want to say again, I will do everything in my power to reach out to the leaders and the Members of this new Congress. It must be possible to make it a more effective, more functioning institution. It must be possible for us to give our people a Government that is smaller, that is more effective, that reflects both our interests and our values.

But to those who would use this election to turn us back, let me say this: I will do all in my power to keep anyone from jeopardizing this economic recovery by taking us back to the policies that failed us before. I will still work for those things that make America strong: strong families, better education, safer streets, more high-paying jobs, a more prosperous and peaceful world. There is too much at stake for our children and our future to do anything else.

Well, a lot has changed since yesterday. But what hasn't changed is the reason I was sent here and the reason the Members of the Congress will be sent here, to restore the American dream and to make this country work, this Government work, this city work for the interest of ordinary Americans again. That is what the American people expect of us.

Last night they said they were not satisfied with the progress we had made. They said the Democrats had been in control of the White House and the Congress. They said they were going to make a change, and they did make a change. But they still want the same goal. I pledge today to work with all the Members of the Congress, and especially the new Republican leadership, to achieve that goal. If they will work with me, and they have pledged to do so today, then we can

make great progress for this country. We should be optimistic, and we should work to make that optimism real.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Midterm Elections

Q. Yesterday not a single Republican incumbent lost in any race for Governor, House, or Senate while the Democratic Party, your party, suffered its worst losses for decades. Do you view this as a repudiation of you, or is there another common denominator in this election that we're missing?

The President. Well, I think that I have some responsibility for it. I'm the President. I am the leader of the efforts that we have made in the last 2 years. And to whatever extent that we didn't do what the people wanted us to do or they were not aware of what we had done, I must certainly bear my share of responsibility, and I accept that.

You know, a lot of us haven't had a lot of sleep, and we're going to need a few days to digest all these results. There will be a lot of you doing exit surveys, asking the American people what they meant and said. But what I think they said is, they still don't like what they see when they watch us working here. They still haven't felt the positive results of things that have been done here that they agree with when they hear about them, but they don't feel them. They're still not sure that we understand what they expect the role of Government to be.

I think they want a smaller Government that gives them better value for their dollar, that reflects both their interest and their values, that is not a burden to them but that empowers them. That's what I have tried to do, but I don't think they believe we're there yet, by a long shot. They want us to do more.

I went back today and read my announcement speech for President, and I said in that speech that the job of Government was to create opportunity and then to expect citizens to assume the responsibility to make the most of that opportunity. I think that's about where the American people are. They don't think we've done that yet.

And the only thing I think they knew to do yesterday was to try to make a change in the people who were in control and who had been. I regret that some of the people

who lost are people who made this a lot better country and who will always, when the history books are written, get the credit they deserve, in hindsight, for helping to make the American people more secure.

I don't believe the American people were saying, "We're sorry the deficit has been reduced; we're sorry the size of Government has been reduced; and we're sorry you've taken a tough stand on crime; we're sorry you're expanding trade." I don't believe that. I don't think they were disagreeing with a lot of the specifics. I do think they still just don't like it when they watch what we do up here, and they haven't felt the positive impact of what has been done. And since I'm the President, I have to take some responsibility for that.

Q. Would you have survived if you had been on the ballot yesterday?

The President. Well, some Democrats did. I like to think I would have because I believe that I would have been a ferocious defender of what we have done, and I hope that I could have characterized what the choices were. But I don't know that, and neither does anybody else.

I think it's important to say that yesterday's election, like every election, was fundamentally about the American people. And they looked at us, and they said, "We want some more changes, and we're going to try this and see if this works." There is a lot of evidence—I've read it in a lot of your reporting—that the American people believe, a majority of them, and have believed for decades now that divided Government may work better than united Government. As you know, I disagree with that—why I did my best to make it work the other way—but they didn't agree, and they're in charge. We all work for them, every one of us. And their will, their voice was heard. We got the message. And now we have to think about it, analyze it, rest up, and move on.

But this country is facing its problems. And what I think they told us was, "Look, 2 years ago we made one change; now we made another change. We want you to keep on moving this country forward, and we want you to accelerate the pace of change," in the areas that I mentioned.

I do not believe they voted for reversals of economic policy or the positions on crime. I don't think they voted for a reversal of the Brady bill or the military assault weapons ban. I don't believe that. But I do think they sent us a message, and I tried to hear it. And we're going to work together and do the best we can.

Republican Agenda

Q. What do you think this does for your expected bid for reelection, and how will you deal with the contract for America if there are proposed cuts in Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits, the whole 9 yards?

The President. Well, first of all, we've got plenty of time to worry about the next election. The American people are sick of the one they just had, and they want to get away from politics for a while. I think we should think about the people, their interests. I think we should say, "What message were they sending us, and what are we going to do about it, and how can we pull this country together?" How can the Democrats and the Republicans in the Congress and the White House and the Republican leadership work together in a nonpartisan way to push this country forward?

Now, on the contract, as I said specifically in Cleveland and elsewhere, there are some things in that contract that I like. I hope the Congress will give me the line-item veto and do it quickly. If they do, we'll bring this deficit down even more quickly. I hope that we will have aggressive efforts to work together on welfare reform. I hope we will be able to still reduce several areas of Federal spending and continue this whole reinventing Government effort to do more with less.

The issue in the contract is what it has always been. I do not believe that we can afford to go back to the days of exploding deficits, which I believe would lead to a weaker economy, to lost jobs, and to a more difficult future for ourselves and for our children. So the question there is, how will all of this be paid for?

I do not believe, now many Republicans in the campaign said they do not believe that we should cut Social Security or Medicare. So if we can't cut Social Security or Medicare, if we must maintain the world's strong-

est defense, which I think the Republican leadership and I are strongly in agreement on, then what else are we going to do? And that will be a challenge. But you know, give them a chance. They've got to enjoy their victory today. Give them a day or so to enjoy their victory, and don't push them too far in the future. They will come to grips with that, I'm sure.

Q. Do you really think you are going to be able to compromise with them on that?

The President. Well, I'm not going to compromise on my convictions, what makes America strong. We are stronger today, but we have more strength to get. We have to have—I'll say again what I think makes our country strong: strong families, better education, safer streets, more high-paying jobs, a Government that reflects their values and the interest of the American people, and work to make a world that's more prosperous and more peaceful. Those are the principles on which I do not intend to compromise.

But I want to work with them. Look, let me just give you one example. I have always wanted to make The Tax Code more fair. The Tax Code is more fair today than it was when I took office. We did cut income tax rates for families with incomes of up to \$27,000. They want to go further than that. I would like to go further than that. The question is, how far can we go; can we focus on working families with children; how are we going to pay for it? We have to answer now the details. And in large measure, that is a question that can only be answered by some sort of partnership and by getting their views. And again, I say: Let's give them a day or two to enjoy their victory, and then they'll have an opportunity to work forward.

Tax Cut

Q. Mr. President, following up on that, would you support a tax cut such as they propose in their contract with America, of \$500 for every family under \$200,000 income, if you don't think it's paid for? Or, would you veto it? Would you get into that kind of confrontational mode with them on something specific?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say they have to have a chance to look at the budget now. When you're in opposition,

you can be an advocate entirely, and you can put out ideas you think are good.

I hope we can find some way to continue to improve the fairness of the Tax Code and to help middle class working Americans. When I was trying to reduce the deficit in 1993 and make the Tax Code fairer, we had to stop at \$27,000 in income for families with children, working families with children, in our tax relief. I think perhaps we can go further. But I don't want to get into a lot of details today. I'd just say that if we do this, we need to pay for it. We don't need to explode the deficit again. We do not need to weaken the economic recovery again. We need to be responsible with our budget and with our future. I still believe that the American people want us to do that.

Yes, Bill [Bill Plante, CBS News].

Welfare and Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, you talked a moment ago about the role of Government. And Government's intervention seems to be what a lot of the voters ruled out, voted against. Are you willing to scale back your expectations in areas like health care and welfare reform, or are you going to go in with plans that look like the ones you had this past year and wait for them to compromise, or will you go to them with something less than you had asked before?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say, if you look at the welfare reform issue—let's take that first. I sent them a bill last March that is quite similar to one that several Republicans themselves have proposed. I don't think anybody would characterize it as a Government intervention bill. It's a bill designed to move people from welfare to work after a certain set time, to have tougher child support enforcement, to provide education and training and support for people who go into the workplace so they can know their children are all right. I think there is over 80 percent support in this country among Americans of both parties, among people of all races and backgrounds for doing something like this. So I think we will get an agreement.

