AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, February 27, 1995
Volume 31—Number 8
Pages 263–313

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Appointments and Nominations
African-American veterans—271
Business Council—287
Canada, President's visit
Arrival—294
Dinner—302
Luncheon—295
Parliament—296
House Democratic Caucus—284
Iwo Jima, 50th anniversary—276
National Basketball Association champion Houston Rockets—274
Radio address—272
Regulatory reform—278

Appointments and Nominations

White House Office, Chair of National Economic Council, remarks—282

Communications to Congress

Budget rescissions and deferrals, message transmitting—287

Executive Orders

Amendment to Executive Order No. 12950 (Railroad dispute)—311
Establishing an Emergency Board To Investigate a Dispute Between Metro North Commuter Railroad and Its Employees by Certain Labor Organizations—286
Release of Imagery Acquired by Space-Based National Intelligence Reconnaissance Systems—304

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Briefing Room—282
Capitol—284
Ottawa, Canada—305
Roosevelt Room—274
Interview with Brian Lamb of C-SPAN—263
News conference with Prime Minister Chrétien of Canada in Ottawa, February 24 (No. 86)—305

Letters and Messages

Presidents' Day, message—263

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Canada
Governor General LeBlanc—294, 295
Prime Minister Chrétien—295, 296, 302, 305

Proclamations

Irish-American Heritage Month—302

Statements by the President

Northern Ireland, peace process—286
Persian Gulf veterans, compensation—286

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—313
Checklist of White House press releases—312
Digest of other White House announcements—311
Nominations submitted to the Senate—312

Editor's Note: The President was in Ottawa, Canada, on February 24, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

Message on the Observance of Presidents' Day, 1995

February 16, 1995

Greetings to Americans across the country celebrating Presidents' Day, 1995. As citizens gather to reflect upon our nation's rich history, I am proud to salute our former Presidents for the legacy of leadership they have built in this nation.

From the bold example of George Washington to the timeless courage of Abraham Lincoln—the Presidents whose birthdays we commemorate today—each President, in his own way, has sought to use the power of the American government to make our country better, stronger, and truer to the ideals of its charter. Fueled by the mission of our nation's citizens, Presidents of each generation have aspired to serve the common good, recognizing that whether we Americans choose to rise or fall, move forward or backward, we will all do so together. On this special occasion, and in honor of that great tradition, I ask each of you to join in rededicating yourselves to maintaining the freedoms we hold most dear, for ourselves and for the generations to come.

Best wishes for a wonderful holiday celebration.

William J. Clinton

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

Interview With Brian Lamb of C–SPAN

February 17, 1995

Former U.S. Presidents

Mr. Lamb. Mr. President, we're talking in and around President's Day, so I want to see if you could tell us the purpose of having this little thing on your desk that involves another President—"Dewey Defeats Truman."

The President. Well, of course, that's the famous headline from the Chicago Tribune. I got it when I was in Independence, Missouri, at the Truman Library. And I'm a big admirer of President Truman. He was my neighbor—you know, Arkansas and Missouri border each other—and I always—I like having that on my desk. It reminds me that things are not always what they seem and that it's important to keep fighting. I look at it every day; I have it right there on the desk.

Mr. Lamb. If you could talk to any past President—and I know you just got off the golf links with a couple of them—who would it be, and what would you want to talk to him about?

The President. Well, it's difficult to say which one President I would talk to. For myself, personally, I would talk to Lincoln because I admired him so much, personally, and because I believe he grew so much in the job. His personal growth in the job was extraordinary, and his ability to distill all the forces at work into clear and powerful language was so great.

But there are others. Jefferson, I would like to speak with because he carried around in his very soul the ideals of the Founders. And he found himself in the same position to some extent I find myself in, in a very different historical context, in that he believed deeply in limited Government, he didn't want Government to oppress people, but he felt that there were occasions in which the national interest demanded a level of activism.

In Jefferson's case, he purchased Louisiana, for example, which cost the equivalent of one year's Federal budget. So I think Jefferson understood the kind of complexity that we're facing today. He had a fertile, complex mind, and he understood how to reconcile the bedrock principles and apply

them to the facts of the case at hand, and I like that.

I wish I could have a long conversation with Truman, because the time we're living in today somewhat parallels the period after the Second World War in the sense that we're going through a period of transition, things are being redefined, the size of the Government is being reduced, but there's still a mission for the Federal Government to advance the cause of ordinary citizens in America. There is a new security reality in the world, and we have to adapt to that. So the times that we live in now are quite a lot like those times.

Mr. Lamb. Do you read the Presidents now, since you've been in the White House—their words?

The President. Yes, I just read—interestingly enough, I just read Benjamin Thomas' biography of Lincoln, which was written in the fifties, I think. And it's a biography I had never read. You see over there on my desk I've got a new biography of Jefferson, the Randall biography of Jefferson I'm about to get into.

I just read Doris Kearns Goodwin's magnificent biography of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt during the war, ''No Ordinary Time.'' It's a terrific book. So I read quite a bit about it. I read August Heckscher's biography of Woodrow Wilson last year, something which I should have read before, I guess, but I had never gotten around to reading.

Mr. Lamb. As you're reading, do you delve in and see yourself in any of those positions and learn anything that you can change, or is that another period?

The President. Of course you do. You can't help imagining how you would have done in their time, how they would do in your time, what strengths did they have that you could perhaps develop, what errors did they make that you could perhaps avoid, how different is it?

Mr. Lamb. What's the first thing you'd ask Jack Kennedy if you could talk to him today?

The President. I would ask for his advice about what we could do to restore at least a measure of the optimism and the sense of trust that existed when he became President, because he had more space, in some ways, to govern and to be President, even though there were terrific conflicts. In fact, he had much more difficulty with the Congress than I did in the 2 previous years. But there was a sense of confidence in the American people and a sense of trust in their elected leaders and a willingness to look at things in a more balanced way, I think, than exists today. And I would ask for his advice about how we could get some of that back.

Mr. Lamb. Did you change your mind at all about F.D.R. after you read Doris Kearns Goodwin's book?

The President. No, I just appreciated him more. I was sad for him in a way, personally. I was sad—I knew that his life was somewhat difficult and that Mrs. Roosevelt's was. But they had a remarkable positive impact on this country, and I'm grateful for that. But I didn't change my opinion of him. He was, in many ways, the most adroit politician who ever occupied this office. And he was a person who was fortunate enough to be there at the right time for him. The country sometimes brings us the right people for the right times, and he was, I think, really perfectly suited, temperamentally and by means of experience, to the times in which he governed.

Mr. Lamb. You know, a lot is written about the criticism of you at this point in your Presidency. When you read the history, do you find that other Presidents were hit about by their critics as much as you are?

The President. Well, they were subject to the same criticism, but it didn't—by and large, it wasn't nearly as intense or public. There wasn't as much news. And the news rules were different then; they were different.

I suppose Jefferson——

Mr. Lamb. Like what?

The President. Well, they just didn't have the—you know, Roosevelt could have off-the-record press conferences. Roosevelt could debate matters and take months deciding issues without having 100 commentarians talk about how indecisive he was.

I got tickled the other day—I read an analysis of decisionmaking and record that was done in ''The American Prospect,'' which said that I was—in which the author argued that I was much more decisive in difficult

situations than President Roosevelt had been early on in his term and that I had paid a bigger political price for it, in other words, arguing that Roosevelt was viewed as being sly and canny. But that's just—part of it is just the times, you know, the times change. And the nature of coverage of politics today and the sort of instantaneous commentary about every issue and the obsession with process over product and with politics over policy, I think these things just give a President less space. They require you to affect an almost arbitrary way of decisionmaking because of the heavy tilt in the way your decisions are characterized to the American people.

Mr. Lamb. There have been a half dozen books already written about Presidency.

The President. It's crazy.

Mr. Lamb. The latest one was the David Maraniss book.

The President. It's just crazy. I mean, how can you possibly reflect on someone—I mean, you know, I've given a lot of thought to—that's another thing, Kennedy had Arthur Schlesinger in the White House, you know. But you didn't have people out there writing books about his administration until it was over, until they had some time to reflect and get some fairness or balance in it. It's amazing now, it's sort of—it's just the difference in the time in which we live.

Mr. Lamb. Do you read any of those books?

The President. What I—normally I look at them. I don't spend a lot of time reading them just because I think that what I need to be doing is, I need to focus on today and tomorrow. I can't do anything about yesterday. And particularly if I read a little and I think, you know, somebody's got an angle and a line, and all the facts are going to fit into the angle and the line, I try to figure out what that is, and then I just go on and go about my business.

Golf Tournament With Former Presidents

Mr. Lamb. I've got the Christian Science Monitor here from Friday, and they've got a picture of you on the front page with George Bush. And then they have an editorial "Presidents and the Links," and this one line I wanted to ask you about. It says, "He at least appears as though he's enjoying the job" now. The "now" is mine, but that's the essence of what they're saying. Are you——

The President. Absolutely.

Mr. Lamb. ——enjoying it?

The President. Yes, I had a great time. And I had a great time out there playing golf with President Ford and President Bush and Bob Hope. Even though it was the worst golf game I've had in about 3 years, I still had a great time.

Q. What did you talk about?

The President. We talked about golf and what was going on. We talked a little about Bob Hope and what an amazing man he was—astonishing that he could be 92 and out there playing golf. Still has a great swing, he made some great shots that day. It was all light and friendly. I think we share some common concerns about some of the issues being debated today. But I just thought it was inappropriate to bring it up on the golf course.

Mr. Lamb. So you didn't have any——

The President. No——

Mr. Lamb. ——didn't seek any advice or——

The President. Well, I do talk to them from time to time and ask their advice about other things. But on this occasion, it just seemed like we ought to be out there having fun. And the crowd was great. There was a vast crowd there. And they were very nice to all of us, and they wanted to talk and chat and visit. So it just wasn't an appropriate thing to discuss business.

I thought they needed the day off, and I knew I did. So we all took it.

The Media

Mr. Lamb. You talk about the, you know, being difficult when people are writing books about you and you're only in here 2 years. I brought with me a Time magazine cover story in January. One of your favorite people is on the cover, Rush Limbaugh. But inside there's an article by Bob Wright about hyperdemocracy. And the headline is, "Hyperdemocracy: Washington Isn't Dangerously Disconnected From The People; The Trouble May Be It's Too Plugged In."

What about that, just that headline? Is this whole town too plugged into every moment of your life?

The President. Well, there's something to be said for that. I mean, the argument is, of course, that every decision can become the subject of instant analysis and communications and that Congress can be paralyzed by a blizzard of faxes, not F-A-C-T-S, F-A-X-E-S. And that you can just have a stampede based on the emotion of the moment. I think there's something to that.

But Andrew Jackson once said that the cure for any problem of democracy was more democracy. I mean, you know, look what we're doing here. C–SPAN is exactly the reverse. It's plugged in, but you just cover everything the way it is, and people can make their judgments about Bill Clinton or Newt Gingrich or Bob Dole or whomever they wish to evaluate. And they can hear the ideas, they can assess the people.

And I think even, you know, talk radio can be a very positive thing if it's a conversation rather than a weapon. But our—I remember, I just went today, before this interview started, as you know, to the memorial service for Senator Fulbright. And I remember 20 years ago—and he's been gone from the Senate for 20 years—coming on his last campaign he was complaining about how the Members of the Congress then, by his standard, had to travel around too much, had to be almost too accessible, didn't have the time they needed to think and absorb and then discuss with their constituents in an unhurried way what the great issues of the day were. Well, that's 10 times more true today then it was then. So what I think we need to do is not recoil from the democracy, the hyperdemocracy, but try to work through the more irrational and destructive aspects of it to have a national conversation again.

You know, when I was running for President, we had all these town hall meetings, and I just loved them. And I—particularly when I attracted no notice, I never had to worry about whether I could have a meeting with 400 people and answer 40 questions, and then if one of them turned out to be controversial question, that would then be on the evening news. And 100 million people would see that, and only 400 would have heard the regular things. So I could go around and carry on this democracy. And we just have to find ways to do more of that and to show things whole and balanced and not twisted.

Presidential Debates

Mr. Lamb. As you know, we were a part of reenacting the Lincoln-Douglas debates this last summer.

The President. It was great.

Mr. Lamb. But it was 3 hours. Could you ever see yourself, either in a conversation or in a debate, spending 3 hours with an opponent or somebody that you could go through the issues with?

The President. Oh, sure. I don't know if people would watch it that long, but I think they would watch them for an hour. Look at the Presidential debates in the election. They were watched for a long time. And I think, you know, having discussions with people, including people of different perspectives, I think it would be a very good thing. And the American people would get a good feel for it.

Mr. Lamb. Where you'd have just two people instead of a moderator?

The President. Sure, I could conceive of that. You know the—I met Lincoln and Douglas, your Lincoln and Douglas, came to Galesburg, Illinois, when I was there at Carl Sandburg Community College. And they warmed up the crowd for me. And I thought it was—you know, when they did that, they were both on an equal footing, they were both running for the Senate, and they both were speaking of issues that had both local and national impact. I think it did a great service to the country. I don't know that—as I said, I don't know how much of an audience you could get for a 3-hour debate now, but for an honest discussion, I think you could get a good hour.

Mr. Lamb. Right over your shoulder is a copy of the Lincoln-Douglas debates on your shelf over there.

The President. Yes.

Mr. Lamb. Have you every read them?

The President. I've never read the whole thing, but I've read extensive passages of them to try to understand the evolution of Lincoln's thinking, because he started with

the proposition that slavery should not expand. And even in his first Inaugural Address, he made a commitment not to try to abolish slavery. And then he, for a long time, had all kinds of legal problems about how much he could do and how far he could go.

My staff actually gave me that. You know, I collect old books about America. And in '93 for my birthday, my staff gave me the first campaign biography of Abraham Lincoln written in 1860. And then, last year, they gave me the Lincoln-Douglas debates.

The Presidency

Mr. Lamb. Based on what you've learned after being here 2 years and—assume you run again next time around, would you do something different?

There was a lot written, for instance, when you went on MTV and somebody asked you what kind of underwear you wore, and then for weeks afterwards, it was written about all the time. Are there things like that you're to avoid, or did that bother you?

The President. Oh, I think you have to avoid them. I think one of the things I would do is, I wouldn't stop doing these town meetings; I think they're important. But I would be much more careful before I do them, not to do them at a time when I'm very busy, preoccupied with other things, and maybe a little overtired. Because then, sometimes you just simply answer questions when you shouldn't or you say things you shouldn't say.

I think with the Presidency, there is a fine line which has to be walked between being really responsive to people and listening to them and not giving up the dignity and strength of the office. So I would—you know, I have a much greater appreciation now than I did before I took this office about the symbolic impact of every word you say and everything you do.

It isn't like being a Governor, for example, where people really do have a chance to see you as a whole person and evaluate your whole record, and they don't necessarily look for great, symbolic significance in everything you say or every suit you wear or, you know, that sort of stuff. When you're President, you're just so far removed, on the one hand, from the people and, on the other hand, you bear the responsibility of carrying the idea of America. So it requires a different level of care and understanding, and it's something I've learned quite a lot about, I think, in the last 2 years.

The Media

Mr. Lamb. Back to that piece in Time magazine. Bob Reich quotes a lot of Madison, and the issue is whether or not this is a representative Government or whether it's a direct democracy. And back to this theme of hyperdemocracy, is it anywhere close to being ungovernable with all this attention every day to——

The President. I wouldn't say that, but one of the frustrations is that what is going on—in a funny way, you don't have either one. Because if you had direct democracy, at least people would then want to take real time and have real debates and assume real responsibility. But what happened—what is happening often now, particularly to us in the first 2 years, where the Democrats had the Congress but not a controlling majority—that is, the Republicans could kill anything but a budget in the Senate—and I was in the Presidency, the culture of criticism took over. I mean, if the people could say anything and not have to be responsible and not even be held accountable, and very often the mainstream media even would not pay any attention to what was being said on talk radio or by my political opponents, because after all, it didn't affect decisions. But the impact of this was that the people tended to understand the criticism more than the record of what was done. It's an almost stunning disconnect between what you're actually doing and what is being talked about and understood out there.

So that's why I say the cure for this is not to try to undo it. You can't undo it. You can't go back the other way and abolish technology and abolish opportunities to communicate. We have to look at where we are now as a stop along the way, and we have to keep working through it, so that people don't just use their information as an instrument of anger and frustration and so they know when they're being manipulated by people who have an axe to grind and they have access to things they care about, to hear both sides, evaluate the facts, and then go forward.

So we just have to keep working through it, and we'll get there.

The President's Accomplishments

Mr. Lamb. This Parade Magazine—I don't know if you've had a chance to see your picture——

The President. I saw the copy. It comes out Sunday, I think.

Mr. Lamb. It does, and by the time people hear this, they will have already read it, but there was just one line in there I wanted to ask you to explain. You said, ''I think we did a good job of doing things,'' meaning your first 2 years, ''but not a very good job of communicating.'' What do you mean by that, and how can you improve that?

The President. Well, I think in some ways we did almost—you might argue we did too many things. But when I say I think we did a good job of doing things, I think it's quite obvious. You know, we passed the biggest deficit reduction package in history. We passed the biggest expansion of trade in history. We had, therefore, a major positive impact on the growth of the economy and almost 6 million new jobs.

We had, in 1994, the best year for educational opportunity in 30 years, with expansion of Head Start and apprenticeships for young people who don't go to college and more affordable college loans for millions of people. We passed the family leave bill. We passed a major crime bill. We launched a rigorous effort to reinvent Government so that we were not only creating opportunities for Americans, but we were actually downsizing the Government, reducing regulation, reducing the size and burden of Government, giving more power to the States, everything the Republicans said they were going to run on, things we did.

And along the way, 15 million American families with incomes of under $25,000 a year or less got an average tax reduction of $1,000. And people didn't know those things, and in many surveys when people were given those facts, they just refused to believe it. They said, ''That's just not true. If that had happened, I would know it.''

Mr. Lamb. How do you break through, then?

The President. I think—that doesn't mean I didn't make any mistakes, and I don't want that to be read—I mean, I think I have also made mistakes. But on balance our record was very, very strong, and it was only the third time since World War II that a Congress had enacted over 80 percent of a President's initiatives in 2 years—only happened three times since World War II. And I don't believe any American that's counter to the experience of—Americans, when they hear it they say, ''Well, why don't I know that?'' I think that when you get into the business of making decisions and taking responsibility, if you're not careful you become the captive of the language of incumbency, and you look like a defender of government even though you're trying your best to change it and warring against the forces you don't agree with. And I think when you do a lot of things, then as soon as you lay down one fight, you take up another, and there's not enough time to really impress upon the American people what has been done.

I also think that one weakness I had was that I didn't easily keep the language of my campaign in the office of the Presidency, particularly in the first year. I think I did exactly what I said I'd do, and one Presidential scholar says I've kept a higher percentage of my commitments than the last five Presidents have averaged keeping theirs.

