

Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, March 27, 1995  
Volume 31—Number 12  
Pages 443–475

## Contents

### Addresses and Remarks

- See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings
- College Press Forum—457
- Radio address—444
- Saint Patrick's Day reception—443

### Appointments and Nominations

- Justice Department, Director of the Office of Violence Against Women, remarks—448

### Bill Signings

- Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, remarks—453

### Communications to Congress

- Export controls, message reporting—450
- Haiti, letter reporting—452
- National Science Foundation, message transmitting report—449
- Welfare reform, letter—446
- West Bank and the Gaza Strip, message—471

### Communications to Federal Agencies

- Customer service, memorandum—456
- Savings bond campaign, memorandums—455

### Proclamations

- Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy—467
- To Amend the Generalized System of Preferences—471
- To Implement Certain Provisions of the Trade Agreements Resulting From the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, and for Other Purposes—468

### Statements by the President

- Line-item veto legislation—446, 467
- Welfare reform, House action—467, 472

### Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—474
- Checklist of White House press releases—474
- Digest of other White House announcements—472
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—473

## WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

## PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Week Ending Friday, March 24, 1995

**Remarks at a Saint Patrick's Day Reception**

*March 17, 1995*

Is the microphone on? Now it is. Taoiseach and Mrs. Bruton, let me say again, welcome to the White House. *Ceade mile failte*.

We have been breaking out the green for many years on St. Patrick's Day, but this is truly an historic St. Patrick's Day. For the first time we have invited leaders of all the major political groups from Northern Ireland to join us, and I am delighted that so many are here tonight. Those who take risks for peace are always welcome under this roof.

President Kennedy, with his marvelous Irish understatement, once pointed out, and I quote, "The observance of St. Patrick's Day is almost as old in America as the Irish themselves. And some say they arrived in the 6th century." Actually, the first recorded mention of St. Patrick in America was in 1636, when an Irish ship bearing that name sailed into, where else, Boston Harbor. It, however, did not receive a warm welcome. The Puritans were not well disposed toward the Catholics, but as history shows, it was only a temporary setback as—[laughter].

During the Revolutionary conflict, George Washington even paid his own compliment to the holiday in 1776. On March 17th, he ordered that the password of the day be "Boston," and the response, "St. Patrick." By the way, the Colonies' general at that time was a Sullivan.

A few months later, at least a dozen Irishmen signed the Declaration of Independence, and another, Mr. Dunlap of Philadelphia, printed the Declaration for the first time. He also lost the original copy. [Laughter] But that setback, too, was temporary because the Irish knew then how to back winners.

The Irish first became a force in our politics in the 1790's when they supported

Thomas Jefferson. To their eternal credit, many of their descendants have seen fit to back his Democratic descendants in the years since. Taoiseach, as you know, I am on my mother's side Irish; her name was Cassidy. What you may not know was that the decisive battle for the nomination for President in 1992 was in Illinois and Michigan on St. Patrick's Day.

It is said that Ireland's greatest export is its people. No country has benefited more from that export, Catholic and Protestant, than the United States. These two traditions have been intertwined, and together have contributed immensely to our success as a nation and to our greatness as a people. More than a dozen Presidents descended from Irish ancestors, from Andrew Jackson, the son of immigrants from Carrickfergus near Belfast, who was our first President of Irish Protestant heritage, to John Kennedy, the great-grandson of a cooper who left County Wexford and was our first Irish-Catholic President. I might say we're honored to have his sister as our Ambassador to Ireland, and his brother and two of his nephews in the United States Congress today. They're now seeking to expand their stranglehold; one of his nieces is the Lieutenant Governor of Maryland. The next thing you know they'll insist on a position on every city council in America. They have enough relatives to fill that. [Laughter]

In the fight for our independence, and in the fight to preserve our Union, there were Irishmen from both traditions serving side by side in all-Irish units. In both wars they were among the most feared warriors. They put freedom over faction, and they helped to build our Nation.

Finley Peter Dunne, the great Irish-American humorist, wrote that a fanatic is someone who is sure God would be on his side if only He knew all the facts. [Laughter] Today with good humor, but complete seriousness, I urge all our guests from Northern

Ireland and all the parties concerned to put aside all extremism for the common good of peace.

The Prime Minister of Ireland and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, at no inconsiderable risk to themselves, have paved the way to a new era of peace. I urge all of you to follow that path. The tough tasks of compromise still lie ahead. The hard, unending work of democracy is never easy. Even here, after all these years, two centuries of it, we still have our difficulties from time to time, living with those who differ from us. But as you work to forge a new future, free of violence, free of intimidation, with the participation of all the people of Northern Ireland, the United States will stand by you.

American has received so many gifts from Ireland, so many people who have enriched our Nation, people who continue to come to the present day. We perhaps have many to give back. Some are perhaps financial in nature, but maybe the most important thing we could give to Ireland, and, indeed, to a very troubled world today, is the example of what is possible when people find unity and strength in their diversity.

We know from our own hard experience, from the blood we have shed on our own land, from the struggles we have been engaged in for a long time, and the joys that we draw every day from the increasing diversity of our people, that strength can be drawn from differences, differences, which are celebrated, respected, appreciated. That kind of strength can build a future worthy of all the people of Northern Ireland.

Tonight, our hopes and our prayers are with all the people of Ireland, and especially with you, Mr. Prime Minister, and with your fine wife and your family. We loved having you here. We love every St. Patrick's Day, but this one especially, we will remember above the rest.

Thank you. Godspeed.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

## **The President's Radio Address**

*March 18, 1995*

Good morning. This morning I want to talk about responsibility, the responsibility all parents have to support their children. I'm please to be joined by Gerri Jensen, the president of the leading child support enforcement group in America, along with six other conscientious parents who have struggled to raise their children without the child support they were entitled to.

Our generation, at the end of the 20th century, has two great responsibilities: first, to keep the American dream alive and well for all our children and, second, to help our country remain the strongest force for freedom and democracy in the world. We can't do that if we don't have strong families and responsible parenting.

In Washington we're having a great debate about what we ought to do here to support these goals. On one side is the old Washington view that big, bureaucratic, one-size-fits-all Government can provide big solutions to America's big problems. On the other side is the new extreme view that Government is the source of all our problems and if we just get rid of it every problem would go away as well.

I've got a different view based on practical experience. I think we have to chart a course between the old way of big Government and the new rage of no Government. I think Government's job is to expand opportunity while shrinking bureaucracy, to get more jobs and higher incomes with less burden from Government, to empower people to make the most of their own lives through more education and training and technology and support for families and for work, and to enhance our security on our streets and around the world.

To achieve these ends, the Federal Government has to be a partner, a partner with the private sector, with State and local governments, with individual citizens to strengthen our communities, a partner in promoting opportunity and at the same time demanding more responsibility. That's what the New Covenant is all about.

Nowhere is the lack of values, the lack of opportunity and responsibility more apparent than in our own failed welfare system. We all agree we have to end welfare as we know it. I think to do it we'll have to offer more opportunity to move people from welfare to work and demand more responsibility in return, to have a requirement that anyone on welfare who can work must go to work, and to discourage irresponsible behavior that lands people on welfare in the first place by insisting on tougher child support enforcement and responsible parenting. We have to make responsibility a way of life.

I've been working on this issue for the last 15 years. Last year I sent Congress a sweeping welfare reform plan. Congress didn't act last year, but I applaud the new Republican majority and the Democrats, both of them for making welfare reform a priority this year. Meanwhile, in the last 2 years, we've cut through Federal redtape to give 26 States, more than half the country, the authority to conduct their own welfare reform experiments. And Republicans and Democrats now agree on tougher child support enforcement. They all agree that we have to have national action on tougher child support enforcement because 30 percent or more of the child support cases that are delinquent cross State boundaries.

I've worked hard on this. Since I've been President, child support collections are up substantially. And I just issued a tough Executive order to crack down on delinquency by Federal employees.

If deadbeat parents paid all the child support they should in this country, we could immediately move over 800,000 mothers and children off welfare. Let me say that again. If deadbeat parents paid the child support they owe, we could move immediately over 800,000 mothers and children off welfare. This goes way beyond welfare. Millions of children of working parents would have more secure lives and much brighter futures if the errant parents, absent parents, paid what they owe.

The welfare reform plan I sent to Congress last year included five key provisions for tough child support enforcement: employer reporting of new hires to catch deadbeats who move from job to job, uniform interstate

child support laws, computerized statewide collection to speed up payments, streamlined efforts to identify the father in every case, and tough new penalties, like driver's license revocation.

These reforms will work. According to a report issued today by the Department of Human Services—of Health and Human Services, if we crack down on deadbeat parents by making these five provisions the law all over America, child support collections would go up by \$24 billion in the next 10 years.

I am pleased that the House Republicans have come our way on these child support enforcement issues. They have included four of the five steps I proposed in their welfare bill. But I think the fifth step is crucial as well. Our plan calls on States to deny driver's licenses and professional licenses to people who refuse to pay the money they owe for their own children. Nineteen States are doing that today, and they're collecting a lot more child support as a result.

So I hope the House Republicans will take a look at these new findings and join us to send deadbeat parents all across this country a loud signal: If you neglect your responsibility to support your children, we'll suspend your license, garnish your pay, track you down, and make you pay.

Eighteen years ago, Gerri Jensen's husband abandoned her and her two young sons. She held down several low-paying jobs, but eventually was forced to turn to welfare because her ex-husband stopped paying child support altogether. She got so fed up with weak laws and bureaucratic runarounds that she launched a grassroots movement to crack down on deadbeat parents nationwide. We are all in her debt, and we all owe an obligation to all the people like her in America who are doing their dead-level best to be good parents. They deserve our support.

Gerri Jensen stood up and fought to make our laws reflect our values. No parent has a right to walk away from responsibility to his or her children. Now, if we work together, we can make this kind of responsibility the law of our land.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 3:23 p.m. on March 17 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on March 18.

### **Statement on Proposed Line-Item Veto Legislation**

*March 20, 1995*

The Senate is now debating the line-item veto legislation which passed last month in the House. I urge the Senate to pass the strongest possible line-item veto and to make it effective immediately. If the Members of Congress from both parties are serious about cutting the deficit, give me this line-item veto, and I will get started right away. This is one area where both parties can and should come together.

I have advocated the line-item veto for a very long time. When I was a Governor, I had a line-item veto and I balanced 12 budgets in a row. I advocated the line-item veto when I ran for President, and I have pushed for it since becoming President because it is a very effective tool for cutting wasteful Government spending and bringing down the deficit.

We have made great headway in cutting wasteful spending. We have already cut the Federal bureaucracy by 102,000 positions, on the way to cutting a quarter million. We are bringing the deficit down by more than \$600 billion. My new budget calls for another \$81 billion in deficit reduction.

But there is still too much waste in the Federal budget. This year I have proposed eliminating 131 programs altogether and consolidating 270 others. I proposed many of these spending cuts last year and the year before, only to have Congress tell me I couldn't cut their pet projects. I tried to cut \$16 million for the Small Business Administration's tree planting program. But Congress put it back in the budget. Congress even spent \$12 million for a cattle tick eradication project.

Well, this year, if the Congress gives me the line-item veto, I will cut each one of these programs, and a whole lot more. I also think the line-item veto should be applied to the revenue as well as the spending sides of the budget, so I can curb wasteful tax and spending provisions.