On the health care issue, I will concede that by the time the folks who were characterizing our program had finished with it, and

one of your publications said that they thought about \$300 million had been spent in lobbying against the health care reform, it looked like a Government program designed to solve the problem by restricting the choices of the American people and injecting the Government more into health care. That is not what I want to do. And I will concede this: I have got to find a way to reassure the American people that if they like what they've got, they can keep it.

But let me say, I remain committed to solving the health care problem. Last year another million Americans, almost all of them in working families, lost their health insurance. We have more and more people—I talk to them all the time when I go out in the country—small business people and others who have health insurance that is so limited because their copays and deductibles are so high that all they've really got insurance against is losing their home if they get sick. So I remain committed to finding a way to keep Americans from losing their health insurance if they change jobs or if someone in their family gets sick; to controlling the cost increases in health care by market mechanisms; to providing ways for people in small businesses and self-employed people to buy health insurance at the same rates that those of us in Government or big employers, working for big employers, can do it.

This is still a problem. And let me say, as the Republicans leaders know—they've been here working on this budget—we reduced both defense and domestic spending this year for the first time in 25 years. The only thing that went up this year was the cost of Medicare and Medicaid. So this problem will not go away, and I expect to work with the Congress to address it.

Mike [Michael Duffy, Time].

Entitlement Programs

Q. You seem to have backed yourself into a corner on the budget. You say that Medicaid and Medicare cuts will go to fund health reform. Will your next budget outline what you will do to keep the budget deficit going down, particularly if you won't cut Social Security?

The President. Well, I will work with the Republican leadership on that. I will be interested to see what their ideas are. I believe furthermore—as you know, the Kerrey commission has been looking at the whole entitlement question and the long-term implications for our country. I have said, on the Medicare savings, that I thought Medicare savings should be used to help deal with the health care problem because Medicare is paid for entirely by a payroll tax, the purpose of which is to deal with health care. So that's what I have said.

Now, Social Security I think should be dealt with on its own terms. As you know, several years into the future, it is projected that we will once again have a Social Security problem. Ten years ago, a bipartisan commission met and worked out the problems and dealt with that in ways that have, in essence, solved the Social Security problem well into the next century. But we must always be vigilant about that.

The point I want to make about Social Security, though, is that as a percentage of our national income, Social Security is about the same it was 20 years ago, 22 years ago. The Social Security tax has, in fact, produced a surplus for some years now. So it doesn't seem to me to be the right thing to do to try to restrict benefits to recipients overall when the Social Security tax has more than paid its own way all these years.

Now, as you know, in the last session of Congress, we did ask the most well-off—about 12 or 13 percent—of Social Security recipients to pay taxes on a higher percentage of their income, more like private retirees. But I do not believe we should be in the business of cutting Social Security to pay for a tax cut in some other area. I think that would be an error.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Midterm Elections

Q. Mr. President, did you mean to say here, sir, that the message the voters sent yesterday was basically an extension of the demand for change they made when you were elected in '92, and that you've been going in the right direction but perhaps need to go farther and faster with the sense of the same agenda?

The President. Well, I think they were saying two things to me—or maybe three. They were saying—maybe 300. [Laughter]

I think they were saying, "Look, we just don't like what we see when we watch Washington, and you haven't done much about that." You know, we haven't changed the lobbying reform laws. Congress is still not required to live under the same laws that it imposes on private employers. There's still no line-item veto. There's still not campaign finance reform. "We don't like it when we look at it. It's too partisan, too interest group oriented; things don't get done, too many people up there playing politics. Democrats are in charge; we're holding you accountable. And we hope you hear this, Mr. President." I think they said that.

The second thing I think they said is, "Look, you may have done all these things, although we haven't heard much of it, and we're not sure we believe it. But even if the deficit is down, the Government is smaller, more is being invested in education, the crime bill passed, and the economy is growing, we still feel insecure. We don't feel that our incomes are going up, that our jobs are more stable, that our neighborhoods are safer, that the fabric of American life is growing more civilized and more law-abiding."

Then I think the third thing they were saying—and this maybe gets to the point of your question—is, "There are things we expect Government to do, but we don't think Government can solve all the problems. And we don't want the Democrats telling us from Washington that they know what is right about everything. We want the Government to be smaller. We want it to be more efficient. We want it to create opportunity, to empower us. And we want it to demand responsibility of people who aren't behaving responsibly. In short, we want it to reflect our interests and our values." And I think what they were saying is that the Republicans did a good job of defining us as the party of Government, and that's not a good place to be. I think that was a clear message that they were sending in the election.

Q. Those are all things, sir, that you have said. Are you essentially saying that the electorate yesterday was agreeing with you?

The President. I think they were agreeing with me, but they don't think we produced them. In other words—let me say it in another way. I'm saying that I agree with much of what the electorate said yesterday. Now, there were segments of that majority the Republicans put together obviously that I do not agree with and on matters of conviction I can't say I agreed with. I don't agree that we should repeal either the assault weapons ban or the Brady bill. The NRA would like to do that. I don't think we should. I don't agree that the answer to the abortion problem is to criminalize abortion again. That was a big part of that vote. So I'm still pro-choice, not because I'm pro-abortion; I'm not. But I still believe that it's a mistake to criminalize that. So I don't agree with all that.

But I think that the swing voters, the people that first of all voted for Bill Clinton and Ross Perot in '92 against the incumbent President and then voted for the Republicans for Congress against the incumbent Democrats—and in the challenging races and out in the country—were making a statement about what they think about Government. They still believe that Government is more often the problem than the solution. They don't want any party to be the party of Government. They don't want the presumption to be that people in Washington know what's best. They do want the Government to protect their interest, promote their values, I think, and to empower them. And then they want people held accountable.

So I'm saying that, to that extent, that message—I got it. I accept responsibility for not delivering. To whatever extent it's my fault that we haven't delivered back to the American people what they want on that, I have to accept that responsibility.

But you know, I've worked hard, the Vice President has worked hard on this whole business of downsizing the Government, deregulating several areas of our national life. We have not done as much as we are going to have to do to satisfy the voters, but we also have to recognize that this Government has a responsibility to protect and promote certain fundamental interests that I think the people really also want protected and promoted.

But they sent us a clear message. I got it, and I'm going to try to redouble my efforts to get there. I think that the Republican congressional leadership will at least have the chance to work with us. I'm going to do my dead-level best to do that, and to be less partisan. Most Americans are not strongly partisan, and they don't want us to be.

Downsizing Government

Q. Mr. President, if one of the signal messages of yesterday is that Americans want smaller Government, how much smaller do they want it, and what can you do to shrink it?

The President. Well, we're shrinking it already. One thing we can do—

Q. What can you do that you haven't done, that you haven't done already, to shrink it?

The President. Well, I think it's important, though—let me put the record out. All we have to do is to stay with the present 6-year plan, and we will reduce the size of Government by 272,000. We have already passed major laws to deregulate banking and interstate trucking. We have already given 20 States total freedom from Federal regulations to pursue their welfare reform experiments and about 9 States freedom to pursue their health care experiments. And the education bill cuts a lot of Federal strings that are tied to the States to improve the performance of children in the schools.

So what I think we have to do is to look at every single Government department, every single Government program, and especially the nature of Government regulation and ask ourselves: Is there a better way to do this? Is this something where the American people will think we're more of a burden than a help? Is there a way to give more flexibility to people at the State and local level and in private life to achieve the same goal?

We're going to have to continue, in other words, to review everything that this Government does. And I think that there are more things that can be done. I'm going to propose them. I encourage the Republicans in Congress to propose them and the Democrats in Congress to propose them. I think that this is—we're in the middle of a revolution here in the way organizations work in America, in the world, and the Government is still

behind the eight ball. And we're going to have to keep pushing until people believe that they have a Government that works for them, that they have confidence in, and that they think gives them good value for their dollar, and that doesn't overreach where they think it shouldn't overreach.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

Whitewater

Q. Mr. President, you know, the Republicans are taking over the Senate now and the House, so they'll be in charge of all of the committees. Are you especially concerned that Senator Alphonse D'Amato, if he becomes chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, and Representative Jim Leach, if he becomes chairman of the House Banking Committee, will now intensify their Whitewater investigations?

The President. No, I have said I would cooperate with the Congress, and I will continue to cooperate with the Congress, as I have. I think that they will have, obviously, other responsibilities as well now, and I think that they will just fulfill those responsibilities as they see fit. I'll do my best to fulfill my responsibilities.

One more.

Midterm Elections

Q. Mr. President, the recurring refrain in the preelection interviews was that this was the nastiest campaign in modern times. Do you agree with that? If you do agree, what do you think caused that, and what do you think can be done about it?