But I think that there is an enormous obligation on the President, again, in an atmosphere of hyperdemocracy and also, quite apart from politics, hyperinformation—you think about just the blizzard of stuff coming at the average American voter every day, and the average America voter is working harder, sleeping less, more stressed out, buried in information—to get a message through there requires enormous discipline and focus and concentration. And I simply believe that I've spent massive amounts of my time and effort trying to get things done, which was my first job. But I didn't organize and deploy the resource properly to make sure that we had communicated what we had done and how it fit into the vision that I ran for President to pursue.

Then of course, when we got into the health care debate and we had all that vast array of resources against us, telling the

American people I was trying to have the Government take over the health care system and all that kind of stuff. It wasn't true, but that's what they were told. That cut against the image that I was trying to reduce the size of Government and expand opportunity while shrinking bureaucracy, which was the message I ran for President on.

Former Presidents and Reelection

Mr. Lamb. This is an amateur count, so those professional counters out there may get me on this one, but I counted last night that there have been 11 Presidents, out of 41 men, who have been elected to 2 terms and served those 2 terms. The law of averages there aren't very good, one in four.

The President. They've gotten worse here lately, I mean, in the last——

Mr. Lamb. Yes.

The President. That tends to go up and down. If you look at it, in wartime we tend to stick with the people that we've got, and that's Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt. And we tend to stick with war heroes, Grant and Eisenhower. And then when times are good, we tend to reelect when people feel good, when people feel secure; that's Kennedy, Johnson. You know, if Kennedy had lived, I believe he would have been reelected, but it's the Kennedy-Johnson thing. Truman defied the odds, because he was coming at the end of the New Deal, he was in a period of historic change when people were disoriented and looking for a new way. He did it by staying at the job, doing the task at hand, and then fighting like crazy.

But I think if you go back, Teddy Roosevelt did it by being relevant, vigorous and relevant, to the times in which he lived. He didn't serve two full terms, but you know, he did serve 7 years, virtually two terms.

So I think the lesson is, it has a lot to do with the times in which you live and a lot to do with how people feel about those times. But I can't worry about that. What I've tried to do in my public life is to help people make the most of their own lives and to deal with the challenges of the moment. And that's what I'm trying to do now.

The President's Message

Mr. Lamb. Based on your experience watching what happened over the 2 years, when does your message get through the best, at what kind of thing you do—either an Oval Office speech here, a speech out on the hustings, an appearance on a television show? What have you found?

The President. Well, the State of the Unions. There's no question they're far and away the best, because that's the only time the President has to talk about all the things that he's doing and put it into some context. So I don't think there's any question that those audiences are listening and giving you a shot and listening to you.

I like the prime time press conferences. I have talked to the Nation on occasion, as you know, on national television when we did Haiti and when I spoke in December about how I was going to try to relate to the new Congress and what kind of tax relief I would propose for the middle class, that I wanted to tie it to education so we could raise people's incomes in the long run and not just have a tax cut. But on balance, I would say the State of the Union.

I love the town hall meetings, and they're the best forum, because you have an honest dialog with people. But in candor, the difficulty with the town hall meetings is, if there are 40 questions and 38 are positive and 2 are negative and you're slightly off, the real hazard of the town hall meetings is that one then becomes the evening news story and 100 million people hear one thing and then maybe one million people hear the town hall meeting.

I like doing more of those, though, because it's good for me. It reminds me it's too easy for Presidents to get isolated and see all issues in terms of their combatants. Most Americans are not combatants, they want you to be fighting for them and so I like those.

State of the Union Address

Mr. Lamb. Did you know, by the way, that speech was going to be an hour and 21 minutes long?

The President. No, it should have been about my standard length. We thought it would be about 45 minutes, 50 minutes.

Mr. Lamb. How did it get so long?

The President. Well, for one thing, they were very nice to me. The Congress was much more receptive than I thought they'd be. I think there were 90 interruptions, and it added a little more time than I thought. And then I think I probably—at the end, I was so exuberant about all those people I probably maybe elongated it a little bit, you know, talking about the folks at the end. I wanted them to come because they symbolize what I think is important here.

You know, in this time where we've got to create more opportunity and have more responsibility, the Government can only do so much. We can expand opportunity. We can shrink bureaucracy. We can empower people to make more of their own lives. We can enhance security through being tough on crime at home and taking care of foreign policy concerns. But we need a different sort of citizen action. We need more people who are engaged and who are involved, so that the hyperdemocracy, to use your phrase, become a positive force, not a negative one. So it's not just composed of people who are either political couch potatoes on the one hand or inflamed about one issue on the other, but by people who are really trying to engage their fellow citizens, and that's why I did that at the end.

1996 Election

Mr. Lamb. Go back to when you're talking about all of the different Presidents and the different scenarios. What kind of a scenario do you think yours will be when you run again, and will people be saying, oh, he's doing the Truman strategy or he's doing the Eisenhower strategy or——

The President. I don't know, I think it would be a mistake to draw too tight an historical analogy. This time bears some relationship to Truman's time. But it is very different in many ways, too, in terms of what the issues are and the facts are and the political forces. But the larger historical fact is there, that it's still a period of great change. It depends on what happens, partly, this year. You know, I'm making a good-faith effort to work with this new Congress; I think that's what the American people want me to do. And a lot of what they want to do are things I want to do. I want to downsize the Government. I want to reduce the burden of unnecessary regulation. I want to have more discipline in the budget. So I don't have any problem with that.

But I don't want to do things that will undermine the economic recovery, undermine the ability of the President to protect the national security interests of the country. And most importantly, I don't want to do things that will undermine our responsibilities to try to give middle class people economic opportunity and educational opportunity and give poor people the opportunity to work themselves into the middle class.

So I think what happens this year will dictate, to some extent, what happens in the election. You know, I'm going to keep doing what I said I'd do when I ran in '92. I'm going to try to keep moving the country forward. I'm going to try to be less partisan. The biggest disappointment, I guess, in the first 2 years I had was how bitterly, bitterly partisan it turned out to be.

The image I think the people had was that the Democrats weren't necessarily sticking with me in the Congress. But the facts are that they voted with me more loyally than they voted for Kennedy or Johnson or Carter, something that would again, I think, based on the coverage I think would surprise people.

The Republicans opposed me more than any opposition party had opposed any President since World War II. And they were rewarded for it because of the times in which we live and maybe because I didn't make the best case I could have to the American people or maybe because of the things that happened in the congressional races.

But now, that's water under the bridge, and we've got a country to see after. We've got a people to attend to, to work with, to challenge. So I hope it'll be less partisan.

Presidential Libraries

Mr. Lamb. About out of time. Let me just ask you a couple of off-the-subject questions. The last time we were here, I asked you about Presidential libraries and whether you had thought much about that. And you said no, but since then I understand that you've had somebody out and about checking out

the other libraries. Have you got any plans yet?

The President. Well, I expect to have one, but that's all I can say about it. I mean, I like the idea of them; I think they've served the country well. I've been at President Nixon's for his service. I've been at President Carter's. I've been at President Johnson's. And I strongly support the concept.

I did talk briefly to President Ford about that at the golf course; it was, I guess, the only substantive thing. He just mentioned to me that he sure thought the Archivist ought to be somebody that supported the Presidential library system. So I like them. But I'm worried about doing this job, and then I'll worry about what's in the library when I finish the job. But I believe in the system, and it's served the country well.

Of course, I've been to the Truman Library and the Roosevelt Library, so I guess I've been to most of them.

Mr. Lamb. We're out of time, and I thank you.

The President. Thank you. I enjoyed it.

NOTE: The interview began at 12:45 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House and was embargoed for release until 12:01 a.m. on February 19. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Salute to African-American Veterans

February 17, 1995

Ladies and gentlemen, Secretary Perry, Secretary Brown, General Shalikashvili, General Powell, General Davison, Admiral Gravely, Ossie Davis, Colonel Earley.

I hate to throw any cold water on this magnificent night, but I'm just sitting here thinking whether as Commander in Chief I should dismiss or simply demote whoever it was who arranged for me to speak after Colonel Earley. [*Laughter*] If ever there was an embodiment of what we came here to celebrate tonight, if ever there was evidence that this celebration is occurring at least 50 years too late, it is Colonel Earley.

Tonight we celebrate the extraordinary history of patriotism of our Nation's African-American citizens, whose courage and devotion to country helped to raise the consciousness of a nation, and through years and decades and centuries to reverse a tragic legacy of discrimination. History records their great deeds, and we have honored them tonight.

We can only marvel at the dedication that they manifested year-in and year-out, war-in and war-out, from the first days of the Republic, in spite of all that they were denied under the Constitution and laws. In spite of being treated as second-class soldiers, segregated from their peers, with second-class training, too often with rifles that jammed or misfired, sometimes shamefully harassed by comrades, still they served.

Peter Salem, who fired the shot that killed the leader of the British forces at Bunker Hill served in the Revolutionary War. Sergeant Alfred Hilton, under the withering fire outside Richmond during the Civil War, picked up the Union flag from its fallen bearer and carried it further into battle until he, too, fell, mortally wounded. You should know that today that soldier's great-grandnephew, Steve Hilton, upholds his tradition of service to the country as a Captain in the Army Reserve and a member of the White House senior staff. The 369th Infantry Regiment in France during the First World War, whose French commander said they never lost a prisoner, a trench, or a foot of ground.

But it was during World War II, as we saw tonight, when our country was forced to marshal all its resources, to call forth every ounce of its strength, that African-Americans in our Armed Forces made contributions that would literally save the world from tyranny and change the course of our Nation at home.

Time and again, from the far reaches of the Pacific to the very heart of Europe, the more than one million African-Americans in uniform distinguished themselves as P–40 fighter pilots and Navy Seabees, Sherman tank drivers, orderlies, and engineers.

You've heard the stirring story of Dorie Miller, a steward aboard the USS *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor, who saw his captain fall wounded and pulled him to safety. And then despite the fire, he manned a machine gun and downed two enemy planes.

At Iwo Jima, the African-American Marines of the 16th Field Depot, working as

stretcher bearers, braved shells and bullets and mines to pull their comrades back from the frontlines when they were wounded.

At the Battle of the Bulge the men of the 3496th Truck Company hauled weapons, soldiers, and prisoners down roads that the rain had turned into rivers of mud and ice. They unloaded their 2.5 ton trucks as mortars fell all around them. And even today, 50 years later, their commander, Colonel Benjamin Layton, says he can still feel the driving snow and the deadening cold of the Ardennes. He's with us tonight, and we honor him and those like him who served their Nation so well. Thank you, Colonel Layton.

And I, too, must say just a word about the legendary Tuskegee Airmen, who flew over 1,500 combat missions and never lost a single bomber under their escort. Some of them are here with us tonight, including Second Lieutenant Luther Smith, who was forced to bail out over Yugoslavia after a successful attack on an ammunition dump, where he was captured and interned as a POW in Austria. He entered that camp weighing 150 pounds. Six months later when the British forces liberated him, he was down to 70 pounds. But he survived, and he's here. God bless you, sir.

After the war, after winning the victories over fascism and intolerance, these heroes came home to a nation that still could not shed its habits of hatred and bigotry. A mayor and a city marshal pulled a young black sergeant from a bus in South Carolina and beat him blind. A mob gang in Georgia dragged a newly returned veteran and his wife from their car and shot them so savagely they could scarcely be identified. These and other horrible acts of violence done to our African-American veterans moved President Truman to desegregate the military and put forward the most sweeping civil rights legislation our country had then known.

So it was that in Korea and Vietnam, African-Americans were able to serve shoulder to shoulder with soldiers of all races for the first time. Beamed by television into America's living rooms, images of their camaraderie and shared sacrifice helped our Nation to act on a truth too long denied: that if people of different races could serve as brothers abroad, putting their lives on the line together for this country, surely, surely at last they could live as neighbors at home.

It is a measure of the progress we have made as a people that today many of our most revered military leaders are African-Americans. Admiral Gravely and General Davison came in with me tonight. I was proud to look up here at the beginning of the program and see the Commander of our district here, General Gorden. And of course, we heard the 220-year saga tonight that led from Crispus Attucks to General Colin Powell.

Today I say to you, ladies and gentlemen who have served us in uniform, at last our children, without regard to their race, see in you nothing more and nothing less than what you are: American heroes in the proud tradition of George Washington, John Pershing, and George Marshall. You have earned their way into the Nation's hearts, and you are there now forever and ever.

Tonight let me salute you for many things but most of all for never giving up on America. Finally, finally, in the military your country is worthy of you, worthy of the words of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, worthy of the sacrifice that you and your forbearers have given. Let us never forget it. And let us now say: Wouldn't it be nice if the rest of America worked together as well as the United States military?

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:13 p.m. at Constitution Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Colin Powell, USA, Ret.; Maj. Gen. Frederick Davison, USA, Ret.; Vice Adm. Samuel L. Gravely, Jr., USN, Ret.; Ossie Davis, narrator of the salute; Mrs. Charity Adam Earley, former Lieutenant Colonel, Women's Army Corps; and Maj. Gen. Fred Gorden, Commander, Military District of Washington. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

February 18, 1995

Good morning. I'm joined today by the Houston Rockets, last year's National Basketball Association champs. I'm glad they're here to have their recognition and take their tour of the White House, not only because

of what they've achieved but because I believe team sports reflect America at its best.

And in America, as in team sports, anyone can rise as far as his or her God-given talents and hard work will take them. That doesn't mean everyone can lead the NBA in scoring. The American dream doesn't guarantee results for anybody. But it does mean that opportunity is there if you're willing to work and struggle and do your very best. At the same time, for teams to succeed, people have to work hard and work together. Hakeem Olajuwon would probably be the first to admit that stars can break records, but only teams win championship rings.

That's what I mean when I talk about a New Covenant in America. It's about teamwork, partnership among all of our people.

In this country at this time, as we move into a new century and a new economy, the Government's job is to expand opportunity while shrinking Government bureaucracy; to empower people to make the most of their own lives; and to enhance our security, not just abroad but here at home on our streets, too.

At the same time, we must demand more responsibility from every citizen in return, not just for ourselves and our families but responsibility for our communities and our country. We're all in this together—more opportunity and more responsibility.

I know the American people want us to practice that here in Washington, and I've reached out to the Republican Congress. At the end of the cold war as we move into this information age, there are many areas where we can work together to improve the lives of hard-working Americans: reducing the size of the Federal Government, reducing the burden of unfunded requirements on State and local governments, requiring Congress to live under the same laws it imposes on people in the private sector, the line item veto to control unnecessary spending, and giving more flexibility to States to reform their welfare and health care systems.

But we still have our differences as well. And when we do, I'm going to judge a policy not on whether it's a Republican or a Democratic one but on whether it's best for the American people. If it is, I'll support it, fight for it, sign it into law. But if it isn't, I will oppose it.

Just this week, we've seen where some of these differences lie. When I ran for President, I pledged to cut 100,000 Federal bureaucrats and use the money to put 100,000 new police officers on the street. I did it because one of the jobs of the Federal Government is to enhance our security at home and because crime and violence is a problem all over America in communities small and large.

Well, we're keeping that promise. Last year's crime bill reduces the Federal bureaucracy and takes all the money and gives it to our communities to fight crime. It provides explicitly for 100,000 new police officers. Just since the 4 months since the crime bill took effect, police departments in America have been able to hire over 16,000 police officers. That's in just 4 months. We're going to make the 100,000 goal.

And just so you'll know how much that is, there are only 550,000 police officers in America. So with these 100,000 all going on the streets, that's about a 20 percent increase in the police forces of America to keep our people safer.

Incredibly, Republicans in the House of Representatives voted to replace our guarantee of 100,000 police with a blank check that has no guarantees at all, with money that can be used for all kinds of things other than police. Now, I'm all for cutting bureaucracy. Under our plan, communities can apply for police with a one-page, eight-question application. But I know the American people want more police on the street, and I know the law enforcement officers of this country know it's the best crime-fighting tool there is. I'm going to work with the Senate to fix this proposal. But I will veto any effort to repeal or undermine our promise.

Some are saying that this change is necessary because police departments won't hire 100,000 people because we require them to come up with a little of the money, too. To them I say, in only 4 months one-half of all the communities in the entire Nation have written to us asking for more police. This is popular in the country, and it ought to stay the law here in the Congress.

As we enter the 21st century, the keys to opportunity for every American are education and training. That's another one of our jobs here in Washington, to give people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives. That's why we reformed the student loan system, eliminating middlemen and actually cutting the cost to the taxpayers and making college loans more affordable for all kinds of middle class students all across this country, lower costs and easier to pay back. We also expanded the Head Start program by 30,000 children and made it apply to younger kids. We're helping young people who don't choose college learn the skills they need to get and keep high-paying jobs.

In the last Congress many Republicans supported these things as well as Democrats. But in this Congress, some Republicans want to limit the reach of our college loans so over half the students in the country can't get them. They want to slow down or stop or reverse a lot of these other educational gains.

But creating opportunity for people who take responsibility for themselves is exactly what the Government should be doing at this time in our history. Some of these Republicans see education as just another place to cut and gut. I want to cut Government. I have cut Government. There are already more than 100,000 fewer people working here than there were the day I became President. But I don't want to do it at the expense of our children's skills and education in our future.

Finally, this week our administration opposed Republican efforts in the House of Representatives to force the Government to spend billions on a Star Wars-type defense system, diverting those resources from high priority national security areas and threatening our Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. I was gratified that the Democrats and some Republicans who joined them had the courage to defeat this unacceptable and unconstitutional infringement on the President's authority. America's security must never be about Republicans and Democrats, about who happens to be President and who happens to control Congress. Our national security should never be a partisan issue. And I will not allow Congress to jeopardize that security by making it one. After all, our job, no matter what our party is, is to work together, to move America forward, and to preserve the American dream for all Americans in the new global economy.

That's why I proposed the middle class bill of rights to cut taxes for ordinary people to help them invest in their families and in their education, why I want to raise the minimum wage, so people who will take the responsibility to work full-time and stay away from welfare can earn a decent living for themselves and their children while they're doing it.

I will fight for every idea, every proposal, every piece of legislation that strengthens the American dream. And I'll keep doing everything in my power to fight against anything that weakens it.

Thanks for listening.

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

Remarks Congratulating the 1994 National Basketball Association Champion Houston Rockets and an Exchange With Reporters

February 18, 1995

The President. Good morning, everyone. I am delighted to be here with the Houston Rockets; along with NBA Commissioner David Stern; Congresswoman Sheila Jackson-Lee; the owner of the Rockets, Leslie Alexander; and of course, Rudy Tomjanovich, the head coach.

I want to congratulate the Rockets formally on their championship last year. We've been trying to find a time for them to come to the White House and make their official visit for some time, and as you know, they played the Bullets here last night, and I'm glad to have them here.