This is really about closing the door on business-as-usual in Washington. If Congress is serious about changing the way Washington works and getting a handle on wasteful spending, they will put politics aside, stand up to the special interests, and pass the bill.

The President, no matter what party, needs the line-item veto to bring discipline to the budget process. I urge the Senate to pass it and make it effective right now.

### **Letter to Congressional Leaders on Welfare Reform**

*March 20, 1995*

*Dear Mr. Speaker:*

This week, the historic national debate we have begun on welfare reform will move to the floor of the House of Representatives. Welfare reform is a top priority for my Administration and for Americans without regard to party. I look forward to working with Republicans and Democrats in both houses of Congress to enact real reform that promotes work and responsibility and makes welfare what it was meant to be: a second chance, not a way of life.

In the last two years, we have put the country on the road to ending welfare as we know it. In 1993, when Congress passed our economic plan, we cut taxes for 15 million working Americans and rewarded work over welfare. We collected a record level of child support in 1993—\$9 billion—and last month I signed an executive order to crack down on federal employees who owe child support. In two years, we have granted waivers from federal rules to 25 states, so that half the country is now carrying out significant welfare reform experiments that promote work and responsibility instead of undermining it.

I have always sought to make welfare reform a bipartisan issue. I still believe it can and must be. Unfortunately, the House Republican bill in its current form does not appear to offer the kind of real welfare reform that Americans in both parties expect. It is too weak on moving people from welfare to work, not as tough as it should be on dead-beat parents, and too tough on innocent children.

Last year, I sent Congress the most sweeping welfare reform plan any administration has ever presented. It did not pass, but I believe the principles and values at its core will be the basis of what ultimately does pass:

\* First, the central goal of welfare reform must be moving people from welfare to work, where they will earn a paycheck, not a welfare check. I believe we should demand and reward work, not punish those who go to work. If people need child care or job skills in order to go to work, we should help them get it. But within two years, anyone who can work must go to work.

This is not a partisan issue: Last year, 162 of 175 House Republicans co-sponsored a bill, H.R. 3500, that promoted work in much the same way as our plan. But the current House Republican bill you will consider this week fails to promote work, and would actually make it harder for many recipients to make it in the workplace. It cuts child care for people trying to leave welfare and for working people trying to stay off welfare, removes any real responsibility for states to provide job placement and skills, and gives states a perverse incentive to cut people off whether or not they have moved into a job. When people just get cut off without going to work, that's not welfare reform. I urge you to pass a welfare reform bill that ends welfare as we know it by moving people from welfare to work.

\* Second, welfare reform must make responsibility a way of life. We should demand responsibility from parents who bring children into the world, not let them off the hook and expect taxpayers to pick up the tab for their neglect. Last year, my Administration proposed the toughest child support enforcement measures ever put forward. If we collected all the money that deadbeat parents should pay, we could move 800,000 women and children off welfare immediately.

I am grateful to members in both parties for already agreeing to include most of the tough child support measures from our welfare reform plan. This week, I hope you will go further, and require states to deny drivers and professional licenses to parents who refuse to pay child support. We have to send a clear signal: No parent in America has a

right to walk away from the responsibility to raise their children.

\* Third, welfare reform should discourage teen pregnancy and promote responsible parenting. We must discourage irresponsible behavior that lands people on welfare in the first place, with a national campaign against teen pregnancy that lets young people know it is wrong to have a child outside marriage. Nobody should get pregnant or father a child who isn't prepared to raise the child, love the child, and take responsibility for the child's future.

I know members of Congress in both parties care about this issue. But many aspects of the current House plan would do more harm than good. Instead of refusing to help teen mothers and their children, we should require them to turn their lives around—to live at home with their parents, stay in school, and identify the child's father. We should demand responsible behavior from people on welfare, but it is wrong to make small children pay the price for their parents' mistakes.

\* Finally, welfare reform should give states more flexibility in return for more accountability. I believe we must give states far more flexibility so they can do the things they want to today without seeking waivers. But in its current form, the House Republican bill may impede rather than promote reform and flexibility. The proposal leaves states vulnerable to economic recession and demographic change, putting working families at risk. States will have less money for child care, training, and other efforts to move people from welfare to work. And there will not be any accountability at the federal level for reducing fraud or protecting children. We will not achieve real reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives the states more burdens and less money, and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land.

While the current House plan is weak on work, it is very tough on children. Cutting school lunches and getting tough on disabled children and children in foster care is not my idea of welfare reform. We all have a national interest in promoting the well-being of our children and in putting government back in line with our national values.

I appreciate all the work that you have done on this issue, and I am pleased that

the country is finally engaging in this important debate. In the end, I believe we can work it out together, as long as we remember the values this debate is really about. The dignity of work, the bond of family, and the virtue of responsibility are not Republican values or Democratic values. They are American values—and no child in America should ever have to grow up without them.

Sincerely,

**Bill Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Richard Gephardt, minority leader of the House of Representatives. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 21.

**Remarks on the Appointment of  
Bonnie Campbell as Director of the  
Office of Violence Against Women**

*March 21, 1995*

Thank you, Sarah, for your wonderful remarks and for the powerful example of your life. I was watching you speak today, thinking of your story, wondering how many other stories like yours there might have been if our society had responded more properly and how many more there will be now because we are going to do the right things.

I thank Attorney General Reno and Secretary Shalala, and of course, Senator Biden and Senator Hatch and Senator Boxer, Senator Harkin, Senator Kerry, Senator Moseley-Braun, Senator Wellstone—we've nearly got a quorum—[laughter]—Congresswoman DeLauro, Congresswoman Mink, Congresswoman Morella, Congresswoman Blanche Lambert Lincoln. I thank you all for being here.

This is an important day for me. This is an issue with which I have dealt as President, as a Governor, as an attorney general, as a citizen, going for years with my wife to the shelters in our State for battered women and their children, and as a human being. And I have looked forward to this day for a very long time.

We spend a lot of time in Washington, and we are now having a great and fascinating debate about what the role of this Govern-

ment ought to be and how we're going to get into the next century and how we're going to create opportunity for all the American people. This is a good thing that we're doing. It's exciting. And I'm having a good time. But you know, let's be honest with each other. If children aren't safe in their homes, if college women aren't safe in their dorms, if mothers can't raise their children in safety, then the American dream will never be real for them, no matter what we do in economic policy, no matter how strong we are in standing against the forces that would seek to undermine our values beyond our borders. This is key to everything else we want to do.

So I applaud the Members of the Congress, and especially those who have been recognized already—especially Senator Biden and Senator Hatch—for recognizing that we had to take responsibility for trying to come to grips with issues that we ordinarily would think of as issues that belong to local law enforcement or local social agencies or even to the privacy of the home.

When we were fighting so hard last year to pass the crime bill, with the emphasis on more police and more punishment and more prisons and more prevention, one of the things that almost got lost was the Violence Against Women Act. I think it almost got lost for a very regrettable reason in this day and time: The Republicans and the Democrats weren't fighting about it. We really had a national consensus that we had to do something. And because we knew we had to do something and it passed, it was almost unnoticed.

But you know, domestic violence is now the number one health risk for women between the ages of 15 and 44 in our country. If you think about it, it's a bigger threat than cancer or car accidents. The incidents of rape is rising at 3 times the rate of the crime rate. The FBI estimates that a woman is beaten in this country once every 12 seconds. And we know, too, that often when a spouse is beaten, the children are beaten as well.

For too long, domestic violence has been considered purely a private matter. From now on, it is a problem we all share. What are we going to do about it? The first thing we have to do is do what we can to prevent violence. One part of the crime bill I am

proudest of will help in our efforts to stop repeat offenses against women. It will prohibit individuals with a restraining order against them from purchasing or possessing a gun, no ifs, ands, or buts.

When crimes do occur, we must restore the rights of victims to their proper place. That means giving them the right to speak at sentencing hearings. And above all, it means helping victims rebuild their lives. We'll require sexual offenders to pay restitution to their victims. We must help people who suffer violence put their lives back on track and put the burdens on the criminals where they belong.

To help in prevention and in assisting victims, the crime bill establishes a Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice. Today I am pleased to announce that Bonnie Campbell of Iowa will be the first director of that office. As Iowa's first female attorney general, Bonnie Campbell helped to enact strong domestic violence and anti-stalking laws in that State. She worked with counties and college campuses to raise awareness about domestic violence. And she endorsed a victims rights amendment to the State constitution. A big part of her new job will be helping States and communities to deal with domestic violence.

Today we are making available \$26 million to help the States open rape crisis centers, to staff domestic violence hotlines, to provide victims advocates, to pay for more officers and more training. This is the first down payment on a 6-year commitment of \$800 million for this purpose.

This is part of a report I should make at least to these Members of Congress who are here about the crime bill. The work has already begun. In just 4 months we have awarded more than 16,000 police officers to half the police departments in America. We're taking guns and criminals off the streets. The "three-strikes-and-you're-out" law is being enforced in Iowa and in many other States throughout the country. In short, we are under budget and ahead of schedule. And I want more of that from our Government.

We passed this crime bill with bipartisan support. And I'd be the last person to say that it's the end-all and be-all, the ultimate

answer to all the problems of crime in America. But I will not permit the crime bill to be undercut. It is just starting to make a difference in the lives of Americans. We have to keep going. We have to make a difference in the lives of everyone, but especially the women and the children we are called here today to pledge our allegiance to protect.

Let me begin this introduction of Bonnie Campbell and end it with a simple thank you. It's hard to get anybody with good sense to leave Iowa to come to Washington. [*Laughter*] And I thank her for doing it and for the shining example she has set in public service and for the excellent work I am confident she will do in this important position.

Bonnie.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:11 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Sarah M. Buel, Evelyn Green Davis Fellow in Law at Radcliffe College and 17-year activist on family violence issues. Following the President's remarks, Ms. Campbell made remarks.

### **Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the National Science Foundation**

*March 21, 1995*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with section 3(f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862(f)), I am pleased to transmit to you the Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for Fiscal Year 1993.

The Foundation supports research and education in every State of the Union. Its programs provide an international science and technology link to sustain cooperation and advance this Nation's leadership role.

This report shows how the Foundation puts science and technology to work for a sustainable future—for our economic, environmental, and national security.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
March 21, 1995.

## Message to the Congress on Export Controls

March 21, 1995

*To the Congress of the United States:*

1. On August 19, 1994, in Executive Order No. 12924, I declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*) and the system of controls maintained under that Act. In that order, I continued in effect, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, the Export Administration Regulations (15 C.F.R. 768 *et seq.*), and the delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977 (as amended by Executive Order No. 12755 of March 12, 1991), Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980, Executive Order No. 12735 of November 16, 1990 (subsequently revoked by Executive Order No. 12938 of November 14, 1994), and Executive Order No. 12851 of June 11, 1993.

2. I issued Executive Order No. 12924 pursuant to the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including, but not limited to, IEEPA. At that time, I also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). Section 204 of IEEPA requires follow-up reports, with respect to actions or changes, to be submitted every 6 months. Additionally, section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (NEA) (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*) requires that the President, within 90 days after the end of each 6-month period following a declaration of a national emergency, report to the Congress on the total expenditures directly attributable to that declaration. This report, covering the 6-month period from August 19, 1994, to February 19, 1995, is submitted in compliance with these requirements.

3. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12924, the Department of Commerce has continued to administer and enforce the

system of export controls, including antiboycott provisions, contained in the Export Administration Regulations. In administering these controls, the Department has acted under a policy of conforming actions under Executive Order No. 12924 to those required under the Export Administration Act, insofar as appropriate.

4. Since my last report to the Congress, there have been several significant developments in the area of export controls:

### ***Bilateral Cooperation/Technical Assistance***

- As part of the Administration's continuing effort to encourage other countries to implement effective export controls to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as certain sensitive technologies, the Department of Commerce and other agencies conducted a range of discussions with a number of foreign countries, including governments in the Baltics, Central and Eastern Europe, the Newly Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union, the Pacific Rim, and China. Licensing requirements were liberalized for exports to Argentina, South Korea, and Taiwan, responding in part to their adoption of improved export control procedures.

### ***Australia Group***

- The Department of Commerce issued regulations to remove controls on certain chemical weapon stabilizers that are not controlled by the Australia Group, a multilateral regime dedicated to stemming the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. This change became effective October 19, 1994. In that same regulatory action, the Department also published a regulatory revision that reflects an Australia Group decision to adopt a multi-tiered approach to control of certain mixtures containing chemical precursors. The new regulations extend General License G-DEST treatment to certain categories of such mixtures.

### ***Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG)***

- NSG members are examining the present dual-use nuclear control list to both remove controls no longer warranted and to rewrite control language to better reflect nu-

clear proliferation concerns. A major item for revision involves machine tools, as the current language was accepted on an interim basis until agreement on more specific language could be reached.

- The Department of Commerce has implemented license denials for NSG-controlled items as part of the “no-undercut” provision. Under this provision, denial notifications received from NSG member countries obligate other member nations not to approve similar transactions until they have consulted with the notifying party, thus reducing the possibilities for undercutting such denials.

#### ***Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR)***

- Effective September 30, 1994, the Department of Commerce revised the control language for MTCR items on the Commerce Control List, based on the results of the last MTCR plenary. The revisions reflect advances in technology and clarifications agreed to multilaterally.

- On October 4, 1994, negotiations to resolve the 1993 sanctions imposed on China for MTCR violations involving missile-related trade with Pakistan were successfully concluded. The United States lifted the Category II sanctions effective November 1, in exchange for a Chinese commitment not to export ground-to-ground Category I missiles to any destination.

- At the October 1994 Stockholm plenary, the MTCR made public the fact of its “no-undercut” policy on license denials. Under this multilateral arrangement, denial notifications received from MTCR members are honored by other members for similar export license applications. Such a coordinated approach enhances U.S. missile non-proliferation goals and precludes other member nations from approving similar transactions without prior consultation.

#### ***Modifications in Controls on Embargoed Destinations***

Effective August 30, 1994, the Department of Commerce restricted the types of commodities eligible for shipment to Cuba under the provisions of General License GIFT. Only food, medicine, clothing, and

other human needs items are eligible for this general license.

- The embargo against Haiti was lifted on October 16, 1994. That embargo had been under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Treasury. Export license authority reverted to the Department of Commerce upon the termination of the embargo.

#### ***Regulatory Reform***

- In February 1994, the Department of Commerce issued a *Federal Register* notice that invited public comment on ways to improve the Export Administration Regulations. The project’s objective is “to make the rules and procedures for the control of exports simpler and easier to understand and apply.” This project is not intended to be a vehicle to implement substantive change in the policies or procedures of export administration, but rather to make those policies and procedures simpler and clearer to the exporting community. Reformulating and simplifying the Export Administration Regulations is an important priority, and significant progress has been made over the last 6 months in working toward completion of this comprehensive undertaking.

#### ***Export Enforcement***

- Over the last 6 months, the Department of Commerce continued its vigorous enforcement of the Export Administration Act and the Export Administration Regulations through educational outreach, license application screening, spot checks, investigations, and enforcement actions. In the last 6 months, these efforts resulted in civil penalties, denials of export privileges, criminal fines, and imprisonment. Total fines amounted to over \$12,289,000 in export control and antiboycott compliance cases, including criminal fines of nearly \$9,500,000 while 11 parties were denied export privileges.

- **Teledyne Fined \$12.9 Million and a Teledyne Division Denied Export Privileges for Export Control Violations:** On January 26 and January 27, Teledyne Industries, Inc. of Los Angeles, agreed to a settlement of criminal and administrative charges arising from illegal export activity in the mid-1980’s by its Teledyne Wah Chang division, located in Albany, Oregon. The settlement

levied criminal fines and civil penalties on the firm totaling \$12.9 million and imposed a denial of export privileges on Teledyne Wah Chang.

The settlement is the result of a 4-year investigation by the Office of Export Enforcement and the U.S. Customs Service. United States Attorneys offices in Miami and Washington, D.C., coordinated the investigation. The investigation determined that during the mid-1980's, Teledyne illegally exported nearly 270 tons of zirconium that was used to manufacture cluster bombs for Iraq.

As part of the settlement, the Department restricted the export privileges of Teledyne's Wah Chang division; the division will have all export privileges denied for 3 months, with the remaining portion of the 3-year denial period suspended.

- **Storm Kheem Pleads Guilty to Non-proliferation and Sanctions Violations:** On January 27, Storm Kheem pled guilty in Brooklyn, New York, to charges that he violated export control regulations barring U.S. persons from contributing to Iraq's missile program. Kheem arranged for the shipment of foreign-source ammonium perchlorate, a highly explosive chemical used in manufacturing rocket fuel, from the People's Republic of China to Iraq via Amman, Jordan, without obtaining the required validated license from the Department of Commerce for arranging the shipment. Kheem's case represents the first conviction of a person for violating section 778.9 of the Export Administration Regulations, which restricts proliferation-related activities of "U.S. persons." Kheem also pled guilty to charges of violating the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from August 19, 1994, to February 19, 1995, that are directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to export controls were largely centered in the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Export Administration. Expenditures by the Department of Commerce are anticipated to be \$19,681,000 most of which represents program operating costs, wage and salary costs

for Federal personnel and overhead expenses.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
March 21, 1995.

### **Letter to Congressional Leaders on Haiti**

*March 21, 1995*

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

On September 21, 1994, I reported to the Congress that on September 19, 1994, U.S. forces under the command of the Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Command, were introduced into Haitian territory following an agreement successfully concluded by former President Jimmy Carter, Senator Sam Nunn, and General Colin Powell and as part of the Multinational Force (MNF) provided for by United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 940 of July 31, 1994. I am providing this update of events in Haiti (Operation "Uphold Democracy") consistent with the War Powers Resolution to ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed regarding events in Haiti.

At their peak last September and into October, U.S. forces assigned to the MNF in Haiti numbered just over 20,000. Approximately 2,000 non-U.S. personnel from 27 nations also participated in the initial stages of the MNF. Over the last 6 months, U.S. forces gradually have been reduced, consistent with the establishment of a secure and stable environment called for by UNSCR 940, such that they currently number just under 5,300. Non-U.S. forces—both MNF and International Police Monitors (IPM)—currently number approximately 2,800. When the transition to the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) authorized by UNSCR 975 of January 30, 1995, is complete on March 31, 1995, approximately 2,500 U.S. forces will remain in Haiti as the U.S. contribution to UNMIH's force structure. Following transition to UNMIH, non-U.S. forces will total approximately 3,500, for a total force of approximately 6,000. In addition, a U.N. civilian police monitor component of UNMIH will number approximately 900.

In January, the United Nations Security Council determined that a secure and stable environment had been established in Haiti, based upon assessments from the MNF Commander and the U.N. Secretary General, and recommendations from the MNF Member States. As to the duration of the deployment, it is anticipated that the entire U.N. security mission, including U.S. forces, will withdraw from Haiti not later than February 1996. Presidential elections are scheduled for November 1995 and the inauguration will be held February 7, 1996.

Overall, Haiti has remained calm and relatively incident-free since the deployment of U.S. and MNF forces. The level of political violence has decreased substantially since the departure of the *de facto* government. There is normal activity in the streets, and in stark contrast to when MNF forces first arrived, people are able to go outside at night due to a more secure environment. The number of weapons in Haiti also has been significantly reduced. Early in its deployment, the MNF took control of heavy and crew-served weapons belonging to the FAd'H (The Haitian Armed Forces). The MNF is also administering a weapons buy-back, seizure, and reduction program that has thus far yielded over 33,000 weapons, including hand grenades.

Thus far, there have been only five incidents involving attacks on or gunfire by U.S. forces. On September 24, 1994, a U.S. Marine Corps squad exchanged gunfire with members of the FAd'H at the police headquarters in Cap Haitien. One Marine was wounded, and ten Haitians were killed. On October 2, an unidentified individual fired shots over a wall in Les Cayes, wounding an American soldier. On October 14, a member of the FAd'H was wounded by U.S. Special Forces when he burst from his barricaded room and ran towards a U.S. soldier during a confrontation in Belladere. On December 26, U.S. forces came under fire during a demonstration by disgruntled former members of the FAd'H outside FAd'H General Headquarters. After receiving fire, the MNF fired on the Headquarters resulting in several Haitian, but no U.S. casualties. Finally, on January 12, 1995, a two-man Special Forces team was fired on at a toll booth south

of Gonaives. One U.S. soldier was killed and another injured in the incident. The Haitian gunman was also killed.

I have taken the measures described above to further the national security interests of the United States. I have ordered the continued deployment of U.S. forces to the MNF pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I remain committed to consulting closely with the Congress, and I will continue to keep the Congress fully informed regarding this important deployment of our forces.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 22.

### **Remarks on Signing the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995**

*March 22, 1995*

I thank Governor Winter for his introduction and for the fine work he has done as head of the Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations. I want to welcome all of you here, especially the Members of the Congress. The Senate's been involved in business, and I think the House may still be voting. Representative Towns, I'm glad you made it. And I thank Senator Dole for coming. I want to say a special word of thanks to Senator Kempthorne, who picked a great first bill to pass in the United States Senate; to Senator John Glenn, who was the Democratic floor manager of this bill; Congressman Bill Clinger, the House sponsor; Congresswoman Cardiss Collins, the Democratic floor manager; Congressman Gary Condit and Jim Moran, who both pushed this bill. And I welcome Governor Voinovich from Ohio here, who drew State and local governments together on this matter. We have many mayors here. I see Mayor Abramson and Mayor Daley and Mayor Lashutka. And there are representatives of the counties and the State legislatures here, other Members of Con-

gress. I thank all of you for your work on this important piece of legislation.

I had the privilege in 1989—he may not remember this—of having dinner in Chicago with Mayor Daley just a couple of weeks after he took office. I learned that night, somewhere between salad and the main course, just how much Mayor Daley hated unfunded mandates. [*Laughter*] For those of you who would have been nice enough to let me get all the way to dessert, I welcome you here, too. [*Laughter*]

I share these concerns, having served as a Governor for a dozen years and witnessed the growth of many of the unfair burdens that unfunded mandates impose. Shortly after I became President, I signed an Executive order to prohibit Federal agencies from imposing nonstatutory unfunded mandates on State and local governments without full consultations first.

We have a few more Members coming. Come on in. Representatives Peterson and Tauzin, we're glad to see you.