The President. Well, I think it is—the causes are many and complex, partly because of the real feelings people have about where they are in their own lives and what they saw here in Washington and how it was presented to them for a good long period of time, partly because of the enormous expenditure of funds for negative ads of all kinds. And I think campaign finance reform would help some. But let me say that there were pockets in this country, there were elections in this country where people won by being more positive and less negative, but they could only do it if the voters felt that they were part of a process.

If you ask me for one of the mistakes that I think that I have made since I've been here, I have spent so much time trying to pass bills through Congress that I haven't spent as much time as I was able to spend when I was running for President making sure that the people understood, were in on, and felt a part of the process by which we make decisions. And I believe that, again I will say, as much as the specific decisions that were made, it was the alienation people feel from the Government and the process.

Let me just give you another example. If you look at North Dakota, where Senator Conrad and Congressman Pomeroy were elected in a State where I lost by a large margin in 1992, and yet they supported these programs, these initiatives, and the economic plan, I asked myself: Did that happen in part because it's a small enough State where people can talk together, they can work together, they are less easily moved by the negative ads? What can I do to use modern technology better, to work with the Republicans in Congress and the Democrats to involve the American people in this as we go along? What responsibility is there? In other words, the President can work 60, 70 hours a week and lose his voice several times and pass a bunch of bills, and if people don't feel that they're a part of it, then so what if I'm signing another piece of paper up here.

If you look at—Governor Romer in Colorado has some very interesting thoughts about this and has worked very hard on this. But I think this is something that I'm going to have to really ask others about and get some advice about, because one of the things I prided the 1992 campaign on—and I give credit to the other candidates as well—but for all of the attacks and the criticisms in '92, the fact that there were some negative ads back and forth, the truth is we had a big turnout based largely on hope. We had three debates, one of which people were involved in, ordinary citizens. We had countless town meetings, two of the candidates did. We had other things that constantly made the American people feel that they had some say up here. And I think that—to go back to Brit's question—I think that part of it is they think that we get up here and we just get up every day and, even if we're working hard,

we just are going this way, when they may want to go this way. And it just doesn't mean anything to them. They worry then about having a Government that is more of a burden than a support. And it's something we have to find a way to crack. It's not a simple issue.

I'll take one more. Go ahead.

Democratic Party's Future

Q. Do you feel at all that this election has pushed you politically to the right? And would you have any message for the Democrats in Congress, like Senator Shelby, who are considering or might be considering switching to the Republican Party?

The President. I think he did switch.

Q. Yes, I know, but if there are Democrats in the House who are considering switching.

The President. Oh, I see what you mean. Well, first of all, let me say that if we can have a bipartisan coalition, then we can be both nonpolitical and more centrist. I ran for President saying that we should not be governed—we should not be governed by either Republicans or Democrats who are pushed too far in either direction, that most of the good ideas are ideas that take us into the future, not push us left or right.

There were times when our inability to have cooperation in the Congress dictated a solution that came primarily out of the Democrats. When we got cooperation, when we were able to work together—to give you two examples—on NAFTA and on the crime bill I ultimately signed, we had a bill I think that resonated pretty well with the American people. So I feel good about that. I want to have a bipartisan cooperation.

A lot of the things they have advocated I have advocated, like the line-item veto, the lobby reform, the congressional reform, further reductions in unnecessary spending and regulation. I do not believe that we should give up on our efforts to make the economy stronger, the streets safer, our people better educated, our families more supported in the work of parenting and work. But I think there's a lot we can work together on that will be consistent with my convictions, consistent with what I have always believed, consistent with what I've always worked for. And when we can do that, we ought to do that.

I always felt, in the last 2 years, that we could work together, consistent with our convictions, more than we were working together because of politics. When we can't work together because our convictions are different, I will stand on my convictions.

Yes, go ahead.

Q. Even before you ran for President, you had an idea of where the Democratic Party had to go to reclaim the center and become a majority again. Now that your party is a minority in Congress and in the statehouses, what do Democrats have to do to avoid becoming a permanent minority party?

The President. I think we have to, first of all, as I said, take a little nap, take a little sleep, take a little rest, let the Republicans enjoy their victories, and analyze why they won, and ask ourselves to what extent do we also believe some of the things the voters believe.

You know, sometimes in life—let me just say this—sometimes in life, you have to be in the minority because you just cannot, in good conscience, go along with what's popular. Sometimes that happens. I really regret the loss of some of these fine young progressive Members of Congress who clearly are in the mainstream of their views to the people back home, because they could not defend themselves against either the efforts of certain groups on votes like the crime bill or because they couldn't find a way to convince the majority of their constituents that when they voted for that economic plan it would bring the deficit down, it was a sacrifice worth making, it will make the country stronger. I regret that.

But those people did what was right for their country and for the future. And if they hadn't done it, we wouldn't be where we are today economically, and we would be in a terrible fix with regard to the deficit. And we wouldn't have the middle class college loan program. We wouldn't have a lot of things. So I regret that.

But I think we have to analyze the results of the elections, hear what the voters were saying, and go back to them and say: We believe that the Government is not inherently bad. We agree that the Government needs to be smaller and more efficient. We believe it needs to reflect our values as well as our

interests. And we believe that we have more to offer in that regard, and here is what it is and here is what the distinctions are.

That, I think, was the work that we have been trying to do for 10 years. I believe that a lot of these things that we saw yesterday were the culmination of many years of trends, as well as a dissatisfaction with the last 2 years. And I think that we have an opportunity now to go back and capture the imagination of the American people with good ideas consistent with Democratic values.

I've got to go. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 78th news conference began at 3:33 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

**Remarks at the Edmund A. Walsh
School of Foreign Service at
Georgetown University**
November 10, 1994

Thank you very much, Father O'Donovan, for your introduction and for our wonderful trip to the Middle East. Thank you, Dean Krogh, for your comments and for your outstanding leadership. To the Members of Congress, the Cabinet, and the administration who are here, members of the faculty, the diplomatic corps, the students, and a special word of hello and thanks to many of my former classmates who are here. It's nice for us to be here with no obligation to take notes. [Laughter]

I want to thank Robert Wagner for endowing this series of lectures, and also Ron Lignelli and the Georgetown Phantoms for keeping you all entertained. It is wonderful to be back in this magnificent hall. And I am particularly honored to be here to give this first, inaugural lecture.

In the fall of 1964, with about 200 other freshmen in the School of Foreign Service, I was enrolled in Carroll Quigley's Western civilization course. All of us—that was 30 years ago; it's kind of spooky now to think about it. [Laughter] All of us who were there then—and there were a bunch of us here who were there then—we can remember things from those lectures. At the end of the series he did a lecture on Plato, and he always

had this appropriately beat-up copy of the "Republic" which he ripped into at the end of the lecture and threw across the room and said, "Plato was a fascist." [Laughter]

Even then I was a decent politician, and I remember the best grade I made on any of his tests was the question about Plato and the myth of the cave, and I only wrote one page in the little test book and three other lines. And he said, "If you can explain it in this short a duration, you obviously understand it"—[laughter.]—"98." Hooray! I might add, it was the only 98 I received in the entire year. [Laughter]

Carroll Quigley's ideas were expressed well, both in the very terse prose of his book on civilizations and the high drama of his lectures. He left a lasting impression, I think, on every one of us who ever entered his class. And as you have already heard Father O'Donovan say, he drummed into us that Western civilization was the greatest of all, and America was the best expression of Western civilization because of its commitment to future preference, the belief that the future could be better than the present and that we have an obligation to make it so. It is interesting that we would come here today at a time when, frankly, a lot of our fellow Americans, in the face of ample evidence to support Carroll Quigley's dictum, are not sure they believe it anymore.

Three years ago, here in this hall as a candidate for President, I had an opportunity on three different occasions to speak about those lessons of Professor Quigley's and how I thought they applied to the present moment. And I expressed the belief then that, working together, we could shape the future and meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world at home and abroad at the end of the cold war, but that we could only do it by leaving behind the old political debates and the divisions and forging a new dynamic center of American politics, not a compromise but a move forward based on the ideas of opportunity, responsibility, and community.

I argued 3 years ago that the main job of Government is not to solve all our problems. In this day and age, it simply can't do that. But it's also not to sit on the sidelines and shout and preach at people because that's

not enough. Instead, I believed then and I believe today that the primary obligation of Government is to empower citizens to make the most of their own lives and then to insist on responsible behavior in turn.

Finally, I urged that we should see ourselves not as isolated individuals but as members of interdependent communities, locally, nationally, and of course, globally, communities in which we have to work together if we're going to make the most of our opportunities and deal with our problems.