I enjoyed last season immensely. I enjoyed watching the Rockets win. It was the first-ever major championship in sports for a Houston team. It opened the season with 15 straight wins, tying an NBA record. And the victories, the number of victories they had, was the best in the team's history. So it was a great season for them. And you all know, I kind of liked basketball last year anyway. And I'm beginning to like it better this year as it goes along.

It occurs to me that basketball is a lot like my work around here: You get behind; you get ahead; you never know whether you're going to win until the end of the game. But the most important thing is that you keep playing and doing the best you can and working on the teamwork.

Coach Tomjanovich did a great job in leading the Rockets to victory last year. He's been with the Rockets for 24 years. And I might say that's sort of a rarity in professional athletics today. But it's the kind of loyalty to an organization that I think we need more of all across America in every walk of life.

I was just told that, before I came in here, that Hakeem Olajuwon's name in Arabic translates into "always on top." [*Laughter*] I would say that even for the NBA's most valuable player and defensive player of the year, it helps to be on top if you're 7-feet tall. And he's really done very, very well.

Let me say in closing, I think all Americans enjoy athletics, and I think it's a very healthy thing. But as I said in my radio address today, the thing I like best about basketball is that it is every play, in every way a team sport. And it requires a team mentality, even with a lot of stars, to win. You can't win without great players, but you can't win without good teamwork either. And that's what our country needs more of. And I'm delighted to have the Houston Rockets here.

I'd like now to ask the NBA Commissioner, David Stern, to come forward and say a few words.

[*At this point, Mr. Stern made brief remarks and presented the President with a jacket.*]

The President. What do you think this will do for my image, guys? [*Laughter*] I love this. I love this.

Mr. Stern. It's an extra large, Mr. President. [*Laughter*]

The President. I need an extra large. That's great. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Stern. With that, I'd like to introduce the owner of the Houston Rockets, Les Alexander. Les.

The President. Thank you.

Mr. Alexander. Thank you, Mr. President, for having us here today. I'd like to present you with a championship ring with your name on it, and it says, "To the number one fan in America, from the Houston Rockets."

The President. Thank you so much. That's beautiful. Thank you.

Mr. Alexander. Now I'd like to introduce one of the great coaches in the world, Rudy Tomjanovich, and of course the greatest player in the world, Hakeem Olajuwon.

Mr. Tomjanovich. Thank you, Mr. President, for taking time and making this a very special day for us. It's a day we'll always remember. And I would like to present to you a Rocket jersey with your name on the back and the number one.

The President. That's great.

Mr. Tomjanovich. You're the number one man on the number one team in the world.

The President. You know, I've got a basketball court down here in the backyard. Do you think I should wear this? [*Laughter*] Good length, too, don't you think? [*Laughter*]

Mr. Olajuwon. Well, I would just like to thank Mr. President for this an honor for us as a team and also to have this opportunity to visit the White House. And we're so glad you're the President. And thank you so much for inviting us. And we would like to come back next year as the champion—[*laughter*]

The President. Will you come back next year? Thank you very much.

It's all aired up. I may go down and——

Q. All you need is trunks. [*Laughter*]

The President. Yes. A shot might help—if I had a shot. [*Laughter*] I still need a shot.

Thank you very much. It's good to see you. It was great.

Meeting With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Q. Mr. President, have you put off a summit with Yeltsin in May?

The President. No. I don't know what the—let me just say this. I don't know what the source of that story is, but I want to make it very clear: We have made no decision about the May schedule. And there are lots of issues involved, because there are lots of 50th anniversary events on celebrating the end of World War II. And we literally have not had a meeting on that. So it would be wrong to draw any inference one way or the

other. There has literally been—I've gotten no recommendations from my staff on it. We've had no meeting. Tony Lake and I had our first passing conversation about it last night about 6 p.m. So we'll make a decision quite soon and announce it, but there has been no decision made.

Q. Well, you wouldn't go, would you, if there's a war on in Chechnya?

The President. I have said, there is no decision made. I have made no decision. I've had no meeting. And when I do, I'll let you know.

Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown

Q. Mr. President, does Ron Brown still have your support?

The President. He's the best Commerce Secretary we've ever had. And he's gotten more results. That ought to be the test. He's a good Commerce Secretary. The questions that have been raised about what happened before he became Commerce Secretary are being looked into in an appropriate fashion. And meanwhile, he's on the job, and I'm supporting him in that.

No Commerce Secretary has ever done more than he has to create jobs for Americans and to support the interest of American business. And that is the test. And he should go forward and do his job. That's what I want him to do.

Thank you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:47 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Remarks Commemorating the 50th Anniversary of Iwo Jima in Arlington, Virginia

February 19, 1995

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I think we should give Colonel Barber a round of applause for his remarks and for his service. [*Applause*]

General and Mrs. Mundy, Secretary and Mrs. Brown, honored veterans and families, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans. Today on this wonderfully quiet morning, within sight of so many of our Nation's great monuments and on the edge of our national cemetery, where some of those whom we honor today are buried, we recall the fury of war and a landmark in our history that is one of both loss and triumph. We gather in the company of heroes, those who served at Iwo Jima. Many of them do rest nearby, but we thank God that many are still here today.

Fifty years ago, with their lives before them, they left everything, their families, their loved ones, the serenity and security of their homes, to fight for a just cause. They departed on a journey to places they had never heard of to confront dangers they could not have imagined. But they never wavered or faltered. And when they were done, our liberties and our homes were safe again.

Last year at Normandy, I was privileged to say something I would like to say again because I think that the rest of us can never say it enough: To all of you who served at Iwo Jima, we are the children of your sacrifice, and we are grateful. On behalf of a grateful nation, I would like to ask all of those here who served at Iwo Jima to stand and be recognized. [*Applause*]

Today the dimensions of their struggle still stagger us. As we have heard, when they attacked Iwo Jima, the enemy was so deeply dug in as to be invisible and all but impregnable. The carnage on the beaches was almost unimaginable. The sands were black and deep and so soft that one man said it was like walking on coffee grounds. Trying to claim just a few hundred yards, troops were raked by gunfire and pinned down. And as Secretary Brown said, on the first day 2,400 were killed. On hearing of the casualties, President Roosevelt was reported to have gasped with horror for the first time since Pearl Harbor.

Securing Iwo Jima was supposed to take less than 2 weeks, but it took 5. Progress was a yard's advance. But never were the words "issue in doubt", the call for withdrawal, uttered. The 75,000 who went ashore pulled together. Privates rose and took command. In just one case of many, a platoon suffered so many casualties that command passed to 12 different marines. Navy corpsmen saved one life after another, pulling the wounded from battle. The Seabees did their vital construction work under constant fire.

But 13 days into the battle, the first crippled B–29 touched down on an island landing strip. And eventually more than 2,200 of those B–29's made emergency landings on their return from bombing runs. Nearly 25,000 airmen owed their lives to the troops who secured Iwo Jima.

Admiral Nimitz put it perfectly: ''Among the Americans who served on Iwo Jima, uncommon valor was a common virtue.'' Our country saw the true definition of courage. Everyone who waded ashore on Iwo Jima shared that quality.

Captain Robert Dunlap scrambled to an exposed position 200 yards ahead of our lines at the base of Mt. Suribachi. Amid constant enemy fire, he directed the attack on pillboxes and emplacements, not for 1 or 2 hours but for 48 hours. His extraordinary action helped to make it possible for the marines to sweep through the island's western beaches. ''All in a day's work,'' he said.

Douglas Jacobson, a private first class from Rochester, New York, showed what real strength of body and spirit can do. When a fellow marine was shot, he grabbed the man's bazooka and sprinted through the area called ''Meat Grinder,'' destroying 16 positions before he ran out of ammunition. The bazooka, by the way, that he had was a two-man weapon, but he shouldered it alone.

Captain Joseph McCarthy showed us the meaning of determination. With his company under merciless fire from several enemy strongholds, he charged through an open field to one of them and knocked it out with a carbine and grenades. He then repeated the feat three more times, using his bare hands when necessary. He cleared an essential ridge on the way to one of the island's airstrips.

And Jack Lucas, whom I had the privilege of introducing at the State of the Union Address, was 17 years old when he threw himself on two grenades to save the lives of his comrades. Not long ago he said: ''It didn't matter who you were or where you were from, you relied on one another, and you did it for your country.''

These are just a few of the countless feats of heroism from that distant place in time, deeds all of you who served performed for your Nation. And these stories are just 4 of the stories of the 27 Medal of Honor winners on Iwo Jima, the largest from any single battle in American history. We are honored to have these four winners today with us. And I ask them to be recognized at this time. [*Applause*]

This is their legacy. This is the legacy of all of you who served, to those in the units that took Suribachi; to the nurses and doctors who worked under constant fire on the beachfronts; to the sailors on the hundreds of support ships; to the African-American Montford Point marines, who fought off the last desperate attack by the enemy; to the families who so courageously endured at home, this is the legacy of bravery and dedication you have given us.

To be worthy of that sacrifice, we must determine in this time to remain the strongest nation in the world so that our freedom is never again threatened. And we must work to create a nation worthy of the generation that saved it for our freedom. We must do it together.

Ultimately no lesson from Iwo Jima looms larger than the one behind me. This image of the flag-raising over Mt. Suribachi, known around the world from Joe Rosenthal's picture and captured before us in Felix de Weldon's great bronze memorial, tells it all. Instantly it became the symbol of our effort in World War II. It was published and republished until every American could see it with his eyes closed. Six men straining together, giving all they have, faces turned to the task of planting our flag: Block, Sousley, Hayes, Bradley—the Navy corpsman—Gagnon and Strank. A real picture of America, a Texan and Kentuckian, a Wisconsin farm boy, a Native American, a New Englander of French Canadian stock, a kid from the coal country of Pennsylvania.

Hard men wept when they saw the flag fly over Suribachi. President Roosevelt wanted the flag-raisers brought stateside as he rose to boost morale on the homefront. But three of them never got the chance. They were on Iwo Jima, their faces still turned to the task, when they were killed days later. They gave us still forever this picture of common purpose of striving together, of the unity that our Nation forged out of the many who make it up.

For all Americans today, for those who still defend our liberty in uniform, and those who fight for decency and civility in our towns and communities, the men and women of Iwo Jima will forever stir our hearts, spur our conscience, and summon us to action. With our eyes closed, we can all still see the flag rising atop the hill.

May God bless them all, and may God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. at the Iwo Jima Memorial. In his remarks, he referred to Iwo Jima veteran Col. William Barber; Gen. C.E. Mundy, Jr., USMC, Commandant, Marine Corps; and Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown.

Remarks on Regulatory Reform

February 21, 1995

Thank you very much. I want to begin by thanking the Vice President for his leadership on this issue. When we formed our partnership back in 1992, and we talked about all the things we wanted to do, and we had a series of long, fascinating conversations in which he talked to me about science and technology and the environment, and I talked to him about education and economic development and reinventing Government, and I told him that when I was a Governor, every couple of years we'd eliminate an agency just to see if anybody noticed. [*Laughter*] And normally, they didn't. [*Laughter*] And they never did complain when they did notice.

And I asked him if he would—then after we actually won and came here, I asked him if he would get involved with this and really try to make it work for the American people, because I was convinced that there was so much justifiable anxiety out there among our people about the way Government operates, that unless we could change that we'd never be able to maintain the faith of the taxpayers and the integrity of the Federal Government.

I also asked him to do it because he was the only person I could trust to read all 150,000 pages in the Code of Federal Regulations. [*Laughter*] At this very moment, Tipper is being treated for insomnia at the Georgetown Hospital—[*laughter*]—but he's just about through.

I also want to thank all of you who are here who represent really the future of the Federal Government and the future of its ability to maintain the confidence of the American people that we're protecting and promoting their interest and doing it in a way that reinforces instead of defies common sense.

I believe very strongly in the cause of regulatory reform. And as the Vice President said, we've been working at it for about 2 years now. I also believe that we have to hold fast to certain standards. I believe we can bring back common sense and reduce hassle without stripping away safeguards for our children, our workers, our families.

There are proposals pending in the Congress today which go beyond reform to roll back, arguably even to wrecking, and I oppose them. But I believe we have the burden of reform. And that means we have to change in fundamental ways the culture of regulation that has permeated this Government throughout administrations, from administration to administration, from Republicans to Democrats occupying the White House.

The Federal Government to many people is not the President of the United States. It's the person who shows up on the doorstep to check out the bank records or the safety in the factory or the integrity of the workplace or how the nursing home is being run. I believe that we have a serious obligation in this administration to work with the Congress to reduce the burden of regulation and to increase the protection to the public. And we have an obligation on our own to do what we can to change the destructive elements of the culture of regulation that has built up over time and energize the legitimate and decent things that we should be doing here in Washington and, more importantly, that should be being done all across the country.

I thank those who have come here today as examples of the progress which has been made. We do want to get rid of yesterday's Government so we can meet the demands of this new time. We do want results, not rules. We want leaner Government, not meaner Government. At a time when I have said our obligation should be to create more

opportunity and also to provide more responsibility, our responsibility here is to expand opportunity, empower people to make the most of their own lives, enhance security, and to do it all while we are shrinking the Federal bureaucracy, to give the people a Government as effective as our finest private companies, to give our taxpayers their money's worth.

Now, everybody has talked about this for years now, but in fact, we have taken steps in the right direction. Already, we have reduced Federal spending by over a quarter of a trillion dollars, reduced the size of the Federal payroll by over 100,000. We are on our way to a reduction in excess of 250,000 in the Federal work force, which will give us by the end of this decade the smallest Federal Government since the Kennedy administration.

Vice President Gore's leadership in the reinventing Government initiatives have already saved taxpayers $63 billion. Some of the more visible changes have been well-noted: the reduction of offices in the Agriculture Department by more than 1,200, throwing away the Government's 10,000-page personnel manual. I haven't heard a single soul complain about it. [*Laughter*] Nobody has said, "You know, I never thought about the personnel manual, but I just can't bear to live without it now." [*Laughter*] I haven't heard it a single place.

We've worked hard to solve problems that had been long ignored: reforming the pension benefit guarantee system to secure the pensions of 8.5 million working Americans whose pensions and retirement were at risk, reforming Government procurement so that the days of the $500 hammer and the $10 glass ashtray are over, turning FEMA from a disaster into a disaster relief agency, breaking gridlock on bills that hung around in Congress for years, 6 or 7 years, like the family leave law, the motor voter law, the Brady bill, and the crime bill.

But maybe the most stubborn problem we face is this problem of regulation. How do we do what we're supposed to do here? How do we help to reinforce the social contract and do our part to work with the private sector to protect the legitimate interests of the American people without literally taking leave of our senses and doing things that drive people up the wall but don't make them safer.

We all want the benefits of regulation. We all want clean air and clean water and safe food and toys that our children can play with. But let's face it, we all know the regulatory system needs repair. Too often the rule writers here in Washington have such detailed lists of do's and don'ts that the do's and don'ts undermine the very objectives they seek to achieve, when clear goals and operation for cooperation would work better. Too often, especially small businesses face a profusion of overlapping and sometimes conflicting rules. We've tried to set up an effective procedure here for resolving those conflicts, but it drives people crazy. I had somebody just yesterday mention being subject to two directly conflicting rules from two Federal agencies.

We have to move beyond the point where Washington is, to use the Vice President's phrase, the sort of national nanny that can always tell businesses, consumers, and workers not only what to do but exactly how to do it, when, and with a 100-page guideline. And as has already been said, we have begun to take the first steps in doing this.

You've heard about what the Comptroller of the Currency has done. I can tell you one thing: When I was out in New Hampshire in 1992, I heard more grief about the regulation of the private sector by the Comptroller of the Currency than any other single thing. And now every time I go to New England, they say, "We're making money. We're making loans, and we can function, because we finally got somebody down there in Washington who understands how to have responsible and safe banking regulations and still promote economic growth." I hear it every time I go up there, and I thank you, sir, for what you've done on that.

We've got industry and environmentalists alike supporting Carol Browner and the EPA's Common Sense Initiative and our proposed overhauls of the Superfund and the safe drinking water laws which I pray will pass in this session of Congress, and I believe they will, would increase both flexibility and improve results for consumers.

We've slashed the small business loan form from an inch thick to a single page.

We haven't had to wait for legislation to streamline all regulations. We've asked regulators and instructed them to use market mechanisms whenever possible and to open up the regulatory process to more public scrutiny and involvement.

HHS has cut its block grant application form in half for maternal and child health programs. EPA is exploring using enforceable contracts instead of regulation to eliminate potential risk. The FAA is reviewing all of its rules to identify those that are out of sync with state-of-the-art technology practices. And there's nothing more maddening to a businessman than being told one thing on Monday by one governmental agency and another thing on Tuesday by another.

Our Labor Department did something unusual about that as it relates to regulations that affect both labor and the environment. They talked to EPA before issuing their asbestos rules, a stunning departure from past practices. So that at least there, there are now no contradictory instructions.

We're also trying to bring common sense in other ways, targeting high-risk areas, focusing, for example, on lead in day care centers rather than aircraft hangars. We're making school lunches more nutritious but reducing the forms the local schools have to fill out to qualify for the program.

Today we're attempting to work with Members of both parties in Congress to further reform regulation. Soon the Congress will pass legislation so that Washington won't order States to solve problems without giving them the resources to do it. We're working together to pass legislation that ensures that regulation is especially sensitive to the needs of small businesses and to reduce paperwork. But we must clearly do more. We must ask ourselves some questions that are very, very important. And I want to emphasize those here.

Would you take the card down? This is why I asked all of you here, not just to be between me and the press corps. [*Laughter*]

Today, this is what we are now going to do. I am instructing all regulators to go over every single regulation and cut those regulations which are obsolete, to work to reward results, not redtape, to get out of Washington and go out into the country to create grassroots partnerships with the people who are subject to these regulations and to negotiate rather than dictate wherever possible.

We should ask ourselves—let me go through each one—on the regulations, we should ask ourselves: Do we really need this regulation? Could private businesses do this just as well with some accountability to us? Could State or local government do the job better, making Federal regulation not necessary? I want to really work through these things, and I want you, all of you, to review all these regulations and make a report to me by June 1st, along with any legislative recommendations you need to implement the changes that would be necessary to reduce the regulatory burden on the American people.

Second, I want every one of you to change the way we measure the performance of your agencies and the front-line regulators. I love the comment the Vice President had about people in Customs being evaluated about how many boxes they detain. I believe safety inspections should be judged, for example, by how many companies on their watch comply, not by how many citations our regulators write. We ought to be interested in results, not process.

Third, I want to to convene immediately groups consisting of the frontline regulators and the people affected by their regulations, not lawyers talking to lawyers in Washington or even the rest of us talking to each other in Washington but a conversation that actually takes place around the country, at our cleanup sites, our factories, and our ports. Where this has been done, as we saw here, we have seen stunning results. Most people in business in this country know that there is a reason for these regulations, for these areas of regulations. And most people would be more than happy to work to find a way that would reduce hassle and still achieve the public interest we seek to achieve.