This bill today extends that discipline to Congress. And I applaud Congress for passing it. It for the first time limits the ability of Congress to pass laws which impose unfunded mandates on State, county, local governments and tribal governments. Having been there as a Governor, I know this bill will make a big difference in the lives of our people.

We've made important progress this year in reforming Government already. The Congress passed a bill which I was proud to sign which requires Congress to live by the laws it imposes on the private sector.

Now, this unfunded mandates law will be another model for how we have to continue to change the way Washington does business. The best ideas and the most important work that affect the public interest are often done a long way away from Washington. This bill is another acknowledgement that Washington doesn't necessarily have all the answers, that we have to continue to push decision-making down to the local level, and we shouldn't make the work of governing at the local level any harder than the circumstances of the time already ensure that it will be.

The other thing that this bill shows is that Republicans and Democrats can come to-

gether and break gridlock and do what the American people expect us to do. For all of you who are part of that cooperative effort, and especially for the Members of the Congress, I thank you.

This is spring, and the roses are about to bloom here in the Rose Garden. This is a new beginning and a time for a new spirit of cooperation. I hope the Congress will move on from this to first pass the line-item veto, so we can bring more real discipline to our spending process, and then to pass welfare reform that promotes work and responsible parenting and tough child support enforcement.

We have got to build a true partnership with the American people, with a Government that gets rid of what's unnecessary for today and tomorrow and does what we have to do in a limited but effective way. We're trying to do that in reducing the deficit, the size of the Federal Government, reducing the burden of unnecessary regulation. This bill will make a real start.

Listen to this: Before 1964, the number of explicit mandates from the Congress on State and local governments was zero. But according to the National Performance Review, on the day I took office there were at least 172 separate pieces of legislation that impose requirements on State and local government. The Congressional Budget Office estimates the cost to States and localities of all the regulations imposed just between 1983 and 1990 is between \$8.9 billion and \$12.7 billion. After today, this should stop.

This bill requires Congress to show how much mandates over \$50 million per year will cost State and local governments, to require Congress to identify a specific funding source for these mandates, and if it does not meet these criteria, Congress must explicitly waive the requirement that there be no unfunded mandate, something which I think will become increasingly rare with the passage of this law.

You know, our Founders gave us strong, guiding principles about how our governments ought to work, and they trusted us in every generation to reinvigorate the partnership they created with such wisdom so long ago.

For 200 years, we've had to do that over and over and over, and about once a generation, we had to make some really big changes in the way we work together as a people, citizens in their private lives, local governments, State governments, and our Government here in Washington.

Today, we are making history. We are working to find the right balance for the 21st century. We are recognizing that the pendulum had swung too far, and that we have to rely on the initiative, the creativity, the determination, and the decisionmaking of people at the State and local level to carry much of the load for America as we move into the 21st century.

This bill will help to keep the American dream alive, and help to keep our country strong. Every Member of Congress here who voted for it and everyone who is not here deserves the thanks of the American people. And all of you from all over America who are here, from the cities, from the county operations, from the State legislatures, and State Governments, we are all in your debt. I thank you, and I am honored to sign this bill.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:45 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to former Governor William Winter of Mississippi; Governor George V. Voinovich of Ohio; Mayor Jerry Abramson of Louisville, KY; Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago, IL; and Mayor Greg Lashutka of Columbus, OH. S. 1, approved March 22, was assigned Public Law No. 104-4.

### **Memorandum on the 1995 Savings Bond Campaign**

*March 22, 1995*

*Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies*

The 1995 Federal U.S. Savings Bonds Campaign will soon be underway. Attached is a special message to all Federal employees who are eligible to take part in this campaign. Please give this letter appropriate distribution within your organization to enhance your campaign.

I encourage you to also generate a letter for each of your Department or Agency employees. Good luck on a successful campaign. I look forward to receiving your results later this year.

**William J. Clinton**

### **Memorandum on the 1995 Savings Bond Campaign**

*March 22, 1995*

*Memorandum for All Federal Government Employees*

*Subject: 1995 U.S. Savings Bonds Campaign*

The Federal Government will soon be conducting the 1995 Savings Bonds Campaign. This campaign is your chance to sign up for the Payroll Savings Plan for U.S. Savings Bonds or to increase your rate of saving if you are already participating.

Getting into the habit of saving money is not easy, no matter how hard you try. The Payroll Savings Plan for U.S. Savings Bonds is a convenient method of saving regularly that offers tax advantages and investment market-based interest rates for small sums of money. When you join the plan, you select an amount to be set aside from each paycheck to buy bonds. The rest is automatic; you save payday after payday without interruption.

In addition to their direct personal benefits, Savings Bonds also help reduce Federal spending. As members of the Government, we must set an example for all citizens to follow by establishing a high rate of participation in this excellent program.

Savings Bonds have helped millions of Americans purchase homes, finance college educations, guarantee secure retirements, and weather financial emergencies. When one of your fellow employees calls on you during the campaign, please consider how bonds can help you to achieve your own financial goals—then sign up for bonds.

**William J. Clinton**

## Memorandum on Customer Service

March 22, 1995

*Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies*

*Subject: Improving Customer Service*

In the first phase of this Administration's reinventing government initiative, I established the principle that government must be customer-driven. Executive Order No. 12862, "Setting Customer Service Standards," called for a revolution within the Federal Government to change the way it does business. The initial agency responses to that order, including the service standards published in September 1994, have begun the process of establishing a more customer-focused government. For the first time, the Federal Government's customers have been told what they have a right to expect when they ask for service.

In the second phase of reinventing government ("Phase II"), this effort should be continued and integrated with other restructuring activities. The first question agency restructuring teams should ask is whether a program or function is critical to the agency's missions based on "customer" input. To carry out this Phase II effort and assure that government puts the customer first, I am now directing the additional steps set forth in this memorandum.

**Actions.** The agencies covered by Executive Order No. 12862 are directed as follows:

1. In order to continue customer service reform, agencies shall treat the requirements of Executive Order No. 12862 as continuing requirements. The actions the order prescribes, such as surveying customers, surveying employees, and benchmarking, shall be continuing agency activities. The purpose of these actions will remain as indicated in Executive Order 12862—the establishment and implementation of customer service standards to guide the operations of the executive branch.

2. Agencies shall, by September 1, 1995, complete the publication of customer service standards, in a form readily available to customers, for all operations that deliver significant services directly to the public. This shall include services that are delivered in partner-

ship with State and local governments, services delivered by small agencies and regulatory agencies, and customer services of enforcement agencies.

3. Agencies shall, on an ongoing basis, measure results achieved against the customer service standards and report those results to customers at least annually. Reports should be in terms readily understood by individual customers. Public reports shall be made beginning no later than September 15, 1995. Measurement systems should include objective measures wherever possible, but should also include customer satisfaction as a measure. Customer views should be obtained to determine whether standards have been set on what matters most to the customer. Agencies should publish replacement standards if needed to reflect these views.

4. Development and tracking of customer service measures, standards, and performance should be integrated with other performance initiatives, including Phase II restructuring. Customer service standards also should be related to legislative activities, including strategic planning and performance measurement under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, reporting on financial and program performance under the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, and the Government Management and Reform Act of 1994. Operating plans, regulations and guidelines, training programs, and personnel classification and evaluation systems should be aligned with a customer focus.

5. Agencies shall continue to survey employees on ideas to improve customer service, take action to motivate and recognize employees for meeting or exceeding customer service standards, and for promoting customer service. Without satisfied employees, we cannot have satisfied customers.

6. Agencies should initiate and support actions that cut across agency lines to serve shared customers groups. Agencies should take steps to develop cross-agency, one-stop service to customer groups, so their customers do not needlessly go from one agency to another. Where possible, these steps should take advantage of new information technology tools to achieve results.

The standard of quality we seek from these actions and the Executive order is customer

service for the American people that is equal to the best in business.

**Independent Agencies.** Independent agencies are requested to adhere to this directive.

**Judicial Review.** This directive is for the internal management of the executive branch and does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 23.

### **Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the College Press Forum**

*March 23, 1995*

**The President.** Thank you and welcome to the White House. This is, as I'm sure you agree, a fascinating time to be in our Nation's Capital. We are now having a great debate about how we can best assure the American dream for your generation and for your children well into the next century. The choices we make here will have a profound effect on all of your lives.

This is an historic era: We have the end of the cold war, the dawn of the information age, a globalized economy, an explosion of entrepreneurialism, an enormous amount of opportunity. At the same time, we have profound challenges. We have almost 20 years of stagnant incomes in the United States. We have growing inequality of incomes based primarily on educational differentials. We have deep strains within our society and still profound problems related to the breakdown of family and community and the rise of crime and violence. We have challenges abroad in terrorism, environmental destruction, population explosion, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The issue we are most debating around here now in many different ways is what is the proper role of the National Government in working with the American people to meet our challenges. The old view is that Govern-

ment is inherently a positive force and that there is a one-size-fits-all, big Government solution for every big problem. The new view that's all the rage around here is that the Federal Government is the cause of every problem and if we just didn't have one we might not have any problems.

My view is different from both of these. I ran for President to advance that view, and I still believe it is the proper one. I believe Government does have a role to play as a partner in meeting the challenges of the future with all of the American people. I believe the role of Government is to increase opportunity as we shrink bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security at home and abroad.

We have to work economically to expand the middle class and to shrink the under class. We have to work to promote mainstream values of work and family and future. We have to do it with a Government that is smaller and less bureaucratic but still effective. The key to our future is our ability to create more opportunity and, at the same time, the willingness of our citizens to assume more responsibility. That's what I have called the New Covenant.

I agree that we have to cut outmoded Government, and our administration has led the way. There are already more than 100,000 fewer people working here for the National Government than there were on the day I became President. We're on our way to the smallest Federal Establishment since President Kennedy worked here.

But I also believe that this Government should invest in your future and in your capacity to contribute and to live up to the fullest of your abilities. Therefore, I support more investments in education and technology and training and empowering people to make the most of their own lives.

I also believe that if you look at the end of 2 years, the evidence is pretty good that our approach is right. We have reduced the deficit 3 years in a row for the first time since Mr. Truman was here. We have 6.1 million new jobs, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years, the first time in 20 years the African-American unemployment rate has been under 10 per-

cent. We have in 1993 the largest number of new businesses incorporated in any given year in American history. Finally, in 1994, we began to make some progress on the wage issue when we had more high-wage jobs coming into the economy than in the previous 5 years combined.

Notwithstanding that, the American people said they wanted a different sort of debate here in Washington last November, and so we are having it. Now, I believe that nothing will more clearly define the contours of this debate than what we decide to do in the area of education and training.

In the global economy into which we are moving, we can see what is happening to American jobs and incomes. Those who are able to grasp the high-wage jobs of the future are doing very well, indeed. We're going to have record numbers of millionaires created in this 4-year period. But we also see more and more and more Americans in the grip of insecurity as they work harder than they were working 20 years ago for wages that are the same or lower. And overwhelmingly, it is because technology and global economic competition have depressed wages in areas that are not high skilled, with the capacity to grow and learn for a lifetime.

Therefore, I do not agree that we should cut our investments in education and training, starting with the advances we made in Head Start, going through the school lunch program, all the way to the apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go to college, to college loans, to the subsidies for college loans for working young people—right the way through. I don't believe we should cut them, certainly not to pay for tax cuts and not even to reduce the deficit. We do not have to cut education to reduce the deficit.