After I was elected President, I was well aware going into the office that it would be very difficult to translate these ideas into specific policies, then to get them enacted into law, and to keep the country with me during a process which would take time and patience, which would inevitably be contentious, and which would require a delicate balance between a determination to stand on principle and a willingness to have principled compromise.

Why is this? First of all, the problems we face are absolutely immense. The social problems of crime and violence, rooted in the breakdown of families and communities, have been building in this country for 30 years at least. And they plainly require for their reversal much more than specific governmental actions. Indeed, no matter what we do, millions of Americans are going to have to decide to change their ways, to put the interest of their families, their communities, and their own personal development ahead of momentary selfish impulses.

The economic problems we face—the stagnation of American incomes, the declining rate of security in jobs and health care and retirement—these things have been building for 20 years. And they, too, plainly require for their reversal more than simply specific governmental policy changes, although these are imperative.

The pressures of the global economy are relentless and dynamic. And Government can help to deal with them, but it cannot reverse them. The fact that workers must be willing to upgrade their education and their skills throughout a lifetime is absolute. Government can help to create opportunities to do that, but workers must take advantage of

them and cannot deny the facts of economic life.

We also know that in this time, particularly as we are going through a period of change, people feel uncertainty because they don't have a new framework within which to view the world after the cold war that is neat and understandable and that has a definable enemy. And here at home, people feel genuine insecurities that are personal to them, an uncertainty about their personal future.

We see it all the time. Yesterday there were several stories about people saying, "Well, yeah, there has been a recovery, but I don't think it's going to last." There is this feeling that we're waiting for the other shoe to drop. A lot of people feel that even as they walk home every day. I never will forget the man in New York who told me during the campaign—he was working in a hotel—that he had come here from another country; he was proud to be an immigrant. He was doing well economically. But his son wasn't free. And I asked him what he meant, and he said, "Because my son can't walk across the street and play in the park unless I go with him. My son can't even walk two blocks to school unless I go with him." He said, "My son has read up on all the candidates. He says I should vote for you. If I do, I want you to do one simple thing: Make my son free." In this atmosphere, people are easily unsettled.

Finally, there is the immutable fact that in every age and time, real change is difficult. Most everybody is for change in general but then against it in particular. Machiavelli said over 400 years ago, "It must be considered that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle than to initiate a new order of things." He turned out to be pretty smart. [Laughter]

In spite of all these difficulties, until Tuesday I thought we'd made a pretty good beginning. [Laughter]

The voters clearly all along had wanted smaller, more effective, less intrusive Government that reflects both our values and our interests, governmental action that brings stability into their lives and doesn't create too many problems because most folks think they've got enough problems already. But

they plainly want us also to be strong and secure and to lead them into the next century in a country that is strong and secure, with the American dream alive.

The reason I thought we'd done pretty well is that in the last 22 months, we brought the deficit down more than at any time in history in a comparable period, and next year we'll have 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Mr. Truman was President. We've reduced the Federal work force by 70,000 already and put it on a path to shrink to its smallest size since Mr. Kennedy was President. More than 5 million new jobs have come into our economy, and this year for the first time in a good, long while, a lot of them are high-wage jobs. We have more high-wage jobs coming into the American economy this year than in the last 5 years combined.

We have deregulated significant parts of our economy, and we've freed States from regulation so that they can pursue their own paths to reform welfare and health care and education.

We passed a very strong crime bill with tough penalties and funds for prison and police and with prevention programs that have enjoyed the support of members of both parties and all law enforcement agencies. We've supported working families with the family leave law, with childhood immunizations, with expanded Head Start and more affordable college loans and income tax cuts for 15 million working families with incomes of up to \$27,000.

We've expanded trade dramatically in these last 2 years, opened new markets, relaxed a lot of our controls on our own products so they can be sold overseas in the aftermath of the cold war. We have kept the world's strongest, most mobile, most flexible defense. We've worked for peace and freedom from the Persian Gulf and the Middle East to Northern Ireland and southern Africa and of course in Haiti. And for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States.

Most of these measures required the support of members of my party in Congress, especially in the especially polarized environment in which we have been operating. In

an ordinary time, that record would have generated support for Congress men and women who made it, and a desire to have more people to have that kind of record continue. Even though some of the decisions were tough, and change is always controversial, and there is always a lag time between when change occurs and when it is felt, nonetheless, in an ordinary time, even though tough decisions were required, especially in the area of deficit reduction and crime where things had gotten so out of hand for so long, the people who made that record would have been supported.

But this is no ordinary time. And on Tuesday the voters reflected their frustration with the pace of change and the messy and often, to them, almost revolting process by which it was made; their frustration that some things were not done which ought to have been done, particularly in the area of political reform. And they clearly said that we have to do more to limit Government's reach into their lives and to make more efficient the Government they pay for.

They also thought that, frankly, we sent them some mixed signals, especially in the area of the economic program, the crime bill with the very controversial assault weapons ban, and the health care program, where after over \$200 billion by the best estimates had been spent by people who were organized against it, a remarkable feat of reverse plastic surgery was performed.

Well, anyway, the reasons for this vote will be analyzed by experts who are more objective than I am for a long time. But you don't have to be as bright as a tree full of owls to say that it was a smashing victory for the Republicans, for their strategy, their tactics, and their message that Government is no longer the problem—that was their message in the eighties—now Government is the enemy.

Well, I think it's also clear that I bear some responsibilities for policies and political decisions that hurt our candidates. I do believe that we were moving in the right direction, and I think we have to continue to try to address the problems of this country. But I also regret particularly the loss of those who were trying to take the country in the direction that the voters said they wanted: the

people who voted to reduce the deficit, to reduce Government, to deregulate large areas of our economy; people who voted to break partisan gridlock. I regret that in this swirl, this national sea change, that people who actually were building the blocks of the future that the American people in every survey say they want were lost to the Congress. And I hope they will have a chance to serve again.

Regardless, the American people have now entrusted their fate and their future to a Republican-led Congress and a Democratic President. I have heard them, and I will continue to listen closely to them. With all my strength I will work to pursue the new Democrat agenda I outlined here at Georgetown in 1991. And I hope the Republicans will move beyond the rancor of the campaign rhetoric to be new Republicans as well.

After all, the American people told us to make America work for them. They want to be the subject of this debate—not the Republicans, not the Democrats, not the President, not the Congress—they want to be the subject of this debate. They want us to rebuild the American dream, to stop playing politics now and start pulling together.

I know we can do it. There is clear evidence in what has already happened in the last couple of years. In this last Congress, there were bipartisan majorities who stood up for education reform, for the new trade agreements, for national service, for a tough crime bill, for many other efforts to move our country forward.

Now the American people want us to move ahead to help solve the problems that still block our progress as a people. I am ready to share responsibility with the Republican Party when it assumes leadership in the Congress. I ask them only to join me in the center of public debate, the place where the best ideas for the next generation must arise. I ask them to join me in moving forward to keep America strong. Already there are areas where clearly we can work together: welfare reform, congressional reform, the line-item veto, continuing efforts to reduce and reinvent Government. And I must say, their term limits proposal is looking better to me every day. [Laughter]

I hope we'll be working together on lobby reform, campaign finance reform, continued advances in education and training, and health care reform that leads us to real solutions. Above all, we must not do anything to jeopardize this country's economic recovery.

All of us who do the people's business must be ready to work, as Professor Quigley said over and over again, to make the future better than the present. That commitment is not only important at home, it is terribly important when it comes to our crucial role in the world. From the beginning of this administration, we have chosen to engage fully in this rapidly changing world, and the results are known to the people the world over, from Haiti to North Korea, from Northern Ireland to the Middle East. We have remained firm in our commitments to build greater security, to spread democracy, and to usher in a new age of prosperity and open markets all across the world.

Today I want to talk with you about the third of those goals, our strategy in the global economy, and three crucial events that are coming up in rapid succession in the next couple of weeks that will help to broaden and bolster our progress.

When I came to this hall as a candidate for President in 1991, I said something that I'm still having trouble getting everybody in the country to focus on, that we had to tear down the wall in our thinking between domestic and foreign policy and forge a new economic policy, rooted in our own security interests, that would serve ordinary Americans by launching a new era of global growth. I argued then that all our efforts to lead the world would fail if we weren't strong at home, but that if we withdrew from the emerging global economy, our workers and our families would inevitably be hurt. And from the day I took office, we have acted on those beliefs.