Fourth, I want to move from a process where lawyers write volumes to one where people create partnerships based on common objectives and common sense. I want each regulatory agency head to submit to the White House a list of pending procedures

that can be converted into consensual negotiations.

Now, I want to say this again. This is very important. By June 1st, I want to know which obsolete regulations we can cut and which ones you can't cut without help from Congress. We want a system that will reward results, not redtape. We want to get out of Washington and talk to people who are doing the regulating and who are being regulated on the frontline. That is the only way we will ever change the culture that bothers people. We could stay here from now to kingdom come in this room, and we would never get that done.

And finally, we need to look for the areas in which we can honestly negotiate to produce the desired results rather than dictate.

Finally, the Vice President has been conducting a serious review of regulation in the areas of greatest concern. In the coming months, he will present to me a series of recommendations for regulatory reform on the environment, on health, on food, on financial institutions, on worker safety. And when appropriate and necessary, I will present them to the Congress.

This is what we are going to do, and it is high time. But let me also emphasize what we are not going to do. We have to recognize that, done right, regulation gives our children safer toys and food, protects our workers from injury, protects families from pollution, and that when we fail, it can have disastrous consequences.

The American economy is the envy of the world, in part because of the public health protections put in place over the last 30 years. Toxic emissions by factories have dropped by more than 50 percent, and lead levels in children's blood have dropped by 70 percent in three decades. Lake Erie, once declared dead, is now teeming with fish. One hundred and twelve thousand people survived car crashes because of auto safety rules. Workplace deaths are down by 50 percent since OSHA was created. Our food is safer, and we know its true nutritional content because the Government stood up for public interests.

These protections are still needed. There's not too little consumer fraud. Toys are not too safe. The environment is still not able to protect itself. Some would use the need for reform as a pretext to gut vital consumer, worker, environmental protections, even things that protect business itself. They don't want reform; they really want rigor mortis.

Some in Congress are pushing a collection of proposals that, taken together, would bring Federal protection of public health and safety to a halt. Later this week, the House will vote on an across-the-board freeze on all Federal regulations. It sounds good, but this stops in its tracks Federal action that protects the environment, protects consumers, and protects workers. For example, it would stop the Government from allocating rights to commercial fishermen. A person who's worked with those folks in Louisiana is here today. It would stop the Government from authorizing burials at Arlington Cemetery. It would stop good regulations, bad regulations, in-between regulations, all regulations. No judgment—sounds good but no judgment. It would even cancel the duck hunting season. [*Laughter*] That gives me some hope that it will not prevail. [*Laughter*] It would stop new protection from deadly bacteria in our drinking water, stop safer meat and poultry, stop safer cars, stop final implementation of the law that lets parents take a leave to care for a sick child. It would undermine what we're trying to do to promote safety in commuter airlines. If a moratorium takes effect, all these benefits will be on hold for the foreseeable future. Therefore, to me, a moratorium is not acceptable.

I agree with the Republicans in Congress on many things. We do need to change this system. We have been working for 2 years to change it, and believe you me, I know we've got a long way to go. But there is a right way to do it and a wrong way to do it. We can agree on many things, but I am convinced that a moratorium would hurt the broad interests of the American people and would benefit only certain narrow interests who, in the moment, think they would be undermined by having this or that particular regulation pass.

The best thing to do is to change the culture of regulation, to do the four things that I have outlined, not to put these things on hold but to put these things in high gear.

That is the right way to do this. I still believe that, working together with Congress, we can achieve real and balanced regulatory reform. But we shouldn't go too far. For example, we want all agencies to carefully compare the cost and benefits of regulations so that we don't impose any unnecessary burdens on business.

But the Contract With America, literally read, could pile so many new requirements on Government that nothing would ever get done. It would add to the very things that people have been complaining about for years—too many lawsuits, everything winds up in court. The contract, literally read, would override every single health and safety law in the books; distort the process by giving industry-paid scientists undue influence over rules that govern their employers; in the name of private property could literally bust the budget by requiring the Government to pay polluters every time an environmental law puts limits on profits.

These are extreme proposals. They go too far. They would cost lives and dollars. A small army of special interest lobbyists knows they can never get away with an outright repeal of consumer or environmental protection. But why bother if you can paralyze the Government by process? Surely, after years and years and years of people screaming about excessive governmental process, we won't just go to an even bigger round of process to tilt the process itself in another direction. We cannot strip away safeguards for families in this country.

Here in our audience today are real people on whose behalf we act or we might have acted. There's a father in this audience whose son died from *E. coli* bacteria in food that might have been discovered if our proposed rule had been in effect when his son ate the contaminated food. There are people here whose lives were saved by air bags. Let's not forget these people as we cut redtape and bureaucracy. There's a woman here who is a breast cancer survivor who lost a child to cancer, who lives in an area unusually high in the density of people who suffer from cancer. Let's not forget the kind of work that still needs to be done.

At every stage in the history of this country, our Government has always had to change to meet the needs of changing times. And we need to change now. We need a Government that's smaller and more entrepreneurial, that provides a lot less hassle, that realizes that there are an awful lot of people out there in the private sector who have enlightened views and they want to do the right thing and they need to be helped instead of hindered in that.

I would never defend the culture of this community when it is wrong. But let us also not forget that as we strive for a Government that is costing less and is more flexible, that is producing better results and not more rules, that we have a job to do for the American people and that people are entitled to protection. So I echo again what the Vice President said earlier: Reform, yes. Bring it on. Roll back, no. There is too much good to do to turn this noble enterprise into something that we would live to regret. Let us instead work to do what must be done.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:40 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.

Remarks Announcing the Appointment of Laura D'Andrea Tyson as Chair of the National Economic Council and an Exchange With Reporters

February 21, 1995

The President. Good afternoon. I am pleased to announce today my decision to appoint Dr. Laura Tyson, the Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers, to be the new Special Assistant to the President for Economic Policy and the Chair of the National Economic Council.

When I became President I believed that to have a sound economic policy, our economic policymakers had to work together as a solid and carefully coordinated team. To that end, I established the National Economic Council to play a coordinating role in economic policymaking, similar to the role the National Security Council has played in defense and foreign policy for 47 years. I believe that was clearly the right decision. It added discipline, direction, and strength, as

well as sweep to the administration's economic policymaking.

For 2 years, under the leadership of Robert Rubin, now the Secretary of the Treasury, we did work together as a team. We had talent. We had discipline. We had common vision, and we have produced results. We had an economic strategy that focused on the expansion of trade, technology, and educational opportunities and the reduction in the Government deficit and the size and sweep of adverse governmental policies. We had $600 billion plus in deficit reduction to which we have proposed another over $80 billion in deficit reduction. We've done more to open the world's markets to our products and services than any administration in a generation. We have reduced taxes on 15 million American working families and made tax cuts available to 9 out of 10 small businesses that invest more in their business. The economy in the last 2 years has created about 6 million new jobs, with the lowest combination of inflation and unemployment in 25 years.

Reversing the economic policies of the previous 12 years did not come easily. It required tough choices. Many of them were unpopular in the short run, but the results have clearly been felt. We were able to make those choices and follow through on them in the face of relentless predictions that they would produce recessions and produce disasters, because of the hard work of the outstanding members of our economic team.

One of the most important members of that team was Laura Tyson. She came to our administration from the University of California where she's a professor of economics and business administration. I found when I met her in the Presidential campaign that she had an exceptionally analytic mind and an understanding of the underlying global economic and political realities affecting our ability to compete and our economic future. She has been a very credible voice for us on the economy, and I have appreciated especially her unfailingly frank, direct, and principled advice. She has been a consensus builder and an honest broker without in any way compromising her own views in the inner councils and when we discussed economic policy.

We'll miss her at the Council of Economic Advisers, and I will appoint a new chair in the near future. But I am confident she will be a worthy successor to Bob Rubin at the National Economic Council. I'm glad she's taking on this new job. I think it will help us to keep taking on the job of keeping the American dream alive.

I also want to say again how important this is. I think when the history of this administration is written, one of the most significant organizational changes we will have made, and one that I predict all future administrations will follow, is the creation of the National Economic Council and the development of a coordinated, disciplined national economic policy for global economy.

I'd like to now introduce Dr. Tyson and let her make a few remarks. Thank you for doing this. Congratulations—no condolences. It's going to be a good change.

Thank you.

[*At this point, Dr. Tyson thanked the President and made brief remarks.*]

Contract With America

Q. Mr. President, tomorrow's day 50 of the Republican Contract With America. Do you find yourself in the position now, as you criticized the Republicans the first 2 years of simply saying no to many of your initiatives, that you are saying no, consistently threatening vetoes to many of the Republican initiatives? Is there a way around this so that there can be some bipartisanship in the next 2 years?

The President. There can be a lot of bipartisanship. First of all, I have not said consistently, no. I strongly supported applying to Congress the laws that apply to the private sector. I have supported limiting the ability of Congress to impose unfunded mandates on State and local government. I support the line-item veto. I support significant reform in the Federal regulatory process.

But where I do not agree with the extreme elements of the contract—and I might add, where also a number of Republican Senators do not agree with it and where, apparently, some Republican House Members no longer agree with it—Star Wars, eroding the 100,000 police commitment, cutting Medicare to pay for tax cuts. On those things, I

think I'm obligated to say where I don't agree. And that's what I'm doing. I'm trying to be as clear as I can be, hoping we can work together, hoping we can get legislation out of this.

I have not done what was done frequently in the previous 2 years, which is to say "We're walking away from this no matter what it is, even if we have to change our position on it," which is what they did on the crime bill.

So I'm looking forward to this. We're still going to make some good things happen, and we can still do it. But I owe it to the American people to protect them. They did not, in my judgment, ratify every extreme element of the contract as defined in every piece of legislation there. I am not trying to thwart them; I am trying to give them an opportunity to know exactly where I stand and to work with them.

This is Dr. Tyson's day, and I want to let her answer questions.

Thank you.

Mexican Loan Agreement

Q. To both of you, sir, Mexican markets took quite a tumble today on the news of the agreement reached here, which I think was probably considered surprising in some quarters. I wonder if both you and Dr. Tyson could comment on why you think that is and any worries you may have that the cure here may turn out to be worse than the disease.

Dr. Tyson. Well, I don't want to comment on specifics of the agreement, simply because there was a comment made by Secretary Rubin at luncheon because, frankly, I just got off an airplane and haven't been fully briefed on the agreement. What I will say is that we believe that the path that we've gone down is the correct path, and that we've worked hard to reach an agreement which we believe to be a sensible agreement which will do the trick.

Q. Mr. President?

The President. I don't know; I don't have an opinion. I think it may have something to do with the other decisionmakers than the United States and Mexico. We'll just have to see, but I would not overreact to it. We have done the right thing. Mexico is taking some very courageous steps, difficult steps for them. They have followed the proper economic path in general, and the United States has great interest there. There are many jobs tied up in it, our whole strategy of promoting democracy and free markets throughout Latin America. I think we did the right thing, and I believe it very strongly, and I think that time will bear us out. And if it doesn't, then we have very good collateral on this deal, so we have done the right thing by the American taxpayers and the American people as well.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:39 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Remarks Following a Meeting With the House Democratic Caucus and an Exchange With Reporters

February 22, 1995

The President. Good morning. Everyone here? I had an excellent meeting this morning with the House Democratic Caucus. We discussed a wide range of issues. I complimented them; I compliment them again on the work they are doing to remain unified in pursuit of the best interests of the people of this country.

I reaffirmed my willingness and desire to work with the Republican leadership in the Congress to advance the cause of the American people but that there are things which we simply disagree on and where we feel very strongly. I think it is ironic that here, on the 50th day of this 100-day effort that they are making to put in their contract, the single most important issue in the world to them seems to be to cut the school lunch program and end it.

And old conservative adage used to be, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Here's a program that isn't broke, that's done a world of good for millions and millions of children of all races and backgrounds all across our country, and I think it would be a terrible mistake to put an end to it, to gut it, to undermine it. And I hope that my party will stand against this. I do not agree with it. I do not think it is right, and it seems to me that this is one of the things that we hired on to do, to stick up for the interest of children, for the vast middle class, and for our future. And

I intend to do that, and I believe the Congress will, as well—at least those in our party will, as well.

Mr. Leader.

[*At this point, Congressman Dick Gephardt made brief remarks.*]

Tax Cuts

Q. Mr. President, as Republicans look at balancing the books now, support for a big tax cut is supposedly softening and may very well wither and die on the Senate vine. Do you still feel that it's responsible to have some kind of tax cut?

The President. Yes, I didn't—of course, I always thought their tax cuts were too big and couldn't be paid for. The one that I offered was, I think, roughly less than a third in aggregate costs of what theirs was. And of course, in the second 5 years, if theirs had passed, it would have been much greater. So I'm glad to see a sobering of attitudes about that.

But I do believe, again, that our main mission here has to be to try to advance the cause of the American people. And we have to continue to bring the deficit down, but we also have to recognize that there is out there in this country what Secretary Reich has called an anxious class, people who are working harder and for whom more jobs in the American economy have not meant more security.

If we allow a deduction of the cost of education after high school, especially if we couple that with a minimum wage increase, and continuing to increase the college loans and the investments in education, we will increase those folks' incomes in the short run in ways that will increase their incomes in the long run, increase their ability to pay taxes, and strengthen the American economy.

So I believe a carefully targeted tax relief to the middle class, tied to education in ways that will grow the economy and grow jobs, is an appropriate thing to do. I'm glad to hear the talk of abandoning tax cuts of the size that were being proposed. I tried to tell the American people in the campaign there was no way in the wide world that could be done, and I welcome that talk.

Democratic Action on Capitol Hill

Q. Does this 50-day point mark some sort of turning point for you in terms of shoring up, taking a firm stand on things, trying to present the Democratic side as a unified side against the Republicans?

The President. Well, I think they've been doing a good job on that. There have been two or three issues here lately where the Democrats have really rallied: first, in the national security area, where they basically were responsible for not going back to Star Wars, which would have been a big mistake and, secondly, where they voted against abandoning our commitment to the American people to put 100,000 more police officers on the street. And I believe they will be even more unified against an attempt to destroy the school lunch program. So I feel good about that.

But I also think we have been willing to work with the Republicans. You know, the bill to apply to Congress the laws that applies to the private sector passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives with the same level of Democratic support as Republicans support. The bill to reduce the burden of unfunded mandates on State and local governments received large Democratic support.

So we want to work with the Republicans. But we have no intention of abandoning the American people to unproven theories and extreme positions. We're the people party, and we're going to stick up for the people. And when we can do that in good conscience by working with them to reduce the burden of Government, we want to do that, and we should do that. But I'm excited by the opportunity that this new period offers us to stand up for what we believe in.

Q. Where will you draw the line?

Deputy Press Secretary Ginny Terzano. Thank you.

The President. What did you say? Thank you? You want me to quit? [*Laughter*]

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. at the Capitol.

Statement on the Peace Process in Northern Ireland

February 22, 1995

I welcome today's announcement by Irish Prime Minister Bruton and British Prime Minister Major of the launching of a joint framework document outlining their shared proposals for inclusive talks on the future of Northern Ireland. The publication of this document marks another significant step forward in the peace process. I congratulate both Prime Ministers, former Irish Prime Minister Albert Reynolds, Irish Foreign Minister Dick Spring, and British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland Sir Patrick Mayhew, all of whom have worked hard and risked much in the search for a new path forward to reconciliation and lasting peace.

The framework document lays the foundation for all-party talks among the British and Irish Governments and the political parties in Northern Ireland. The talks are intended to be all-inclusive, with all issues on the table. As the Irish and British Governments have emphasized, the document is designed to assist discussion and negotiation on Northern Ireland and will not be imposed on any party. The clear wish of the people of Northern Ireland is for a lasting peace. We call upon all the parties to examine the document carefully and move forward on the basis of it.

The guns and bombs have been silent in Northern Ireland for almost 6 months. The benefits of peace are obvious to all, and I urge the parties to seize this opportunity. I will continue to strongly support the peace process in Northern Ireland and to work with the Governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom to build on today's courageous step forward toward lasting peace. In addition, I look forward to our Trade and Investment Conference to be held this May as a way to underscore the tangible benefits to peace.

Statement on Compensation for Persian Gulf Veterans

February 22, 1995

Today, the country takes a long-overdue step to recognize the sacrifices of these Persian Gulf veterans. We are taking an unprecedented approach to assisting these veterans by providing compensation for conditions that have defied conventional diagnoses. We encourage any Persian Gulf veteran who is sick to file a claim, and we will automatically reopen previously denied claims as a result of this new law.

I felt that we could not wait on science. For some Persian Gulf veterans like Michael Sills, medical science does not have answers today, but we must not and will not give up.

Michael Sills and veterans like him who served their country honorably have earned our gratitude. And when they are sick, we must do what is right.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing that the President met with Michael I. Sills, one of the first recipients of a compensation check awarded to Persian Gulf veterans with chronic disabilities resulting from undiagnosed illnesses.

Executive Order 12950—Establishing an Emergency Board To Investigate a Dispute Between Metro North Commuter Railroad and Its Employees by Certain Labor Organizations

February 22, 1995

Disputes exist between Metro North Commuter Railroad and certain of its employees represented by certain labor organizations. The labor organizations involved in these disputes are designated on the attached list, which is made a part of this order.

The disputes have not heretofore been adjusted under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U.S.C. 151 *et seq.*) (the "Act").

A party empowered by the Act has requested that the President establish an emergency board pursuant to section 9A of the Act (45 U.S.C. 159a).

Section 9A(c) of the Act provides that the President, upon such request, shall appoint an emergency board to investigate and report on the disputes.

Now, Therefore, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, in-

cluding section 9A of the Act, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Establishment of the Board.* There is established effective February 22, 1995, a board of three members to be appointed by the President to investigate these disputes. No member shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of railroad employees or any carrier. The board shall perform its functions subject to the availability of funds.

Sec. 2. *Report.* The board shall report to the President with respect to the disputes within 30 days of its creation.

Sec. 3. *Maintaining Conditions.* As provided by section 9A(c) of the Act, from the date of the creation of the board and for 120 days thereafter, no change, except by agreement of the parties, shall be made by the carrier or the employees in the conditions out of which the disputes arose.

Sec. 4. *Records Maintenance.* The records and files of the board are records of the Office of the President and upon the board's termination shall be maintained in the physical custody of the National Mediation Board.

Sec. 5. *Expiration.* The board shall terminate upon submission of the report provided for in section 2 of this order.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 22, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:09 p.m., February 23, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order and the attached annex were published in the *Federal Register* on February 27.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Budget Rescissions and Deferrals

February 22, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral, totaling $7.3 million, and two revised rescission proposals, totaling $106.7 million.