The leaders of Congress have targeted two areas that I would like to mention—three, if I might, although only one reduces the deficit—or two. The first is, the student loan program. We have, through our direct loan program, offered the opportunity for millions of young people to borrow money at lower costs on better repayment terms in a way that is less hassle for colleges and universities, less paperwork, and actually saves the Government money because we take out the middle

man. We don't have guarantees to banks. We just make the loans directly. That has actually reduced the deficit and reduced the costs of college loans. At the same time, we have gotten tougher on collecting delinquent loans, reducing the costs to the taxpayers of delinquent loans from \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. So, more loans, lower costs to the students, lower costs to the taxpayers, less hassle to the schools: It's a win-win deal.

The Republicans in the Congress want to change all of that. They, first of all, want to put a lid on the number of students who can participate in the direct loan program, which will add to the deficit. And then, they want to eliminate the student loan subsidy for 4 million college students and charge people interest on their loans while they're in college, even if they come from very modest backgrounds.

Interestingly enough, this cut in education will only replace the money that they want to keep giving middlemen in the old student loan program so we could have the same reduction in the deficit by leaving the interest subsidy in place and making the direct loan program available to all the students in America. I think it's clear that our decision is a better one than theirs, and I hope that we will prevail. We are doing some things together, you know. We signed the unfunded mandates bill yesterday. We're about to get a bipartisan consensus for a line-item veto, which I have worked very hard for. So I hope that my view can prevail here, because it's very important to you.

The other thing that has happened in the House is that the Republicans have voted to cut the national service program, AmeriCorps, to the bone. I think that is a mistake. The AmeriCorps program is giving thousands of young Americans a chance to serve their communities, serve their country, and earn money for higher education. I don't believe we need to trade in our future for what is a piddling amount on the deficit but will have an enormous negative symbolic and substantive impact on what we're trying to do in this country.

There is an article in the Washington Post this morning by Mary McGrory, whom I see sitting in the back who quotes a Georgetown student who happens to be a Republican who

says, "I understand that taxpayers are heavily burdened, but if we give up what's best about America, what kind of legacy will we leave?"

So I will close with that. I urge you to think about this question. Yes, we have to continue to reduce the deficit, and we will. Yes, we have to move ourselves into the future economically. How can we do both? What are our other challenges?

One of the things we know is that the countries that do the best job of developing the full capacities of every one of their citizens will be the most successful in the 21st century. That's in all your interests, and that's what we should be debating here.

Thank you very much.

I'd like to now call on as many of you as we possibly can. I'd like to ask you when I recognize you, please, to say what your name is and what your school is. And we'll start here.

### **Education Legislation**

**Q.** Jeff Glasser, from Yale. How do you plan to stop Congress from capping direct loans, or cutting Pell grants, or paying the interest on loans taken out during college? Are you willing to veto legislation if it comes across your desk?

**The President.** Well, of course I am in the areas of education, which are so important to me. But let me say again what my first choice has been all along—is to try to prevail in the debate in the Congress. We are making progress. As I said, we—I signed a bill yesterday that I strongly believe in, the unfunded mandates bill, which limits the ability of Congress to pass laws that require State and local governments to raise taxes or otherwise pay for things that we require. We're going to get the line-item veto I hope and believe, which is a good way to cut out unnecessary spending. So maybe we can make some progress here.

I don't think there's as much enthusiasm in the Senate among Republicans, and I know the Democrats will oppose eliminating the subsidies, cutting the Pell grants, limiting the direct loan program. So I hope we can prevail in the Congress. But the veto pen is always there.

And this is a—look, I wouldn't be standing here today, no way in the world would I be

standing here today if it hadn't been for the opportunities America gave me through education. When I was born in my State in 1946, the per capita income of my State was barely over half the national average. And my whole generation owes everything we have to the educational opportunities our country gave to us. And now education is even more important to the general welfare of America than it was when I was your age.

I cannot sit by and watch it go backward. We need to bear down and do more, not ease up and go back.

Yes.

### **President's Education**

**Q.** Francine Friedman, from Georgetown. As a fellow Hoya about to graduate and start paying back my loans, I was wondering if you could share with us how you financed your Georgetown education.

**The President.** I had a \$500—as I remember, it was a \$500-a-year scholarship and a job. I worked in the Congress for 2 years. And when I went to Yale to law school I had a grant, a loan, a tuition postponement option, which works like the direct loan does now. That is, I paid it back as a percentage of my income. I had a national defense loan and six jobs. But never more than three at once. [Laughter]

### **NCAA Basketball Championship**

**Q.** Kristal Adams, from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. On a lighter note, I was wondering who do you have picked for the Arkansas-Memphis game, and do you think Arkansas will make it all the way to the championship game this year?

**The President.** Well, I feel somehow, after the last two games, there is some divine providence that keeps us going. [Laughter] So I'm more hopeful now than I was when they started the tournament. Thank you.

### **Affirmative Action**

**Q.** Yes. My name is Peter McKay. I'm a sophomore at Florida A&M University. And my question deals with the White House review of affirmative action that's been going on for several weeks now. What is the status of the review, and what conclusions have you reached about affirmative action?

**The President.** Well, first, the status is ongoing. I'll talk a little about where we are now, but I want to emphasize that the review is still underway.

And let me urge you—I know there must be a lot of discussion about this on college campuses as it affects admissions policies. But I want to emphasize to begin with, if you spark a debate about this, it's important to know what people are talking about when they're talking about affirmative action. There are policies of the Government and policies in the private sector that affect admissions to colleges, availability of financial aid to schools, admissions to workplaces and promotional policies within the workplace, and access to contracts in the public sector, and sometimes, in the private sector as well, like big companies contracting with smaller ones. So you're basically talking about a range of programs.

When there is evidence of past discrimination, as found in a court, then there can be more strenuous rules and regulations. Otherwise, there are actually a lot of strictures on how far affirmative action can go in giving preferences to people based on race or gender.

But let me back up a little bit and again talk about a little history. When I was your age and I began to work in political campaigns, which I know was a long time ago—almost 30 years ago now, but it's not so long in the life of the country—there were still courthouses on squares in county seats in my State that had segregated restrooms. In my lifetime, when I was your age, in the mid-sixties, there were still older African-Americans in my State who did not know that they could vote without buying a poll tax, because it had only been abolished by the Supreme Court a couple of years before. I can remember when there were no women in any number of jobs now where we take it for granted that women will be.

The point I want to make to you is that we have made a lot of progress in this country. It has been inexact. It has been imperfect. There are still problems. We have made a lot of progress because we tried to take action to open up more opportunities to people without regard to their race or gender.

And all of us, including white males, are better off because of that.

If you look at the countries around the world today that are being absolutely ripped apart because of violence based on ethnic or religious or racial disputes, and sometimes also related to the role of women, if you look at the countries that are struggling to become modern today where there's still regularly violence against women—the general point I want to make to you is that it is in everyone's interest to see that everybody gets the best chance to live up to the fullest of their abilities.

On the other hand, it is in no one's interest to see that people get positions if they're completely unqualified to hold them. So the question is: How do we now go forward? And let me tell you the questions I've asked my folks to answer. I've said, first of all, how do these programs work, and do they have a positive effect? Okay, that's the first question. Secondly, even if they work, are they sometimes, at least, unfair to others? Could you argue that in some cases there is reverse discrimination, and if so, how? Thirdly, are there now others in need who are not covered by affirmative action programs?

Keep in mind that's really what's fueling this whole thing. You've got 20 years in this country where most hourly wage-earners have not kept up with inflation. Most Americans are working harder for lower wages than they were making 20 years ago. If so, how are we going to deal with them?

And finally, let's look at what clearly works, and I'll give you three examples. I don't think anybody in America would like us to suspend what we are doing in the military, the system that produced not only General Powell but countless other generals and colonels who are not only African-Americans and Hispanics and Asian-Americans, but also women, doing things that never were available before. How does that system work? Why does nobody reject it? Because nobody thinks anyone unqualified gets promoted.

What do they do? They work as hard as they can to develop the capacities of everybody who signs up. They do their very best to see that at each level in the promotional pool, there is a mix of people that reflect the population in the rank just below, and

then nobody—nobody gets promoted who is not qualified. But they really work hard to give everybody a chance and develop everybody's capacities.

A second example: This is self-serving, but I'll give it to you, anyway. I have appointed at this point in my tenure, to this point in the 2 years, more judges to the Federal bench who were women or members of racial minorities than my three predecessors combined, I believe. But my judges have the highest ratings, on average, from the American Bar Associations of any of the last four Presidents. So no one suggests that I am not promoting quality in the Federal bench.

Fourth example: My Deputy Chief of Staff, Erskine Bowles was, before he came to the White House, the head of the Small Business Administration. And he spent 20 years helping people finance small business. And I said, "We've got to bring enterprise into the depressed areas of this country. We have got to do it." So in one year, there was a huge increase in the volume of loans given to African-Americans, Hispanics, and women, from the Small Business Administration, without in any way discriminating against qualified white males, and every one of the loans was to a qualified person. Now, I don't believe any American would object to those three things.

The last thing I want to say is, I have also asked, "Where does discrimination still exist among people who are not poor or not economically distressed, in the traditional definition, based on race or gender?" We just had the "Glass Ceiling" report issued this last week, which was originally initiated, I believe, by Senator Dole, which said that there is still evidence of discrimination in promotional practices in large enterprises.

So I want to review all this, I want to make the best decision I can, and I've given you the questions.

I want to close with just two points. I'm against discrimination. I'm against giving people opportunities who are unqualified. But we all have an interest, including white males, in developing the capacities of all of us to relate to one another, because our economy will grow quicker, it'll be stronger, and in a global society, our diversity is our greatest asset. We must not let this debate be an-

other cheap political wedge issue to divide the American electorate. We can use this to come together, and that's what we ought to do.

Tell me your name and where you're from.

### **Careers in Politics**

**Q.** My name is Lori Wiechman. I go to the University of Georgia. And in your first remarks, you had mentioned that you're really concerned about the future of us as college students and as—our children. And I was just wondering, looking back on your experience in politics, which areas would you suggest for the college students who attend all of the universities here who are wanting to go into politics to pursue before they begin their career?

**The President.** Well, first of all, I do not believe that there is a specific academic discipline that is necessarily better than another one to pursue a political career. If you are pursuing a degree in science or mathematics or economics, let's say, I would recommend that at least you take whatever electives you can in history and in the social sciences, like political science, and in psychology. [*Laughter*] And then—but I think the most important thing is to develop your mind, is to learn to think.

And then the second thing I would say is, it's very important to spend your free time deciding whether you're interested in people as individuals and interested in public problems. Not everybody is, you know. And it's a good thing—I mean, a lot of wonderful work has been done in the world by people who didn't want to spend hours a day talking to people who were different from them.

But if you really want to make a positive difference, in my judgment, you have to be able to imagine what life is like for people who are very different from you, and you have to be willing to invest some time in listening to those people.

If you think about what's happening, even in—I read stories on college campuses, that kids are sort of separating by race, at least younger people and—I'll give you something positive—one of the best things that's happened is a lot of older people are now coming back to schools, especially to community colleges but also to 4-year colleges. If you want

to be effective in public life, you have to understand how other people view the world, and you have to be able to imagine yourself in their position.