Our economic strategy embraces change and prosperity, growth and security. We are pursuing this strategy because it promotes peace and prosperity around the world, but also because it is clearly in the interests of our working people and their families. It's good for American families. It produces high-wage jobs. It's a strategy that enables the

United States to keep leading the fight to open markets worldwide, a strategy to promote free trade and the growth that undergirds democracies and helps to assure peace, a strategy to help every American family, every American worker, every American farmer benefit from the worldwide growth and the prosperity it will yield. The center, the heart of our economic policy must be an unbreakable link between what we do to open the global marketplace and what we do to empower American workers to deal with that marketplace.

Understandably, at the end of the cold war when the nuclear threat is receding, when we have so many pressing problems here at home and when people are clearly worried about their own personal circumstances, and when the Government itself faces serious financial constraints because of years and years and years of piling up massive deficits, there are those on both the traditional left and traditional right in our country who would like us to withdraw more from the world, politically, strategically, economically, to stay more within our own borders.

We have not; and we need only look around the world, to Kuwait, to the former Soviet Union, to the Middle East, to the Korean Peninsula, to NATO and its Partnership For Peace, to Haiti to see how important it is for America to continue the role of engagement in the world.

Long before the cold war was over, a new global economy was emerging, an economy which started 20 years ago to put great pressures on the wages and benefits of our working people, to put great pressure on many of our companies to compete and win, to make internal changes in order to survive and prosper.

Now, this has helped to prompt a serious question about what our country should want and about whether Government should act or should retreat in this area of our national life. I think what we have to want is a strong America, a strong America in terms of national security and national defense, but also in terms of stronger families, better education, higher paying jobs, and safer streets. Strong at home, strong abroad; two sides of the same coin.

The United States has never been in a stronger economic position to meet both these challenges to compete and win in the world. We have the world's most productive work force, an economy that is gaining strength every day, an economy that just since I became President has created now over 5 million new jobs. And as I said, there are more high-wage jobs this year than there have been in the previous 5 years. And this gives us some hope that finally we have begun to move to counteract this 20-year trend of stagnant wages, a trend which unbelievably last year—at a time when we had rapid growth, millions of new jobs, and no inflation—still led to a slight drop in the average income of American workers.

Our Government is working as a partner with the private sector on this strategy. We are reemerging as the world's largest producer of automobiles, for the first time in 15 years. We've regained our position as the globe's top seller of semiconductors. We're creating the industries of tomorrow, from biotechnology to express delivery. We've opened markets with our Japanese partners in products from cellular telephones to rice. We've sold power plants to India, fiber optic systems to Indonesia. Our businesses are proving that they can meet and beat the global competition if only given a chance to do so.

But we know that we cannot meet the challenges of competition unless we help all Americans also adjust to the changes we're all facing. For too many of our people, trade still appears to be a gale-force wind, just another threat ready to blow away the prospects of a stable job at a good wage, just another problem adding to the already unstable, uncertain condition of their lives.

I believe that if we continue to work together on this trade issue—Democrats, Republicans, and independents—as Americans, we can agree on ways to help all our people make their way in the new economy. We must help workers whose jobs are threatened by changing the workplace, by doing what we have to do to help them deal with imports or shifting winds. They'll have to retool. They'll have to reengage. But we can do that.

In the recovery which is occurring now, the economy has created more high-wage

jobs. It is growing steadily. But as I said, our workers' wages, millions of them, are still caught in that period of stagnation. And last year more than a million Americans lost their health insurance. Almost all of them were in working families. This is not a problem that will go away. We are the only nation with an advanced economy, the only one, where in the last 10 years the percentage of our people with health care coverage under 65 has declined. So it is easy to understand why many Americans still aren't feeling the impact of growth. It's also easy to understand why many Americans are frustrated by what it takes to sustain that growth.

On Tuesday morning, I had an interesting conversation with a radio talk show host in Detroit who said to me, "Mr. President, I'm not one of those cynics." He said, "I see these jobs coming into our economy. The biggest problem we've got now in the auto industry is people complaining about overtime." But he said, "I want to ask you something. Is it absolutely necessary for the Fed to raise interest rates every time we announce more jobs? I don't mind helping other people to get jobs, but I don't see why my income should go down just because we're hiring new people." And he said, "If you've got a variable mortgage, or you're about to go buy a car, that's what happens. We get punished. The economy adds jobs; my income goes down. I don't get it. If there were inflation, I would understand." These are interesting questions, but this is the way the American people are thinking about this complex global society in which we live.

So our ultimate goal has to be to both spur the growth and provide the skills and create the package of high-wage jobs that will reverse the trend and increase the ability of our people to feel secure in the face of all this change, to see the changes that are going on as our friend and not our enemy. Of course, I believe very strongly that the only way we can do it is to keep breaking down barriers and keep expanding our exports. Every billion dollars in exports creates about 16,000 jobs in America, and on average, those jobs pay much better than other jobs in our work force.

Look at NAFTA, our trade agreement with Mexico and Canada that provided our great-

est moment of bipartisan cooperation in the last Congress. Thanks to NAFTA, new exports to Mexico and Canada have helped our businesses create as many as 100,000 jobs. In the 6 months after the treaty's adoption, exports from the United States to Mexico increased by nearly 20 percent, about 3 times the rate of our overall export growth in this time of economic expansion. And the future looks brighter still and will be even brighter as the growth rate in Mexico picks up.

But NAFTA and the debate that led up to its passage also reminds us of the changing nature of the economy. In a time when capital and factories and entire industries are completely mobile, our competitive edge and the ultimate source of our wealth must be our own people's knowledge and skill and their ability to continue to learn throughout a lifetime. At the dawn of this century, this new century, and indeed this new millennium, the livelihoods of one-half our people will depend upon their ability to engage in what we now call lifetime learning. As never before, we are what we know; we earn based on what we learn.

Again I say, this should not be a partisan issue. We should continue our vigorous program to give our children and our workers the world's finest education and training and retraining. In less than 2 years, with bipartisan support in Congress, we've already expanded Head Start, established the first-ever national standards for our schools, put our Nation on the right road by saying, "Here are the national standards; we'll help you measure how you're doing. But you get to decide, with fewer Federal strings, not more, how to meet those standards."

We've created a national network of youth apprenticeship programs to help high school students who want to go on into the workplace, don't go to college, but do want good jobs to continue to increase their educational attainment, again with bipartisan support. We reformed the student loan program to give millions and millions of Americans lower cost and better repayment options so that no one should ever refrain from going to college because they're afraid to borrow the money because they're afraid they'll never pay it back.

Now, our next big challenge in the coming Congress is to replace the unemployment system with reemployment, helping workers who are laid off, most of whom now will never be called back to their jobs, but who do need new training to develop new skills and find new jobs. The present unemployment system is geared to yesterday's economy. It is premised on the idea that you will be called back to your old job and you will be given a living standard that is far below what you're earning in the workplace just to get you by until you're called back. Most people are not called back in America anymore, and it is time to fundamentally change that system. It would be better for workers, but it would plainly be better for employers as well because they would not be paying for an unemployment system that does not achieve the objectives that it was originally designed to achieve.

This will help our workers because, as I say, nobody, nobody can promise to remove the uncertainty from modern international economic life. They will face uncertainty whether we act or not. What we wish our people to do is to look at the future with more confidence, more optimism. And if together we help them to get the tools they need to be ready for whatever the future holds, they will be able to do that.

In the coming weeks, we have the opportunity to continue pursuing our economic strategy and to put in place three more crucial building blocks for American success in the 21st century. Next week, as part of our strategy to develop regional initiatives that put the United States at the center of emerging and dynamic regions, I'll be in Indonesia to meet with leaders of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum. I'll be following that up with meeting with 33 democratically elected leaders of our hemisphere at next month's Summit of the Americas down in Miami. And in the midst of these meetings, as Congress reconvenes, we'll be engaged in an historic effort to pass GATT, the largest, most comprehensive trade agreement ever.

In this century there have been a handful of congressional votes that have demonstrated what kind of country we are and what kind of people we're going to be. The vote on the League of Nations after the First

World War was one. And when the United States failed to engage, we paid a terrible price and so did the rest of the world in economic stagnation, isolation, and eventually another world war.

After the second war, Congress faced a vote on the Marshall plan. At that time, we rose to the challenge and put aside our partisan differences and helped to launch 50 years of peace and prosperity, not only with the Marshall plan but with other institutions that rebuilt our former enemies and constructed the framework of security which enabled us ultimately to prevail in the cold war.