The revised deferral affects the Department of Health and Human Services. The revised rescission proposals affect the Department of Education and the Environmental Protection Agency.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 22, 1995.

Remarks to the Business Council

February 22, 1995

Thank you very much. Ed, you did such a good job, I was thinking there wasn't much more for me to say. I'll just—what if I say I agree and sit down and get a free meal? [*Laughter*] I'm delighted to be back here with this group, and I'm glad to see many old friends. I've tried to make a couple of the tables, and afterward, I want to go around to say hello to everybody I missed.

I, more than anything else, want to say, too, I appreciate the receptivity that many, many members of this group have had to working with me and with the members of our administration. I have many members of the Cabinet here and sub-Cabinet members, and we've worked on a whole range of issues.

As a gesture of good will, I left my golf clubs home tonight—[*laughter*]—so none of you are in danger of being hit by errant balls. Actually, I didn't hit anybody last week, either. I didn't hit it far enough to hit anybody. I was trying, but I couldn't get the ball up in the air.

I've given some thought to what we ought to talk about tonight. There are several issues I want to speak about. Maybe I should try to do pretty much what I did last year, which is to just give you an update as big stockholders in America on where I think we are and where we have to go.

I'd like to begin by thanking you for the work we've done together in trade, particularly, and the support many of you have given to our deficit reduction and budget control and Government reduction efforts over the last couple of years and the involvements we've had in building new and, in many ways, unprecedented partnerships with the private sector to try to promote American products and services around the world.

But even more fundamental than that, I'd like to say that perhaps the thing we have

most in common is not that we run big operations. Some of you may have heard the story I've been telling about the college president who told me over New Year's that being president was like running a cemetery. You had a lot of people under you, but nobody was listening. [*Laughter*] And sometimes you may feel that way as well.

But what we really have in common is that we've had the chance, each of us in our different ways, to live the American dream. We've had opportunities to do what we want to do, to live out the dreams of our childhood, to be rewarded for our labors in ways that very few people in this country and in this world have had. And it may be just because we're eminently deserving, but I'm sure we'd all admit we've been the beneficiaries of good fortune and a lot of help along the way as well. I know that I certainly feel that way.

And I think we have a peculiar obligation at this moment in our country's history when there is so much change going on to try to make sure that we preserve the dream that we've lived for all the people that are coming after us. That's really the mission that I think we should all be on at the end of the 20th century.

As you look ahead to the future, it is so full of excitement and opportunity and unimaginable benefits. But it is also full of a range of changes and challenges to ordinary people that are truly intimidating. And these challenges, these great opportunities that are sweeping across our country as we hurdle into the global economy of the 21st century are having very uneven impacts out there in America, even among people who are all trying to do the right thing as hard as they can. All the downsizing and rightsizing and changing all the challenges and all the rewards that come to people who meet the education premium of the knowledge society, they all have a different side which brings upheaval and uncertainty and insecurity to an awful lot of our folks.

And at a time like this, it's very important that the people who are out there, trying to make sense of what's going on in the world as it affects their lives at least know that those of us who are in positions of leadership and who have responsibility for capturing and keeping and preserving and passing on the American dream are doing our dead level best to do that and to keep a world in which, if you're in this country and you're doing the right things, you've got a good chance to be rewarded for your efforts in making a successful career and raising a successful family.

I ran for President because I thought we were running away from too many of our major challenges, because it was too easy to play the politics of the moment. There is, as we find repeatedly, a price for taking the long view and doing things that are difficult and unpopular, but nonetheless, that's work that has to be done.

When I got here, we began by passing the biggest deficit reduction package in history, one that would reduce the deficit by $600 billion-plus over 5 years. We cut or eliminated outright more than 300 programs, reduced the Federal Government already by over 100,000 positions and, if no new laws were passed by the new Congress, the size of the Federal Government would be shrunk by 272,000 now over 5 years, making it the smallest it's been since Mr. Kennedy was the President of the United States.

In that budget, we were able to give tax relief for working families with incomes of under $26,000 a year, increase the expensing provision for the small businesses of our country in ways that benefited large numbers of them, and of course, we've worked together to lower export barriers and to pass NAFTA and GATT, to get the APEC nations to agree to a free trade zone in Asia early in the next century, and at the Summit of the America's, we've agreed to work on a free trade zone here in our own back yard.

We've had the most active and aggressive efforts on behalf of American interests by the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, at least, in all of my experience, and I think of that of most of yours. We've tried to harness the power of science and technology and the downsizing of the defense budget to make them opportunities for us to develop new commercial products that we can sell around the world.

It is important in all these things to realize that we have made a fundamental choice as Americans, a choice we've been making now

for many decades, and that is that we're going to compete and win in the world; we're not going to run away from it; we're not going to attempt to hide behind barriers; we're going to face the very vigorous challenges that global competition presents; and we're going to make them work for the American people and for our future.

Not everyone believes that that's a course we should take. That has not only economic implications but also security implications. And so I ask that those of you who understand that support the decisions that we will have to make that may be unpopular in the short run.

Many of you have already written to me or called me, supporting the action that I took with regard to the financial crisis in Mexico. I appreciate that. It is an important issue for the workers and the business interests of this country, long-term, and as many of you know not simply because of Mexico but because of Argentina and Brazil and all of Latin America and, indeed, the developing world at large. We have a stake in seeing that people who are committed to democracy and to free market economics and to open trade have a chance to succeed in a difficult world. And we should not be surprised when there are certain rocks in the road when the path is uneasy and uneven. And so I hope that all of you believe that I did the right thing, but I do want to say for those of you who have expressed your support, I appreciate that.

The second point I want to make is that this is not just an economic issue. The burdens of leadership, if we want to benefit from them, also require us to be involved in the world in foreign policy issues, require us to take the lead, for example, in trying to resolve the nuclear issue with North Korea, require us to do things that are wildly unpopular in the short term but are in our long-term interest, like restoring democracy in Haiti and require us to continue to support responsible operations in the United Nations.

Now, in this new Congress, there will be many debates designed basically to try to withdraw the United States from a role of world leadership. And I understand why people who voted for both parties in the last congressional election are overwhelmingly preoccupied with their own problems at home. But what you understand is, we cannot solve our problems at home unless we remain a leader in the world. It is a false choice.

And so, I urge you to engage the new Congress in a constructive debate from your perspective about our responsibilities to maintain the leadership of the United States in economic affairs, in support of freedom and free markets, and in security affairs. And the two things go hand in hand. We should be prudent. We should be restrained. We should not be involved in every conflict. We cannot solve every problem. But where we can make a difference, where it is plainly in the interest of the United States, we must be in a position to do so, in terms of our economic interests and our security interests. So that's the first request I would make of you in our common obligation to preserve the American dream into the next century.

The second thing I'd like to say is that we have cut Government, and we've made it work better. We've tried to do things that other people talked about. We've deregulated much of the banking operations. We've deregulated interstate trucking. We have lowered dramatically export controls on high-tech products. We've reformed the Federal procurement system, which was an unbelievable mess and which the Vice President liked because it got him on the David Letterman Show, breaking up $10 glass ashtrays. [*Laughter*]

We cut the SBA loan form from an inch thick to a page long and the response time to nearly nothing. We did the same thing with FHA processing. We are working hard with this new Congress in many ways that I think all Americans support. I was glad to sign the law applying to Congress any requirements it imposes on private employers, and I think that will make the Congress think a while when they start passing laws that affect you, when they have to consider how it will affect them.

We are working now to pass a bill that will reduce the burden of unfunded Federal mandates on State and local governments, and I think we should. We are trying to resolve the conflicts in Federal regulations that have often occurred between one agency and another, and we are making some specific

progress there in getting the Labor Department and the EPA to work together.

All of these things have been part of an economic strategy that, when combined with your remarkable efforts and those of American businesspeople large and small and American workers all across this country, booming productivity, all these things together have given us the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation in 25 years, nearly 6 million new jobs—93 percent of them in the private sector—the highest rate of private sector job growth in any recovery in the last 20 years.

For the first time in 9 years, last year our country's economy was voted the most productive in the world. We've reduced our deficit to about half the percentage of our national income it was when I became President. And the Council of Economic Advisers gave me an interesting chart the other day which showed the annual deficit of the country, except for interest on the debt—to show you what a problem that is—you take away interest on the accumulated national debt; the last time we had an operating surplus in the Federal budget was in Lyndon Johnson's term, and it was tiny. In the Kennedy-Johnson term, it was larger. In our first 2 years, our operating surplus, without interest on the debt, is as large as it was in the Kennedy-Johnson term, the first time in 30 years that's been the case through Republican and Democratic administrations alike. So we have worked hard to control Government spending, but the accumulated burden of interest on the debt has changed the dynamics rather dramatically of managing that problem.

We had to make some tough decisions to get to this point. They were characterized by our opponents in the last election in ways that benefited them politically and burdened us. People accused us of raising their taxes when we didn't and accused us of expanding the Government when we were contracting it.

But the important thing is not the results of any particular election but that we did the right thing and that the country is moving in the right direction, and we must continue to do that and take on the jobs that are still ahead. We know we've got a lot more work to do in changing the way the Federal Government works. And I believe now more than anything else, we are in place and on the way to eliminating and consolidating any number of Government programs. In this new budget, we cut or eliminate another 400 and consolidate them.

We've proposed the ''GI bill'' for America's workers, which I hope every one of you will support, which would consolidate 70 Federal training programs into one program and give an unemployed worker or a worker with a wage so low that he or she qualifies for Federal training funds the right to a $2,600 a year voucher to take to the nearest community college or to any other approved training program to get whatever training they need. So that instead of having all these piecemeal Federal programs of uncertain impact, we just put the money in a pot and use it to educate and retrain workers who are moving between jobs. That will increase the productivity of the work force, reduce the time of unemployment, and increase the earning capacity of a lot of workers.

Those are the kinds of things we're working on. I think perhaps the most important thing we can do, to go back to something Ed said, is to try to change this sort of culture of regulation which has accumulated over the last 30 or 35 years in both Republican and Democratic administrations, unrelated to whether the objectives of the regulation are in conventional terms, if you will, liberal or conservative.

We have regulators who have not wanted to be arbitrary, so they've tried to think of every conceivable circumstance that could happen in a certain area and then write rules with overwhelming precision, the impact of which was to be so incapable of understanding that the administration of them was as arbitrary as if you had written something very general.

We have other rules which focus too much on the process rather than the end product. Instead of saying, this is the clean air standard that State X must meet, they say, here are the 25 things you have to do because they will produce the clean air standard whether they will or not.

We have too many rules where the process of enforcing the rules is evaluated more than the results. We've found, for example, that

we had Customs officials who were evaluated on their jobs based on how many shipments of imported toys they commandeered. Well, not surprisingly, we had more toys than other products in certain Customs places, because that's how you determine whether you were doing a good job, not whether there was anything wrong with the toys or not. We have other places where people are qualified and evaluated for promotions based on the volume, the number of fines that they write, not whether or not they eliminate the problem which causes people to get fined in the first place.

So this whole culture, it seems to me, needs a thorough reexamination. Yesterday, the Vice President and I made an appearance before all of the Federal regulators from all of the agencies, and introduced some of our success stories, a banker from Oklahoma who came to talk about how the Comptroller of the Currency was dealing with banks from his point of view better than anybody had in decades. We also introduced some reminders of why we need regulation, a man whose wife was saved by air bags, a man whose son was lost to *E. coli* poisoning because the rule we now have in place on meat inspections was not there when his son ate contaminated food. And we talked about the changes we were going to try to make.

I instructed these regulators to review every single regulation they have by June 1st and make a report to me by June 1st based on which ones they thought could be scrapped altogether, which ones could be modified, and whether any of the regulation could better be done at the State and local level or by some self-policing mechanism. I asked them to look for new measures of success that focused more on results as opposed to process.

Finally, the Vice President's conducting a review of all of the regulations covering food, health, the environment, worker safety, and financial institutions to make further recommendations for reforms in those areas.

I want to work with the Republicans in this area to try to help to break and change a culture of regulation that makes people hate the Federal Government when they think it is grinding on them in ways that don't make sense and which don't necessarily—the culture often doesn't necessarily give us better regulation and better results. And I hope that we can work together to do this, but I don't think we ought to roll back or wreck things that do work or walk away from our obligation to elevate the quality of life in this country.

One of the reasons our economy is strong, in my judgment, is that we have found a way to pursue economic growth and pursue environmental protection. We have found a way to pursue increasing productivity, and we have seen a reduction in injuries in the workplace.

So I don't think most people believe we ought to walk away from our obligation to have safe food or safe toys or clean air or clean water. I don't believe that it's wrong to make sure that our cars are safe or that mammograms are accurate. I think that these safeguards really work. The question is, how can we change them in ways that really make sense?

I find that a lot of the things we have to do, like a lot of the things you have to do, are not particularly sexy, flashy changes; they require hard work. And the impact of them accumulates over time. It's just like these 102,000 employees that don't work for the Federal Government anymore. A lot of people are genuinely surprised because they didn't see any of them leaving on the news at night. And they didn't, because we managed the process in a very disciplined way to try to minimize disruption in people's lives, the same way you would manage the process.

Now, the temptation is always to try to do something that will make a statement that will pierce the public consciousness even if it's not the right remedy. That's what we're facing on regulation now, from my point of view. Some of the people in the Republican Congress are proposing that we freeze all Federal regulations for an extended period of time in a way that would override every single pending health and safety law on the books. To me, that's not acceptable. And there are a whole lot of pending regulations that we have people in this room who want to go through. And it will create unimaginable headaches. The last time we did it, every single analysis was that it cost more money

than it saved, that it led to lawsuits, that it turned out to be a headache.

I know we need to change the way the Federal Government regulates. We have already done it in some areas. We have not done nearly what we need to do. We have a process in place that we've been working on for months to do it. But I ask you to help us do it in the right way. I also hope that when we get into this whole budget, we will be able to proceed in the right and responsible way.

A lot of you here, for example, have argued in the past and have testified in the Congress for expanding Head Start, for the Women, Infant, and Children program, for continuing to invest in the education and training of our people. We know that the only way to raise incomes in America and the global economy is to improve the education and training of the work force and to improve the overall productivity and wealth-generating capacity of the economic system itself. We clearly have an obligation there. And so, I would hope that the second thing I would ask you—the third thing, after the regulatory issue—support regulatory reform, insist on it, demand on it, demand it, give us your ideas, but let's don't do something that looks good that will have a perverse impact.

And the third thing I would ask is that you would support an investment budget for the Federal Government that gives people the chance to make the most of their own lives. It gives people the chance to get the education and training they need.

You know, one of the best things we've done is this direct student loan program. When I ran for President—and I had been a Governor for a dozen years; I had listened to students who dropped out of college; I listened to people who couldn't go to college; I listened to older people who wanted to go back—and one of the things I kept hearing complaints about was the loan program, and how a lot of people wouldn't go to school or would drop out because they didn't want to borrow so much money, and they didn't think they could pay it back. So under our system now, people who borrow money, number one, get it at lower cost, and number two, have the option of paying the money back as a percentage of their income, so that if they get out of school and take a modestly paying job, they can still pay their loans back no matter what the burden is.

And believe it or not, because we went to direct loans and got out of the middleman system where we essentially guaranteed student loans to banks who made them so that there was no risk and very little incentive on collecting and no incentive to go to court to collect, because we were going to pay anyway, we actually have cut the cost of the student loan program by over $5 billion over a 5-year period and increased the volume of loans and lowered its cost.

These are the kinds of things, it seems to me, we ought to be doing. And by the way, every now and then the Government does something right. When I became President, you were paying out $2.8 billion a year in tax money because of loan defaults. We've cut that to $1 billion a year. We've cut it by almost two-thirds, the costs.

So these are the things, it seems to me, we ought to be doing. And so I would say to you that on this last point—this is very important—it's not only important for us to say what the Government should not be doing—and I will support this new Congress, as I said, in many ways; we're going to have a big fight on the line-item veto, and a lot of people in my party aren't for it, but I am strong for it; I think we ought to have it; I will support it—but there are some things we should be doing, things that we do right. And I hope that you, of all people, who understand the critical importance of education and training for a lifetime will support a responsible Federal role here.

Let me just tell you that this is not an idle discussion I'm having. Just today, just for example, the chairman of the relevant House committee introduced a bill that would eliminate the Federal commitment to food and nutrition for children, throw the money into two block grants, and send it to the States, and freeze the money, which will effectively mean the end of the school lunch program.

Now, that has been a remarkable success. It feeds 25 million kids every day. It has a low administrative overhead, and we are in the process of simplifying the ability of the schools to participate in the program, cutting their costs, cutting their hassles.

We have done everything we could, by the way, to make flexibility the order of the day for States. We've granted more waivers in welfare reform and health care reform than the two previous administrations put together, so that States who were serious about changing their own systems could get around all these Federal rules. But doing away with the school lunch program is not my idea of reinventing Government or saving tax money.

When I was growing up, a conservative was somebody who said if it ain't broke, don't fix it. And now we've got lots of folks in Washington—there are all these things that are broken we ought to be fixing, and they're running right by them, trying to fix things that are working just fine.

The school lunch program does not need to be destroyed in our common lust to reduce the Federal Government where it has to be reduced. In 1991 as I said, there were five major CEO's who appeared before Congress to say that the WIC program, the Women, Infants, and Children was a good idea. Three of them are here tonight: Bob Allen, John Clendenin, and Bob Winters. They said WIC was, I quote, "a triple-A rated investment" in the future. They were right then; they're right now. At that time, a bipartisan group in the Senate, led by Senator Leahy and Senator Dole, helped to save that program. We have expanded that program, and we're going to have healthier children and a stronger future as a result. So I ask you, please to stand up for that.

Lastly, let me say that a lot of you supported, a lot of you opposed, and a lot of you sat on the sideline and scratched your head when we had the big health care debate last year. I want to put this issue before you. As has always been the case—at least since President Nixon first tried to do it in '72, I don't know what happened when Harry Truman did it; I know what happened to him, but I don't know what happened to health care costs—but there was a dramatic moderation of health care costs last year. More people are going into managed care plans. But there are still serious problems with it.

The only part of the Federal budget that's going up at faster than the rate of inflation are Medicare, Medicaid, and interest on the debt. We've now had 2 years in a row where we have reduced both defense and domestic discretionary spending and produced what I said before, an operating surplus, except for interest on the debt.

The only responsible way to deal with the entitlements problem over the long run is to keep working to help to solve the health care problem. And in spite of the moderation in health care costs, you should know that another million Americans in working families lost their health insurance last year. We're the only country in the world with an advanced economy that has a smaller percentage of people under 65 with health insurance today than had it 10 years ago. And most of you represent companies that are paying for that, because these people do get health care when they're too sick and it's too late and they show up at the emergency room, and you get the bill in indirect costs. You know that.