And then, the third thing I would say is, you should get some experience in campaigns and in other public endeavors to find out both how hard and how exhilarating it is to get people together and try to work to change something. Those are the three pieces of advice. But there is no single academic discipline that's the best.

### **Illegal Immigration**

**Q.** My name is Shafeeq Qaasim. I'm from Los Angeles Trade Technical College. As opposed to the budget that everybody's concerned about, and we have all of these illegal aliens that mostly—that affect all of us, including the taxpayers—I would like to know, considering we passed a proposal of Proposition No. 187 in California, and it's now somewhere in the Federal court system, what's being done, and how can it get back into the State where the voters have already voted?

**The President.** Well, the voters voted for it, and then like any law, it's subject to court challenge, and it's being challenged in the courts. Let me tell you what we've tried to do in the meanwhile. First of all, after I became President, I increased spending by 30 percent on programs designed to reduce the problem of illegal aliens. We have increased the number of border guards on the southern borders, assuming my next budget is adopted on this—I think it will be—by about 60 percent in 3 years. We are turning more people back.

We are also sending more people back home more quickly who come in contact with the criminal justice system. We are working to increase our ability to check workplaces for illegal immigrants, and we're trying to standardize identification so people can't give phony papers and stay in jobs. And we are trying to alleviate some of the costs that States face. We've given California, for example, more money to deal with their costs of imprisonment and health care and other things. And I asked the Congress to do even more than they voted to do, but I think that we should, as a matter of principle, no illegal

immigrant is entitled to the expenditure of American people's tax dollars.

I did not support 187 for a very different reason. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people to have kids here and have them not in school. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people to have families here and not be able to get into a health clinic and maybe have them get seriously ill and spread whatever illness they have to the population at large. So my problem with 187 was in the details.

We do not give welfare benefits, for example, to illegal immigrants, and we should not be spending our money there, except where it is in the interest of our larger sense of self-interest. And I think schools and health care are. But we've got to do a lot more to crack down on the borders, and we have to do a lot more to go into these workplaces and send people away. And I would hope again—this was a great wedge issue in the last election, but I'd like to remind you of where this issue came from, in part.

A lot of the very same people that were out there for 187, just a few years ago when the California economy was booming, weakened the anti-immigration—anti-illegal immigration legislation pending in Congress, so they could get more illegal immigrations into workplaces in California who would work for lower wages—for their supporters. Now, that's the truth.

And what we need to do is crack down in the workplace, crack down at the borders, crack down in the criminal justice system, and not spend any money that we don't have to spend. And that's our policy and the one we're going to pursue.

### **Student Loans**

**Q.** I'm from Ohio University—we're represented by a freshman Republican in Congress—to be a freshman Democrat—he says he opposes cuts in student aid, yet he says we need to look at your direct funding program, because it builds a billion-dollar bureaucracy here in Washington. Could you respond to that?

**The President.** It's just a—it's a myth. It's a myth. The direct lending program—the Secretary of Education is here with me—the direct lending program will save the tax-

payers \$12 billion over 6 years, the same amount of money they propose to save by eliminating the interest subsidy on student loan. Why is that?

You know how the student loan program works now under the old system? It's a 90-percent guarantee. So you go to the bank, and you borrow the money, right? And the Government guarantees 90 percent of it. And the bank gets payment in the middle. And then if somebody defaults on the loan, unless it's a huge amount of money, it's not worth it to the bank to go try to sue somebody and get the money back. Why? Because they're going to get 90 percent of it anyway. And they'll spend 10 percent or more on lawyer fees.

So what have we done? We have reduced the number of defaults. We have been tough on this—over and above the previous administrations who were here before me—we have reduced the loan defaults from a cost a year of \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. This direct lending program is far less expensive to run than the alternative. It is pure ideology to say it costs a little money to run the direct loan program, and we don't want to hire one Government employee; we'd rather pay billions and billions and billions of dollars to banks that could be going for lower cost college loans to more students.

This program is working. It saves money for everybody, and we shouldn't limit its reach. I think it is a real error.

Yes. Go ahead.

### **Diversity and Unity**

**Q.** Margretta Sundelin, from Brigham Young University. It seems the United States is a nation founded on and prided upon its diversity. However, in the course of the last few years, it seems its diversity is dividing us. What I want to know is, in your Presidency, what have you done to bring cohesion back to the Nation and to settle the unrest?

**The President.** Well, I've tried to do many things, but let me emphasize two or three. The first thing I've tried to do is to focus on initiatives that would provide opportunities to all Americans; that would unite us in getting more opportunities by, first of all in economic terms, by bringing down the deficit and expanding trade opportunities for Amer-

ican products, by working to create more jobs for the American people. Secondly, in education, by increasing everything from Head Start programs to college loans, I have tried to offer broadbased opportunity.

The second thing I've tried to do is to demonstrate to the American people that you could have diversity and excellence at the same time. That's what I just mentioned: If you look at the people I've appointed to high public office, the people I've appointed to the Federal judgeships, and the things that I have tried to do that I think are important.

The third thing I have tried to do is to emphasize the importance of uniting the American people around shared values. That's what welfare reform is all about. That's what the attempts of the crime bill to clean up our streets from violence are all about. We should all be able to agree that we are going to pursue policies that promote family, that promote work, that strengthen communities, that look to the future. These are the things that I have tried to do.

And I believe that the American people would think more in these terms—I know that a lot of people are so bewildered by the changes and they feel so threatened by the changes going on today, that it's easy to lash out at someone who is different from us. But if we would focus on those three things I think we'd come together more.

### **Technological Initiatives**

**Q.** I'm Jaimee Silverstein, from Northwestern University. With the knowledge of computers and other types of technology becoming more crucial in order to succeed in the workplace, what steps is your administration taking to promote this type of education?

**The President.** Well, we are doing a number of things. First of all, I think you saw the White House on the Internet today, didn't you? We're trying to set a good example. But we're also promoting the availability of more computers and the use of more responsible computer education in our schools, starting in the earliest grades. It was a big part of the education reform legislation that Secretary Riley and I and the administration pushed last year.

One thing I note—Mr. Gingrich said the other day something that I really agreed with,

and then he said maybe it was an unrealistic thing. But I don't think it is. He said it would really help to cure poverty if every poor child in America had a little laptop computer. And then I think he backed off of it. I don't think that's a bad idea at all. I think that if we had enough resources to teach every poor child in this country how to interact with the whole world of information that's available, if you can work that, it would be a very good thing.

So I believe we should continue to press technology. It is not an excuse—it's not a substitute for learning to read, for learning to write, for learning to express yourself clearly, for learning to reason and argue and think. But it is enormous leverage to us. And I think we should do more.

#### **"Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Policy**

**Q.** My name is Carrie Budoff. I'm from Rutgers University. Many colleges have policies of nondiscrimination. And your "don't ask, don't tell" policy for ROTC programs—it applies to ROTC programs—and it's an obvious conflict with the university's policy. The ROTC program in the case of Rutgers may lose funding because of this, because they are not abiding by the nondiscrimination policy. How can these programs—how can the ROTC program on college campuses deal with this if they have a nondiscrimination policy?

**The President.** Explain what you mean. I'm sorry I don't understand it. Go ahead.

**Q.** Okay. The ROTC program at Rutgers University may lose scholarship funding because they are on the campus. And the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which extends—

**The President.** Conflicts with Rutgers' nondiscrimination policy.

**Q.** Yes.

**The President.** Well, it's an act of Congress, so Rutgers will have to decide what to do about it. I mean, there isn't—I'll say this: If the policy were implemented in spirit and in letter the way it was really written, if you read the whole policy, I don't think it would be in conflict. But if you read the whole policy—I would urge you to go back and read the whole policy and see what it really says—I don't think it would be in conflict. But if Rutgers deems it's in conflict,

then Rutgers will have to do whatever it decides to do, because that policy was written into law as an act of Congress and so it is not subject to change unless Congress changes it.

#### **Education and Tolerance**

**Q.** Christan Hanna, Western Michigan University. On our campus we had a non-violent protest because a faculty member told a student that she asked "stupid—blank—questions." And instead of dealing with the problem of racism and talking about it on campus, the university's reaction has been to try to quell all of the surrounding problems instead of dealing with the issue, the main issue, which is the racism and problems that people have with that. What do you think the university's role in educating beyond your study, your area of study, is?

**The President.** Well, I think it's a very important role. I mean, if you have the luxury of going to college and you stay there for 4 years or in the case of a community college, 2 years, it's maybe different if you've got a family to raise and a full-time job and all. But if basically you're a full-time student and you're in your formative years, some of the most important things that happen to you happen to you outside the classroom and involve things you don't get a grade on.

And I think one of the things—I've been really quite concerned about the challenges that both students and faculty members face in this so-called political correctness atmosphere. I think we need to encourage people to say what they really think but to do it in an atmosphere that is more tolerant. And I think universities ought to be laboratories all across this country for people airing their real feelings and convictions but doing it in a way that other people can hear them and really being honest and forthright about it, because otherwise, then the universities can just become one more island of isolation for the American people. We don't need that. We don't need more islands of isolation. We need instruments to open us up to one another.

#### **Health Care Reform**

**Q.** Jim Buchanan, St. Louis Community College. Mr. President, I congratulate your efforts to try to bring about health care re-

form. And I wonder if you're going to try that again. And do you think a single-payer system might make it?

**The President.** The answer is, I am going to try to health care reform again this year. Obviously, the American people made a judgment, or at least the Congress did, and I think the American people did—that this was such a big issue, they didn't want me or anybody else to try to put together a program that purported to solve it all at one time. So I think we'll have to go back and take it a piece at a time.

My own view is that this is something—you need to know about this, by the way—the entire problem with the Federal deficit in 1995, 1994, 1993, now since our budget has come in, is interest on the debt and health care costs. Everything else is going down. Last year we reduced spending on both defense and domestic spending overall for the first time in 25 years. The deficit's going up because of interest on the debt and health care costs. So we have an interest in doing that.

The second thing you need to know is that your country is the only advanced country in the world where there are a smaller percentage of working families with health insurance today than had it 10 years ago. That is not true in any other advanced country in the world. So we have to do it. We have to—we should do it by reforming the insurance system, helping people when they're unemployed not to lose their insurance, giving incentives to cover children, and helping families with disabled kids or with parents who want care other than nursing homes, and where that would be a cheaper, more affordable thing to do.

Let me give a little—go ahead in the back there. I'll take a couple more. Go ahead. Yes, go ahead. [Laughter] You're great. You know, when they're here, they all stand up if I point in the general direction. [Laughter]

### **Scholarship Grants**

**Q.** My name is Evan Koblentz from Kean College of New Jersey. Much progress has been made in your administration for financially-strapped or opportunity-privileged students to get grants and loans. What are you doing with the Republican Congress to get

more grants available for merit-based and academic-based scholarships?

**The President.** Well, let me say, first of all, I'm not—I don't believe that that should primarily be the subject for the Federal Government. Historically, it hasn't been. And I'll come back to that in a moment. Secondly, let me emphasize that the direct loan program is not very much income-limited. It's really available to quite a broad range of young people to participate in. And since there are at least four different options for repayment, the idea is that you don't lose the right to get a loan even if you're a middle class student. And if you decide to take a job that doesn't pay a high wage, you can afford to pay it back if you want to be someone who's more interested in public service early on than higher incomes.