Now once again we face such a test. The United States has been leading the world in pushing for the adoption of GATT. And now we've got to follow through and lead once again. We should not delay GATT. That will jeopardize our leadership and our prosperity. Negotiations among scores of nations have produced an agreement that will produce the biggest tax cut in history and in the long run help tie together a global economy and usher in a new era of prosperity. It is the key link to free trade, more open societies, and economic growth all around this world.

For the United States it means both free and fair trade. For 40 years our markets have been more open than those of other major economies. These rules are not right for 1994. GATT will require all nations to finally do what we have already done, cut tariffs, eliminate nontariff barriers, protect copyrights and patents. It will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs here in United States, good-paying jobs, and it will level the playing field for our companies, our workers, our farmers. It will make our exports more competitive, exactly when our ability to send more American products and services overseas is expanding.

For 8 years, Presidents of both parties, from President Reagan to President Bush to our administration, have worked hard to complete this agreement. We were able to do it. GATT has enjoyed the kind of broad bipartisan support in Congress that NAFTA did. And it's supported by a wide range of business and consumer and farm groups. I invite the leaders and the members of both parties once again to put aside our partisan

differences and do what's right for all Americans. And I'm confident that Congress will ratify the GATT this month.

While we work to pass GATT, I'll also be looking ahead to continuing to cement our relations with two of the fastest growing regions in the world, Asia and Latin America. For decades, our sights have been set on traditional economic relationships, the large, mature economies of Europe and Japan. These nations will remain close allies, key competitors, and critical markets for us. But the new century demands a new strategy, and it is clear that the young, vigorous economies of Asia and the Western Hemisphere offer enormous untapped potential for our people to prosper.

Consider this: Asia's dynamic economies account now for 4 out of every 10 dollars of world trade. Almost one-third of our own exports go now the Pacific Rim. Markets in Asia have already created more than 2 million American jobs. And over the next 6 years, the Asian members of APEC plan to invest \$1.1 trillion in infrastructure, enough to rebuild 15 Santa Monica freeways every day.

Yet, despite these opportunities, the presence of stiff economic competition and the end of the cold war have left some Asians to wonder whether we're ready to withdraw from the region. Nothing could be further from the truth. That's why, after visiting six countries in 3 days in the Middle East, and coming home for 8 days of this campaign, and trying to stand here without missing a beat on my speech—[laughter]—I am going to Indonesia to say, we remain engaged.

We must say to the world, we will maintain and strengthen our bilateral security relationships with Japan, with South Korea, with Australia, with the Philippines, with Thailand and others, including that forward presence of our troops to deter conflict. We will encourage stronger regional security structures, and we will continue our active work to implement the agreement for a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula.

We are also committed to expand our economic ties across the Pacific. And as I said, in spite of all the events of the last few days and the fact that I'm a little bit jet-lagged from the first round, I think it's important

for the United States to be in Jakarta. When we met in Seattle a year ago it was at my invitation, because I wanted the leaders of the 14 Asian economies to come together for the first time, to invigorate APEC, to embrace a vision of a new Asia-Pacific community with no artificial dividing line down the middle of the Pacific.

Next week we'll move from a common vision to a common direction. We'll work to set concrete goals to open the way for doing business in Asia, taking down tariff walls, eliminating nontariff barriers, simplifying procedures and standards to smooth the flow of goods. I hope and I expect we'll set a target date for achieving free and open trade among all the Asia-Pacific economies.

APEC is fundamentally an economic institution, so our meetings will focus on those questions. But there will be private meetings, and during them, I will also raise some other questions. I'll raise our concerns about many other issues, including the progress of human rights and democracy in the region.

These things require patience and persistence, but we must not give up on our commitment to the values in which we believe, even as we pursue our own economic interests. Over the long run, we have learned in America that justice and progress go hand-in-hand, and it will also be true for our interests in the world.

Even though there may be no sudden breakthroughs, we must continue to be persistent. As in the past, I will be doing everything I can to be frank in terms of our differences as well as our potential partnerships with the Chinese, with the Indonesians, and with others.

I don't think we have to choose between increasing trade and fostering human rights and open societies. Experience shows us over and over again that commerce can promote cooperation, that more prosperity helps to open societies to the world, and that the more societies are open the more they understand that maximizing freedom and prosperity can go hand-in-hand. The rule of law, accountable government, the free flow of ideas, all these things encourage economic development and political maturity and freedom.

The advance of human rights and democratic values also requires strong government-to-government contacts. So I'll continue to promote without apology those rights and values in Asia and around the world. We have a long history of friendly relations with Indonesia, with other countries, but we are engaged in a range of bilateral and global issues with the Indonesians, with the Chinese, and with others. We recognize and we respect the differences among cultures. Like all Americans, I struggle with our own society's ongoing tensions and inequities and very difficult social problems. But I don't believe the search for human dignity is peculiar to the American culture. Everywhere people aspire to be treated with dignity, to give voice to their opinions, to have a say in choosing their leaders. At a time when we are strong enough to inspire people around the world, we have to keep pressing on for freedom.

In Asia and elsewhere, we have good reason for hope, we have good reason for progress because free markets and democracy are on the move. The new global community is taking place all around the world, enshrouding the values of tolerance and liberty and civil society. I guess I really do believe that history is on our side and we have to keep trying to push it along.

If we're looking for further confirmation of these trends, of course, we can find them in abundance in our own hemisphere. One month from now, leaders from South and Central America, the Caribbean, and North America will be in Miami at our invitation to discuss the future of our hemisphere and to celebrate the spread of freedom and democracy. Think of it: 33 leaders, including President Aristide of Haiti, will attend the Summit of the Americas, the first such hemispheric gathering in almost three decades; all democratically elected leaders.

There, we'll be able to work to strengthen the roots of those democracies through sustainable development; we'll be able to take crucial steps to increase trade, to maintain growth in the region, to lay concrete plans to open markets, to expand trade. We'll have a partnership for prosperity that stretches from Canada to the tip of South America. It means more jobs and higher income. It

also means more peace, more freedom, and more security.

As with GATT and APEC, the Summit of the Americas will move us toward a future of greater prosperity. It will tie us to new partners. And if we follow through, historians will look back at these events and see that our generation reached across the oceans and the borders to cement relationships with nations that will rank among the economic and political powers of the 21st century. We will have demonstrated that the American people have learned the lessons of the past, have learned the lessons of the present, and are ready for all the challenges that lie ahead.

Thirty years ago in this hall, Carroll Quigley told the class of freshmen that I was a part of that our greatness rested on the extraordinarily American belief that we could make the future better than the past. Many Americans today don't believe it, but the evidence is there; the future is there. We have to have the courage to act on that belief, to seize that future, and to keep our people optimistic, outward-looking, and strong. If we are strong in our convictions, the reality is that our future will be strong as well.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:36 a.m. in Gaston Hall at Georgetown University. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. Leo J. O'Donovan, S.P.J., president, Georgetown University; Peter F. Krogh, dean, School of Foreign Service; and alumnus Robert Wagner.

Remarks Announcing Patsy Fleming as National AIDS Policy Director and an Exchange With Reporters

November 10, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Secretary Shalala, ladies and gentlemen. In the last 13 years, AIDS has claimed the lives of more than a quarter million of our fellow citizens. Today, it is the leading cause of death among all Americans between the ages of 25 and 44.

For nearly every American now, the face of AIDS is no longer the face of a stranger but the face of a friend. Now more than ever, we must redouble our efforts for effective treatments, for a vaccine, for a cure.

I have committed this administration to working hard to stop the spread of HIV and to finding a cure for AIDS. In the last 2 years, as Secretary Shalala said, we've increased the Federal resources directed at AIDS by 30 percent. We've increased funding for AIDS-related research by 25 percent, funding for the Ryan White Care Act by 82 percent, bringing services to thousands of Americans who are in desperate need of medical and social services. We've reorganized the Office of AIDS Research at NIH. And we've done this at a time when, this year, for the first time in 25 years, there was an actual reduction in Federal domestic, as well as, defense spending. We've stepped up our efforts to develop and improve new AIDS drugs. We're working hard to find an effective vaccine. We've put forth a very frank HIV prevention campaign aimed at young adults.

And soon we'll announce the creation of a new advisory council made up of experts from the community to advise our administration on the important steps that must still be taken in this fight. We're making progress, but we have to keep pressing forward. Defeating this epidemic demands a disciplined and passionate approach.

That's why I'm so pleased to announce the appointment of Patsy Fleming to serve as the AIDS Policy Director here at the White House. For more than a decade, she has been an important voice in our national response to HIV and AIDS. She helped to shape our new AIDS education message and push for aggressive AIDS drug development. She put together an immediate response to research results that could help to stem the rate of infection from infants born to HIV positive women.