So as I have said in the State of the Union Address, we bit off more than we could chew last time. We tried to do too much. But piece by piece, we need to have some insurance reforms. We need to think about people whose families are without insurance when they're unemployed. We need to think about what we can do to put some pieces in place that will stop the cost-shifting and allow some long-term reform of this system and bring the Medicare and Medicaid programs within line of inflation without having even more costs passed along to you.

Those are things that I can report to you this country's in better shape than it was 2 years ago, but these are things that we need to work on. We need to maintain America's economic and security leadership in the world. We need to continue to work to downsize the Government and to change the culture of regulation in the right way. We need to stand up for what is necessary and appropriate from our National Government in terms of preserving the quality of life and more important than anything else, empowering people to make the most of their own lives. And we need to keep working at this entitlement/health care problem piece by piece so that we can help the economy to grow, help the deficit to be controlled, and provide health care to the people who de-

serve it. If we do those things, we will be doing what we should do to give the next generations of Americans the American dream that brought us all here tonight.

I think it is a very exciting time to be here. I enjoy it. I enjoy working with the new Congress, and I don't mind the disagreements with the new Congress. But the most important thing is, this is not a game, and it is not a dress rehearsal. We are taking the American people into the next century, and we owe it to them to do it in a way that gives countless generations that come behind us the chance to be in rooms like this for generations from now and to do whatever they want to live up to their God-given ability.

Thank you very much. Thank you. Ed, tell them to go serve dinner, and I'll go shake hands. [*Laughter*] Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:40 p.m. at the Park Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Edgar S. Woolard, Jr., chief executive officer, E.I. du Pont de Nemores & Co.; Robert E. Allen, chairman and chief executive officer, AT&T Corp.; John L. Clendenin, chairman and chief executive officer, BellSouth Corp.; and Robert C. Winters, chairman emeritus, Prudential Insurance.

Remarks on Arrival in Ottawa, Canada

February 23, 1995

Governor General and Mrs. LeBlanc, Chief of Protocol Lederman, Ambassador and Mrs. Blanchard, Ambassador and Mrs. Chrétien, ladies and gentlemen: *Je salut nos voisins, nos alliés, nos amis.* I salute our neighbors, our allies, our friends.

I must say that on this beautiful day I can't help recalling the wonderful visit that Vice President and Mrs. Gore enjoyed here last July. I thank you for the hospitality you showed them. And I also want to tell you what I told the Vice President, Governor General: The next time, I get July and he gets February.

I come to Ottawa to celebrate the vital friendship and the partnership between Canada and the United States and the work to make it even stronger. Our relationship is centered on a shared continent, shared values, shared aspirations, and real respect for our differences. Its very success makes it easy to take for granted, but we must never take it for granted.

In a world in which too many nations still choose conflict over cooperation and erect barriers instead of bridges, our partnership has been and must ever be a model for others and the foundation on which to build a common future.

Over the years, our alliance has been enriched by strong leadership from Canada, and I have come to appreciate that firsthand. Prime Minister Chrétien possesses an extraordinary breadth of experience in government and a passion for this great nation from Halifax to Vancouver. He has forcefully advanced Canada's interests. Fair in settling our differences, he has been a true friend in working with me on the dozens of concerns our countries share.

Our nations have forged the most comprehensive ties of any two nations on Earth. They bind not only our Governments but also our economies, our cultures, and our people. From NORAD to NAFTA, Canadians and Americans have seized opportunities to provide for our common security and prosperity. We've tackled tough problems from acid rain and water pollution to differences over beer and grain in the spirit of friendship and in pragmatism.

We've grown so close that some Americans find it uncomfortable that your Blue Jays have won the last two World Series. We hope and we believe they will not be the last World Series, and we were grateful for a little equal time when our Rangers got bragging rights to the Stanley Cup.

This week we'll focus on commerce between our countries, which last year exceeded $270 billion. It is the largest bilateral trading relationship in the world. It supports millions of good jobs, and thanks to NAFTA, it's growing by more than 10 percent every year. It sends a powerful message around the world that open markets can be the key to greater prosperity. Now, to take greater advantage of the opportunities free trade offers our people, we'll sign a new aviation agreement that makes it easier for passengers and cargo to travel between our countries.

The work we're doing to better the lives of people within our borders will also benefit from our leadership beyond our borders. From making peace in the Middle East to restoring democracy and keeping the peace in Haiti, we are working together to spread freedom and tolerance and civility. From expanding NATO to revitalizing the G–7, which Canada will host in Halifax this June, we are preparing the world's major organizations to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

At a time when some tell us to retreat from our problems abroad rather than to reach out to make the world more peaceful and more prosperous, Canada's strong internationalist tradition is an inspiration to those of us in America and to countries around the world.

Addressing your Parliament 50 years ago, President Truman declared that the success of the U.S.-Canadian relationship was due to, and I quote, ''one part proximity, and nine parts good will and common sense.'' Good will and common sense remain the foundation of our friendship. This week we will go forward to strengthen it, a friendship in which all of us take real and just pride, and from which all of us draw strength, and for which all of us, Canadians and Americans, should be very, very grateful.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:59 a.m. in Hangar 11 at McDonald-Cartier International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Governor General Romeo LeBlanc of Canada, and his wife, Diana Fowler-LeBlanc; Canadian Chief of Protocol Lawrence Lederman; U.S. Ambassador to Canada James J. Blanchard, and his wife, Janet; Canadian Ambassador to the United States Raymond Chrétien, and his wife, Kay; and Prime Minister Jean Chrétien of Canada.

Remarks at a Luncheon in Ottawa

February 23, 1995

Governor General LeBlanc, Mrs. LeBlanc, Prime Minister and Mrs. Chrétien, ladies and gentlemen: Hillary and I are honored to be your first official guests, humbled to be reminded of the results of the last two World Series—[*laughter*]—grateful to be reminded of the results of the last Stanley Cup. [*Laughter*]

I have to say for the benefit of the American press corps traveling with us and especially for my often beleaguered Press Secretary, Mr. McCurry, who's over there, the Governor General, I learned in preparation for this trip, in a former life was the Press Secretary to two previous Canadian Prime Ministers. So there is life after the labors, Mr. McCurry. [*Laughter*]

It's a great pleasure for me to be here in this beautiful Rideau Hall to celebrate the friendship of our two nations. It is fitting that not far from here two rivers come together to form the powerful Rideau Falls, much like the strength of our two nations increase as we join together. Shared history, shared borders—they are the foundation of our unique and intensely productive relationship, an alliance the likes of which the world has really never seen before.

From the Canadians who helped slaves to freedom on the Underground Railroad, to the battalions who fought side by side on the beaches of Normandy, to the United States astronaut who used a Canadian-made robotic arm on the space shuttle 2 weeks ago, Americans are grateful to our neighbors for helping us along the way.

When President Kennedy visited Ottawa here over 30 years ago, he said, ''Geography has made us neighbors. History has made us friends. Economics has made us partners. And necessity has made us allies. Those whom nature has so joined together let no man put asunder.'' So President Kennedy proclaimed our wedding vows—[*laughter*]—and I am here to tell you we should reaffirm them. The bond that the President described so well must continue to deepen. Together we have pushed open the doors of commerce and trade. We have found common ground to preserve the beauty and the natural resources of our lands. We have walked as one in our efforts to make the world beyond North America more secure and more free.

I thank you for your support of our common endeavors in Haiti. I admire you for your faithfulness in seeking peace in the former Yugoslavia. And I thank you most recently for your support in the action we have taken to try to stabilize the situation in Mexico, our partner and friend.

Today, instant communication has made our world so much smaller that some say the entire globe is our neighborhood. Yet, the ties that bind these two nations, Canada and the United States, remain unique. And as we move into the next century, let us, both of us, resolve to help make those ties grow in spirit, grow in harmony. The times demand it. Our children deserve it. The world is depending upon it.

Thank you for welcoming me to this beautiful city and this wonderful country.

I would now like to offer a toast to Canada, to the Governor General and to Mrs. LeBlanc.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:21 p.m. at the Governor General's residence. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and his wife, Aline.

Remarks to the Canadian Parliament in Ottawa

February 23, 1995

Mr. Prime Minister and Mrs. Chrétien, Mr. Speaker of the Senate, Mr. Speaker of the House of Commons, honorable Senators and Members of the House of Commons, distinguished members of the diplomatic corps, ladies and gentlemen: I have pondered for some time the differences between the Canadian political system and the American one, and when the Prime Minister pointed out the unanimous resolution you passed yesterday, I realized that in one respect, clearly you are superior. We do not control the weather in Washington, DC—[*laughter*]—and I am grateful that you do.

I also thank the Prime Minister for his history lesson, I have never believed in the iron laws of history so much as I do now. [*Laughter*]

I thank the Prime Minister and all of you for welcoming me to this magnificent capital city. The Prime Minister first came to this Chamber to represent the people of Canada when President Kennedy was in the White House. I resent that, because when President Kennedy was in the White House, I was in junior high school—[*laughter*]—and now the Prime Minister has less gray hair than I do. [*Laughter*] And he does, in spite of the fact that since that time he has occupied nearly every seat in his nation's Cabinet. The first time I met him, I wondered why this guy couldn't hold down a job. [*Laughter*]

I can tell you this: We in the United States know that his service to this nation over so many years has earned him the gratitude and the respect of the Canadian people. It has also earned him the gratitude and the respect of the people of the United States.

I know it is traditional for American Presidents, when they address this body, to speak of their affection for their ties to the Canadian people. On behalf of the United States, let me stay with that tradition, and say, *l'amitie solide*.

But let me say to you that it is a big part of our life. I remember so well more than a decade ago when Hillary and I with our then very young daughter came to Canada to celebrate the new year, and we started in Montreal, and we drove to Chateau Montebello. And along the way, we drove around Ottawa, and we watched all those wonderful people skating along the canal. I came from a Southern State. I couldn't imagine that anybody could ever get on skates and stand in any body of water for very long. [*Laughter*]

And I could see that always—Hillary has had in the back of her mind all this long time how much she would like to be skating along this canal. And I think tomorrow Mrs. Chrétien is going to give her her wish, and we are looking forward to that.

My wife has visited Toronto, and we had a wonderful, wonderful family vacation in Western Canada in Victoria and Vancouver back in 1990, one of the best times that all of us have ever had together anywhere. We are deeply indebted to your culture. Our daughter's name was inspired by Canadian songwriter Joni Mitchell's wonderful song, "Chelsea Morning."

And all of you know that in the spring of 1993, the first time I left the United States as President, I came to Vancouver for the summit with President Yeltsin. Both of us at this time were under some significant amount of stress as we tried to reaffirm our relationship and solidify democracy in Russia. And I can say without any equivocation, the reception we received from the people

of Canada, as well as from the Government and the Prime Minister, made it very, very easy for us to have a successful meeting. And for that we are very grateful.

I come here today to reaffirm the ties that bind the United States and Canada, in a new age of great promise and challenge, a time of rapid change when both opportunity and uncertainty live side by side in my country and in yours, a time when people are being lifted up by new possibilities and held down by old demons all across the world. I came here because I believe our nations together must seize the opportunities and meet the challenges of this new age. And we must—I say again—do this together. From the oil from Alberta that fires factories in the United States to the silicon chips from California that power your computers, we are living proof of the value of partnerships and cooperation. Technologies produced in your nation save lives in our hospitals, while food from our farms line your supermarkets.

Our horizons have broadened because we have listened in the United States to the CBC. And our culture is much richer because of the contributions of writers like Robertson Davies, whom Hillary had the pleasure of meeting last week after reading him for years, and Margaret Atwood and because of the wonderful photography of Josef Karsh whose famous picture of Churchill I just saw. He took some pictures of Hillary and me that aren't so distinguished, but I love them anyway. [*Laughter*] And as a musician, I have to thank you especially for Oscar Peterson, a man I consider to be the greatest jazz pianist of our time.

Ours is the world's most remarkable relationship—the Prime Minister said, whether we like it or not. I can tell you that on most days I like it very, very much. We have to strengthen that relationship. We have to strengthen it for our own benefit through trade and commerce and travel. And we have to strengthen it because it is our job to help to spread the benefits of democracy and freedom and prosperity and peace beyond our shores. We're neighbors by the grace of nature. We are allies and friends by choice.

There are those in both our nations who say we can no longer afford to, and perhaps we no longer even need to, exercise our leadership in the world. And when so many of our people are having their own problems, it is easy to listen to that assertion. But it is wrong.

We are two nations blessed with great resources and great histories. And we have great responsibilities. We were built, after all, by men and women who fled the tyranny and intolerance of the Old World for the new. We are the nations of pioneers, people who were armed with the confidence they needed to strike out on their own and to have the talents that God gave them shape their dreams in a new and different land.

Culture and tradition, to be sure, distinguish us from one another in many ways that all of us are still learning about every day. But we share core values, and that is more important, a devotion to hard work, an ardent belief in democracy, a commitment to giving each and every citizen the right to live up to his or her God-given potential, and an understanding of what we owe to the world for the gifts we have been given.

These common values have nourished a partnership that has become a model for new democracies all around this world. They can look at us and see just how much stronger the bonds between nations can be when their governments answer the citizens' desires for freedom and democracy and enterprise and when they work together to build each other up instead of working overtime to tear each other down.

Of course, we have our differences. And some of them are complex enough to tear your hair out over. But we have approached them directly and in good faith, as true friends must. And we in the United States come more and more every day to respect and to understand that we can learn from what is different about your nation and its many peoples.

Canada has shown the world how to balance freedom with compassion and tradition with innovation in your efforts to provide health care to all your citizens, to treat your senior citizens with the dignity and respect they deserve, to take on tough issues like the move afoot to outlaw automatic weapons designed for killing and not hunting. [*Applause*] And I might say, since you applauded so, you are doing it in a nation of people who respect

the right to hunt and understand the difference between law and order and sportsmanship.

Those of us who have traveled here appreciate especially the reverence you have shown for the bounty of God's nature, from the Laurentians to the Rockies. In a world darkened by ethnic conflicts that literally tear nations apart, Canada has stood for all of us as a model of how people of different cultures can live and work together in peace, prosperity, and respect.

The United States, as many of my predecessors have said, has enjoyed its excellent relationship with a strong and united Canada, but we recognize, just as the Prime Minister said with regard to your relationships to us a moment ago, that your political future is, of course, entirely for you to decide. That's what a democracy is all about.

You know, now—[*laughter*]—now, I will tell you something about our political system. [*Laughter*] You want to know why my State of the Union Address took so long—[*laughter*]—it's because I evenly divided the things that would make the Democrats clap and the Republicans clap. [*Laughter*] And we doubled the length of the speech in common enthusiasm. [*Laughter*]

I ask you, all of you, to remember that we do look to you, and to remember what our great President of the postwar era, Harry Truman, said when he came here in 1947. "Canada's eminent position today," he said, "is a tribute to the patience, tolerance, and strength of character of her people. Canada's notable achievement of national unity and progress through accommodation, moderation, and forbearance can be studied with profit by sister nations." Those words ring every bit as true today as they did then.

For generations now, our countries have joined together in efforts to make the world more secure and more prosperous. We have reached out together to defend our values and our interests, in World War I, on the beaches of Normandy and Korea. Together we helped to summon the United Nations into existence. Together we stood fast against Communist tyranny and prevailed in the cold war. Together we stood shoulder to shoulder against aggression in the Gulf war.

Now our nations have stepped forward to help Haiti emerge from repression and restore its democracy. I thank the Prime Minister for what he said about that. When it was not popular anywhere in the world to worry about poor, beleaguered, abandoned Haiti, Canada was truly a friend of Haiti.

In one international forum after another, we stand side by side to shape a safer and a better world. Whether it is at the World Population Conference, pushing together for an indefinite extension of NPT, in any number of ways, we are working together.

Now we know that for Canada, this history of action is a matter of deep tradition and personal conviction. The tradition runs from Lester Pearson to Jean Chrétien. It says we must be engaged in the affairs of the world. You have always shown the wisdom of reaching our instead of retreating, of rising to new responsibilities instead of retrenching. Your tradition of engagement continues to this day, and believe you me, it earns respect all around the world from people of all races and ethnic groups and political systems.

In places like Cyprus and the Sinai, Canadian troops have played an invaluable role in preventing more violence in those critical hot spots. Today, your 2,000 peacekeepers in the former Yugoslavia are courageously fulfilling their mission in the midst of one of the most intractable, difficult problems in our lifetime.

For a half century, the United States has shared your philosophy of action and consistent exercise of leadership abroad. And I am determined, notwithstanding all the cross currents in our country, that we shall preserve that commitment. These times may be turbulent, but we have an historic opportunity to increase security and prosperity for our own people and for people all around the world. And I want you to know that I intend to do everything in my power to keep our country constructively involved in the problems that we must face if we're going to guarantee that our children will live in a peaceful, sane, and free world.

Imagine what the Persian Gulf would look like today if we had not risen to the challenge of Iraqi aggression. Imagine what tariffs and barriers would plague the world trading system if we hadn't worked so hard together

over such a long period of time from the end of World War II to the events the Prime Minister described, to NAFTA, to GATT, to the Asian-Pacific Cooperation, to the Summit of Americas that was held in Miami in December. Imagine how different it would have been. Imagine how much worse the horrible tragedy in Rwanda would have been if we had not been there to try to provide essential help in those refugee camps to keep people alive.

We cannot let anyone or anything break this great tradition of our nations. In our partnership, we will find the key to protecting our people and increasing their prosperity and the power to reach beyond our shores in the name of democracy and freedom, not only because it is right, because it is our interest to do so.

Just before we came down here, the Prime Minister and I agreed again that if we were going to meet these new challenges in the 21st century, we must adapt the institutions that helped us to win the cold war so that they can serve us as well in the 21st century. We have to do that.

Some have evolved with the changing world. Some have, clearly, already discarded their old missions and assumed new roles. But we have also seen that the end of the East-West conflict, the advent of 24-hour financial markets, sudden environmental disasters, the rise or international terrorism, the resurgence of ancient ethnic hatreds, all these things have placed new demands on these institutions that the statesmen of 50 years ago simply did not imagine. The 21st century will leave behind those who sit back and think that automatically these problems will be solved. We simply have to face these challenges and ask ourselves what do we have to change and how are we going to do it.

For example, to meet the security needs of the future, we must work together to see that NATO, the most successful military alliance in all of history, adapts to this new era. That means that we must make certain that the inevitable process of NATO expansion proceeds smoothly, gradually, and openly. There should be no surprises to anyone about what we are about. And we will work so that the conditions, the timing, the military implications of NATO expansion will be widely known and clearly understood in advance.