Now, on the merit-based scholarships, let me just say what I meant by that. There are many States—Georgia is one—I know we have some journalists here from Georgia—Georgia has now passed a law that says that if you have a B average in Georgia and you go to school there, you get a tuition scholarship. And I think you get some money for books as well. When I was the Governor of my State, I instituted a Governor's scholarship program that was similar to that. These programs are sweeping the country, but they are basically the province of State government.

Let me further state that this is the second year in a row when the economy of all 50 States has grown. So they're in a—if they don't do it, they're in a better position to do it than they were a couple of years ago. And that's one I would direct you to the State legislatures for.

### **The Middle Class**

**Q.** Yes, all day we've been hearing—I'm sorry, Kelly McEvers, from the University of Illinois. All day we've been hearing about the growing disparity between those in the upper echelon of income and those in the lower—those at the low poverty level. However, especially after the election in November, the rhetoric that seemed to be coming through, at least in the mainstream media, was solely toward the middle class. I guess one example is the middle class bill of rights. It seems

to me that there's an attitude that we're becoming a classless society when, in fact, we're moving in opposite directions—

**The President.** We are—

**Q.** Is that because that's the class that goes to the polls?

**The President.** No. It's because—let me just say this. The argument of the Republicans in last November's election was the middle class should vote for us because all the Democrats do is take your taxes and spend it on poor people—right?—or minorities or illegal immigrants or criminals or whatever. That was the basic argument—right? Government's bad, vote for us, we'll give you less government, lower taxes, and we'll be harder on all those groups.

And the voters bought it—wrongly, I think—at least those who voted, because we had done more for the middle class. But you have to understand what middle class is. Middle class is more than an economic designation in America. It's a statement about values. When we say middle class in America what we really mean is, everybody ought to have the chance to be rewarded for their work. If you work hard, raise your kids, obey the law, you ought to have a chance to do better.

And what is happening is we are becoming more stratified by economic class, but it's different than before. In other words—and I guess—I'm really glad you asked this, because I'll try to clarify the point I was trying to make before. We do have poor people in America. Mostly they're young women and their little children, but there are also a lot of working people who are poor who are making the minimum wage or right near it, which is why I'm for raising the minimum wage. And then we have a lot of wealthy people in America, and our economy is producing more wealthy people, and that is good. Entrepreneurs—more entrepreneurs are becoming millionaires today than ever before, who started with nothing—not inherited wealth, but are making money. That is a good thing, not a bad thing.

But what is happening is that the middle class itself is splitting apart. That's the point I'm trying to make. The great American middle class, which basically rose more or less evenly with the poor and the rich in income

from the end of World War II to the late seventies—everybody rose together about the same amount—the American middle class itself is now splitting apart, based largely on education, age, and job description. And if you don't have the skills and you're not in the place—in the workplace, where you can hook into one of these groups that is growing, then you tend to work harder every year for lower wages. That's what I'm pointing out.

So what do we try to do? In the economic plan in '93, we had one big tax cut. We cut taxes for working families with children to make sure nobody who was working 40 hours a week with children would be below the poverty line. That's what the earned income tax credit was about. On average this year it's worth about \$1,000 in lower taxes to families of four with income of under \$26,000. Why do we do that? To reward work and family and lift people, keep trying to push people toward the middle class.

So this whole education thing—we know if our Government here can continue to follow responsible economic policies, we can create jobs, we can have growth. But we still—that will not raise incomes. And it won't overcome this inequality, this splitting apart of the middle class.

So that's what I'm saying. The middle class mentality, which has been—what made America great, requires us to follow policies that lift everybody's income.

I will close with just one thing. I had an interview with Money Magazine the other day. Do you all know Money Magazine? It's a—and they did a readers' survey, they told me. And they said—I guess I'm jumping my interview. They'll probably be mad at me, but—[laughter]. They said—they said that their readers said that they recognize that we have lowered the deficit, created jobs, sparked an economic recovery, and two-thirds of them were still worried about their future. Right? Yes, you lowered the deficit, created jobs, there's an economic recovery. Am I worried? You bet I am. Why? Because of all this churning instability in the global economy.

That is our challenge. We've got to find a way to keep the entrepreneurship, keep the growth going, but lift the middle class folks

that are good people that have been left behind.

That's why I'm glad to see some of the nontraditional students in the community college. That means that they're going to make the transfer from the middle class that might be left behind to the middle class that's surging ahead. And we need more of that, which is why we don't need to be in a position of reducing our commitment to education at the end of this century when the next century will trigger opportunity to education more than ever before.

Thank you very much. I have to go. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:05 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

### **Statement on Action in the House of Representatives on Welfare Reform**

*March 23, 1995*

I want to applaud Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives for approving an amendment this afternoon to require States to deny drivers and professional licenses to deadbeat parents who refuse to pay child support. This tough provision was a central part of the welfare reform plan my administration introduced last year and sends a clear signal: No parent in America has a right to walk away from the responsibility to raise their children.

I congratulate the sponsor of the amendment, Representative Marge Roukema (R-NJ), as well as Representative Barbara Kennelly (D-CT) and other Members who have worked across party lines to make tough child support enforcement a central part of welfare reform. With this amendment, the House welfare reform legislation now includes every major child support pillar of our welfare reform plan, which offered the toughest possible child support enforcement measures ever put forward.

These actions on child support enforcement prove that welfare reform can and must be a bipartisan issue. Unfortunately, the House Republican bill still does not offer the kind of real welfare reform that Americans in both parties expect. Welfare reform must

be tough on work and tough on deadbeat parents, not tough on children.

I look forward to working with Republicans and Democrats in both Houses of Congress to enact real reform that makes work and responsibility a way of life.

### **Statement on Action in the Senate on the Line-Item Veto**

*March 23, 1995*

The Senate tonight has taken another step toward passing strong line-item veto legislation. I hope the House and Senate will now get together quickly to resolve their differences and pass the strongest possible bill.

The sooner such a bill reaches my desk, the sooner I can take further steps to cut the deficit.

### **Proclamation 6779—Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy, 1995**

*March 23, 1995*

*By the President of the United States of America*

#### **A Proclamation**

Two thousand five hundred years ago in Athens, across the Peninsula of Attica and throughout Greece, the idea of democracy was embodied in a series of rights and laws. The resulting freedom for the citizens of that land sparked a period of unprecedented activity in philosophy and the arts. The birth of democracy in Greece signaled the beginning of a lasting cultural transformation clearly reflected in the course of Western civilization.

The United States is proud to acknowledge the debt it owes to the ancient Greeks, whose philosophy and political system guided America's founders in forming a representative democracy on this continent. Yet the common bond that unites our modern nations goes beyond our commitment to the principles of democracy; beyond, too, the close friendship that we share. Through the years, our citizens have demonstrated a willingness to fight for the right to self-deter-

mination and for the cause of human dignity. The Greek struggle for independence 174 years ago won the hearts of Americans and all those who love freedom. As we mark the anniversary of that momentous occasion, Americans and Greeks join again in celebration.

Our countries now stand at the dawn of a new era—a time of growing hope and expanding opportunity. Nations across Central Europe are striving to turn from ancient rivalries and to embrace the possibility of democratic, market-oriented change. The Greek dedication to independence can provide both an important example and a helping hand for its neighbors, and Greece's recent efforts to strengthen these ties can serve to foster stability and prosperity throughout the region. Today, as ever, the United States supports Greece in its call for fellowship and peace. We stand together in affirming that the blessings of democracy will long survive and flourish.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim March 25, 1995, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy." I call upon all Americans to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-third day of March, 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, 5:05 p.m., March 23, 1995]

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

**Proclamation 6780—To Implement Certain Provisions of the Trade Agreements Resulting From the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, and for Other Purposes**

*March 23, 1995*

*By the President of the United States of America*

**A Proclamation**

1. On April 15, 1994, I entered into trade agreements resulting from the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations ("the Uruguay Round Agreements"). In section 101(a) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("the URAA") (Public Law 103-465; 108 Stat. 4814) (19 U.S.C. 3511(a)), the Congress approved the Uruguay Round Trade Agreements listed in section 101(d) of that Act.

2. Pursuant to section 101(b) of the URAA, I decided to accept the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization ("the WTO Agreement") on behalf of the United States, and I determined that the WTO Agreement entered into force for the United States on January 1, 1995.

3. (a) Sections 1102 (a) and (e) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, as amended ("the 1988 Act") (19 U.S.C. 2902 (a) and (e)), authorize the President to proclaim such modification or continuance of any existing duty, such continuance of existing duty-free or excise treatment, or such additional duties, as he determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any trade agreement entered into under these sections.

(b) Section 111(a) of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3521(a)) authorizes the President to proclaim such other modification of any duty, such other staged rate reduction, or such other additional duties beyond those authorized by section 1102 of the 1988 Act (19 U.S.C. 2902) as the President determines to be necessary or appropriate to carry out Schedule XX—United States of America, annexed to

the Marrakesh Protocol to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 ("Schedule XX").

(c) Section 103(a) of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3513(a)) authorizes the President to proclaim such actions as may be necessary to ensure that any provision or amendment made by the URAA that takes effect on the date that any of the Uruguay Round Agreements enters into force with respect to the United States is appropriately implemented on such date.

4. Proclamation 6763 of December 23, 1994, implemented the Uruguay Round Agreements, including Schedule XX, with respect to the United States; and incorporated in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("the HTS") tariff modifications necessary and appropriate to carry out the Uruguay Round Agreements and certain conforming changes in rules of origin for the North American Free Trade Agreement ("NAFTA"). Certain technical errors, including inadvertent omissions, were made in that proclamation. I have determined that it is necessary, to reflect accurately the intended tariff treatment provided for in the Uruguay Round Agreements and to ensure the continuation of the agreed NAFTA rules of origin, to modify certain provisions of the HTS, as set forth in the Annex to this proclamation.

5. (a) One of the Uruguay Round Agreements approved by the Congress in sections 101(a) and 101(d) of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3511(a) and (d)) is the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights ("the TRIPs Agreement").

(b) Section 104A of title 17, United States Code, as amended by section 514 of the URAA, provides for copyright protection in restored works. Section 104A(h), as amended, provides that the date of restoration of a restored copyright shall be the date on which the TRIPs Agreement enters into force with respect to the United States, if the source country is a nation adhering to the Berne Convention or a World Trade Organization (WTO) member on such date.

(c) Article 65, paragraph 1, of the TRIPs Agreement provides that no WTO member shall be obliged to apply the provisions of this Agreement until one year after the date of entry into force of the WTO Agreement.

The date of entry into force of the WTO Agreement with respect to the United States was January 1, 1995.

(d) The statement of administrative action, approved by the Congress in section 101(a)(2) of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3511(a)(2)), provides that, "in general, copyright will be restored on the date when the TRIPs Agreement's obligations take effect for the United States."

(e) Accordingly, I have decided that it is necessary and appropriate, in order to implement the TRIPs Agreement and to ensure that section 514 of the URAA is appropriately implemented, to proclaim that the date on which the obligations of the TRIPs Agreement will take effect for the United States is January 1, 1996.