In her short tenure as the interim AIDS Policy Coordinator, her tremendous performance convinced me that she is the best person for the job. And I'm glad she decided to accept my request that she stay on. She'll head a newly structured AIDS Policy Office. She'll have direct access to me, to members of the Cabinet. She'll play an important role in developing our budget and our policy proposals.

I ask her to provide me with a detailed report on the rapid increase of AIDS among adolescents and to examine the efforts we

are now making to reverse these terribly troubling trends. As we continue our struggle against this disease, I'm pleased to have her at my side.

And as I ask her to come up and make remarks, I'd just like to remind all of you that—and all the people who are watching this day—that this is a disease with a human face. And my human face today is—I would like to dedicate this announcement to my dear friend Elizabeth Glaser.

Thank you.

The President. Do you want the box back? Where's the box?

Ms. Fleming. I'm a little shorter than you are.

Secretary Shalala. It's my box. [*Laughter*]

The President. This is a step up. [*Laughter*]

[*At this point, Ms. Fleming thanked the President and explained her agenda as Director of the Office of National AIDS Policy.*]

Representative Newt Gingrich

Q. Mr. President, can you respond to Newt Gingrich calling you a "countercultural McGovernik"? [*Laughter*]

The President. I'm a middle-age man who's worked very hard in his life—[*laughter*—to be a mainstream American. And I think I've done a reasonable job of it.

Q. Do you think this will make it harder to work with him if he keeps coming out with statements like that, sir?

The President. Oh, the American people can draw their own conclusions. I can only control my own words and my own deeds. My hand is open to them—[*inaudible*].

Office of National AIDS Policy

Q. Sir, a question on AIDS, AIDS activists and gay groups have demanded you pick a prominent, high-profile czar and also asked for a seat at the Cabinet table. Why did you choose this route and what about the seat at the Cabinet table?

The President. Because I think that—I made a decision that—the most important thing we could have is a good advocate, is a person I knew, had great confidence in, and had real access to the White House, and

a real chance to influence me and my decisions.

I think it was the right decision. And a very large number of people who are interested in AIDS recommended it to me even before I told them I was thinking about it. So I think that the people who are here can answer the question better than me.

Thank you.

NOTE. The President spoke at 1:55 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

**Executive Order 12936—
Amendments to the Manual for
Courts-Martial, United States, 1984
November 10, 1994**

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 801-946), in order to prescribe amendments to the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984, prescribed by Executive Order No. 12473, as amended by Executive Order No. 12484, Executive Order No. 12550, Executive Order No. 12586, Executive Order No. 12708, Executive Order No. 12767, and Executive Order No. 12888, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Part II of the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984, is amended as follows:

a. R.C.M. 405(g)(1)(B) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) *Evidence.* Subject to Mil. R. Evid., Section V, evidence, including documents or physical evidence, which is under the control of the Government and which is relevant to the investigation and not cumulative, shall be produced if reasonably available. Such evidence includes evidence requested by the accused, if the request is timely. As soon as practicable after receipt of a request by the accused for information which may be protected under Mil. R. Evid. 505 or 506, the investigating officer shall notify the person who is authorized to issue a protective order under subsection (g)(6) of this rule, and the convening authority, if different. Evidence is reasonably available if its significance out-

weighs the difficulty, expense, delay, and effect on military operations of obtaining the evidence.”.

b. R.C.M. 405(g) is amended by inserting the following new subparagraph (6) at the end thereof:

“(6) *Protective order for release of privileged information.* If, prior to referral, the Government agrees to disclose to the accused information to which the protections afforded by Mil. R. Evid. 505 or Mil. R. Evid. 506 may apply, the convening authority, or other person designated by regulations of the Secretary of the service concerned, may enter an appropriate protective order, in writing, to guard against the compromise of information disclosed to the accused. The terms of any such protective order may include prohibiting the disclosure of the information except as authorized by the authority issuing the protective order, as well as those terms specified in Mil. R. Evid. 505(g)(1)(B) through (F) or Mil. R. Evid. 506(g)(2) through (5).”.

c. R.C.M. 905(f) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) *Reconsideration.* On request of any party or sua sponte, the military judge may, prior to authentication of the record of trial, reconsider any ruling, other than one amounting to a finding of not guilty, made by the military judge.”.

d. R.C.M. 917(f) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) *Effect of ruling.* A ruling granting a motion for a finding of not guilty is final when announced and may not be reconsidered. Such a ruling is a finding of not guilty of the affected specification, or affected portion thereof, and, when appropriate, of the corresponding charge. A ruling denying a motion for a finding of not guilty may be reconsidered at any time prior to authentication of the record of trial.”.

e. R.C.M. 1001(b)(5) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) *Evidence of rehabilitative potential.* Rehabilitative potential refers to the accused’s potential to be restored, through vocational, correctional, or therapeutic training or other corrective measures to a useful and constructive place in society.

(A) *In general.* The trial counsel may present, by testimony or oral deposition in accordance with R.C.M. 702(g)(1), evidence in the form of opinions concerning the accused's previous performance as a servicemember and potential for rehabilitation.

(B) *Foundation for opinion.* The witness or deponent providing opinion evidence regarding the accused's rehabilitative potential must possess sufficient information and knowledge about the accused to offer a rationally-based opinion that is helpful to the sentencing authority. Relevant information and knowledge include, but are not limited to, information and knowledge about the accused's character, performance of duty, moral fiber, determination to be rehabilitated, and nature and severity of the offense or offenses.

(C) *Bases for opinion.* An opinion regarding the accused's rehabilitative potential must be based upon relevant information and knowledge possessed by the witness or deponent, and must relate to the accused's personal circumstances. The opinion of the witness or deponent regarding the severity or nature of the accused's offense or offenses may not serve as the principal basis for an opinion of the accused's rehabilitative potential.

(D) *Scope of opinion.* An opinion offered under this rule is limited to whether the accused has rehabilitative potential and to the magnitude or quality of any such potential. A witness may not offer an opinion regarding the appropriateness of a punitive discharge or whether the accused should be returned to the accused's unit.

(E) *Cross-examination.* On cross-examination, inquiry is permitted into relevant and specific instances of conduct.

(F) *Redirect.* Notwithstanding any other provision in this rule, the scope of opinion testimony permitted on redirect may be expanded, depending upon the nature and scope of the cross-examination."

f. R.C.M. 1003(b)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) *Forfeiture of pay and allowances.* Unless a total forfeiture is adjudged, a sentence to forfeiture shall state the exact amount in whole dollars to be forfeited each

month and the number of months the forfeitures will last. Allowances shall be subject to forfeiture only when the sentence includes forfeiture of all pay and allowances. The maximum authorized amount of a partial forfeiture shall be determined by using the basic pay, retired pay, or retainer pay, as applicable, or, in the case of reserve component personnel on inactive-duty, compensation for periods of inactive-duty training, authorized by the cumulative years of service of the accused, and, if no confinement is adjudged, any sea or foreign duty pay. If the sentence also includes reduction in grade, expressly or by operation of law, the maximum forfeiture shall be based on the grade to which the accused is reduced."

g. R.C.M. 1004(c) (4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) That the offense was committed in such a way or under circumstances that the life of one or more persons other than the victim was unlawfully and substantially endangered, except that this factor shall not apply to a violation of Articles 104, 106a, or 120."

h. R.C.M. 1004(c) (7) (B) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) The murder was committed: while the accused was engaged in the commission or attempted commission of any robbery, rape, aggravated arson, sodomy, burglary, kidnapping, mutiny, sedition, or piracy of an aircraft or vessel; or while the accused was engaged in the commission or attempted commission of any offense involving the wrongful distribution, manufacture, or introduction or possession, with intent to distribute, of a controlled substance; or while the accused was engaged in flight or attempted flight after the commission or attempted commission of any such offense."

i. R.C.M. 1004(c) (7) (I) is amended to read as follows:

"(I) The murder was preceded by the intentional infliction of substantial physical harm or prolonged, substantial mental or physical pain and suffering to the victim. For purposes of this section, "substantial physical harm" means fractures or dislocated bones, deep cuts, torn members of the body, serious damage to internal organs or other serious bodily injuries.