And to parallel the enlargement of NATO, we have to develop close and strong ties with Russia. I have worked hard for that, and so has the Prime Minister. We must continue working together at the United Nations, where our nations have together taken the lead in efforts to reform our peacekeeping operations, to control costs, to improve information gathering, to make sure we have the right kind of command and control system before the young people who put on our uniforms are put in harm's way.

We have to continue also to work at reforming the international economic institutions. We've already made some great strides in reshaping the new global economy with the passage of GATT, which is the most comprehensive trade agreement in history. But the work is only beginning. At the upcoming G–7 summit in Halifax, which we're very much looking forward to, we will be working to ensure that our international trading institutions advance the cause of trade liberalization in ways that produce tangible gains for the people of the countries involved.

We also have to reexamine the institutions that were created at the time of Bretton Woods—the IMF, the World Bank—to make sure that they're going to be able to master the new and increasingly complex generation of transnational problems that face us, problems like explosive population growth and environmental degradation, problems like those that we have been facing together in Mexico and throughout Latin America in the recent financial crisis.

Real progress on all these areas will depend not only on our willingness to be involved but our willingness to lead as partners. Together, Canada and the United States are striving to seize all the advantages the new global economy has to offer. Trade produces high-wage jobs, we know that, the kind of jobs that give our people the opportunity to care for their families and educate their children and to leave the next generation better off than they were, a dream that has been called into question in many advanced economies in the last few years.

The success of NAFTA, which is generating new jobs and creating new markets from

Monterey to Medicine Hat is the proof. And now, as the Prime Minister has said so well, we in NAFTA are on our way to becoming the Four Amigos. That phrase will go down in history. I wish I'd have thought of it. We'll soon start our consultations with Chile for accession in NAFTA, and they will be a very good partner. The addition of that thriving economy will only continue to increase the benefits for all of us.

I want to take another moment here to thank Canada for its recent support and help in the financial crisis in Mexico. You understood what we had on the line, that more than Mexico was involved, that jobs and trade and future and our support for democracy and stability throughout Latin America was at issue. You understood it, and we are grateful. Because we stood shoulder to shoulder, we have a chance to preserve this remarkable explosion of democracy that we saw at the Summit of the Americas, and we should continue to do that.

I want to say a word if I might about the environment. As we expand trade we have to remember, we must defend that which we have inherited and enhance it if we can. The natural riches of this continent we share are staggering. We have cooperated to such great effect on our continent in the past: our air quality agreement is solving the acid rain problem; the Great Lakes are on the road to recovery; the eagles have returned to Lake Erie. Now we have to build on those accomplishments.

With the NAFTA environmental commission located in Montreal, your country will play a key role in ensuring that we protect the extraordinary bounty that has been given to us for our children and our grandchildren. NAFTA is only one of the several fronts on which we can work together to both increase our prosperity and protect our environment. But we must do both.

Our nations are building on the progress of last years Summit of the Americas, as well. It will create a free trade area embracing the entire hemisphere. Across the Pacific, as the Prime Minister said, we paved the way of new markets and for free trade among the dynamic economies in the Asian-Pacific area. That was a very important thing for us to do because they are growing very fast, and we did not want this world to break up into geographical trading blocks in ways that would shrink the potential of the people of Canada and the United States for decades to come.

All these efforts will only enhance what is now the greatest trading relationship, yours and ours. Every day, people, ideas, and goods stream across our border. Bilateral trade now is more than a billion Canadian dollars every day—I learned to say that—[*laughter*]—and about 270 billion United States dollars last year, by far the world's largest bilateral relationship.

Our trade with each other has become an essential pillar in the architecture of both our economies. Today, 4½ million Americans have jobs that involve trade between our two countries. Those are the concrete benefits of our partnership. Between 1988 and 1994, trade between our nations rose about 60 percent. Last year alone, it increased by 15 percent.

But the statistics don't give the human reality behind the flourishing exchange of goods and ideas. Our trade is creating real jobs for real people. In Boscawen, New Hampshire, just for example, a small company called Secure Care Products produces monitoring systems for patients in nursing homes. Recently, Secure Care began exporting its products to Canada. Sales there are already growing fast, and the company expects them to triple this year. And so Secure Care is hiring people like Susan Southwick, the granddaughter of Quebeckers, the mother of two, and now the company's 26th employee. Giving Susan and her husband a shot at the dream which Canadians and Americans share, that's what this partnership is all about.

Much further away from you in Greensboro, North Carolina, another small company called Createc Forestry Systems is showing how our trade helps people turn their hopes into realities. It was founded by a man named Albert Jenks in his family's kitchen. Createc makes hand-held computers that track lumber mill inventories. Those computers help managers assess their needs better so fewer trees are cut unnecessarily. A few years ago, Createc began to export to Canada, and now those sales accounts have risen to nearly 20

percent of their total business. That means a more secure future for the company, for Mr. Jenks, for his son, Patrick, who works with his father in the family business. That shows how our trade can increase our prosperity and protect the environment as well.

Your companies are thriving in our markets, bringing tangible benefits to Canadians. Whether it's repairing the engines of some of the U.S. Air Force's largest planes, or manufacturing software to manage our natural resources, or building some of the Olympic Village for Atlanta's 1996 games. Canadian firms are a strong presence in the United States. Their successes there help your people to turn their hopes into facts and their dreams into reality.

The example of our biggest industry shows another side of this remarkable story. Working together, U.S. and Canadian companies have integrated North America's auto industry and staged one of the most remarkable comebacks in all the history of the industrial revolution. We have drawn on each other's strengths, and today, our companies work so closely that we do not speak any longer of U.S. or Canadian content in these vehicles, but of North American content, whether it's a Chrysler minivan made in Windsor or a Chrysler Jeep made in Detroit. I think that was the Ambassador from Michigan—I mean from the United States clapping down there.

Productivity and employment have risen to such a point that when I visited Detroit last fall, the biggest complaint I heard in a State that was given up as lost economically a decade ago—the biggest complaint I heard from the autoworkers was that they were working too much overtime. [*Laughter*] Now, where I come from, that is known as a high-class problem. [*Laughter*]

The auto industry now provides more than one million jobs in our countries. To reinforce our commitment to NAFTA and to dramatically expand an important market, tomorrow our nations will sign an agreement to open the skies between our two nations. This agreement, which allows for a dramatic expansion of U.S. and Canadian service to each other's nations, will create thousands of new jobs and billions of dollars of economic activities in our cities, yours and mine. We've reached a fair solution that will make life easier for travelers on both sides of the border, that will profit both Canadian and U.S. airline carriers, that will increase the mutual travel and interconnections of our people. That we have done so amicably provides yet another model of how neighboring nations can settle their differences.

Friendship, engagement: Canada and the United States have shown the best there is in partnerships between nations, all the great potential that awaits all the free peoples of this Earth if they can join in common cause. We are, as the monument at the St. Lawrence Seaway declares, "two nations whose frontiers are the frontiers of friendship, whose ways are the ways of freedom, whose works are the works of peace.

Every day we see the enormous benefits this partnership gives us in jobs, in prosperity, in the great creative energy that our interchanges bring. But we have only seen the beginning. For the Susan Southwicks who want a chance to build better lives and the companies like Createc that are trying to build solid businesses that will last, this partnership of ours holds a great promise with vast horizons as vast as our great continent.

Together we've turned our energies toward improving the world around us for now nearly a century. Today, more than ever, let us reaffirm and renew that great tradition. Let us engage and confront the great challenges of the end of this century and the beginning of the next. We must sustain our efforts. We must enhance our efforts. We must maintain our partnership. We must make it stronger. This is our task and our mission. Together, we will be equal to it. The border separates our peoples, but there are no boundaries to our common dreams.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:23 p.m. in the House of Commons at the Parliament. In his remarks, he referred to Gilbert Tarent, Speaker of the House of Commons, and Geldes Malgat, Speaker of the Senate.

Proclamation 6771—Irish-American Heritage Month, 1995

February 23, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

America's bounty—the abundance of the fields, the beauty of the landscape, the richness of our opportunities—has always attracted people who are in search of a better life for themselves and their children. Our democracy owes its success in great part to the countless immigrants who have made their way to our shores and to the tremendous diversity this Nation has been blessed with since its beginnings.

In March, when communities all across the country celebrate St. Patrick's Day, our Nation honors the rich heritage of the millions of Americans who trace their lineage to Ireland. Coming to this land even before our Nation was founded, sons and daughters of Erin undertook the perilous journey to make their home in a place of hope and promise. They made inestimable contributions to their new country, both during the struggle for independence and in the founding of the Republic. Nine of the people who signed our Declaration of Independence were of Irish origin, and nineteen Presidents of the United States proudly claim Irish heritage—including our first President, George Washington.

The largest wave of Irish immigrants came in the late 1840s, when the Great Famine ravaging Ireland caused 2 million people to emigrate, mostly to American soil. These immigrants transformed our largest cities and helped to build them into dynamic centers of commerce and industry, and their contributions to our smaller cities and towns are evident today in the cultural, economic, and spiritual makeup of the communities. Throughout the country, they faced callous discrimination: ''No Irish Need Apply'' signs were ugly reminders of the prejudice that disfigured our society. But with indomitable spirit and unshakable determination, they persevered. They took jobs as laborers, built railroads, canals, and schools, and committed themselves to creating a brighter future for their families and their new country.

Today, millions of Americans of Irish ancestry continue to enrich all aspects of life in the United States. Irish Americans are proud to recall their heritage and their struggle for well-deserved recognition in all walks of American life. Throughout their history, they have held tightly to their religious faith, their love of family, and their belief in the importance of education. The values they brought with them from the Emerald Isle have flourished in America—and in turn these values have helped America to flourish.

In tribute to all Irish Americans, the Congress, by Public Law 103–379, has designated March 1995 as ''Irish-American 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 March 1995 as Irish-American Heritage Month.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-third day of February, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, 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, 3:11 p.m., February 23, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on February 27.

Remarks at a Gala Dinner in Ottawa

February 23, 1995

Prime Minister and Mrs. Chrétien, Ambassador and Mrs. Chrétien, Ambassador and Mrs. Blanchard, ladies and gentlemen: let me begin by thanking the Prime Minister for his generous words and by thanking Prime Minister and Mrs. Chrétien and all of our Canadian hosts for making Hillary and me feel so at home here today in our first day of our wonderful visit.

We all have so much in common, so many roots in common. I couldn't help thinking, when we shared so many jokes in the Parliament today and so many good laughs, of all the things I might have said. One of the

things that is most fascinating to Americans about Canada is the way you blend your cultures. I understand, now that we've come across the river from Ottawa to Hull, everything is first in French and then in English. And I'm trying to accommodate to all this. And I thought about a true story that I would share with you.

One of the members of our official party today came all the way from Georgia, Mr. Gordon Giffen, who's sitting out here, but he was born in Canada. And you should know that Georgia, in the heart of the American South, has a lieutenant governor named Pierre Howard. He was very self-conscious about running with a name like Pierre in the South. And in desperation one day, he said, "Well, you have to understand, Pierre is French for Bubba." [*Laughter*] And you all know that I come from Arkansas. I can say to you with absolute confidence that if any person were here from my State tonight, he or she would say, "*Je me sens chez moi au Canada*."

The Prime Minister and I have a lot in common. We have small-town roots and modest backgrounds, his in Shawinigan and Quebec. Did I say that right? Shawinigan? Shawinigan. Better? And mine in Hope—I have a hometown that's easier to pronounce. We began early in political life. He entered the Parliament, I think, when he was 29. I tried to enter the Congress when I was 28. I failed, and I have been grateful for it ever since. [*Laughter*]

Our political persuasions and our programs are so similar that one magazine called me a closet Canadian. I think that is a compliment, and I take it as such. We talk a lot about our humble roots. At home when our friends wish to make fun of me, they say that if I talk long enough I will convince people that I was born in a log cabin I built myself. And that's what I thought the first time I met Prime Minister Chrétien. [*Laughter*]

We've had a few agonizing political defeats, and we've managed a comeback. As I think about it, I can only think of one thing that separates me from the Prime Minister: about 15 points in the public opinion polls. [*Laughter*] I resent it, but I'm doing what I can to overcome it.

Mr. Prime Minister, one of the glories of Ottawa is the wonderful old canal that winds through this community. It's protected by sweeping and weeping willows in the summertime, and it's, as I saw today, animated by skaters in the winter. As I understand it, the canal was constructed about 150 years ago by a British engineer to help defend Canada from the United States. Thankfully, I'm told that if you ask most Canadians today why the canal was built they can't say. The fact that the canal's origin is unremembered speaks volumes about the unique relationship between our two countries, neighbors, allies, friends. Each of us is blessed to share with the other the bounty of this magnificent continent.

Over the years the partnership we have forged has produced many tangible benefits for our people, as you pointed out. We have a joint defense program that protects our skies and makes us more secure. We have a shared commitment to our environment that improves the quality of the air we breathe and the water we drink. We have economies that are so complementary we enjoy the world's largest trading relationship in ways that create jobs and raise incomes on both sides of our border. We have a common passion for democracy that has united us in trying to protect freedom and peace and democracy and enterprise far from our own lands.

The interests and values we share have allowed us to recognize and respect our differences as well. Canada has shown the world how to build a gentler society with a deeply felt concern for the health and well-being of all its citizens. It has shown the world that strength and compassion are not incompatible. There is much in your country from which Americans can and do draw inspiration.

And so tonight, in celebrating all that unites us, let us also remember that which is unique in our countries. Hillary and I enjoyed very much our all-too-brief tour of this magnificent tribute to your unique culture. Let us resolve to work together to bring out the best in each other as we move forward together as partners and as friends. Long live this great nation.

Mr. Prime Minister, one of your most illustrious predecessors, Lester Pearson, put it well when he said, ''I now accept with equanimity the question so constantly addressed to me, 'Are you an American?' and merely return the accurate answer, Yes, I am a Canadian.''

And so tonight in celebrating our countries and what unites us, let us work together and let us say: Long live Canada! *Vive le Canada!*

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 8:35 p.m. at the Museum of Civilizatione. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and his wife, Aline; U.S. Ambassador to Canada James Blanchard and his wife, Janet; and Canadian Ambassador to the United States Raymond Chrétien and his wife, Kay. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Executive Order 12951—Release of Imagery Acquired by Space-Based National Intelligence Reconnaissance Systems

February 22, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America and in order to release certain scientifically or environmentally useful imagery acquired by space-based national intelligence reconnaissance systems, consistent with the national security, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Public Release of Historical Intelligence Imagery.* Imagery acquired by the space-based national intelligence reconnaissance systems known as the Corona, Argon, and Lanyard missions shall, within 18 months of the date of this order, be declassified and transferred to the National Archives and Records Administration with a copy sent to the United States Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior consistent with procedures approved by the Director of Central Intelligence and the Archivist of the United States. Upon transfer, such imagery shall be deemed declassified and shall be made available to the public.

Sec. 2. *Review for Future Public Release of Intelligence Imagery.* (a) All information that meets the criteria in section 2(b) of this order shall be kept secret in the interests of national defense and foreign policy until deemed otherwise by the Director of Central Intelligence. In consultation with the Secretaries of State and Defense, the Director of Central Intelligence shall establish a comprehensive program for the periodic review of imagery from systems other than the Corona, Argon, and Lanyard missions, with the objective of making available to the public as much imagery as possible consistent with the interests of national defense and foreign policy. For imagery from obsolete broad-area film-return systems other than Corona, Argon, and Lanyard missions, this review shall be completed within 5 years of the date of this order. Review of imagery from any other system that the Director of Central Intelligence deems to be obsolete shall be accomplished according to a timetable established by the Director of Central Intelligence. The Director of Central Intelligence shall report annually to the President on the implementation of this order.

(b) The criteria referred to in section 2(a) of this order consist of the following: imagery acquired by a space-based national intelligence reconnaissance system other than the Corona, Argon, and Lanyard missions.

Sec. 3. *General Provisions.* (a) This order prescribes a comprehensive and exclusive system for the public release of imagery acquired by space-based national intelligence reconnaissance systems. This order is the exclusive Executive order governing the public release of imagery for purposes of section 552(b)(1) of the Freedom of Information Act.

(b) 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.

Sec. 4. *Definition.* As used herein, ''imagery'' means the product acquired by space-based national intelligence reconnaissance systems that provides a likeness or representation of any natural or man-made feature or related objective or activities and satellite

positional data acquired at the same time the likeness or representation was acquired.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 22, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:13 p.m., February 24, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 24, and it will be published in the *Federal Register* on February 28.

Exchange With Reporters at the Canadian Parliament in Ottawa

February 24, 1995

Secretary of State Christopher

Q. Mr. President, how did you find Secretary Christopher?

The President. He was doing well this morning. I had a great talk with him. And he feels good, and he's going to go home with us this afternoon.

Q. Will he be able to get back to work soon?

The President. I'm encouraged.

Q. Would it affect the Mideast trip at all, sir?

Q. [*Inaudible*]—that's what gave him the ulcer? [*Laughter*]

The President. Gee, I hope not. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:30 a.m. at the Parliament. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Jean Chrétien of Canada in Ottawa

February 24, 1995

Prime Minister Chrétien. Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes a great meeting between the President of the United States and myself, members of his Cabinet, and members of my Cabinet. As I had the occasion to say many times, the relations between our two countries is an example to the world. We have some problems, but we are able to work on them and find solutions.

I'm delighted, Mr. President, that the Canadians appreciate very much the relations between Canada and the United States at this moment. It was some years ago only 25 percent were happy with the quality of our relations. Now 53 percent are happy. So it's probably more because of you than of me, but—[*laughter*]—I just want to say to you that it's been, for my wife and I, a great occasion to receive your wife and you. And the bond between our two nations, I'm sure, are better because you came here.

[*At this point, the Prime Minister spoke in French, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.*]

It is always for us a great pleasure to welcome our neighbors to the south. We share a continent. We share history. If there have been difficulties between the United States and Canada a century and a half ago, today we are able to sit down together and to find solutions that bring about a better understanding between two neighbors where mutual respect resides and neighbors who understand that it is in working together that we can go forward.

[*The Prime Minister resumed speaking in English.*]

The last 15 months that I have been the Prime Minister I have had many occasions to meet with the President. It's probably the ninth time that we are together, and we speak on the phone. But I can see the influence that the Americans have on the world scene at this moment. And it's extremely important to keep the leadership in the world. In my traveling in Latin America, in my traveling in Asia the last few months, I realize that we've made some fantastic progress.

For me to see that all these countries in Asia want to be part of APEC and now of a free trade arrangement by the year 2010, and they want to work in a market economy and break down barriers and specialize and take share of the market in the best way, the way that we have developed in America and Canada over the last century is fantastic. But probably, the most significant thing that I've lived was when I was in Latin America and I saw this democracy, as I said this morning, getting better now and all these leaders very

anxious to develop our values in the era of dictatorships in these areas and talk and be open about trade, but mostly about democracy and about human rights was a great satisfaction.