6. (a) Section 902(a)(2) of title 17, United States Code, authorizes the President to extend protection under chapter 9 of title 17, United States Code, to mask works of owners who are nationals, domiciliaries, or sovereign authorities of, and to mask works, which are first commercially exploited in, a foreign nation that grants United States mask work owners substantially the same protection that it grants its own nationals and domiciliaries, or that grants protection to such works on substantially the same basis as does chapter 9 of title 17, United States Code.

(b) Australia, Canada, Japan, Switzerland, and the Member States of the European Community provide adequate and effective protection for mask works within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. 902(a)(2), and have been subject to interim protection under 17 U.S.C. 914. Consequently, I find that these countries satisfy the requirements of 17 U.S.C. 902(a)(2), and are to be extended full protection under chapter 9 of title 17, United States Code, effective on July 1, 1995.

(c) In addition, 17 U.S.C. 902(a)(1)(A)(ii) provides that mask work owners who are nationals, domiciliaries, or sovereign authorities of a foreign nation that is a party to a treaty affording protection to mask works to which the United States is also a party are eligible for protection under chapter 9 of title 17, United States Code. The TRIPs Agreement, which requires all WTO members to provide protection equivalent to that provided under chapter 9 of title 17 on the basis of national

treatment, is such an agreement. Because the United States is a member of the WTO and thus of the TRIPs Agreement, and because the TRIPs Agreement will be effective for the United States on January 1, 1996, all other WTO members will become eligible for full protection under chapter 9 of title 17, United States Code, on January 1, 1996.

7. Section 491 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979, as amended ("the 1979 Act") (19 U.S.C. 2578), requires the President to designate an agency to be responsible for informing the public of the sanitary and phytosanitary standard-setting activities of each international standard-setting organization. I have decided to designate the Department of Agriculture as the agency responsible for providing the public with this information.

8. (a) The March 24, 1994, Memorandum of Understanding on the Results of the Uruguay Round Market Access Negotiations on Agriculture Between the United States of America and Argentina ("the MOU"), submitted to the Congress along with the Uruguay Round Agreements, provides for "an appropriate certificate of origin" for imports of peanuts and peanut butter and peanut paste from Argentina.

(b) Proclamation 6763 proclaimed the Schedule XX tariff rate quotas for peanuts and peanut butter and peanut paste. However, that proclamation did not specify which agency should implement the MOU.

(c) Section 404 of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3601) requires the President to take such action as may be necessary to ensure that imports of agricultural products do not disrupt the orderly marketing of commodities in the United States.

(d) Accordingly, I have decided to delegate to the United States Trade Representative ("the USTR") my authority under section 404 of the URAA to implement the MOU, through such regulations as the USTR, or, at the direction of the USTR, other appropriate agencies, may issue.

9. Section 604 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2483) ("the 1974 Act"), authorizes the President to embody in the HTS the substance of the relevant provisions of that Act, of other Acts affecting import treatment, and actions thereunder, in-

cluding the removal, modification, continuance, or imposition of any rate of duty or other import restriction.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including but not limited to section 301 of title 3, United States Code, section 902(a) (1) and (2) of title 17, United States Code, section 604 of the 1974 Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2483), section 491 of the 1979 Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2578), section 1102 of the 1988 Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2902), title I of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3511-3551), and section 404 of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3601), do hereby proclaim that:

(1) To more completely implement the tariff treatment accorded under the Uruguay Round Agreements, the HTS is modified as set forth in the Annex to this proclamation.

(2) The obligations of the TRIPs Agreement shall enter into force for the United States on January 1, 1996.

(3) Australia, Canada, Japan, Switzerland, and the Member States of the European Community shall be extended full protection under chapter 9 of title 17, United States Code, effective on July 1, 1995. In addition, as of January 1, 1996, full protection under chapter 9 of title 17, United States Code, shall be extended to all WTO Members.

(4) The Secretary of Agriculture is designated, under section 491 of the 1979 Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2578), as the official responsible for informing the public of the sanitary and phytosanitary standard-setting activities of each international standard-setting organization.

(5) The USTR is authorized to exercise my authority under section 404 of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3601) to implement the MOU with Argentina, through such regulations as the USTR, or, at the direction of the USTR, other appropriate agencies, may issue.

(6) In order to make conforming changes and technical corrections to certain HTS provisions, pursuant to actions taken in Proclamation 6763, the HTS and Proclamation 6763 are modified as set forth in the Annex to this proclamation.

(7) All provisions of previous proclamations and Executive orders that are inconsis-

ent with the actions taken in this proclamation are superseded to the extent of such inconsistency.

(8) This proclamation shall be effective upon publication in the *Federal Register*.

**In Witness Whereof**, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-third day of March, 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, 11:03 a.m., March 24, 1995]

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

**Proclamation 6778—To Amend the Generalized System of Preferences March 17, 1995**

*By the President of the United States of America*

**A Proclamation**

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

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

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

(1) General note 4(a) to the HTS, listing those nonindependent territories whose products are eligible for benefits of the GSP, is modified by inserting “West Bank and

Gaza Strip” in alphabetical order in the enumeration of nonindependent territories.

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

(3) The extension of the Generalized System of Preferences program to the West Bank and Gaza Strip pursuant to this proclamation applies only to goods produced in the areas for which arrangements are being established for Palestinian Interim Self-Government, as set forth in Articles I, III, and IV of the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements.

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

**In Witness Whereof**, I have hereunto set my hand this seventeenth day of March, 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, 4:40 p.m., March 21, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 24, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on March 23.

**Message to the Congress on Trade With the West Bank and the Gaza Strip**

*March 17, 1995*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am writing to inform you of my intent to designate the West Bank and Gaza Strip as a beneficiary of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program, which offers duty-free access to the U.S. market, was originally authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

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

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

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
March 17, 1995.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 24.

**Statement on Action in the House of Representatives on Welfare Reform**  
*March 24, 1995*

At a time when so many Americans without regard to party agree on the need for welfare reform, it's a shame the House of Representatives could not produce a real welfare reform plan that would promote work and responsibility and attract broad bipartisan support. I am disappointed that instead of joining in a real, bipartisan effort to move people from welfare to work, a narrow partisan Republican majority passed a bill that is weak on work and tough on children.

I am determined to work with Republicans and Democrats in Congress to produce the kind of welfare reform Americans, regardless of party affiliation, want and expect. To end welfare as we know it, we must be tough on work and tough on deadbeat parents not tough on children.

I commend the House of Representatives on one part of the bill that enjoyed true bipartisan support—tough measures on child support enforcement, including refusing drivers' and professional licenses to deadbeat parents who refuse to pay child support. The House passed every major child support element of our welfare reform plan, which will enable us to mount the toughest child support enforcement crackdown in history. It is time to demand responsibility from parents who bring children into the world, not let

them off the hook and expect taxpayers to pick up the tab for their neglect.

Welfare reform can and must be a bipartisan issue. I look forward to working with Republicans and Democrats in the Senate to pass real welfare reform that will make work and responsibility the law of the land.

---

**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.

---

**March 19**

In the morning, the President had a telephone conversation with Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom.

**March 20**

In an afternoon ceremony in the Oval Office, the President received diplomatic credentials from the following Ambassadors: Abdulla Bin Mohamed Al-Dhahab of Oman; Jorge G. Prieto of Paraguay; Franklin Sonn of South Africa; Mahamat Saleh Ahmat of Chad; Jayantha C. B Dhanapala of Sri Lanka; Kun Woo Park of South Korea; Courtney N.M. Blackman of Barbados; Corentino Virgillio Santos of Cape Verde; Severin Ntahomvukiye of Burundi; Jesus Silva Herzog of the United Mexican States; Hadj Osmane Bencherif of Algeria; Willie Chokani of Malawi; Basudev Prasad Dhungana of Nepal.

The President announced that he will lead a National Rural Conference on the future of America's rural communities on April 25 in Ames, Iowa.

The President announced his intention to nominate Jerome A. Stricker to be a member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board.

The White House announced the President will visit Russia and Ukraine on May 9–11 to attend ceremonies marking the 50th anniversary of V-E Day and for bilateral discussions with President Boris Yeltsin of Rus-

sia and President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine.

The White House announced the President has invited Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom to make an official working visit to Washington, DC, on April 3–4.

**March 21**

The President announced his intention to appoint Peter Chase Neumann as a member of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

The President announced his intention to appoint Joseph T. Gorman and Richard Notebaert to be members of the President's Export Council.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to be members of the National Selective Service Appeals Board:

- Betsy Levine;
- Leo M. Romero;
- James Roosevelt, Jr.;
- Jan Craig Scruggs;
- Barbara W. White.

**March 22**

The President announced his intention to appoint Anne-Lee Verville to the National Skill Standards Board.

The President announced his intention to appoint Kitty Dukakis to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

The President announced the appointment of Secretary of Defense William J. Perry as the Chairman of the 1995 Inter-agency Savings Bonds Committee.

The White House announced the President has made available \$57.8 million in emergency funding to provide assistance to Georgia and Florida in recovering from the damage caused by Tropical Storm Alberto and subsequent flooding.

**March 23**

The White House announced the appointment of William C. Danvers as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Legislative Affairs at the National Security Council.

The President announced his intention to appoint Walter Parker as the academic representative to the Arctic Research Commission.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to be members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

- Patricia Staunton Etchart;
- Meghan Zanolli Holbrook;
- John P. Manning;
- Cherri D. Roden;
- Ann M. DeLaney;
- Kandy Stroud.

**March 24**

In the morning, the President went to the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, MD, where he underwent a routine physical examination.

The President announced his intention to appoint Jimmie Lou Fisher to be a public member of the Rural Telephone Bank Board.

---

**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 March 23**

Mary S. Furlong,  
of California, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 1999, vice Daniel W. Casey, term expired.

Jeffrey M. Lang,  
of Maryland, to be Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, vice Rufus Hawkins Yerxa, resigned.

Jerome A. Stricker,  
of Kentucky, to be a member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 1998, vice Shirley Chilton-O'Dell, term expired.

Carlos F. Lucero,  
of Colorado, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, a new position.

Wenona Y. Whitfield, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, vice William L. Beatty, retired.

---

### **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 March 19**

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's telephone conversation with Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom

#### **Released March 20**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the terrorist attack near Hebron

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the visit of United Kingdom Prime Minister John Major

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's visit to Russia and Ukraine

#### **Released March 21**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry, Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, Council of Economic Advisers Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson on tax cut legislation

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's letter to congressional leaders on welfare reform

#### **Released March 22**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing emergency assistance to Georgia

#### *Administration of William J. Clinton, 1995*

and Florida for damage caused by Tropical Storm Alberto

#### **Released March 23**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Council of Economic Advisers Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson and Deputy Assistant to the President John Emerson on the Southern Economic Conference

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's three commencement addresses

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of a Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Legislative Affairs at the National Security Council

Announcement of the nomination for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit and U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois

#### **Released March 24**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta and Director of the Office of Management and Budget Alice Rivlin on welfare reform legislation

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's annual physical examination

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on Senate unanimous ratification of the Convention on Chemical Weapons

---

### **Acts Approved by the President**

---

#### **Approved March 22**

S. 1 / Public Law 104-4  
Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

***Approved March 23***

S. 377 / Public Law 104-5  
To amend a provision of part A of title IX  
of the Elementary and Secondary Education

Act of 1965, relating to Indian education, to  
provide a technical amendment, and for  
other purposes