The term “substantial physical harm” does not mean minor injuries, such as a black eye or a bloody nose. The term “substantial mental or physical pain and suffering” is accorded its common meaning and includes torture.”.

j. R.C.M. 1102(b) (2) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) *Article 39(a) sessions.* An Article 39(a) session under this rule may be called for the purpose of inquiring into, and, when appropriate, resolving any matter which arises after trial and which substantially affects the legal sufficiency of any findings of guilty or the sentence. The military judge may also call an Article 39(a) session, upon motion of either party or sua sponte, to reconsider any trial ruling that substantially affects the legal sufficiency of any findings of guilty or the sentence.”.

k. R.C.M. 1105(c)(1) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) *General and special courts-martial.* After a general or special court-martial, the accused may submit matters under this rule within the later of 10 days after a copy of the authenticated record of trial, or, if applicable, the recommendation of the staff judge advocate or legal officer, or an addendum to the recommendation containing new matter is served on the accused. If, within the 10-day period, the accused shows that additional time is required for the accused to submit such matters, the convening authority or that authority’s staff judge advocate may, for good cause, extend the 10-day period for not more than 20 additional days; however, only the convening authority may deny a request for such an extension.”.

l. R.C.M. 1106(f)(7) is amended to read as follows:

“(7) *New matter in addendum to recommendation.* The staff judge advocate or legal officer may supplement the recommendation after the accused and counsel for the accused have been served with the recommendation and given an opportunity to comment. When new matter is introduced after the accused and counsel for the accused have examined the recommendation, however, the accused and counsel for the accused must be served with the new matter and given ten days from service of the addendum in which to submit comments. Substitute

service of the accused’s copy of the addendum upon counsel for the accused is permitted in accordance with the procedures outlined in subparagraph (f)(1) of this rule.”.

Sec. 2. Part III of the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984, is amended as follows:

a. Mil. R. Evid. 305(d)(1)(B) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) The interrogation is conducted by a person subject to the code acting in a law enforcement capacity or the agent of such a person, the interrogation is conducted subsequent to the preferral of charges, and the interrogation concerns the offenses or matters that were the subject of the preferral of charges.”.

b. Mil. R. Evid. 305(e) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) *Presence of counsel.*

(1) *Custodial interrogation.* Absent a valid waiver of counsel under subdivision (g)(2)(B), when an accused or person suspected of an offense is subjected to custodial interrogation under circumstances described under subdivision (d)(1)(A) of this rule, and the accused or suspect requests counsel, counsel must be present before any subsequent custodial interrogation may proceed.

(2) *Post-preferral interrogation.* Absent a valid waiver of counsel under subdivision (g)(2)(C), when an accused or person suspected of an offense is subjected to interrogation under circumstances described in subdivision (d)(1)(B) of this rule, and the accused or suspect either requests counsel or has an appointed or retained counsel, counsel must be present before any subsequent interrogation concerning that offense may proceed.”.

c. Mil. R. Evid. 305(f) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) *Exercise of rights.*

(1) *The privilege against self-incrimination.* If a person chooses to exercise the privilege against self-incrimination under this rule, questioning must cease immediately.

(2) *The right to counsel.* If a person subjected to interrogation under the circumstances described in subdivision (d)(1) of this rule chooses to exercise the right to counsel, questioning must cease until counsel is present.”.

d. Mil. R. Evid. 305(g)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) *Counsel.*

(A) If the right to counsel in subdivision (d) is applicable and the accused or suspect does not decline affirmatively the right to counsel, the prosecution must demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the individual waived the right to counsel.

(B) If an accused or suspect interrogated under circumstances described in subdivision (d)(1)(A) requests counsel, any subsequent waiver of the right to counsel obtained during a custodial interrogation concerning the same or different offenses is invalid unless the prosecution can demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that—

(i) the accused or suspect initiated the communication leading to the waiver; or

(ii) the accused or suspect has not continuously had his or her freedom restricted by confinement, or other means, during the period between the request for counsel and the subsequent waiver.

(C) If an accused or suspect interrogated under circumstances described in subdivision (d)(1)(B) requests counsel, any subsequent waiver of the right to counsel obtained during an interrogation concerning the same offenses is invalid unless the prosecution can demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the accused or suspect initiated the communication leading to the waiver.”

e. Mil. R. Evid. 314(g)(3) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) *Examination for other persons.*

(A) *Protective sweep.* When an apprehension takes place at a location in which other persons might be present who might endanger those conducting the apprehension and others in the area of the apprehension, a reasonable examination may be made of the general area in which such other persons might be located. A reasonable examination under this rule is permitted if the apprehending officials have a reasonable suspicion based on specific and articulable facts that the area to be examined harbors an individual posing a danger to those in the area of the apprehension.

(B) *Search of attack area.* Apprehending officials may, incident to apprehension, as a precautionary matter and without probable cause or reasonable suspicion, look in closets and other spaces immediately adjoining the place of apprehension from which an attack could be immediately launched.”

f. Mil. R. Evid. 404(b) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) *Other crimes, wrongs, or acts.* Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show action in conformity therewith. It may, however, be admissible for other purposes, such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident, provided, that upon request by the accused, the prosecution shall provide reasonable notice in advance of trial, or during trial if the military judge excuses pretrial notice on good cause shown, of the general nature of any such evidence it intends to introduce at trial.”

Sec. 3. Part IV of the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1984, is amended as follows:

a. Paragraph 44e(1) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) *Voluntary manslaughter.* Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 15 years.”

b. Paragraph 44e(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) *Involuntary manslaughter.* Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 10 years.”

c. Paragraph 45e is amended to read as follows:

“e. *Maximum punishment.*

(1) *Rape.* Death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

(2) *Carnal knowledge with a child who, at the time of the offense, has attained the age of 12 years.* Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 20 years.

(3) *Carnal knowledge with a child under the age of 12 years at the time of the offense.* Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for life.”

d. Paragraph 51e is amended to read as follows:

“e. *Maximum punishment.*

(1) *By force and without consent.* Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for life.

(2) *With a child who, at the time of the offense, has attained the age of 12 years, but is under the age of 16 years.* Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 20 years.

(3) *With a child under the age of 12 years at the time of the offense.* Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for life.

(4) *Other cases.* Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 5 years.”.

e. Paragraph 85e is amended to read as follows:

“e. *Maximum punishment.* Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 3 years.”.

Sec. 4. These amendments shall take effect on December 9, 1994, subject to the following:

(a) The amendment made to Rule for Courts-Martial 1004(c) (4) shall apply only to offenses committed on or after December 9, 1994.

(b) Nothing contained in these amendments shall be construed to make punishable any act done or omitted prior to December 9, 1994, which was not punishable when done or omitted.

(c) The maximum punishment for an offense committed prior to December 9, 1994, shall not exceed the applicable maximum in effect at the time of the commission of such offense.

(d) Nothing in these amendments shall be construed to invalidate any nonjudicial punishment proceeding, restraint, investigation, referral of charges, trial in which arraignment occurred, or other action begun prior to December 9, 1994, and any such restraint, investigation, referral of charges, trial, or other action may proceed in the same manner and with the same effect as if these amendments had not been prescribed.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Defense, on behalf of the President, shall transmit a copy of this order to the Congress of the United

States in accord with section 836 of title 10, United States Code.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 10, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:16 p.m., November 14, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order and the attached annexes will be published in the *Federal Register* on November 15.

**Executive Order—12937—
Declassification of Selected Records
Within the National Archives of the
United States**

November 10, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered:

Section 1. The records in the National Archives of the United States referenced in the list accompanying this order are hereby declassified.

Sec. 2. The Archivist of the United States shall take such actions as are necessary to make such records available for public research no later than 30 days from the date of this Order, except to the extent that the head of an affected agency and the Archivist have determined that specific information within such records must be protected from disclosure pursuant to an authorized exemption to the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, other than the exemption that pertains to national security information.

Sec. 3. Nothing contained in this order shall create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 10, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:17 p.m., November 14, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order and the attached annex will be published in the *Federal Register* on November 15.

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

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.

November 5

In the morning, the President traveled from Los Angeles, CA, to Anaheim, CA. He then traveled to San Francisco, CA, in the afternoon.

November 6

In the late morning, the President traveled to Seattle, WA. He traveled to Minneapolis, MN, in the afternoon.

November 7

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Flint, MI. They traveled to Wilmington, DE, in the afternoon and returned to Washington, DC, in the evening.

The President announced his intention to appoint Richard St. Germaine as a member of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.

The President announced his intention to nominate Johnnie Carson to be U.S. Ambassador to Zimbabwe.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

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 November 8

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing David Gergen's letter of resignation and the President's letter of acceptance

Transcript of a press briefing by Brig. Gen. Harold W. Nelson on the President's visit to the Far East

Released November 10

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the Executive order on declassification of selected records within the National Archives of the United States

Acts Approved by the President

Approved November 9

H.J. Res. 390 / Public Law 103-464
Designating September 17, 1994, as "Constitution Day"