And they all were telling me to tell you that they need America to be involved. And it's why I'm happy to say that publicly at this moment, because, Mr. President, you are respected by the leaders of the world, and they want the United States of America to remain the champion of democracy and human rights and economic and social progress.

Thank you.

The President. This morning the Prime Minister and I had a fine and wide-ranging discussion with many members of his Cabinet and members of our administration. I want to begin by thanking again Prime Minister Chrétien and Mrs. Chrétien and all the Canadian people for making Hillary and me and all of our group feel so welcome here in Canada. We have had a wonderful trip. Everything we've done has been immensely enjoyable and productive. And I'm very grateful for the chance that we all had to come here and have this meeting.

I thank the Prime Minister for the statement he made about the role of the United States in the world. There are many debates now going on in our country about what we should be doing. It is clear to me that my ability as President to work with our people to open up economic opportunity and to give all Americans the chance to be rewarded for their labors and to solve their own problems and to have a good life for themselves and their children as we move into this next century requires an aggressive leadership on our part, prudent, to be sure; restrained, to be sure; but still American leadership involved in the world and working with real partners like the Canadians on a whole range of issues. And I thank him for that.

I'd like to say a special word of appreciation, too, about the agreement we have just signed to open the skies between our two countries. It will strengthen our partnership. It will create thousands of new jobs and billions of dollars of economic activity. As I said this morning, the only losers in this will be the people who have been piling up frequent flier miles; they'll be a little short because now it will be a lot easier to get back and forth between Canada and the United States. Nearly as I can figure, everybody else involved in this agreement comes out way ahead. And non-stop flights from many major cities in the United States to places like Montreal and Toronto and Vancouver are now going to be more available. And I am very encouraged because today we've agreed to throw out the 30-year old rules that have suffocated business and wasted time and money for millions of travelers.

The travel time on many major routes will now be cut in half because of this agreement. Passengers on both sides of the borders can look towards dramatically expanded services at more competitive prices. Canadian and American airlines will now be able to actually advertise and be telling the truth when they say, you can get there from here. [*Laughter*]

Letting market demand, not Government regulation, determine the number and destination of flights between our two nations is a big step forward. It's consistent with what we've being doing in NAFTA, which has led to a big increase in bilateral trade in just the last year alone. And I believe it's consistent with the larger vision that Prime Minister Chrétien and I have shared and worked for with NAFTA, with the GATT agreement, with the agreement with the Asian-Pacific nations, with the agreement at the Summit of the Americas to open those markets.

I want to say a special word of thanks to the Transportation Minister of Canada, Doug Young, and our Transportation Secretary, Federico Peña, for what they have done here.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Prime Minister, I'm looking forward to coming back to Halifax this summer. We have a lot of work to do to examine the questions that you and I put forcefully on the table in Italy last year. Are the institutions which were established at the end of the Second World War to promote growth and developing trade, are they adequate to meet the challenges of this new age? When so many people in the world are struggling for democracy and are struggling to support enterprise, are they going to be rewarded for those efforts? And if they're going to be rewarded for those efforts, what do we have to do to make sure that the movement to democracy and the movement to en-

terprise, that that is not derailed with the inevitable kinds of crises that will arise from time to time, such as the recent one in Mexico?

I am confident that we can meet that challenge, and I'm glad we're coming back to Halifax because you've been such a leader in that regard. And I thank you, sir.

Thank you all very much, and we'd be glad to answer questions. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, you've said some admirable things about Canada, Mr. President. Can I ask you——

Prime Minister Chrétien. No, no. You know that family—French and English. So I will use my privilege to——

[*The Prime Minister concluded his remarks in French, and no translation was provided. The next question was then asked in French, and a translation was provided by an interpreter.*]

Canadian Unity

Q. Mr. Chrétien, I would like to ask you if you're satisfied with the winks in favor of Canadian unity from the President?

Prime Minister Chrétien. Is it to me or to him?

Q. Both.

Q. First, Mr. Clinton, you said yesterday that Canada's future was for Canadians to decide. After having met with Lucien Bouchard, can you tell us if you consider it—if the Quebeckers were to vote yes in the upcoming referendum—in favor of pulling out from Canada, would you consider this from an American perspective as a minor or a major disturbance or no disturbance at all?

The President. You already said I winked yesterday. I was never consciously aware of having winked at Prime Minister Chrétien. That will, doubtless, be a story at home. [*Laughter*] Look, I came here to celebrate, not to speculate. I'm celebrating the relationship we now have. I said everything I had to say yesterday, and I think that most reasonable people reading or hearing my words knew what I said and process it accordingly. And I don't think that I have anything to add to what I said yesterday about this.

Q. Can you just help us with this interpretation? Since you said so many admirable things about Canada, can one assume that you would like to see it stay united, that would be your preference?

The President. You can assume that I meant what I said yesterday. [*Laughter*]

Affirmative Action

Q. Mr. President, is it true that you have ordered a review of affirmative action programs? And does it mean that you are backing off from giving a leg up to disadvantaged from past eras?

The President. No, it's not true that I'm backing off—it's not true that I'm backing off from giving a leg up. It is true, as I have said publicly now for some time, that I believe that we should not permit this affirmative action issue to degenerate into exactly what is happening—just another political wedge issue to divide the American people.

I believe that every American would acknowledge that there are affirmative action programs which have made a great deal of difference to the lives of Americans who have been disadvantaged and who in turn have made our country stronger. The best examples of all, I believe, are the people who have served in the United States military, who, because of the efforts that have been made to deal with disadvantaged minorities who had not been given a change to rise as high as their abilities could take them. In education, training, leadership, development, the military today is a model; it looks like America, and it works.

I, furthermore, think that it is time to look at all these programs which have developed over the last 20 to 25 years and ask ourselves: Do they work? Are they fair? Do they achieve the desired objectives? That is very different from trying to use this issue as a political wedge one way or the other. I think it would be a great mistake.

So we have been talking for, oh, months now with people about this issue, people who have participated in these programs, people who are knowledgeable about them, people who have both philosophical and practical convictions about them. I think we need to have a national conversation not only about affirmative action but about what our obligations are to make sure every American has a chance to make it. And I'm going to do my dead-level best—and some of you may

try to get in the way of it, but I'm going to try to stop this from becoming another cheap, political, emotional wedge issue. This country—our country has been divided too often by issues that, substantively, were not as important as the political benefit that the dividers got. And that——

Q. You don't think that we have equality in our country, do you?

The President. I absolutely do not, and I think we—we don't have equality. We may never have total equality. But we need—and we don't have—we don't even guarantee equality of results. What we need to guarantee is genuine equality of opportunity. That's what the affirmative action concept is designed to do. And I'm convinced that most Americans want us to continue to do that in the appropriate way. But we shouldn't be defending things that we can't defend. So it's time to review it, discuss it, and be straightforward about it.

The Prime Minister

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, during the election you talked about not wanting to go fishing with the President of the United States in case you looked like the fish and things like that. [*Laughter*] Can I ask you, your relationship has been pretty close during this visit. Are you referring to the President by his first name, or is it still Mr. President? How would you describe your relationship?

Prime Minister Chrétien. You know, he is Mr. President when there is another person in the room. And when we're alone, I don't call him William J., I call him Bill. [*Laughter*]

The President. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President——

The President. I'd be honored to put the bait on his pole if he wanted to go fishing. [*Laughter*]

Balanced Budget Amendment

Q. Mr. President, back home the balanced budget drive is picking up steam. Two more Democratic Senators came out in favor of it. Is this an idea whose time has come, or are you going to try to stop this or get on the bandwagon? What's your position on it now?

The President. Well, my position on it is the same thing it was last year. I don't think it is a good idea. And I don't think it's a good idea in part because of the judicial review provisions which means that, basically, we're allowing—it's ironic to me that the Republicans, who have lambasted the Federal courts and lambasted the courts running our lives for years, are now willing to let the Federal budget be determined in Federal court. I find that astonishing, first of all. Secondly, we don't need this balanced budget amendment to reduce the deficit. And what it really does is give the minority the power to decide what's in the budget and maybe to increase the deficit. Thirdly, the Republicans still don't want to give us the right to know. They dance around Social Security; they dance around the other details. I think they have given us a little right to know with the rescission package they've presented, which is basically making war on the kids of the country. So I hope that it will be—that the Congress will not go along.

And I have talked to some Senators; I intend to talk to some more. But this is a decision most of them will make based on their own convictions, I think. We do need to keep bringing this deficit down; I am committed to doing that. I don't think this is the right way to do it. That's my position.

[*The following question was asked and answered in French, and a translation was provided by an interpreter.*]

Q. Prime Minister, are you sensitive to President Clinton's budgetary intent, that is, to give the middle class a break? I'd also like to hear the President. Has he tried to convince you that a fiscal break for the middle class of Canada is a good thing?

Prime Minister Chrétien. Obviously, everyone wants a taxation system that is beneficial to the middle class. But we haven't really discussed this problem between us. We had other questions to deal with, the President and I. So we did not deal with our respective budgets. But both of us, no doubt, want to provide very good administration to our respective countries and balance the books at some point.

Middle Class

Q. Yesterday, a number of House subcommittees proposed cuts in housing and rental assistance and EPA water projects and your own national service program. With all of this coming at once, what's your strategy to oppose these cuts? And isn't there something to what was said by one of the local newspapers, that, in a way, because of what's going on in Congress, you come here almost more as a titular head of government than as a real chief of state?

The President. Well, near as I can tell, ma'am, we've been here 50 days under this new regime, and they've only sent me one bill and I was proud to sign it. I mean, congressional committees can vote whatever they want; the House can pass whatever it wants. Unless I missed my guess, a bill doesn't become law unless I sign it or it passes over my veto. [*Laughter*] Now, last time I checked the Constitution, that was the rule.

What they're doing is showing what I tried to tell the American people last October and in September. What they should—look at their rescission package. What they want to do is to make war on the kids of this country to pay for a capital gains tax cut. That's what's going on. And the people will figure that out, and I think the Senate will figure it out. And I still believe we can make some real progress here. And meanwhile, I'm going to pursue my agenda and get done as much as I can.

I still believe we can make some real progress. But I do not think the American people expect nor support these radical right-wing measures that are coming out of these House committees. And we'll just see whether they do or not. We've got a constitutional system, and we've got a chance to see it work. I hope they can send me some more bills that is good conscience I can sign. I'm still waiting for the unfunded mandates, the line-item veto, all these things that will help us control unnecessary spending. But their definition of unnecessary spending apparently is the Women Infant and Children program and Head Start and all these programs. I disagree with that, but we knew that to start with.

We've got to go through the Senate and go through conference. So I don't consider myself a titular head of state, and until there is some evidence to the contrary, you shouldn't either. [*Laughter*]

Value of the American Dollar

Q. Thank you, Prime Minister. President Clinton, in terms of North American free trade and, as usual on visits like this, a lot was said about trade. Are you concerned about the value of the Canadian dollar being about 71 cents, the decline of the peso—who knows what it is today, and at what point does your administration lose patience with this and at what point do you have concerns that your many friends in Congress will say, we're at the losing end of this because of the value of the dollar?

The President. You mean because when the value of your currency goes down it changes the trade relationship? Well, the truth is that all of us have not something less than 100 percent control over the value of our currency. And the Prime Minister and I are dealing in part with the accumulated problems that we found when we took office. That is, I was stunned last year when the value of the American dollar went down. When we were having 4 percent growth, the best economic year in 10 years, we had the lowest combined inflation and unemployment rate in almost 30 years, the value of the dollar is dropping. Why? Because we had to borrow a lot of money to finance the accumulated debt of the years before I took office.

So these are problems that we have to work through. But I am not concerned about it. I did what I thought was right in Mexico. I knew it wasn't popular, but I thought it was right because I think, long term, Mexico's on the right path. They are committed to democracy and enterprise. And I don't see how anybody could look at Canada today and believe that it was not—that this country is not a country of massive potential, moving in the right direction, one of the most successful countries in the world by any measure.

And you're going to have these fluctuations in the currency. They're going to happen, and often they're happening because of market forces that were rooted in developments before we showed up. So I'm not impatient.

We're just going to work together and work through these things and make the best of the situation and seize the opportunities that are out there.

House Speaker Newt Gingrich

Q. Speaker Gingrich gave a speech in Washington this morning. He said on ethics, he's a victim of a systematic smear campaign. He said Democrats are the guys who smear mud. Republicans are the guys who pass legislation. [*Laughter*] Your reaction, please.

The President. I think the laughs in the audience are a better reaction than anything I can say about that. I don't have any comment about that. We had—the record was largely lost, I think, on the public, but the fact is that in the previous 2 years, more constructive bills were passed in more areas to get more done than in any time in the previous 30 years.

After 2 years of talking about what wasn't happening, I noticed in one of the news magazines a tiny chart after the elections were over that said, ''Oh, by the way, we neglected to say this before, but this was the third Congress since World War II that passed more than 80 percent of a President's proposals in both years.'' So I think our record for passing laws is pretty good.

And secondly—I mean, on the other deal, I hardly know what to say. I think that it would be better, since I hope we can work together to pass some laws that are good for the American people, it would be better if I didn't say too much about that.

Canadian Unity

Q. Prime Minister, could you tell us, please, if you think that anything that President Clinton has said during this trip has helped your cause of promoting national unity in Canada? And if I might also ask the President, when Lucien Bouchard said that he wanted to meet with you, he said that one of the things he hoped to achieve was to let you meet a separatist in flesh and blood. So what were your impressions of him, and do you feel he was a good ambassador of separatism?

Prime Minister Chrétien. I will reply first. You know, the President has stated the obvious, that Canada is a great example to the world. So there it is—it was a statement of fact. And I was very disappointed when you talk about the values of moderation and sharing and compassion and the ability to live together with our differences, that it could not be applied to the Bloc Quebecois because I know that the Quebeckers share these values and they want—that it's very dear to them. That is my comment about what the President said. I was not present at the meeting between Mr. Bouchard and the President—that was another Chrétien there. [*Laughter*]

The President. My answer to you, sir, is that, as you know, I'm sure, whenever I go abroad as President, I meet with opposition leaders. I do that quite frequently in democratic parliamentary countries. I have very often done that.

I met with Mr. Bouchard because he was the leader of the opposition. He happens to be a separatist, and he stated his case clearly and articulately. I think the people who agree with him would have been pleased with the clarity with which he expressed his position.

Funding for Social Programs

Q. Some of the Republicans on Capitol Hill who are involved in legislation about which you spoke say that, contrary to being cut, the child nutrition programs, about which you and members of your administration have spoken so strongly in recent days, that funding for those programs will actually be increased, though not at as great a rate as had previously been anticipated. In light of that, sir, I wonder if you might think that ''war on children,'' and some of the other phrases have been perhaps a bit extreme?

The President. Well, it's my understanding, Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News], that they wanted to block-grant the school lunch program and, therefore, flat-fund it for 5 years. If that's not what they want to do then I'll—then I need to know what the facts are. My understanding is that they wanted to flat fund it. And my understanding is that in their rescission package, they have proposed to reduce funding already approved for WIC. They proposed, it's my understanding, to eliminate the summer jobs for children, which will make our streets a little steamier in the summer for the next 2 years, and to

do a number of other things that are cuts from the budget that is already approved. If I'm wrong about that, then I'm wrong. But I don't believe I am wrong; I believe that's what they want to do.

Prime Minister Chrétien. *Merci beaucoup*. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 86th news conference began at 12 p.m. in the Reading Room at the Parliament.

Executive Order 12952—Amendment to Executive Order No. 12950

February 24, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to amend Executive Order No. 12950, it is hereby ordered that the list of Labor Organizations attached to and made a part of such order is amended to include the following:

International Brotherhood of Firemen & Oilers

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 24, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:56 a.m., February 27, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order will be published in the *Federal Register* on February 28.

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.

February 18

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

February 19

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Arlington, VA. They returned to Camp David, MD, in the afternoon.

February 20

In the afternoon, the President returned to Washington, DC, and later attended the Georgetown-Villanova basketball game at the USAir Arena in Landover, MD.

February 21

The White House announced that the President named William E. Curry, Jr., as Counselor to the President.

February 23

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Ottawa, Canada.

In the late afternoon, the President had meetings with Preston Manning, leader of the Reform Party, and Lucien Bouchard, leader of Bloc Quebecois, at the U.S. Ambassador's residence.

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton went to the Museum of Civilizatione where they were given a tour of the History Hall.

The President announced his intention to appoint Ken Grotewiel as Presiding Officer and Commissioner and Max Holloway as Alternate Commissioner of the Kansas-Oklahoma Arkansas River Compact Commission.

February 24

In the morning, the President attended a breakfast with U.S.-Canada business leaders at the National Gallery of Canada. Following the breakfast, he went to Parliament where he met with Prime Minister Jean Chrétien.

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton attended a lunch at the Canal Ritz. Following the lunch, they returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to nominate Edmundo A. Gonzales as Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Labor.

The President announced his intention to nominate John D. Kemp to the National Council on Disability.

The President announced his appointment of former Senator Dennis DeConcini to the board of directors of the Federal Home Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac.)

The President announced his intention to appoint Deborah Kastrin as a member of the Advisory Council of the Border Environment Cooperation Commission.

The President announced his intention to appoint Jamie S. Gorelick, Matt L. Rodriguez, and Robert T. Scully to be members of the National Commission to Support Law Enforcement.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted February 22

John Chrystal,
of Iowa, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1997 (reappointment).

George J. Kourpias,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1997 (reappointment).

Gloria Rose Ott,
of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1996, vice Weldon W. Case, term expired.

Harvey Sigelbaum,
of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1996, vice Carolyn D. Leavens, term expired.

Inez Smith Reid,
of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the term of 15 years, vice Emmet G. Sullivan.

Submitted February 24

Kirsten S. Moy,
of New York, to be Administrator of the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (new position).

Checklist of White House Press Releases

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

Released February 21

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by OMB Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs Administrator Sally Katzen and Senior Policy Adviser to the Vice President Elaine Kamarck on regulatory reform

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on National Security Adviser Anthony Lake's meeting with Ulster Unionist Party of Northern Ireland officials

Released February 22

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, Education Secretary Richard Riley, and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Food and Consumer Services Ellen Haas on the Republican proposal to abolish the school lunch program

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the establishment of Presidential Emergency Board No. 226

Released February 23

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's request that Ambassador Madeleine Albright visit United Nations Security Council capitals to consult on Iraq

Transcript of remarks by Dr. Chris Carruthers, Dr. Paul Deneault, and Dr. Andreas Laupacis on the condition of Secretary of State Christopher

Announcement of the nomination of Inez Smith Reid to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals

Released February 24

Transcript of a press briefing by Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, Council of Economic Advisers Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson, Director of the Office of Management and Budget Alice Rivlin, and White House Counsel Abner Mikva on the balanced budget amendment

Acts Approved by the President

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.